

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Plan Bay Area | | |
| January 2012 Public Workshops | | |
| Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops | | |
| Station A: Transportation Trade-Offs | | |
| A number of potential transportation investments will be considered as part of Plan Bay Area. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. At the workshop, participants who visited this station used tokens to "vote" on transportation trade-offs in three areas, or to provide their own idea: | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transportation Investment Priorities ■ Policies to Reduce Driving and Emissions ■ Policies Regarding Public Transit | |
| See the PDF titled "Comments on Transportation Trade-Offs " for how participants ranked the transportation investment categories in those three areas, and what "Other" ideas they offered. | | |
| Below are comments provided in the Comment Booklets related to these topics. | | |
| Transportation Investment Priorities | | |
| <i>Participants commented on investment categories important to them.</i> | | |
| | County | Comment |
| 1 | Alameda | BART around the Bay. Form a five-county JPA to succeed BART and Cal Train. |
| 2 | Alameda | Provide financial incentives to developers to build more multi unit housing and amenities like childcare. |
| 3 | Alameda | High Speed Transit (rail) for inside of our cities - neighborhood to neighborhood. |
| 4 | Alameda | Cars are the least expensive means of transportation - because it is paid for by the car owner and gas taxes. |
| 5 | Alameda | Free bus pass for students - middle school - high school. Gives school choice and starts next generation of bus riders. |
| 6 | Alameda | Repair freeways that exist. Should not take gasoline tax monies for bike and pedestrian ways. |
| 7 | Alameda | Safety education for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. |
| 8 | Alameda | More freeways -- 2 lanes to 4 lanes. |
| 9 | Alameda | To get the public to use mass transit by: forced inst. & monitoring for all fed. State & county prisoners as a cond. of their rel. All new arrivals to the county to reg to vote, social services, and court order workers, to inc. vol. to faith base churches for proper public inst. in their area. |
| | | |
| | | |

| Policies to Reduce Driving and Emissions | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| <i>Participants commented on a variety of strategies being considered to encourage the reduction of driving and associated vehicle emissions.</i> | | |
| | County | Comment |
| 10 | Alameda | Lobby Federal government to reduce subsidies for gasoline, so that driving reflects the true cost of extracting/refining petroleum. This will create real incentives to drive less. |
| 11 | Alameda | Encourage "Smart Driving" - I think this is not going to be effective on a large scale |
| 12 | Alameda | BART around the Bay. New 5 county JPA to succeed BART and Cal Train after a public vote. |
| 13 | Alameda | Stay out of the business of telling people what to do with their lives. The people who will be voting on this are not elected officials. |
| 14 | Alameda | Institute Parking Structures: encourage centralized parking for commercial districts. |
| 15 | Alameda | Expand the Safe Routes to Schools/Pedestrian Network: Infrastructure and encourage walking |
| 16 | Alameda | Encourage "Smart Driving" - What is that? Sounds like something we should all do. |
| 17 | Alameda | Support funding for mass transit. Support funding for transit oriented development. |
| 18 | Alameda | Fix all roads. Not all jobs can be done by telecommuting. |
| 19 | Alameda | Incentives for building walkable/bikeable communities. Congestion Pricing. |
| 20 | Alameda | Where you gonna get the electricity? |
| | | |
| Policies Regarding Public Transit | | |
| <i>Participants considered and commented on a variety of strategies being considered to improve the customer experience on public transit and to operate our existing public transit system more efficiently.</i> | | |
| | County | Comment |
| 21 | Alameda | BART around the Bay. Form a JPA to succeed BART and Caltrain and bring a plan to the voters. |
| 22 | Alameda | Free bus pass for youth. |
| 23 | Alameda | Provide transit access for all, not just to SF and Oakland but from San Leandro to Castro Valley to Berkeley. |
| 24 | Alameda | Public transit is very expensive. |
| 25 | Alameda | Free student bus passes. |
| 26 | Alameda | Tie funding to transit operations reform (scheduling, compensation). |
| 27 | Alameda | More affordable transit. |
| 28 | Alameda | More rapid transit. |
| 29 | Alameda | Enhance connections between transit stations and the community. |
| 30 | Alameda | Expand transit network. |
| 31 | Alameda | End subsidies; make BART responsible. |
| 32 | Alameda | Better scheduling with BART and AC Transit |

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| Plan Bay Area | | |
| January 2012 Public Workshops | | |
| Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops | | |
| Station B: Quality of Complete Communities | | |
| <i>Complete communities are places where transit, jobs, schools, recreation and stores are located within walking distance and help bring the community together. New development (housing) and transportation investments need to be carefully designed to maximize benefits for residents. Of the following benefits select your top two priorities:</i> | | |
| County | Count | Potential Benefit |
| Alameda | 11 | Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street. |
| Alameda | 21 | Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking. |
| Alameda | 20 | More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail. |
| Alameda | 7 | Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees. |
| Alameda | 21 | Better schools through communities that attract residents with a mix of incomes; school impact fees; and shared use of city/school facilities. |
| Indicate here if you disagree or have other suggestions. | | |
| 1 | Alameda | Better transit, longer routes, make areas more conveniently reached. |
| 2 | Alameda | We need BART around the Bay with ample parking at suburban stations. Surface parking converts easily to structures as land values increase. Many more people can drive to BART than walk. A given station's acreage can hold many more autos than dwelling units. |
| 3 | Alameda | Remember there are 0-5 year olds who need well located (near transit) child care/schools (or your just disadvantaged families with young children). They want TOD too and to limit driving emissions for their children's future if not theirs. |
| 4 | Alameda | Good schools will entice new homes and jobs. |
| 5 | Alameda | It is not ABAG nor MTC's right to decide what a "complete community" is. People, housing, condos, apts, stores, etc., put in close proximity or on top of each other is not my idea of a complete community. People need space and property rights. |
| 6 | Alameda | Increased incentives for organizations to hire in their local communities to reduce the need for commuting. |
| 7 | Alameda | Set limits on residential parking. Separate dwelling from parking. |
| 8 | Alameda | Better schools through school vouchers. Private transport systems cost less than public systems. |
| 9 | Alameda | Quality housing affordable to the Bay Area workforce with multiple transportation options to businesses/employment and creating a climate to attract businesses. |
| 10 | Alameda | Want to ensure that bus access is really given and amend with development without displacement. |

| | | | |
|----|---------------|--|---|
| 11 | Alameda | | Recommendation - better connect the PDA and PCA programs so each community gets best of both worlds at the same time. |
| 12 | Alameda | | A participatory meeting where we gather together and decide where does the attention needs to be and how are going to do it. |
| 13 | Alameda | | Shouldn't tie transportation funding to requiring housing. |
| 14 | Alameda | | Areas of mixed housing - not all single family or apartments - but mixed. |
| 15 | Alameda | | It divides neighborhoods into areas where all industrial workers will live in one area close to work and other workers in computer tech will live in another, close to work. This is not diversity. Local jurisdiction - not state jurisdiction. |
| 16 | Alameda | | Can not prioritize these choices - all together they make safe communities. |
| 17 | Alameda | | All of these, and mixed income housing, all fit together. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | <i>Are jobs and housing converging in the right places in your county? Can this convergence support greater access to jobs and housing, particularly for low-income and moderate-income populations?</i> |
| | County | | Comment |
| 18 | Alameda | | <i>Planning decisions in local cities is key to this process, so incentives to them are critical for building housing and affordable housing near transit.</i> |
| 19 | Alameda | | I don't think enough information was provided about the proposed land use scenarios for participants to speak to this question. |
| 20 | Alameda | | <i>No need for them to converge if we get BART around the Bay.</i> |
| 21 | Alameda | | New jobs-to-housing should be focused in the Priority Development Areas. |
| 22 | Alameda | | <i>No, the extremely low income and the homeless population are as usual being ignored. Affordability is a term used in housing and is not truly affordable to the renter. It is affordability for the developer or land owner, only! When asked why a developer could not offer housing based on 30% of income I was told "the developer" could not afford to.</i> |
| 23 | Alameda | | Housing was converged in Pleasanton against the will of the citizens. We voted on a 29,000 unit cap, and Jerry Brown and the legislature are forcing low and extremely low housing into Pleasanton. |
| 24 | Alameda | | <i>No rising sea levels.</i> |
| 25 | Alameda | | No, I live in Oakland and work in Berkeley in technology - obviously there is no convergence. In Santa Clara and San Mateo counties, there are also no options with the amenities that are available. We need walkable communities near all job centers. |
| 26 | Alameda | | <i>There are a lot of low-paying service jobs in our region without the appropriate number of housing units to match.</i> |
| 27 | Alameda | | We need more housing along the transportation corridors. |
| 28 | Alameda | | <i>Generally yes, possibly, if adequate infrastructure is provided.</i> |
| 29 | Alameda | | Texas has a free economy and lots of jobs. |
| 30 | Alameda | | <i>No, the stock of quality housing affordable to our workforce is not concentrated in areas in close proximity to jobs, good schools, quality open space, and transportation choices.</i> |

| | | | |
|----|---------|--|--|
| 31 | Alameda | | (Work) Pleasanton-Dublin sprawl. Heavily segregated land uses (employment, housing). Pleasanton - not enough low-moderate income housing - unaffordable. (Home) Oakland - better integration of jobs/housing, though driving is still often a better option between neighborhoods. |
| 32 | Alameda | | <i>I want to ensure that there is affordable housing near job centers that are complete communities.</i> |
| 33 | Alameda | | Encourage more emphasis for means to develop affordable units in more affluent communities. |
| 34 | Alameda | | <i>Based on the map and my limited knowledge of the area, it appears they are because they are close to existing infrastructure.</i> |
| 35 | Alameda | | Okay. |
| 36 | Alameda | | <i>No, you barely see good jobs and good housing in my neighborhood. There are some jobs but not that much in lower-income population.</i> |
| 37 | Alameda | | Perhaps new housing should mimic the housing already existing in growing areas while adding housing options that sustain all incomes. |
| 38 | Alameda | | <i>Yes, but not TODs. TODs have been shown to not produce the transit riders that they claim.</i> |
| 39 | Alameda | | Need more affordable housing in all parts the Bay Area. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Plan Bay Area | | |
| January 2012 Public Workshops | | |
| Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops | | |
| Station C: The San Francisco Bay Area -- 2040 | | |
| How should the region accommodate projected growth? (Indicate your level of support for each potential option.) | | |
| A. Allow new housing, offices and shops to be built in the centers of cities and town near public transit. | B. Build more affordable housing near public transit for residents without cars who depend on public transit, while preserving the character of single-family residential neighborhoods. | C. Build more affordable housing in existing communities that already have a strong job base. |
| 1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion | 1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion | 1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion |
| Alameda County -- Count | | |
| 1) 24 | 1) 18 | 1) 15 |
| 2) 3 | 2) 3 | 2) 8 |
| 3) 1 | 3) 7 | 3) 5 |
| 4) 1 | 4) | 4) 1 |
| 5) 4 | 5) 3 | 5) 3 |
| 0) | 0) 1 | 0) 1 |
| <i>If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth.</i> | | |
| Alameda County Comments | | |
| 1 | Please provide health measures to protect residents from the health hazards of living near transit (i.e., diesel pollution). | |
| 2 | <i>Suburban station areas should e planned much more for automobile rather than walking access. New and rebuilt freeways should have wide medians, est. I-80, I-580, and SR4. Housing and transit do not mingle well. BART needs better auto and freeway access.</i> | |
| 3 | I don't understand the differences, sorry. | |
| 4 | <i>In addition to the above, cities need to allow small commercial (retail) in existing neighborhoods.</i> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 5 | Increase local hiring incentives, encourage large employers to create regional offices, create multi-areas: work/shopping or home/shopping. Encourage centralized parking for commercial areas. | |
| 6 | <i>Private bus systems = Private Jobs - Reduce regulations.</i> | |
| 7 | More incentives are very important. | |
| 8 | <i>Retain local control. None of the plans are desirable. Cut gas taxes and fix roads and expand roads with the rest.</i> | |
| 9 | Support B the most. Improve upon it by ensuring a mix of incomes for homes near public transit (greater socialization among levels). | |
| 10 | <i>I don't oppose. I'm just concerned about development without displacement.</i> | |
| 11 | Local jurisdiction only. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Plan Bay Area | | |
| January 2012 Public Workshops | | |
| Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops | | |
| Do you support development of Plan Bay Area? | | |
| <i>Plan Bay Area is along-term strategy for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area that is currently being developed. The idea is to accommodate the region's housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years and reduce the region's auto dependence. Plan Bay Area is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it.</i> | | |
| 1. In general, do you support the establishment of this type of a regional plan? | | 3. Changes will be needed in my community and in my lifestyle to improve the quality of life in the Bay Area in the future. |
| 1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion | | 1. Agree Strongly 2 3 4 5. Disagree Strongly 0. No Opinion |
| Alameda County -- Count | | Alameda County -- Count |
| 1) 20 | | 1) 17 |
| 2) 8 | | 2) 8 |
| 3) 3 | | 3) 2 |
| 4) 0 | | 4) 2 |
| 5) 3 | | 5) 4 |
| 0) No Opinion | | 0) 0 |
| 2. Why it that? | | |
| 1 | <i>Generally support reduction of GHG through infill development, increase in public transit and increased options for biking/walking. Please take into consideration the air quality near freeways, ports, truck routes when housing decisions are made to reduce poor health outcomes.</i> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | Support Strongly: Because growth is inevitable, the question is how to plan for it in order to maintain quality of life and avoid destroying the environment. I am very disillusioned that so many people here tonight do not understand this simple fact. | |
| 3 | <i>Support Strongly: Sustainable, transit-oriented communities have proven to result in healthier residents. Planning for a future that does not heavily depend on fossil fuels is necessary since fossil fuels are not going to last forever and they hurt our health and planet.</i> | |
| 4 | Oppose Strongly: It is ill-conceived. BART with ample parking at suburban stations gives people access to regional jobs throughout the region. People can change jobs without moving their homes or driving long distances. Adjusted for inflation and population, a bond issue of the 5 counties ringing the Bay Area would yield about \$66 billion. | |
| 5 | <i>Support Strongly: Greenhouse gases.</i> | |
| 6 | Support Strongly: Right now, each community is an island. It is very important to have each local community to decide how things will look in their community. I am also worried that the public input process is not getting a diverse cross-section of views -- especially from teens, young professionals and young families. | |
| 7 | <i>Support Strongly: Because many issues are regional issues best addressed on a regional scale.</i> | |
| 8 | Support Strongly: Yes, we need a regional planning tool that incorporates growth and transportation. | |
| 9 | <i>No, because it restricts freedom of individuals, especially the poor.</i> | |
| 10 | Support Strongly: I don't like sprawl and strip malls; SMART growth. | |
| 11 | <i>Support Strongly: We need to prepare all of our residents to succeed in the new economy. This is not a survival of the fittest. We need to increase the health of all our residents.</i> | |
| 12 | Support: It's hard to be strategic if we're only leaving it up to every local government. Top down is not always the most efficient but I think a common philosophy or set of standards is necessary for such lofty and comprehensive goals. | |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 13 | <p><i>Support Strongly: There are several reasons: Auto dependence =GHG/CO2 emissions - must reduce to improve air quality. Highways -- new and expanded -- are not possible. New populations must be served big improved, efficient, integrated, public transportation. Land Use/Transportation are inextricably linked to and must be planned together.</i></p> | | |
| 14 | <p>Support: Growth is inevitable and the best way to know of it is through higher density. What is being proposed seems no different than what has been done in other major cities in the county/world. The opposition seems mis-guided. I don't think they understand how zoning works -- natural growth as they are asking for works through approved zoning measures.</p> | | |
| 15 | <p><i>Support: I understand that the meeting tonight did not proceed as planned. The mob mentality and rude interruptions discourage differing opinions from only the most veracious from being heard. The television cameras directly in front of the podium was also incredibly intimidating. I do commend staff and elected officials for doing their best to create an environment where people could calmly ask questions and provide comments, and for surviving the onslaught, I think that goes a long way in making people feel heard, no matter how rude and obnoxious they are. The biggest issue though, is, in this in environment, who is being heard.</i></p> | | |
| 16 | <p>With little exposure to the issues/qualities of PBA, based on what I learned tonight, 1/12/12, the Plan appears to be a much needed step in the right direction. It sounds like it's a work in progress. I'm glad my opinion is valued and invited.</p> | | |
| 17 | <p><i>Oppose Strongly: No regional plan, must be local only!</i></p> | | |
| 18 | <p>Support Strongly: Despite the shouting at the meeting, I don't hear alternatives. It seems like we need an overall mix of strategies in the plan.</p> | | |
| | | | |

| Plan Bay Area | | |
|--|---------|---|
| January 2012 Public Workshops | | |
| Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops | | |
| Other Comments | | |
| <i>Participants were asked to provide any other comments related to Plan Bay Area:</i> | | |
| County | Comment | |
| 1 | Alameda | We need more palpable transit to get people out of cars and affordable to all specifically local low income and fixed income. |
| 2 | Alameda | <i>All of the opposition I hear, here tonight, is coming from people who are afraid of change. They want to stick their heads in the sand and pretend there are no problems, ignore the fact that population growth will happen. These attitudes are based on ignorance, selfishness and a very dangerous sense of individualism with no concern for the common good.</i> |
| 3 | Alameda | I am really concerned about equity and public health. I think affordable, reliable and clean transportation to get people from home to jobs and entertainment would boost our economy and provide ways for folks to get around while decreasing GHG. |
| 4 | Alameda | <i>Form a JPA of the five counties from the SF Bay. Plan for BART around this Bay. Upgrade, separate and fence Caltrain south from Millbrae/SFO and add a third (freight) track on the eastside, regauge, signal and electrify Caltrain as BART. Extend BART beyond the Altamont and the Golden Gate and Carquinez bridges.</i> |
| 5 | Alameda | I'm a one car family living near BART in downtown Oakland. An improvement would be childcare and schools nearby, and safer streets as well. Change would not negatively impact me. |
| 6 | Alameda | <i>I want more places that match my ideal lifestyle - I want denser walkable fully featured neighborhoods with shopping, parks, housing and work in our neighborhood.</i> |
| 7 | Alameda | All great regions, such as the Bay Area, have great parks and natural resource areas. Open space and land conservation agencies, such as the East Bay Regional Park District, are committed to partnering with MTC and ABAG to 1) protect vital natural resource areas, and 2) to find effective and meaningful financial incentives to meet the requirements of SB375. Thanks for all your work on Plan Bay Area to make the Bay Area an even greater region that it is today. |
| 8 | Alameda | <i>There is a contradiction with a plan based on further development areas and complying with BAAQMD's air quality guidelines. Application of the guidelines severely restricts to development of the PDAs. I recommend that this issue be studied by qualified professionals independent from BAAQMD.</i> |
| 9 | Alameda | No. Just look at Oakland and San Jose. Change - new discoveries - plans for 25 years must adjust to change. Bus Service: especially private bus service is more flexible than rail. |
| 10 | Alameda | <i>My community needs to reduce the stressors of life that shorten our life spans. These include stable, livable wages, quality housing, multiple transportation choices, quality schools, etc.</i> |

| | | |
|----|---------|--|
| 11 | Alameda | Work Shop Comments (Dublin 1/11/12): As a transportation/planning/engineering professional (who admits that I did not review entire Plan before workshop), I found some parts confusing (e.g., Tokens to vote for transportation improvements). As an Oakland resident, disappointed that Dublin was the only Alameda County venue. This workshop unfortunately turned into a shouting matches, etc. I did not get to participate in Station C's Q&A because council chamber was turned into an impromptu public meeting with no opportunity for me to participate. You let the loonies (property rights, etc.) take over - too bad. |
| 12 | Alameda | <i>People need to feel they have a choice. If they want to drive an SUV they should be able to. I definitely agree that higher density is needed but if people choose to commute, they should have that choice.</i> |
| 13 | Alameda | I believe growth is inevitable and therefore adaption is necessary. I'm willing to work collaboratively with the Bay Area people to grow and expand. Consciously, intentionally and collaboratively. |
| 14 | Alameda | <i>This plan makes it anti-social and divides communities.</i> |
| 15 | Alameda | Add transportation details to the announcement flyer. |
| 16 | Alameda | Thank you for patience. Be prepared to make this a process. Planning is perseverance. Buy-in is important. How we do this is just as important as what we do. Ideas are good; let's give that all the other side can complain about. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |