

| | |
|---|---|
| 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. | |
| Transportation Investment Priorities | |
| <i>Participants commented on investment categories important to them.</i> | |
| County | Comment |
| 1 | Napa Run existing transportation/transit longer hours on weekends and holidays. |
| 2 | Napa Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes - if you build them, they will come. |
| 3 | Napa Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes - but don't increase too many additions. |
| 4 | Napa We are a rural, agricultural county - we do not support mass transit. We drive tractors and farm trucks. |
| 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 |
| 5 | Napa Increase van pool incentives - at/to major employment centers: Queen of Valley Hospital, Napa County Government Offices, Airport Industrial Park. |
| 6 | Napa Timed lights. |
| 7 | Napa Encourage smart driving - catalytic converters are not efficient for short distances - need 45 MPH to peak efficiency. |
| 8 | Napa Expand the Safe Routes to Schools - driving kids to school when there is a safer route. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | |
| | 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 | |
| 9 | Napa | Expand Clipper card. |
| 10 | Napa | Planned connections (suitable to senior budgets) for bicycles and known destinations like schools, day cares, sports fields and parks. |

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| 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 |
| Napa | 4 | Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street. |
| Napa | 10 | Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking. |
| Napa | 3 | More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail. |
| Napa | 9 | Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees. |
| Napa | 6 | 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 | Napa | Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking - we have enough. |
| 2 | Napa | Look at local zoning, it will show local priorities. |
| 3 | Napa | Suggestion 1: Natural development and individual choice is the "American Standard." Do not interfere with local government working in unique locations by subsuming it into some common plan. # 2: Investment in transportation should serve its local community and not a "one size fits all" combined plan such as the "One Bay Area Plan". |
| 4 | Napa | Keep preservation of productive farmlands. Provide more financial incentives to set aside open spaces and farmlands with long term capability to keep them that way. General endowments as well as initial funds. |
| 5 | Napa | There are biomarkers such as cortisol which go up under stress from noise, fear, lack of safety, too much driving. Re: Improved health through better infrastructure for walking or biking: not just this way. Re: More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail: We have large pockets in the city of Napa with no access to fresh produce - no sidewalks, poor lights and weeds growing in storm drains. Re: Better schools: Better education equals ↑participation and level of knowledge. Desperation and (not legible) leads to crime. Priority Development Area, where growth might occur, therefore plan American Canyon as a mixed corridor place type. |
| 6 | Napa | No representation locally. |
| 7 | Napa | The questions only address cities and not agricultural, the main industry of Napa County. The key question is how to limit growth. |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| | <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> | | |
| 8 | Napa | | <i>Mostly. Not clear how the American Canyon PDA will provide transit within Napa County. How can higher density fit comfortably within the single family unit neighborhoods?</i> |
| 9 | Napa | | American Canyon has the potential to link jobs and housing due to its location and lay out, but we'll need financial support and regulatory flexibility to make it work best for our community. |
| 10 | Napa | | <i>25% of the approximately 140,000 acres of unincorporated area of Napa County is public open space. Density, development belongs in the cities and local decisions are controlled by local general plans legislated by local officials with input from local citizens that differ us from other Bay Area communities with different unique qualities.</i> |
| 11 | Napa | | Need more low income housing in Napa so workers don't need long commutes to work here. |
| 12 | Napa | | <i>Yes. Get out of local cities' business.</i> |
| 13 | Napa | | These need to converge more often within our Napa urban limit lines. |
| 14 | Napa | | <i>No, not yet - still too many commuters and not enough affordable homes.</i> |
| 15 | Napa | | During previous generations, people didn't ask or expect to be given housing or have other tax payers to fund other who choose to have children they can't afford or to not go to school to earn better job options. If you can't even speak the language of the country you live in, how do you expect to earn a good living wage? Options for free lessons exist. |
| 16 | Napa | | <i>In accordance with the Napa County General Plan, yes. The general plan directs urban uses to the 5 incorporated cities. American Canyon is one of the cities of Napa that has absorbed much of the residential growth. Additional steps can be taken by future development to provide transit alternatives.</i> |
| 17 | Napa | | High-end hotels and resorts are approved both in cities and out lying unincorporated areas that create low-paying jobs without affordable proximate housing. In-lieu fees charged to these developers in no way address that gap. Developers must be required greater accountability for reducing the jobs/housing and VMT dilemma. |
| 18 | Napa | | <i>This plan is a "one size fits all" document and compromises the uniqueness of the individual community in the nine Bay Area counties; allow uniqueness to develop and serve individual choice.</i> |
| 19 | Napa | | Do not interfere, with this plan, in the natural and individual development that typifies our 'American' standard. Leave the plan development at the local government and add no layers of frivolous monetary wasting of the tax payer funds. |
| 20 | Napa | | <i>Stop this U. N. Agenda 21 shoving into our throats. It's Big Government Dictatorship.</i> |
| 21 | Napa | | Build better roads in the rural areas (and elsewhere) so that people can reach the workplaces in reasonable time and expense. |
| 22 | Napa | | <i>What type of growth is the plan resenting? I've heard stacked housing. I've seen it in China, Russia and Chicago.</i> |
| 23 | Napa | | I don't think the Bay Area governments should be making long-term development plans based on a "projected" population increase of 2 million people. #1) more people moved <u>out</u> of the State of California than moved <u>into</u> it last year, so how can you predict what the future holds? #2) most government "projections" have proved to be, based on past history, completely inaccurate. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| 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 |
| Napa County -- Count | | |
| 1) ten | 1) ten | 1) seven |
| 2) one | 2) two | 2) three |
| 3) | 3) | 3) two |
| 4) one | 4) | 4) |
| 5) three | 5) four | 5) four |
| 0) | 0) | 0) |
| If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth. | | |
| Comment | | |
| 1 | Why doesn't the mayor of American Canyon live in Yountville if he works there. | |
| 2 | Development projects should be privately funded and not be government redistribution. | |
| 3 | Do not interfere with local government functions by elected persons vetted by the voters. Individual and unique cities must be allowed to manage themselves; not through superimposed entities that are not un-elected, non-governmental organizations. | |
| 4 | Napa County continues to operate "business as usual". Approves urban development, hotels, in rural areas of the county-forcing rural areas to support/provide housing which we can not afford. City centered growth is good-but not rural growth. | |
| 5 | Do not force it. Listen to the people of Napa County. | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 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 |
| Napa County -- Count | | Napa County -- Count |
| 1) nine | | 1) four |
| 2) two | | 2) three |
| 3) | | 3) four |
| 4) | | 4) 0 |
| 5) three | | 5) four |
| 0) | | 0) |
| 2. Why it that? | | |
| 1 Support Strongly: Because the communities we live in directly affect our health, especially those of low income families and individuals -- they will have negative health outcomes if they do not have access to healthy places to live and play. | | |
| 2 Support Strongly: A regional approach to the jobs/housing/transportation issues provides for greater flexibility and options. | | |

| | |
|----|--|
| 3 | <i>Support: Living in a rural community is wonderful but I often travel to surrounding Bay Area and belong to museums and theatre/arts in SF. Coordinating monies is important. Too often, we put blinders on and only look at what work or what's needed in our county.</i> |
| 4 | I believe in planning, but this evening doesn't do it. Just showing up means we have a vote but doesn't represent the citizens. Why not mail a survey to residents and get their opinions. We did not get any info tonight to make informed choices but most of us had already preconceived ideas of what we want to see and this didn't allow for discussion. |
| 5 | <i>Oppose Strongly: We do not need it and it is not financially stable.</i> |
| 6 | Support Strongly: Without strategy and local input, no coordination, and hence an unplanned mess. |
| 7 | <i>Oppose Strongly: Government oversight on local government is not acceptable nor practical. Regional planning supplants and destroys the individual city and lacks city-citizen authorization. Big, bigger, biggest government adds nothing but layers of taxpayer funds waste. Maintain expenditures at the local level.</i> |
| 8 | Support Strongly: Yes, but Napa should get its equal share of bike/ped funds based on use by all the Bay Area bike/ped folks. People commute to Napa but we don't get tax dollars. |
| 9 | <i>Oppose Strongly: We are rural. Let local government and the local population decide what is right for us locally.</i> |
| 10 | Support Strongly: Comprehensive planning or transit will allow for better use of resources. We need to plan for reuse of older/redundant travel corridors. Improve air quality applies to all areas. There are no boundaries to air. |
| 11 | <i>Support Strongly: We need smart growth. We can not allow unplanned growth that leads to increased traffic congestion, pollution and an increased waste of our natural resources. Linking housing, jobs and effective transportation will lead to better for all of us.</i> |
| 12 | Support Strongly: I believe that with expected population growth, a plan is definitely needed. Better prepared to handle larger communities. |
| 13 | <i>Support Strongly: The California Bay Area region is a desirable place to live and is the home to a number of globally leading industries. As a result, millions come here. Without a regional approach, we run the risk of haphazard, inefficient and environmentally destructive development.</i> |

| 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 | | |
| 1 | Napa | Napa County is blessed with agricultural resources which are resources that need to be protected for future generations. The One Bay Area Plan rightly focuses growth in major urban areas where transit infrastructure and retail and services can be easily accessed. |
| 2 | Napa | <i>The Plan is top down government and a waste of our children's future.</i> |
| 3 | Napa | Hell no. We don't need your commie crap! |
| 4 | Napa | <i>Station C: the most valuable because questions answered even from the opponents of Bay Area planning process. Unfortunately, too many in opposition to the process because they had a better networking system.</i> |
| 5 | Napa | It is not necessary and not affordable. |
| 6 | Napa | <i>Good idea!</i> |
| 7 | Napa | My community's character is unique and does not need to be synthesized into a non-distinguishable mass of look-alike buildings, street and structures, which are not user friendly for all modes of transportation or common occupancy. No 1 Bay Area Plan but 159 individual plans using the current interfaces cities currently utilize. |
| 8 | Napa | <i>Less car trips of 3 miles or less through a strong bike/ped network.</i> |
| 9 | Napa | Napa County still approves development/create jobs in far flung rural areas. Then looks to small villages to provide housing, where we do not have infrastructure, or water, or schools. Napa County Planning staff are developer shills - pro growth proponents who force urban growth in rural areas. We object. |
| 10 | Napa | <i>Every young couple strives for their own home. No one strives to live in an apartment for the rest of their lives. Stop focusing on density and celebrate single family homes by finding more options for them.</i> |
| 11 | Napa | Please make the Bay Area more livable by keeping Napa County a rural, agricultural area and has compact communities where people live now, and where they can get around without needing cars to make short trips. |
| 12 | Napa | <i>Napa County has managed growth well, fine tuning is needed, but in general growth principals are sound.</i> |