

Letter  
162

**From:** Laura Robinson  
**To:** CAP  
**Subject:** ATTN: Maggie Soffel / Climate Action Plan, General Plan Amendment and Draft SEIR  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 20, 2017 3:28:47 PM

Maggie Soffel

Department of Planning and Development Services  
 510 Overland Ave, Suite 110  
 San Diego, CA 92123

**RE: Climate Action Plan, General Plan Amendment and Draft SEIR**

Dear Ms. Soffel:

I hope you are well.

While I support some aspects of the draft Climate Action Plan, I ask that the County add a strong, explicit statement to reduce the vehicle miles traveled – and thus greenhouse gas emissions – generated from newly planned residential development. The plan should not facilitate far-flung sprawl that undermines the region’s efforts to become a carbon-efficient economy. Rather, it is incumbent upon the County to use its land use authority to put in place sustainable patterns of development near jobs and transit, as called for by the State of California. Thank you for your consideration.

|  
I62-1  
|

\*\*\*\*\*  
 Re: A general analysis of California Supreme Court decision in *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Association of Governments*

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that public agencies assess the environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, of projects that require government permits. Opinion (Op.) at p.1-2. The question in this case was whether the environmental impact report for a San Diego area transportation infrastructure development plan satisfied the CEQA requirements. Op. at 2.

The lower courts determined that the environmental impact report was inadequate for two reasons:

1. The report did not analyze the consistency between the plan’s emission impacts and Governor Schwarzenegger Executive Orders in 2005, which declared a goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Op. 2, 11.
2. The report did not adequately address feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives that would reduce vehicle miles traveled and curb the rise in greenhouse gas emissions. Op. 11, 23.

|  
I62-2  
|

Reviewing the lower court’s decision, the California Supreme Court rejected their first conclusion—determining that the report makes the plan’s divergence from Governor Schwarzenegger’s 2050 greenhouse gas emissions goal obvious, even though it does not explicitly compare the two. Op. 20. In particular, the fact that the report shows that the plan

## Response to Comment Letter I62

**Laura Robinson**  
**September 20, 2017**

**I62-1** The comment requests the County add a component to reduce VMT from newly planned residential development. Please see Master Response 6 related to the transportation GHG reduction measures.

**I62-2** The comment summarizes the findings of a recent Supreme Court decision in *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Association of Governments*. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft SEIR and no further response is required. However, the comment will be included in the Final EIR and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the project.

would increase greenhouse gas emissions makes it clear that the plan is inconsistent with the 2050 reductions goal. Op. 22.

However, the California Supreme Court did not disturb the lower court's second conclusion that the report failed to sufficiently consider feasible mitigation measures to curb the rise in greenhouse gas emissions. Op. 23.

I62-2  
cont

\*\*\*\*\*

Sincerely,

Laura Robinson  
Temecula, CA

Former Chairman, Legislation & Public Policy,  
Temecula Valley Woman's Club  
Former Chairman, Legislation & Public Policy,  
De Anza District  
Cell: 619.813.8595