

Letter "D"

Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund

P.O. Box 151439 San Rafael, CA 94915 415-331-1982

July 3, 2017  
By E-Mail to:  
2017ctp@ccta.net

Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek CA 94597

Re: DEIR for the 2017 Update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (SCH# 2017022054)

Dear Mr. Beck:

The Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund, TRANSDEF, is an environmental nonprofit focused on reducing the impact of transportation on the climate. We submit these comments on CCTA's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2017 Update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). All page citations are to the DEIR, unless otherwise noted. We hereby incorporate our 3/12/2017 scoping comment letter by reference, as well as our colleague Peter Lydon's recent suggestions on facilitating EV charging installations.

We commented extensively on the 2014 draft CTP and DSEIR. As a result, we were appointed to the 2016 Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee, and actively participated, along with our environmental colleagues in presenting a view notably different from that of staff. TRANSDEF wrote the Voter Guide ballot arguments opposing CCTA's 2016 Measure X. We asserted the tax plan would make traffic to get worse, for reasons that will be discussed herein.

The 2014 and 2017 CTPs are similar in their fundamental approaches. While the 2017 DEIR is not "the most legally inadequate CEQA document TRANSDEF has ever seen" (2014 TRANSDEF DSEIR Comment letter), it is still nevertheless legally inadequate. It appears that CCTA has learned little from losing an election and producing an uncertifiable EIR. The agency badly needs a new strategic approach to its mission.

Introduction

The draft CTP is a great missed opportunity. Instead of looking the county's severe transportation problems squarely in the face, CCTA blinked. This CTP, overdue after the failure of Measure X, is an extended exercise in indecisive dithering about the traffic congestion that is choking mobility in the county. At the same time, the CTP offers only grudging lip service to state and regional requirements to reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Boiled down, Contra Costa's transportation problem is too many cars generating too many greenhouse gas emissions, and a population that will grow substantially from 2015 to 2040. The solution for the excessive growth in VMT needs to be a combined transportation and land use transition: A greater share of the public needs to live close enough to transit stops to be able to walk to them, and use transit a great deal more.

Rather than attacking the real problems, this CTP seems aimed at protecting a status quo that is satisfactory to no one. The CTP is all the more disappointing because even though current conditions are dire, this is a moment of extreme volatility, openness and potential promise in transportation planning for this part of the Bay Area.

Broad public preferences (and property values) are turning toward greater density, walkability and transit orientation. They are turning away from the traditional auto-dependent style of sprawl growth that has resulted in Contra Costa's increasing traffic congestion and higher GHG emissions. The CTP, contrarily, caters to high VMT and CO<sub>2</sub> pollution growth by its eagerness to support fresh growth in the sprawling eastern part of the county, now rebounding from the 2008-09 economic crash. Renewed sprawl there can only raise VMT and hours of delay, in the east and countywide.

D-1

The emergence of Uber, Lyft, and other forms of shared use may challenge the institution of privately owned cars. They will also turn the issue of parking upside down, and may well sharply bring down the basic cost of personal transportation.

Sponsorship of the GoMentum Station test track is a credit to the agency, given the potential of huge transformations that could change everything, well within the twenty-five-year planning period. These certainly include the arrival of electric vehicles and the advent of self-driving cars, trucks and buses.

While CCTA and the CTP/DEIR cannot be expected to make definitive plans in such a difficult and fluid situation, its planning documents should at least better describe the challenges and also the opportunities for improvement in the coming period.

#### Untimeliness of the CTP and DEIR

MTC's Guidelines for Countywide Transportation Plans, 2014, states:

CTPs serve as significant input to Plan Bay Area... (p. 2.)

The timeline for the 2014 CTP would have placed it in position to serve as CCTA's input into the 2017 RTP. However, its certification was postponed, and the plan was ultimately abandoned. As a result, CCTA was unable to submit a current CTP to MTC. Having thus missed the boat, the 2017 CTP and DEIR are improperly using obsolete data. The DEIR should have been based on the Plan Bay Area 2017 DEIR, so that it can be appropriate input for the 2021 Plan Bay Area:

D-2

MTC recommends that CTPs should evaluate transportation system performance using the most recent Plan Bay Area [RTP/SCS] **demographic and land use projections**. (*Id.*, p. 6, emphasis added.)

In order to promote the iterative relationship between CTPs and the RTP/SCS, MTC recommends that CTPs be regularly updated and adopted within 18-24 months (before or after) of adoption of the RTP/SCS. (*Id.*, p. 8.)

The law [Gov. Code § 66531] also states that CTPs should consider the latest RTP/SCS... (*Id.*, p. 2.)

The DEIR is non-compliant with these recommendations and mandates, choosing instead to base its analysis on the 2013 Plan Bay Area and not on the current one. (Note its citations are to the 2013 RTP DEIR, not the FEIR.) In addition, the DEIR should have used the 2017 Clean Air Plan and 2015 Regional GHG Inventory:

... MTC recommends that CTP outreach and regional coordination should: ... Consult the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Clean Air Plan and its respective Transportation Control Measures (TCMs). (*Id.*, p. 3.)

D-3

The information starting on p. 2.2-4, laying out the 2007 BAAQMD Source Inventory, needs to be replaced with current information from the 2015 GHG Emissions Inventory, as reported in the 2017 Clean Air Plan.<sup>1</sup> The materials starting on p. 2.2-6 laying out the Plan Bay Area EIR needs to be revised with current demographic, land use and travel model projections from the 2017 RTP/SCS DEIR. The Regulatory Setting needs to be updated with recent legislation, including SB 32. After also updating the impact analyses, the DEIR needs to be recirculated.

D-4

CTP and the Plan Bay Area Performance Targets

The CTP should be evaluated according to the Plan Bay Area Performance Targets, set forth in MTC Countywide Plan Guidelines Appendix B. As the region's adopted environmental goals, they are relevant metrics for evaluation under CEQA. Decision-makers and the public need to know how the CTP did on the key measures of any transportation plan:

D-5

Increase non-auto mode share by 10% and reduce auto-mobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10%. (*Id.*, p. 11.)

Flawed GHG Emissions Analysis

The EIR for the 2013 Plan Bay Area was challenged because of its flawed analysis of regional GHG emissions. That same flaw is replicated in the CTP DEIR. The following statement about state legislation can be seen to be blatantly false, given the context discussed below:

D-6

<sup>1</sup> Inexplicably, the DEIR cites the 2017 Clean Air Plan and updated GHG inventory, but does not replace the data on pp. 2.2-4 & 5 with their up-to-date data. (p. 2.2-8, fn 11.)

However, **consistent with State legislation**, the *Plan Bay Area EIR* projections incorporate implementation of Pavley and LCFS regulations over the life of *Plan Bay Area*. (p. 2.2-7, emphasis added in bold.)

TRANSDEF asserts that Impact Analyses GHG-2 (p. 2.2-21), GHG-4 (p. 2.2-24), and GHG-5 (p. 2.2-27) fail to comply with the legislative intent of SB 375, as expressed in these legislative findings:

...greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks can be substantially reduced by new vehicle technology and by the increased use of low carbon fuel. However, even taking these measures into account, it will be necessary to achieve **significant additional** greenhouse gas reductions from changed land use patterns and improved transportation. Without improved land use and transportation policy, California will not be able to achieve the goals of AB 32. (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008, Section 1(c) and (i), emphasis added.)

It is clear from the findings that the SCS is intended to achieve emissions reductions above and beyond the state-level measures. When the Advanced Clean Cars/Pavley and LCFS are ignored--as they must be--Table 2.2-8 (p. 2.2-22) shows a 24% increase in GHG emissions, not a 34% reduction. The following statement is flatly incorrect:

Because **implementation of the 2017 CTP** would contribute to a decrease in overall GHG emissions (from baseline condition to 2040), impacts are considered less than significant. (p. 2.2-21, emphasis added.)

This statement explicitly asserts that state-level emissions reductions are the result of the CTP. However, State-level measures are **not** part of the implementation of the CTP. They are being implemented by state-level agencies, not CCTA, and are not part of the Project Description. They are also not part of the existing conditions baseline. These state-level measures cannot be counted in evaluating local emissions, making this statement false. Please revise and recognize GHG-2 as potentially significant prior to mitigation, because the implementation of the 2017 CTP will increase direct transport-related GHG emissions by 24%.

D-7

Because a 24% increase in emissions directly impedes the attainment of goals set forth in the Executive Orders, as well as the goals of SB 32 (inexcusably missing from the DEIR's Regulatory Setting), Impact GHG-4 must be revised to be potentially significant, prior to mitigation.

D-8

Because a 24% increase in emissions directly conflicts with the explicit language of SB 375 calling for local GHG **reductions**, Impact GHG-5 must be revised to be potentially significant, prior to mitigation.

#### CCTA's Hail Mary Strategy

Towards the end of the EPAC process, TRANSDEF sent a letter to the Board (attached) urging it to suspend the emerging tax plan because of its failure to reduce GHG emissions. The DEIR describes the very same scenario that the letter had objected to:

Additional reductions could be achieved with a 15 percent reduction in CO2 per capita by 2050, and a 58 percent zero emissions fleet penetration. Through accelerated deployment of clean vehicles with CTP, the advanced GHG reductions trajectory, shown as the lower line on the graph, could be achieved. It is reasonable to determine that the downward trajectories shown in Figure 2.2-1 represent a reasonable expectation that Contra Costa (like the rest of the Bay Area) is more likely than not to achieve the Executive Orders' goals. (p. 2.2-25 and Figure 2.1-1, p. 26.)

D-9

CCTA learned nothing from its public involvement process. Worse yet, these "additional reductions" are provided solely to paper over the lack of compliance. They have no merit whatsoever. The DEIR showed in Table 2.2-7 (p. 2.2-20) that the CTP is unable to demonstrate **any** emissions reduction per capita. TRANSDEF was unable to identify any funding in Table 1.2-2 (p. 1.2-30) committed to achieving "a 58 percent zero emissions fleet penetration" much less a program that could conceivably achieve such an extraordinary goal. In short, the page 2.2-25 statement cited above has the same evidentiary value as the phrase "If pigs had wings, they could fly."

As we stated in our 2016 TEP letter, it would be far better to plan to achieve per capita GHG emissions reductions now and not kick the can down the road until 2040, relying on a hoped-for technological miracle.

#### Sea Level Rise

The purpose of a transportation plan is to optimize future transportation facilities. It is preposterous to propose to adopt a CTP that knowingly builds projects in locations subject to inundation. These problem projects cannot be mitigated at the project level. That kind of planning is the very purpose of program EIRs. The impacts must be avoided through a competent and comprehensive CTP planning process. That obviously has not occurred here. Note--the proposed Martinez and Hercules Ferry Terminals, as well as the Union Pacific rail line serving them, will also be inundated.

D-10

#### Transportation Analysis

The DEIR offered none of the transit service information needed to evaluate Contra Costa's Priority Development Area implementation:

D-11

PDAs are locations served by frequent transit during commute times and designated as PDAs by local jurisdictions. (p. 1.2-13.)

The DEIR must be revised to make it possible to determine which, if any, of the PDAs meets the standard for frequent transit service under the proposed Transportation Investment Program. Because PDAs are critical to the success of the region's land use strategy, and because frequent transit service is critical to the success of PDAs, the DEIR must evaluate whether adequate resources have been made available to transit.

This analysis is needed for the Alternatives as well. Based on the poor transit ridership increases over baseline for each of the Alternatives, TRANSDEF suspects that planned service levels are grossly inadequate.

D-12

Flawed Mitigation Analyses

Besides citing the wrong sub-section of the CEQA Guidelines (it should be 10591(a)(2)), the DEIR ignores CCTA's power to withhold funding as leverage to induce cooperation:

Furthermore, it is ultimately the responsibility of implementing agencies and individual project sponsors to determine and adopt mitigation. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)[3], CCTA believes that these mitigation measures can and should be adopted ... However, CCTA cannot require implementing agencies and individual project sponsors to adopt the above mitigation measures. (p. 2.2-24, 2.2-34, 3.1-87, and 3.1-91.)

D-13

While CCTA cannot require adoption of mitigation measures by grantee agencies, the identified impacts can be avoided if CCTA withholds funding to agencies unwilling to adopt the full list of mitigations, as very few projects will be able to proceed without CCTA funding.

Flawed Alternative Definitions

It is apparent from Table 3.1-37 (3.1-87) that Alternative 4, Emphasis on Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs, was designed to fail. For an alternative with allegedly no highway investment, the mere 1% shift in Drive-Alone mode share is shocking. The tiny increase in transit ridership over the CTP (~4,000) in Table 3.1-38 (p. 3.1-88) demonstrates extreme ineffectiveness in converting significant funding into new transit riders. The following reasons for this poor performance must be corrected in a revised analysis:

D-14

1. The Alternatives Analysis is heavily biased towards the status quo. The placement of Committed Projects from the 2013 RTP into each alternative prevents a fair comparison from being made between alternative strategies. Because any strategy is operating only on the margins of the multibillion dollar transportation network, the dollar weight of the Freeway and Roadway Projects of the Committed Projects overwhelms any attempt to

D-15

implement a strategy different from the status quo. The funding for all Committed Projects that have not yet entered into construction contracts must be applied to the strategy being tested by the Alternative. The Percent of Total column in Table 3.1-1 (p. 3.1-6) must be revised to indicate the percentage of total funding (including 2013 RTP funds) going to each element of the Alternative.

2. Alternative 4 is a hybrid strategy, promoting both equity and GHG reduction. As a result of its divided loyalties, Alternative 4 achieves little for either strategy. The DEIR needs at least one Alternative designed to optimally avoid or mitigate the potentially significant GHG emissions impacts discussed above. Alternative 4 puts lots of funding into youth, senior and paratransit services, which do little for GHG. These strategies/ programs should be set forth in a separate Alternative for evaluation purposes. Decision-makers can mix elements from among the various Alternatives into their final adopted CTP.

D-16

3. Table 3.1-1 (p. 3.1-6) shows that Alternative 4 is burdened with delivering \$1,680 million to local street maintenance, while the CTP gives only \$473 million. This is not a fair comparison. While it may be justifiable for Alternative 4 to fund substantially more for Transportation for Livable Communities than the CTP (that depends on the program eligibility criteria), the modeling suggests that the model is unable to recognize any mode shift or transit ridership benefit from this investment. Finally, it is unfair that Alternative 4 was made to pay \$480 million for Integrated Corridor Management, when the CTP pays only \$49 million, especially since this program has been left mostly unimplemented for years and has demonstrated little worth so far.

D-17

Flawed Alternatives Analysis

Several statements in the Alternative 4 Analysis are either completely incorrect--or demonstrate that the Project objectives are improperly biased towards the status quo:

Alternative 4 would *meet to a lesser degree* the objective to maintain the transportation system (Goal 4). This alternative would provide less support to maintain the transportation system. (p. 3.1-84, emphasis in original.)

D-18

It is unclear precisely how the word "maintain" is being used here. If it is meant merely as a surrogate for maintenance funding, arguably Alternative 4 does **more** to maintain the system. (See #3 above.) No evidence or analysis is presented to support these conclusions. It is inherent in an alternative with a strikingly different strategy that the dominance of the status quo is not being supported as much. It is unclear if that is the intended meaning, but if it is, that means this Alternative is properly fulfilling its role.

D-19

Alternative 4 would *meet to a lesser degree* the objective to continue to invest wisely to maximize the benefits of available funding (Goal 5). (*Id.*, emphasis in original.)

This conclusion ignores the sea change underway in transportation policy, in which the funding availabilities of today promote projects that **impede** the State's climate policies. New funding is becoming available for projects and programs contained in Alternative 4.

This alternative would not provide the opportunities for public/private partnerships that the Project would provide nor the extent of opportunities for leveraging given the types of projects that would be funded. (*Id.*)

D-20

There is no evidence or analysis to support these conclusions. They appear to be an unsubtle reiteration that Alternative 4 is not the status quo, which is precisely the point of an Alternatives analysis.

The analyses of Vehicle Hours of Delay and Average Speeds, p. 3.1-86, fail to recognize that numeric differences in these statistics may not be significant in terms of on-the-ground experience. The DEIR has not established that 200% worse delays are actually experienced any differently than 166% worse delays. Put another way, when delays are that bad, it's not at all clear that somewhat worse is even noticeable. Similarly, when delays are already that bad, it has not been established that a 1.8 mph difference in average speeds is even observable.

D-21

As a result of the flaws in the Alternative definition discussed above, Table 3.1-37 (p. 3.1-87) depicts a truly worthless Alternative 4. Unless the travel model was also flawed, the Alternative's failure to generate a significant mode shift indicates that the new transit service must not have been convenient enough to attract a significant ridership. It is hard to imagine getting worse results from putting this much money into transit. An effective GHG Emissions Reduction Alternative would focus transit service where it can be frequent enough and fast enough to attract choice riders. The other part of an effective Alternative is getting future land use right, so that trips generated by new residents and new employees are primarily served by transit and active modes, rather than solo driving. See the Mitigation section, below.

D-22

D-23

Note the critical absence of "**non-**":

The potential for impact related to mode shares for transit, HOV, or other non-SOV modes under Alternative 4 is considered less than significant, and would achieve greater mode share split for **single-occupant vehicles** than the Project. (p. 3.1-88, emphasis added.)

D-24

As discussed in the Flawed GHG Emissions Analysis section, the following is false:

Since overall transportation-related GHG emissions are expected to decline from the baseline condition to 2040 under Alternative 4, the impact would be less than significant. (p. 3.1-89.)

D-25

On the contrary, GHG emissions increase by 23%, and must be feasibly mitigated. The following assertion is doubly incorrect, for the same reason:

Emissions are expected to continue on a downward trajectory beyond the 2040 horizon year under Alternative 4. This assessment does not include Pavley or LCFS reductions, which are expected to contribute to greater vehicle emission reductions by 2050. (p. 3.1-91.)

The 23% GHG emissions increase represents a trend that makes the following statements clearly incorrect. It is hard to imagine a scenario in which increases of that magnitude do **not** impede achievement of the Executive Orders' GHG reduction goals, or the intent of laws like SB 375 and SB 32.

The downward trajectory represents a reasonable expectation that Contra Costa (like the rest of the Bay Area) is more likely than not to achieve the Executive Orders' goals, and that, similar to the Project, Alternative 4 is not likely to impede achievement of the GHG reduction goals of these Executive Orders. The impact would be less than significant. (*Id.*)

Alternative 4 is not expected to conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted with the intent to reduce GHG emissions. Specifically, Alternative 4 would not conflict with the GHG reduction goals of SB 375, AB 32, or Executive Order S-3-05 and Executive Order B-16-2012. (*Id.*)

### Feasible Mitigation

During the EPAC process and the Measure X campaign, TRANSDEF identified the location of future development as crucial to the future of transportation in Contra Costa County. The significant and unavoidable increases in roadway delays and GHG emissions are the direct result of the continuation of the current dispersed pattern of suburban development. The fact that 2040 Project mode share is nearly identical to the 2013 mode share indicates that new residents are projected to overwhelmingly adopt the solo driving lifestyle of current residents. That would not occur if new residents had access to convenient, fast and frequent transit, as a result of living in well-designed and well-funded Priority Development Areas (PDAs). This is a failure of planning.

D-26

TRANSDEF, working with its environmental allies in Sonoma County, put forward a proposal (attached) to turn that county's upcoming transportation sales tax into the catalyst for changing where development will take place. If successfully implemented, it would restrain the growth of VMT and roadway delays by shutting down future development in areas accessible only by automobile. The proposal would provide sales tax proceeds for local jurisdictions' road maintenance, but only for those jurisdictions willing to participate in a countywide Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

D-27

The TDR program would convert buildable but unbuilt lots located away from frequent transit into unbuildable lots. Property owners would receive development rights in exchange, which can be sold to owners seeking to increase the allowable densities of lots located in PDAs and along transit routes. Jurisdictions with buildable areas near transit would agree to allow additional development with the purchase of development rights, subject to their planning process. This scheme would not change the amount of planned growth in the county, but would shift its location, thereby reducing the impacts of future growth on transportation and the environment.

Conclusion

CCTA's desire to "stay the course" results in horribly congested roadways, leading to gridlock and a lowering of the quality of life. In addition, the CTP would result in very significant increases in GHG emissions, unfairly shifting the emissions reduction burden onto other jurisdictions. The DEIR fails to contrast the consequences of continuing the status quo with meaningfully different feasible alternatives, thereby denying decision-makers the information they need to create an optimal transportation plan.

D-28

D-29

In these comments, TRANSDEF has identified numerous flaws and errors, and offered an environmentally sound alternative approach. We are willing to assist CCTA in revising the DEIR to accommodate these ideas. Because of the extensive revisions need to make the DEIR compliant with law, TRANSDEF reserves the right to comment on any and all aspects of the recirculated DEIR.

D-30

The whole point of environmental review is to assess the implications of a proposed course of action, so that a conscious evaluation can be made as to whether "Is this really the future we want?" The DEIR projects a future in which Contra Costa County is a decidedly unpleasant place to live. In TRANSDEF's view, the DEIR is more than the obligatory paperwork for a flawed process--it could serve as an excellent starting point for a serious new planning effort, to decide what changes in direction are needed to obtain a more desirable outcome.

D-31

Sincerely,

/s/ DAVID SCHONBRUNN

David Schonbrunn,  
President

Attachments

Sonoma Environmentalists' Sales Tax Proposal  
TRANSDEF's 3/17/16 letter to CCTA Board



SCTLC  
TRANSDEF



May 5, 2017

David Rabbitt, Chair  
Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
490 Mendocino Blvd. # 206  
Santa Rosa, CA 95814

Re: Measure M Extension/Renewal to Encourage Compact Growth

Dear Mr. Rabbitt:

The Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition, Sonoma County Conservation Action, TRANSDEF and Greenbelt Alliance have worked with local officials for many years to improve funding for public transportation and to encourage compact growth within our cities. We urge SCTA to make its proposal for the extension of Measure M consistent with the Sonoma County Transportation Plan's emphasis on the connections between transportation and land use, because of the adverse traffic and GHG impacts of new development.

A jurisdiction's eligibility for funds from a new sales tax should be conditioned on its adoption of planning that directs future growth into urbanized areas. The transit, car sharing, casual carpooling, biking and walking available in those area are viable alternatives to drive-alone daily travel. Any extension of the Measure M sales tax needs to greatly reduce the growth in traffic due to new development. The ballot measure would contain provisions to accomplish the following:

- Set countywide standards for allowable growth in future Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT).
- Provide road maintenance tax money only to jurisdictions that meet the VMT growth standard. This would incentivize a shift in the planning for future growth, moving it away from greenfields and into already urbanized areas, especially Priority Development Areas--walkable communities that enable reduced solo driving.
- Encourage development of Priority Development Areas through a designated funding program.
- Provide enough transit operating funds to enable the operation of a robust transit network linking the County's Priority Development Areas.
- Fund an office to coordinate the Transfer of Development Rights from greenfield areas to Priority Development Areas.

Sonoma County's Priority Development Areas (PDAs), already worked out with MTC/ABAG in Plan Bay Area, represent an important step forward in Growth Management. It is important to invest adequately in the development of the PDAs to help them attract most of Sonoma County's expected new residents in the coming 20 years. Because Transit-Oriented Development represents a change in the thinking of many developers, incentives may be needed to stimulate the creation of more such communities.

Among their benefits, PDAs tend to relieve development pressures on valuable open space. The SCTA should focus on the development and upkeep of the rail and bus transit needed to make PDAs work. Santa Rosa already has a vision for frequent bus service on major arterials.

It is particularly important to encourage the strongest form of PDA, where housing and economic activity for a wide middle-income spectrum of the population are grouped within easy and attractive walking/biking distance of high-frequency bus stops and neighborhood retail. SMART has already departed from reliance on the large parking lots around transit stations that add to pollution.

Planning for future growth around high-quality transit will avoid further burdening existing roadways. The sales tax needs to incorporate a Growth Management Plan that includes explicit disincentives for development that further increases VMT. The county should work to exceed its greenhouse gas reduction goals; major gains could come from programs that speed conversion to battery electric vehicles.

Congestion is the result of too many cars driven by solo drivers. Reliance on intelligent highways and self-driven vehicles would simply encourage more solo driving, making congestion worse, not better. A more effective answer is smartphone-based real-time ride-matching, in which travel time savings in HOV lanes incentivize drivers to share their cars with a passenger.

With the arrival of SMART, Sonoma County should direct funding toward making *itself* an integral part of a vibrant metropolitan region, where excellent public transit is the preferred way to travel. We understand that expanding roadway capacity to meet demand does not increase mobility in the long-term, because that capacity soon fills up. It worsens the climate impacts of transportation, which is contrary to state policy. We can follow the forward-looking thinking of the Los Angeles City Council in adopting Mobility Plan 2035, to encourage alternatives to driving alone.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Plan recognizes that primary emphasis must be placed on maximizing the efficiency of existing and proposed transportation infrastructure through advanced transportation technology, through reduction of vehicle trips, and through focusing growth in proximity to public transit.  
<https://planning.lacity.org/documents/policy/mobilityplnmemo.pdf>

If you have questions or wish to discuss our suggestions further, please contact Steve Birdlebough at 707-576-6632 or [scbaffirm@gmail.com](mailto:scbaffirm@gmail.com). Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Willard Richards". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "W".

Willard Richards, Chair,  
SCTLC

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Allen". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "M".

Michael Allen, Chair  
SCCA

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Teri Shore". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "T".

Teri Shore, North Bay Regional Director  
Greenbelt Alliance

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David Schonbrunn". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "D".

David Schonbrunn, President  
TRANSDEF

# Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund

P.O. Box 151439 San Rafael, CA 94915 415-331-1982

March 17, 2016  
By E-Mail to  
Rlwasaki@ccta.net

Dave Hudson, Chair  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Re: Performance and Equity Evaluation of the Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan

Dear Chair Hudson and Board Members:

The Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund ("TRANSDEF") is a non-profit environmental group advocating for the regional perspective in the planning of transportation, land use and air quality. In the past few years, we have focused on reducing the impacts of transportation on climate change. We have participated in the EPAC because we recognize that Contra Costa County's transportation planning process is an important test case of whether a suburban county can transform itself in response to the dual challenges of catastrophic climate change and impending gridlock.

We wanted you to be aware of several inescapable conclusions from the Performance and Equity Evaluation of the Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan ("Evaluation"), before expending further time and effort on a sales tax plan.

First, your Board previously declared that it wanted a "transformative" tax plan. Table 3 on page 11 of the Evaluation offers conclusive proof that the Draft TEP is not a transformative plan. Neither of the alternatives produces any meaningful change from the conditions projected for 2040 without a sales tax.

Second, your two alternatives are similar enough in effect as to be indistinguishable. The differences fall within the travel demand model's margin of error. The purpose of alternatives is to give policymakers an understanding of the available range of options. These alternatives do not do that.

Third, your alternatives result in a substantial **increase** in GHG emissions, due to an increasing population and a stable VMT per capita. See the upper curve in Figure 1 on page 18 of the Evaluation. The legislative intent of SB 375 recognized that statewide measures alone were insufficient to achieve the 2050 target. It required local changes in transportation and land use patterns in order to **reduce** future local GHG emissions.

As can clearly be seen in Figure 1, the local increase prevents the combined statewide and local efforts from being on track to reach the 2050 target. It misses significantly. Staff calculated that closing that gap would require a last-minute 15% reduction in VMT/capita plus a 58% conversion of the fleet to electric vehicles. Given that information, it would be irresponsible to continue working on the draft TEP.

We note a striking disconnect between the 28% increase in population projected in Table 1 and the following statement:

At present, we do not know what specific strategies MTC will consider to meet the Governor's targets, but we do know that achieving the 80 percent [reduction] goal will require substantial increases in the share of zero emission vehicles as well as **additional reductions in VMT**. (pages 4-5.)

Table 7 shows Contra Costa producing a 28% increase in GHGs, resulting from a population growth-driven **increase in VMT**. Is CCTA actually expecting the other counties of the region to provide all the VMT reductions? That would be grossly unfair to the other counties of the region and state, exposing CCTA to legal challenge.

**TRANSDEF cannot support a sales tax that would lock in an expenditure plan for decades that ignores the County's responsibilities to reduce climate emissions from its vehicular travel.** It would be far less disruptive to implement a small VMT per capita reduction over several decades--to prevent population growth from increasing the total emissions--than to suddenly jam on the brakes in 2040.

Our message to your Board is that it is simply not possible to transplant the priorities and wish lists of the past into the present environment. It requires entirely new thinking. While we believe your staff understands this, they are operating under direction from your Board to proceed with, essentially, a rework of past plans. This approach is bound to fail, either at the polls or in the courts.

We urge you to shut down the TEP process and start intensive work on a Countywide Transportation Plan and DEIR. (Please note that we intentionally did not say DSEIR.) A great deal of thought, analysis, education and discussion will be needed before a truly transformative plan can achieve public support. We stand ready to assist in the transition to a more sustainable transportation system.

Sincerely,

/s/ DAVID SCHONBRUNN

David Schonbrunn,  
President

## Martin Engelmann

---

**From:** Peter Lydon <ptrlydon@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2017 3:27 PM  
**To:** Martin Engelmann; Sarah Zahedi  
**Cc:** Matthew Williams; David Schonbrunn  
**Subject:** Contra Costa Transportation: Gas to Electric Vehicle Transition

Hi, Martin, It was good to talk to you last night at the Open House. The conversation will be helpful to me and the others of us who are working on comments for the CTP's DEIR. Thanks very much for your time and the expertise you imparted.

I said I'd give you in written form the couple of ideas on what CCTA can do to accelerate the transition from gasoline to electric vehicles. Here is the first of them:

1. As you know, it is the nightly home charging point, and secondarily a charging capacity at work, that in real daily life are key for the EV user, far more important than charging points in public places for emergency or convenience re-charging.
2. A sticking point for a customer choosing between the purchase of an electric car and a standard gasoline car is the problem of arranging for the nightly charging of the electric car. As long as this looms as a headache and a hassle and delay factor,, it is an irritant to the buyer, and it works against making an EV or a PHEV purchase.
3. To carry out its plan and its policy commitment to cut GHGs by bringing in electric vehicles, CCTA wants to smooth out or remove such obstacles to buying an EVs.
4. The way to do that is to call in all the car dealers in the county who have EV's to sell, and call in the electricians who actually do the installations, and, call in the city-by-city authorities who issue the permits for the installations, and probably call in reps of PG&E. CCTA should propose that these folks get together and put together a standardized charger installation package that would cost say \$800. for the basic case when 220 volt current is available in a garage, which is the normal suburban picture. Obtaining (or pre-obtaining) the necessary permits should be part of the package, by arrangement with the localities that require the permits. PG&E should write the manual for this package to guide the electrical contractors, and perhaps could administer the overall program once CCTA staff had got it organized.
5. The purchaser of the EV should pay the car dealer for the charger installation package as an option which is part of the price of the car. The the electrical contractor who is going to do the work would show up at the purchaser's house the next day and get it done. such that when the purchaser comes home with his new E-car, it is all ready to be plugged in.,
6. Using the money that has been paid as part of the E-vehicle purchase, the car dealer should reimburse the electrical contractor, perhaps through PE&E, for the wiring and installation work and the obtaining of the permits. It's all intended to be no-fuss and no delay for the E-car purchaser.
7. A case could be made for CCTA to subsidize part of all of the ~\$800 fee for this service, but that is a separate issue. CCTA would be advancing its policy goal to speed up the transition to non-carbon fuels and thus lower GHG emissions simply by organizing and coordinating a simplified and facilitated charger installation process.
8. If this proposal proved to be effective, it obviously could be implemented by MTC or BAAQMD on a region-wide basis, and would help achieve California legal and policy goals of the region.

## Letter D Response – Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF)

- Response D-1: This comment (all of page 1 and the first half of page 2 of letter D) pertains to the merits of the proposed project (the CTP and its investment Program), and does not raise issues with the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR. Comments beyond the purview of the EIR and/or CEQA, while not directly addressed in this document, are noted and hereby made part of the public record. Comments concerning the CTP will be considered by the CCTA separate from the comments on the Draft EIR. Please see the separate responses to comments on the CTP document.
- Response D-2: The rationale for why this EIR relies on population and land use data and projections from Projections 2013 is fully described and explained on pages 2-4 through 2-14 of the Draft EIR. CCTA is aware that ABAG and MTC issued a Draft EIR for the Draft 2017 RTP/Plan Bay Area 2040 in April 2017, and certified that EIR and approved *Plan Bay Area 2040* in July 2017. *Plan Bay Area 2040* reflects updates to ABAG’s demographic forecast based upon regional control totals reviewed and approved by the ABAG Executive Board in January 2016. The updated *Projections 2017* forecast uses the same horizon year as *Projections 2013* (i.e., to year 2040), but forecasts a 27 percent increase in the number of new dwelling units to be constructed in the Bay Region, and an 11 percent increase in dwelling units for Contra Costa as compared to *Projections 2013*.
- CCTA determined not to use the updated forecast as contained in the *Plan Bay Area 2040* EIR for a number of valid reasons specifically identified on pages 2-4 through 2-14 of the Draft EIR.
- Whether either of the forecasts, as presented in *Projections 2013*, or in *Plan Bay Area 2040*, turn out to be “right” cannot be known in advance. However, throughout the Draft EIR preparation process and through the review and comment period (which closed on August 1, 2017), ABAG did not release a new series of projections in a usable format that could have been translated into the fine-grained level of detail required for use in the CCTA Countywide Model. Once ABAG publishes its new forecast (*Projections 2017* - forthcoming), CCTA will proceed with any necessary update. This process includes local review of the new land use assumptions, which must be disaggregated to a finer level of detail than provided by ABAG.
- Response D-3: In January of 2015, the BAAQMD published the Bay Area Emissions Inventory Summary Report: *Greenhouse Gases for Base Year 2011*. At or about the same time that CCTA was producing and published the Draft EIR (in June 16, 2017), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District published a newer update of the Bay Area’s baseline inventory of GHG emissions for the year 2015, presented in the 2017 *Draft Clean Air Plan*. Although the most recent (2017) *Clean Air Plan* was not referenced in the Regulatory Setting sections of either the GHG or Air Quality chapters of the Draft EIR, information from this document was presented in the

Draft EIR, relevant to the Bay Area's baseline (2015) GHG emissions (see Tables 2.2-4 and 2.2-5 of the Draft EIR, page 2.2-8).

Relevant regulatory information from the 2017 Clean Air Plan is hereby incorporated into this EIR – please see the Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR chapter of this response to Comments/Final EIR document. Incorporation of this regulatory setting information does not result in any changes to the analysis or significance conclusions of the Draft EIR. This regulatory setting information does not indicate that any new air quality or GHG impacts would occur, nor does this regulatory setting information suggest any increase in the significance of an air quality or GHG impact as identified in the Draft EIR. As such, regulatory setting information related to the *2017 Clean Air Plan* is not “significant new information” requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Response D-4: Comment noted. On September 8, 2016, Governor Brown approved SB 32 (Pavley, Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016), which added a 2030 target to the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. SB 32 requires that statewide GHG emissions be reduced to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. On January 20, 2017, ARB released its Proposed *2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan Update*, which lays out the proposed framework for achieving the 2030 reductions as established in SB 32 (as well as EO B-30-15 and AB 197). These current regulatory provisions were not referenced in the Draft EIR Regulatory Setting section of the GHG chapter.

Relevant information from these current regulations is hereby incorporated into this EIR – please see the Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR chapter of this response to Comments/Final EIR document. Incorporation of this more recent regulatory information does not result in any changes to the analysis or significance conclusions of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR already considered the 2030 GHG reduction targets of SB 32 in its analysis of consistency with Executive Order B-16-2012, which addresses the CTP's progress towards the same 2050 GHG reduction targets that are the focus of the 2030 interim reduction goals in SB 32. No new GHG impacts occur based on this information, and no increase in the significance of any GHG impacts that are identified in the Draft EIR occur based on this regulatory information. As such, regulatory information pertaining to SB 32 is not “significant new information” requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Response D-5: As indicated on page 2.1-15 of the Draft EIR, “In accordance with current CEQA guidelines, the project will have a significant environmental effect if it would cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. This definition is somewhat limited for the purposes of analyzing a program-level EIR on a regional transportation plan. A more expansive set of criteria has thus been defined to assess the significance of potential transportation and circulation impacts that could result from implementation of various project options within the county. These criteria define a significant impact as one that causes an appreciable change in any given criterion. For the purposes of this section, and consistent with the approach used in the *Plan Bay Area EIR* (2012 and 2017), an appreciable change in a criterion is

defined as a change of at least 5% in that particular measure.” CCTA has full discretion to identify criteria used for traffic thresholds as applicable to this EIR, and has relied on thresholds also used by other public agencies (including MTC). The comment does not provide any evidence to suggest that the criteria adopted by CCTA is not appropriate. The CCTA’s approach is fully consistent with CEQA.

The CTP document itself does include an evaluation of the performance of the CTPs major projects and programs (see CTP Volume 2, Appendix A). This analysis was performed by applying the *Plan Bay Area* performance targets. In combination with the Equity Analysis contained in CTP Volume 2, Chapter, CCTA’s CTP fully meets MTC’s Countywide Plan Guidelines.

Response D-6: The Draft EIR includes five separate significance criteria that evaluate GHG emissions with implementation of the CTP, considering five distinct categories of requirements and regulations. Specifically:

- Impact GHG-1 addresses whether the proposed CTP can achieve the targets under SB 375 based on per capita emissions from cars and light-duty trucks.
- Impact GHG-2 addresses whether implementation of the proposed CTP would result in a net increase in direct emissions from all sectors in 2040.
- Impact GHG-3 addresses whether implementation of the proposed CTP would result in a net increase in indirect emissions from construction sources in 2040.
- Impact GHG-4 addresses whether implementation of the proposed CTP would substantially conflict with the statewide GHG target of 80 percent reduction as compared to 1990 levels for transportation sector GHG emissions.
- Impact GHG-5 addresses whether implementation of the proposed CTP would substantially conflict with any other applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for reducing the emissions of GHGs.

Impact GHG-1 is the only impact analysis that addresses SB 375’s per capita GHG emission reduction targets. The other impact discussions provide information on GHG emissions based on other State and local requirements, and those analyses are not bound by the same considerations as the analysis of impacts under SB 375. SB 375 tasked the California Air Resources Board (ARB) with establishing GHG emission reduction targets for each region for 2020 and 2035, relative to a year 2005 baseline. The ARB-established targets for the San Francisco Bay Area (including Contra Costa County) are a 7 percent per capita reduction by 2020, and a 15 percent per capita reduction by 2035, relative to per capita emissions in 2005. The 7 percent/15 percent reduction goals represent the current (adopted 2011) GHG reduction goals for MTC/ABAG as provided by the ARB.

Unlike the SB 375 mandated target analyzed in Draft EIR Impact GHG-1, the analysis under Impact GHG-2 considers total direct GHG emissions (not per

capita emissions, as was required for Impact GHG-1 under SB 375), and GHG emissions from all transportation sources (not just cars and light-duty trucks, as was required for Impact GHG-1 under SB 375. The analysis (Draft EIR page 2.2-22, Table 2.2-8) discloses what the transportation-based emissions would be without consideration of statewide measures required by the California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards adopted under AB 1493 (Pavley), and also discloses what the emissions would be with implementation of Pavley. The significance determination is based on the total transportation emissions with reductions attributable to Pavley, because the impact criterion considers whether there will be a net increase in overall emissions. This criterion was not mandated by SB 375, but was included by CCTA to disclose additional information about potential impacts of the proposed CTP.

Under CEQA, the lead agency has considerable discretion to decide which significance threshold to apply to an impact. If supported by substantial evidence, that threshold is adequate, regardless of whether a petitioner proposes an alternative threshold.<sup>2</sup> CCTA operated within its discretion when it determined the GHG significance thresholds to be used in the EIR.<sup>3</sup> Further, the thresholds used in the 2017 CTP Draft EIR are the same thresholds used by MTC/ABAG in the 2013 *Plan Bay Area EIR* and in the 2017 *Plan Bay Area 2040 EIR*.

Response D-7: The 2017 Draft EIR does not assert that state-level emission reductions are the result of the CTP. GHG emissions reductions are and will be achieved by a number of means, including implementation of the CTP and the host of measures that are and will be implemented in response to directives in the state Scoping Plan and in other regulations. Similar to the assumption discussed above to include reductions that would result from implementation of AB 1493 (Pavley), changes in the level of GHG emissions, as a result of other regulations, are also reasonably foreseeable. For instance, implementation of SB 350 (requiring 50 percent of electricity from renewable resources), Cap-and-Trade, vehicle mileage standards, and other actions will all play a significant role in GHG emissions reductions. Revisions to Impact GHG-2 are not necessary because, as shown in Draft EIR Table 2.2-8, total annual transportation emissions are projected to be reduced by 34% in 2040, relative to a 2013 baseline.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of Chula Vista* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 327, 335- 336 [rejecting petitioner's argument that the City erred by failing to apply a different significance threshold]; *California Oak Foundation v. Regents of University of Cal.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 227, 282 [rejecting argument that a lead agency used the incorrect significance threshold]; *National Parks & Conservation Assn. v. County of Riverside* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 1341, 1356-1357 [upholding the County's biological significance threshold as supported by substantial evidence]

<sup>3</sup> See also *N. Coast Rivers Alliance v. Marin Mun. Water Dist. Bd. of Dirs.* (2013) 216 Cal.App.4th 614 [upholding a GHG threshold based upon whether the project would interfere with the lead agency's goal of reducing GHG emissions to 15 percent below 1990 levels by 2020]

- Response D-8: ARB has updated the Scoping Plan (2017 Scoping Plan Update) to reflect the passage of Senate Bill 32, which codifies a statewide 2030 GHG emissions reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update identifies several programs that are mandated to meet this statewide GHG target. These programs include:
- providing 50 percent of electricity via renewable sources by 2030;
  - reducing carbon intensity of fuels;
  - maintaining GHG standards for vehicles including adding over 4 million zero-emission vehicles to the road system by 2030;
  - continuing the Cap-and-Trade program and strengthening it to meet declining caps (e.g., lower GHG emissions), and also to achieve co-benefits such as reducing toxic air emissions; and
  - several other programs.

No single program, in isolation, will allow the state to achieve SB 32's goal for 2030. It will require success in each program to meet the goal. The CTP is but one mechanism needed to reduce statewide GHG emissions to meet the SB 32 target. However, many additional actions will be needed to achieve the SB 32 goal, all of which must be implemented by agencies other than CCTA. This is consistent with the discussions of Impact GHG-4, and no revision to the analysis pursuant to Impact GHG-4 is necessary. See also Response to Comment D-6, above.

- Response D-9: As is demonstrated on Table 2.2-8 and Figure 2.2-1 of the Draft EIR, total annual GHG transportation emissions are projected to decrease from approximately 3.8 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year by year 2040, to approximately 2.0 MMTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year by year 2040, with implementation of Pavley I regulations and Low Carbon Fuel Standards that are currently in effect. The Draft EIR concludes that implementation of the 2017 CTP and its Investment Program is not likely to impede achievement of the Executive Order S-3-05 GHG reduction target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by year 2050, based on this downward trajectory of total transportation-related GHG emissions over time. Similarly, the 2017 CTP and its Investment Program is not likely to impede achievement of the SB 32 GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by year 2030.

Figure 2.2-1 of the Draft EIR also demonstrates that implementation of current Pavley I regulations and Low Carbon Fuel Standards, alone, are not adequate to achieve these reduction targets. The GHG reductions necessary to achieve these statewide targets will also require California to “develop new technologies that dramatically reduce dependence on fossil fuels, and shift into a landscape of new ideas, clean energy, and green technology.” As is noted in ARB’s 2017 Draft Scoping Plan Update, “GHG reductions [are] needed by [all] emissions sectors to achieve a statewide emissions level that is 40 percent below 1990 levels before 2030. Many of the programs require statewide action, promulgated through regulation, and are outside the ability of sub-state jurisdictions [e.g. CCTA] to implement on their own accord. This is important to recognize in terms of GHG emissions efficiency and attaining GHG targets. The ability to attain targets will not only rely on transportation

*strategies but also on land use strategies implemented by local cities and counties (e.g., qualified GHG reduction plans) and controls and actions tied to economy-wide changes promulgated by the State.”*

Examples of the types of statewide actions needed are listed in the 2017 Draft Scoping Plan Update, and include a vehicle fleet mix that includes 4.2 million zero-emission vehicles (ZEV) by 2030 and similar changes in urban buses and light- and heavy-duty trucks, and deployment of 100,000 ZEV freight vehicles by 2030. The CTP includes funding in the amount of \$85 million in the category of “Innovation” to support and foster these types of innovative economy-wide changes within Contra Costa.

Response D-10: Sea level rise impacts were fully evaluated in the Draft EIR at a programmatic level (see Impact GHG-6, beginning at page 2.2-27). Based on this analysis, any increase in transportation investment within the sea level rise inundation zone is considered a potentially significant impact. Contrary to the commenter’s opinion, CCTA believes (similar to the conclusions of the *Plan Bay Area 2040 EIR*), that impacts related to sea level rise can be mitigated through careful project-level planning and design that considers long-term sea level rise, and includes adaptive strategies that are appropriate to the project type, surrounding land use, and the adjacent Bay shoreline type. The effectiveness of these strategies depends on vulnerability and risk of inundation associated with specific transportation or transit projects, and a combination of several adaptation strategies may be necessary. The selection of the appropriate adaptation strategy, or strategies, will occur during subsequent project-level analysis and planning.

The Draft EIR (beginning at page 2.2-29) describes two separate programmatic mitigation strategies to address these challenges: Transportation Asset Management Plans (MM GHG-6A), and Sea Level Rise Adaptation Strategies (MM GHG-6B). The Asset Management Plans call for project sponsors and implementing agencies to coordinate with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), Caltrans, local jurisdictions, and other transportation agencies to consider potential impacts of sea level rise over the life cycle of each transportation asset. Adaptation Strategies call for implementing agencies and/or individual project sponsors to consider, where feasible and based on project and site-specific considerations, incorporating sea level rise considerations into the planning for all new construction and routine maintenance projects. Executive Order S-13-08 requires all state agencies to incorporate such planning, but no such requirement exists for local transportation assets and development projects. Appropriate adaptation strategies should be selected as part of future project-level analysis and planning.

It should also be noted that the effects of the environment on a project are generally outside the scope of CEQA, as concluded by the California Supreme Court.<sup>4</sup>

The comment also identifies two transportation projects pursuant to the CTP Implementation Program that are also located within the sea level rise inundation zone: the proposed Hercules and Martinez Ferry Terminals, and the UP rail line. These two projects are hereby added to the list of transportation projects that may be located, partially or wholly, within areas projected to be regularly inundated (i.e., inundated multiple times each year) by sea level rise by mid-century, as provided on page 2.2-28 of the Draft EIR (please see Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR). The addition of these two projects as being susceptible to sea level rise is not significant new information that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR, as the Draft EIR already notes that, “Any increase in transportation investments within the sea level rise inundation zone is considered a significant impact.”

Response D-11: As noted in the Land Use chapter of the Draft EIR (page 2.10-15), “The 2017 CTP is projected to result in a greater increase in total daily transit trips than in drive-alone vehicle trips, when compared to existing mode split characteristics. As such, the 2017 CTP prioritizes transit improvements that generally serve more urbanized locations and PDAs, and supports infill development and urban redevelopment that could influence housing demand in these areas. The 2017 CTP intentionally supports PDA-focused population and employment growth with improved transit access as a means of drawing more development into PDA areas, rather than facilitating urban sprawl and regional growth outside of urban areas, but does not necessarily contribute to greater countywide growth as a whole.”

To assess the efficiency of transit investments in PDAs as attributed to the CTP and its Investment Program, CCTA has conducted a detailed analysis of transportation characteristics that would occur within PDAs (only) pursuant to the CTP. This analysis indicates that, relative to investments pursuant to the 2013 RTP only, the CTP’s Investment Program would:

- result in a 6 percent increase in total transit trips (or an increase of 3,231 transit trips) generated from within PDAs,
- result in a 2 percent decrease in drive-alone trips (or a decrease of 2,179 drive-alone trips) generated from within PDA’s,
- result in greater than an 11 percent decrease in vehicle hours of delay (or a decrease of 6,073 vehicle hours of delay) within PDAs, and

---

<sup>4</sup> See *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* [2015] 62 Cal.4th 369, 377 [“we conclude that agencies generally subject to CEQA are not required to analyze the impact of existing environmental conditions on a project’s future users or residents. But when a proposed project risks exacerbating those environmental hazards or conditions that already exist, an agency must analyze the potential impact of such hazards on future residents or users.”]

- there would be a 7 percent increase in the number of countywide jobs that would be within a 45-minute transit trip of each PDA (an increase of 25,410 transit-accessible jobs)

As compared to the 5 percent thresholds used in this EIR to measure the significance of transportation-related changes, the 6 percent increase in transit trips from within PDAs, and the 7 percent increase in transit-accessible jobs from PDAs represent significant support for PDA-focused population and employment growth.

Response D-12: CCTA has not conducted a detailed analysis of transportation characteristics that would occur within PDAs pursuant to each of the EIR alternatives. However, both Alternative #3 and Alternative #4 would include substantially greater investments in overall transit projects or program, respectively, as compared to the Investment Program. For example, Alternative #3 would result in a substantial increase (73.1 percent) in daily transit ridership when compared with the baseline condition, and that increase would be more substantial than the increase (55.8 percent) under the Project. This increase reflects the influence of two factors. The first factor is an emphasis on increasing travel choices and improving the frequency and availability of transit services throughout Contra Costa, and the emphasis on transit improvement projects included within Alternative #3 (see Draft EIR, page 3.1-60). The second factor is the Countywide Transportation model's tendency to assign more trips to transit as roadways become more congested and speeds become lower. Similarly, but to a lesser extent, Alternative #4 would result in an increase (59.7percent) in daily transit ridership when compared with the baseline condition, which is greater than the increase (55.8 percent) under the Project (see Draft EIR, page 3.1-88. Based on the increase in countywide transit ridership as compared to the Investment Program, it can be reasonably assumed that each of these Alternatives would also result in a similar increase in transit ridership within each of the county's PDAs as compared to the Investment Program.

Response D-13: Comments on the Draft EIR and the CTP expressed concern that CCTA cannot compel implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR that address potential environmental effect of new transportation projects. The commenter suggests that CCTA could compel local agencies and individual project sponsors to implement mitigation measures by making these mitigation measures a condition of receiving funding allocations.

CCTA is responsible for overseeing the use of revenue from transportation sales taxes, as approved by the voters (Measure C and Measure J). The Authority allocates funding for specifically identified capital transportation projects and programs, and allocates separate funding by formula to local agencies for similar but unspecified purposes such as local, sub-regional, and/or regional transportation improvements and maintenance projects. Consistent with voter-approved provisions of these Measures, receipt of a portion of these funds (specifically Local Street Maintenance and TLC) requires that the local jurisdiction demonstrate compliance with the Measure J Growth Management

Program (GMP) through submittal of a GMP Checklist that is reviewed by CCTA prior to allocating the funds. Furthermore, allocation of funds to project sponsors is accompanied by detailed policies and procedures that govern the use of Measure funds. These policies and procedures are contained in Resolution 13-38-P: Policy on Local Agency Coordination, which defines roles and responsibilities related to environmental review, design, right-of-way acquisition and disposal, hazardous materials, construction, funding reimbursement procedures and compliance auditing, among others. CCTA conditions the allocation of transportation funding on adherence to these policies and procedures, generally through cooperative agreements that are entered into at the time project sponsors request funding.

The existing instruments by which CCTA can condition the receipt of funds by local agencies, and the CTP itself, includes numerous means by which to address environmental concerns. Several, but not all of the means by which the CTP and CCTA can and will address environmental concerns are briefly listed and summarized below:

- Local compliance with the GMP, which requires that each city, town and the County adopt a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL). The ULL prohibits new urban development from impinging on existing parks, open space, agriculture, and other lands designated for non-urban uses. The ULL also discourages ‘leapfrog’ development and urban sprawl. The ULL is one component of the GMP that, along with cooperative planning and performance measures, work together to ensure that growth occurs in a responsible manner and strikes appropriate balances between competing values and interests.
- The Measure J GMP requires that local jurisdictions use the CCTA Countywide Model to evaluate changes to local General Plans and the impacts of major development projects, for their effect on the local and regional transportation system and on ability to achieve the Multi-modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) established in the Action Plans, which are incorporated by reference into the CTP. In consultations with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), local jurisdictions must demonstrate that new development does not adversely affect ability to meet the adopted MTSOs, thereby avoiding potential negative effects of future growth. Furthermore, consistent with GMP policy, local jurisdictions are required to mitigate the transportation impacts of new growth through a local and regional development mitigation program, which includes development fees and other mitigations. (Source: *CCTA, Measure J, Contra Costa’s Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan*, pp. 23-26, July 21, 2004.)
- The CTP supports the transportation and land use vision of Plan Bay Area. These supportive strategies and implementation programs (presented in Volume 1 of the CTP), help achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions targets for the region. The CTPs investments in multi-modal mobility and alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle will help reduce traffic congestion

and support greenhouse gas emissions reduction through reduced vehicle miles traveled.

- Many of the programs and projects included in the CTPs 10-year and 20-year project are supportive of, or are implementation strategies included in the Air District's 2017 *Clean Air Plan*. These transportation projects and programs include those intended to sustain and improve bus service, sustain and expand rail service, improve the efficiency and use of transit programs, improve intermodal and arterial connections between regional trade corridors, promote teleworking and other employee-based trip reductions, promote safe access for pedestrians and cyclists to schools, promote carpooling, vanpooling and ridesharing, and promote bicycle and pedestrian access and facility improvements.
- The CTPs transportation projects and programs support the regional growth pattern established in *Plan Bay Area*, of focused growth in existing communities along the existing transportation network. This strategy helps to achieve key regional economic, environmental and equity goals, it efficiently leverages existing infrastructure, and mitigates impacts on areas with less development. Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are key to implementing this focused growth strategy. PDAs promote compact development in established communities with high-quality transportation access, while placing less development pressure on the region's vast and varied open spaces and agricultural lands. The 2017 CTP prioritizes transit improvements that generally serve these more urbanized locations and PDAs, and supports infill development and urban redevelopment that could influence housing demand in these areas.
- The CTP Investment Program includes funds support transportation innovation, including a commitment to autonomous vehicle technology, Intelligent Transportation Systems, clean vehicles and electric vehicles, and shared mobility. These investments are intended to foster increased use of a variety of technologies that are integral to, and consistent with State regulations and policies for long-term congestion, air quality and GHG emission reductions.
- The CTP includes an implementation action affirming the CCTA's responsibility to create a resilient transportation system considers the effects of climate change and the resulting hazards related to rising tides. This CTP program calls for a study related to complete streets, goods movement and truck routes, and transportation systems that are resilient to rising tides and the effects of climate change, and how the Authority might address these issues within the context of Measure J.

While the above measures are indeed significant, they nonetheless must rely heavily on continued monitoring and enforcement by CCTA after allocation of funds has taken place.

As stated in the Draft EIR, CCTA cannot require implementing agencies or project sponsors to adopt the recommended mitigation measures, as CCTA has

no land use authority. The Draft EIR also properly notes that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(2), CCTA has concluded that mitigation measures can and should be adopted, and projects taking advantage of CEQA's streamlining provisions must apply the mitigation measures to address site-specific conditions. These are the appropriate findings because CCTA is not required to adopt a mitigation requirement when it has no ability to enforce the measure or ensure that mitigation would actually be implemented. Were CCTA to condition the granting of transportation funding to local implementing agencies for individual projects, based on incorporation of mitigation measures from the CTP EIR, the implementing agencies would retain the discretion to:

- carry out or approve projects that are not consistent with the CTP;
- exercise their discretion to deny approval of projects even if they are consistent with the Plan; and
- reach environmental conclusions and/or adopt mitigation measures that differ from those identified in the CTP EIR.

In short, the proposed CTP, if adopted, is not binding on local implementing agencies. Further, local implementing agencies are not required to accept funding and thus cannot be compelled to incorporate the mitigation measures recommended in the CTP EIR. For these reasons, CCTA must instead rely on incentives in the form of transportation funding to local implementing agencies in an effort to align their project development with the proposed projects in the CTP. Finally, as discussed throughout the Draft EIR, an implementing agency that elects to take advantage of the CEQA Streamlining provisions of SB 375 (Public Resources Code sections 21155.1, 21155.2, and 21159.28) must commit to the mitigation measures set forth in the Draft EIR, as applicable and feasible, to address site-specific conditions and to reduce impacts to less than significant. Cities, counties and other project sponsors, not the CCTA, are ultimately responsible for the manner in which the implementing agencies proceed with development.

On page 2.2-34, the Draft EIR references CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), whereas the correct reference should be Section 15091(a)(2). Please see Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR.

Response D-14: CEQA requires EIRs to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. The Draft EIR evaluates the proposed CTP and its Investment Program, as well as four alternatives (including a No Project Alternative) that assume the same countywide forecast of projected household and job growth, and the same amount of total funding for transportation system investments. Each of these alternatives comprise a reasonable range of funding allocations to various transportation projects and programs, each intended to attain most of the basic CTP goals and objectives, and each designed to avoid or lessen certain significant environmental impacts as identified for the Project.

Alternative 4, the Emphasis on Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Programs, was not “designed to fail.” Rather, Alternative 4 represents a program-oriented approach that focuses specifically on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction, mitigating the impacts of travel, and addressing climate change. The highest level of investment under this Alternative occurs in expanded and improved operation of transit-based programs, intended to reduce vehicle miles traveled as well as overall vehicle trips. Roadway improvement projects are narrowly focused on those that emphasize safety. Specifically, Alternative 4 includes:

- \$568 million in freeway and roadway projects that focus on Integrated Corridor Management along the I-80 and SR-4 corridors (representing approximately 28% of the funding for freeway and roadway projects as indicated for the Investment Program);
- \$952 million in transit projects (or approximately 44% of the funding of transit projects as compared to the Investment Program); and
- The primary transportation investments under Alternative 4 are under the category of transportation programs (e.g., Transportation for Livable Communities, bus operations, bus passes for middle school and high school students and fare reductions, bus services to/from PDAs, Displacement Prevention Programs, Complete Streets, etc.). These programs would receive approximately \$6.47 billion in funding under Alternative #4 (or more than four times as much funds as indicated under the Investment Program).

As indicated in the Draft EIR, the investment strategies pursuant to Alternative 4 achieve a 1 percent increase in mode share for transit, HOV, or other non-SOV modes and a corresponding 1 percent decrease in single-occupant vehicle mode share, as compared to the mode share splits achieved under the Investment Program. This relatively small percentage point change in mode split is similar to the change in mode split achieved under the Project (the Investment Program) as compared to the 2013 baseline. These relatively small percentage point shifts in mode split are a function of the relative smaller scale of new investments in transportation infrastructure and programs, when compared to the significantly larger size of existing transportation infrastructure (see also Response to Comment C-2, which addresses the percentage point increase in mode shift relative to MTC targets).

Response D-15: The commenter is correct that the Investment Program and each of the Alternatives include transportation projects and programs identified in the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). CCTA has correctly identified those transportation projects and programs included within MTC’s 2013 RTP, which are also integral components of *Plan Bay Area* (the 2013 RTP and SCS). A number of these 2013 RTP transportation projects and programs have been completed, others have undergone individual project-specific environmental review, and others have been (or are being) considered for approval by local and/or sponsoring agencies. Many of these projects have an identified, if not fully committed, funding source. It is therefore anticipated (i.e., reasonably

foreseeable) that these projects and programs will be implemented pursuant to the Project and all alternatives.

The projects and programs included under the 2013 RTP are funded in the amount of \$3.7 billion (2017 constant dollars), as compared to the additional \$6.447 billion in investments presumed under the Investment Program and each of the Alternatives. The dollar weight of the 2013 RTP investments does not overwhelm either the Investment Program or any of the similarly funded alternatives. Rather, the proposed Investment Program and each of the Alternatives increases the RTP investments from \$3.7 billion to more than \$10 billion, and each Alternative builds upon those transportation projects and programs already included within MTC's 2013 RTP.

Response D-16: The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR clearly demonstrate a reasonable range of funding strategies for transportation projects and programs, and represent a reasonable range of alternatives to the Investment Program (i.e., the Project) consistent with the requirements of CEQA. CCTA's reasons for selecting these alternatives were fully disclosed in the Notice of Preparation for this EIR, and within the text of the Draft EIR Alternatives chapter.

Response D-17: Funding for local street maintenance and improvement programs, as assumed under Alternative 4, is at 20 percent of the total available funding. This percentage is consistent with the existing structure of Measure J for "return-to-source funds", and includes the flexibility to assign a portion of those funds to bike, pedestrian and trail improvements. This choice for funding priority under Alternative #4 is consistent with public input, which identified strong support for maintenance and improvements on local streets and roads.

Response D-18: The commenter is correct that Alternative #4 includes substantially more investment in local street maintenance than does the Project. The Draft EIR's conclusion that Alternative #4 would meet *to a lesser degree* the goal to maintain the transportation system (Goal 4), is based on a more balanced and holistic view of transportation maintenance, beyond just local street maintenance. As more fully described in the Draft EIR Project Description (page 1.2-16), Goal 4 of the CTP includes objectives that address:

- a stable sources of funds for transit operations and other programs that support the transportation system;
- funding programs for effective preventive maintenance and rehabilitation of the [entire] transportation system (i.e., deferred maintenance); and
- ensuring funding that will maintain the long-term health of all components of the transportation system.

The conclusion that Alternative 4 would meet these objectives to a lesser degree than the proposed Investment Program is based on this Alternative's emphasis on transit-based programs, with lesser funding for individual transportation projects that address all transportation infrastructure (i.e., freeways and arterial projects, and transit capital projects). Whereas Alternative 4 does include more

funding allocation for local street maintenance and improvements than does the Investment Program or other alternatives, it does not address a more balanced investment in maintenance and improvement of all transportation infrastructure systems.

Response D-19: Alternative #4 is based on the assumption that local funds can be leveraged with other State and federal funding sources to achieve the full \$8 billion funding as presumed under the Investment Program and each of the other alternatives. This planning assumption is based on the premise that new State and federal funding sources for the types of programs included in Alternative 4 may become more available over time. The Draft EIR's conclusion that Alternative #4 would meet to a lesser degree the goal to invest wisely and maximize the benefits of available funding (Goal 5), is based on CCTA's experience in obtaining leveraged funds. As more fully described in the Draft EIR Project Description (page 1.2-16), Goal 5 of the CTP includes objectives that address:

- seeking matching funds, whenever possible, and offering incentives and priority funding to projects that provide greater return on investment;
- developing public-private partnerships and pursuing innovative financing mechanisms to accelerate project delivery; and
- using Measure J funds to leverage State, federal and other funding whenever possible.

The conclusion that Alternative 4 would meet these objectives to a lesser degree than the proposed Investment Program is based on CCTA's experience leveraging local funds with different types of State and federal funding programs. CCTA has been able to leverage Measure C and Measure J funds by a factor of three-to-one (or three dollars from other sources for every Measure C or Measure J dollar) for transportation and transit capital projects and infrastructure. Leveraging of State and federal funding for the types of programs included in Alternative 4 has, in the Authority's experience, been closer to one-to-one.

As established in CEQA case law (*California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz (2009) 177 CA4th 957*), "differing factors come into play" in the assessment of alternatives in the EIR, and in the agency's later consideration of whether to approve the Project. CCTA correctly determined that leveraging of funds to achieve the full \$8 billion funding under Alternative #4 is *potentially feasible*. By contrast, CCTA's conclusion, when making final decisions on the Project, that Alternative #4 would meet to a lesser degree the Project objectives of maximizing the benefits of available funding sources, is appropriately based on CCTA's conclusions as to whether Alternative #4s is *actually feasible*. CCTA's Board may reject Alternative #4 as infeasible based on CCTA's experience in leveraging funds.

Response D-20: See response to Comment D-19, above. Alternative 4 does not represent a status quo funding strategy, as is fully described in the description of this alternative.

- Response D-21: An individual’s perception of traffic congestion may be subjective to that individual’s experience, which is precisely why the Draft EIR relies on quantifiable, objective criteria derived from CCTA’s Multi-Modal Service Objectives as thresholds and comparative metrics. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d), these numeric thresholds and comparisons provide “sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project”, rather than using more subjective criteria such as “bad”, or “noticeable”.
- Response D-22: The definition of Alternative 4 is not flawed, nor is the analysis of Alternative 4 as presented in Table 3.1-37 of the Draft EIR. As indicated in Table 3.1-37, implementation of Alternative 4 would result in greater than a 5 percent overall increase in mode share for transit, HOV, or other non-SOV modes, as compared to the 2013 baseline condition. This non-SOV mode share is greater than the 2.7 percent increase in non-SOV mode share achieved under the Project, reflecting Alternative 4’s emphasis on transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvement programs. The commenter’s opinion as to whether this change in mode share is significant, or achieves adequate value from the investment is noted. Please also see Response to Comment D-14 above, regarding the scale of new investments in transit projects and programs, relative to the scale of existing transportation infrastructure, and Response to Comment C-3 regarding the CTP’s performance relative to MTC’s mode share target.
- Response D-23: An effective transit-based program does rely on a land use program that correlates new residents and employees with transit and active modes. CCTA does not have land use authority, however, and can only affect one side of this equation. Alternative 4 specifically emphasizes new investments in transit-based programs that serve identified Priority Development Areas in Contra Costa, as a means of matching these programs and services to these population and growth centers. See also Response to Comments D-11 and D-12, above.
- Response D-24: The omission of “non” in the first paragraph on page 3.1-88 of the Draft EIR is, when read within the full context of the statement, a typographical error. “Overall, implementation of Alternative 4 would result in an increase in mode shares for transit, HOV, or other non-SOV modes. The potential for impact related to mode shares for transit, HOV, or other non-SOV modes under Alternative 4 is considered less than significant, and would achieve greater mode share split for non-single occupant vehicles than the Project.” Please see Errata and Changes to the Draft EIR.
- Response D-25: Please see responses to Comments D-6 through D-8 above, demonstrating that the GHG analysis of the Investment Program and the similar analysis of Alternative 4 are correct. Response D-6 addresses the issues of declining GHG emissions, correctly including the beneficial effects Pavley and other state-mandated regulations over time. Response D-7 addresses the issue of GHG emissions reductions being achieved through a number of means, including implementation of the CTP and a host of measures that are and will be implemented in response to directives in the state Scoping Plan and in other

regulations. Response D-8 recognizes that no single program, in isolation, will allow the state to achieve AB 32's goal for 2050. It will require success in each program to meet the goal.

Just as the CTP is but one mechanism to reduce statewide GHG emissions to meet the AB 32 goal, it will also be one of the mechanisms needed for the State to reduce GHG emissions to meet the SB 32 target by year 2030. However, many additional actions will be needed to achieve the SB 32 goal, all of which must be implemented by agencies other than CCTA. This is true of the Project analysis, as well as each of the alternatives.

Response D-26: This comment is primarily about the merits of the proposed Project (the CTP), and uses the conclusions of the EIR regarding mode share to suggest that the CTP is the result of failed planning. Please see responses to comments on the CTP, which address this topic.

As this comment relates to the EIR: the linkage between where future development is located, and how and where transportation infrastructure is provided, is crucial to the performance of the transportation system and resulting environmental impacts. CCTA was established pursuant to the Measure C Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program, passed by voters in November 1988. Measure C, and subsequently Measure J, which was approved by the voters in 2004, include an Expenditure Plan for allocating revenues from the collection sales tax to a variety of transportation projects and programs, and established a cooperative, multi-jurisdictional process for managing growth on a countywide basis. Land use decisions, however, are made at the local (city and county) level. Since CCTA does not control local land use decisions, the CTP seeks to link transportation investments to support a voter-approved urban limit line endorsed by the County and each city and town, to support new developments that enhance transportation efficiency and economic vitality, and that support infill and redevelopment in existing urban and brownfield areas. Based on MTC Guidelines, the CTP also includes transportation investments that, when integrated with Plan Bay Area's forecast land use (including Priority Development Areas (PDAs) Transit Priority Projects (TPPs)), support the region's adopted SCS.

The extent to which the CTP is able to achieve success is relative to each reviewer's individual perspective. The purpose of the EIR is to provide information that informs decision-makers, other responsible agencies, and the public, of the proposed actions and the potentially significant environmental impacts of those actions. This EIR does provide comparative, quantitative information to measure the effects of the CTP, and satisfies the obligations of CEQA.

Response D-27: The commenter has attached a copy of a May 5, 2017 comment letter submitted to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority on their Measure M sales tax measure. The letter does not address the proposed CTP and does not raise issues related to the Draft EIR or the analysis of environmental impacts for which

further response can be provided. The members of the CCTA Board will consider these comments as part of their overall consideration of the Plan.

Response D-28: This comment is primarily about the merits of the proposed Project (the CTP), but uses incorrect conclusions about the EIR to support this comment.

Contrary to the commenter's assertion, the EIR does not support the conclusion that the proposed Investment Program would result in very significant increases in GHG emissions. As indicated in Table 2.2-8 (Draft EIR page 2.2-22), with implementation of the Investment Program and assuming continued implementation of on-going State regulations (i.e., Advanced Clean Cars/Pavley), there would be a 34 percent decrease in annual countywide direct GHG emissions from all transportation sources.

Contrary to the commenter's assertion, the EIR does not support the conclusion that the CTP would unfairly shift the GHG emission reduction burden onto other jurisdictions. As indicated on Table 2.2-6 (Draft EIR page 2.2-19) Contra Costa is projected to contain approximately 14.5 percent of the Bay Area's population by year 2040, and emit approximately 15.6 percent of the Bay Area's estimate GHG emissions. However, the rest of the Bay Area's GHG emissions shown in Table 2.2-6 incorporate additional reductions due to a number of MTC policy initiatives. If Contra Costa is able to achieve GHG reductions through these MTC policy initiatives that are proportional to its population, the County's per capita emissions in year 2040 would match the Bay Area's average per capita emissions rate.

As also indicated in Table 2.2-7 (Draft EIR page 2.2-20), the Investment Program would result in an increase in passenger vehicle VMT per capita, from 20 VMT per capita under the year 2013 baseline, to 20.2 VMT per capita by year 2040. This increase in VMT per capita would result in GHG emissions that could exceed the county's "share" of Bay Area per capita emissions by approximately 1 percent. However, as show in Table 2.2-7, the county's projected total GHG emissions represent approximately 15 percent of all Bay Area regional emissions. Therefore, the 1% increase in per capita passenger car and light duty truck emissions from individual projects pursuant to the Investment Program represents only 1 percent of 15 percent (or approximately 0.15 percent) of all regional CO2 emissions. This does not represent an unfair or substantial imbalance in GHG emission reduction burden.

Response D-29: The alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR demonstrate a reasonable range of funding strategies for transportation projects and programs, and represent a reasonable range of meaningfully different alternatives to the Investment Program (i.e., the Project), consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The Table below (derived from Table 3.1.1, beginning at Draft EIR page 3.1-5) demonstrate the range of transportation investment alternatives represented by the EIR alternatives (not including the No Project Alternative):

Comparative Funding Summary by Mode (% of Estimated \$8 Billion in total assumed finding capacity – except Alternative \$2, funded at \$3.7 Billion)				
	Alternative #2: 2013 RTP	Project (Investment Program)	Alternative #3: emphasis on Transit	Alternative #4: Emphasis on Programs
Freeway and Arterial Road Projects	<u>54%</u>	<u>47%</u>	6%	7%
Transit Projects	27%	27%	<u>49%</u>	12%
Other Projects	NA	5%	NA	NA
Countywide Programs	18%	20%	28%	30%
Other Programs	NA	NA	17%	<u>51%</u>

Response D-30: As demonstrated in the responses above, the Draft EIR was appropriately prepared, and commenter’s suggestions and assertions do not reflect any flaws or errors that would show any new significant impacts, or a substantial increase in impacts resulting from the Project, that are not otherwise identified in the Draft EIR. The edits and changes to the Draft EIR reflected in the responses to comments above do not deprive the public from meaningful review or comment. The alternatives presented in the Draft EIR provide a reasonable range of alternatives that provide meaningful comparisons. The “meaningful sound alternative approach” suggested in this comment appears to be the letter submitted to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority on their Measure M sales tax measure. That letter primarily suggests land use controls (i.e., standards for countywide growth based on VMT standards, prioritizing development in Priority Development Areas, and a transfer of development rights program), which are beyond CCTA’s authority to implement. Since CCTA does not have any land use authority, these suggested land use control strategies do not represent a feasible alternative to the Project that is available to CCTA. This comment letter provides no significant new information that would otherwise require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

Response D-31: The purpose of this EIR is to inform decision-makers, other responsible agencies, and the public, of the proposed actions included in the CTP and its Investment Program, and of the potentially significant environmental impacts of those actions. The EIR must also evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed CTP Investment Program (the Project) that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and that would avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental impacts. This EIR does provide this information, and satisfies the obligations of CEQA.

Response D-32: This comment is a May 5, 2017 comment letter submitted to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority on their Measure M sales tax measure. The letter does

not address the proposed CTP and does not raise issues related to the Draft EIR or the analysis of environmental impacts for which further response can be provided. The members of the CCTA Board will consider these comments as part of their overall consideration of the Plan.

Response D-33: This comment is a March 17, 2016 comment letter submitted to CCTA regarding a draft Performance and Equity Evaluation of the Draft transportation Expenditure Plan. The letter does not address the proposed CTP and does not raise issues related to the Draft EIR or the analysis of environmental impacts for which further response can be provided. The members of the CCTA Board will consider these comments as part of their overall consideration of the Plan.

Response D-34: This comment is a correspondence from Mr. Peter Lydon to CCTA, containing suggestions on facilitating EV charging installations. The letter does not raise issues related to the Draft EIR or the analysis of environmental impacts, and no response to these suggestions is included in this response to Comments document. The members of the CCTA Board will consider these comments as part of their overall consideration of the Plan.