

## Comment on Draft EIR

Tue 7/20/2021 9:00 PM

To: EIR Comments <eircomments@bayareametro.gov>

**\*External Email\***

I am an elderly, third generation resident of the East Bay who has held great hope for the regional Plan Bay Area 2050 since I attended community outreach events in 2018. My BS in geology and meteorology is from local CSUs. I have lived and worked in science-based technology in almost all parts of the Bay Area for over 55 years. For the past 16 years I have lived in San Leandro on unconsolidated sediment in a very high liquefaction risk area which FEMA has also designated a flood risk area because of sea level rise. I am fully cognizant that these conditions are worsening and sea level is rising and will continue to rise. In the interest of full disclosure I guess I should also say that before I die I expect to be displaced by San Leandro's Shoreline development which will be destroyed by rising Bay waters but not before it irredeemably impacts the Bay.

After spending many hours reading through the Draft EIR for the Plan Bay Area 2050, and working my way through acronyms, I can say it is a monumental and well-executed report. I truly believe that the regional approach to planning for the future is as necessary as CEQA is. I believe the Plan is an extremely important exercise, but unless impacts are clearly assessed and specific mitigations mandated and implemented, this is just an exercise and I had higher hopes. I will say that this EIR has fulfilled some of its purpose. It represents the depth and breadth of analysis that is needed and is informative, but falls short of clearly classifying impacts and recommending mitigation, I am guessing because the real alternatives don't cater to real estate interests.

I found it just plain depressing that so many of the well-defined impacts noted in the report all were judged to have less than significant impact. I am just an observer of what is happening but I KNOW that there are MANY developments planned (and not just where I currently reside) that WILL greatly increase the likelihood of harm to the Bay and the region. Of course, the Plan Bay Area 2050 is not the cause of the harm, but the writers of the EIR clearly understand the issues and risks and to have the EIR not better acknowledge those risks and issues and to further downplay the significance of impacts makes this EIR a big disappointment. Passing the buck to other jurisdictions and the developers is gutless and just rings false. Developers get around CEQA and BCDC regulations with the help of local jurisdictions that rarely look beyond their current budget cycle or borders. I had higher hopes for the regional approach and am disappointed that the teeth in Plan Bay Area 2050 aren't really supported by the EIR. Everybody I know recognizes that we are experiencing many significant impacts in the early 2000's, not 2050, and they are increasing every year. We need to be planning and implementing real mitigation now. Not even stating the significance of environmental impacts clearly in this important Environmental Impact Report does not bode well for real change in the future.

That well-articulated individual geological impacts GEO-1 through GEO-6 were considered less than significant not worth mitigation immediately sank my high hopes; that only impacts on paleontological sites are deemed significant but unavoidable was deeply disturbing to me. Why are only things of the past given more protection than people who live here? I should have kept a tally of how many of the impacts in all of the 15 discipline chapters were marked as less than significant and not requiring mitigation, as I think that might reveal a pattern. But I was not that organized. I did find well thought-out and delineated mitigation measures to Air Quality Impact AQ-02 but fear they will be ignored because no entity will implement and/or enforce them. Land Use and Housing are at the very heart of the Plan, and the Plan has developed into something I found profound and hopeful, but after reading the EIR I find myself

wondering at what I see as lack of acknowledgment that “physical changes in the environment caused by economic or social effects constitute significant environmental effects” which we must mitigate by action.

I am actually sorry that I can't come up with more positive and specific input. This was an overwhelming task. Outreach to residents is arduous and I want more than anything to thank you for your efforts.

Virginia Madsen

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]