

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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 | SFrancisco | Develop necessary service clusters in each neighborhood where people can buy food, drugs, and other necessities. Develop incentives to keep neighborhood stores. |
| 2 | SFrancisco | Decisions like this can not be made without the costs of each project. Get the cost included. |
| 3 | SFrancisco | Reverse ramp meter - hold cars on freeway. |
| 4 | SFrancisco | Lower transit fares, reduce fare enforcement office. |
| 5 | SFrancisco | Lower fares for public transit. |
| 6 | SFrancisco | Reduce/free transit, eliminate policing and enforcement. |
| 7 | SFrancisco | Prioritize transit monies for transit (bus over rail and construction). |
| 8 | SFrancisco | Increase capacity. |
| 9 | SFrancisco | Rail lines should be extended but build new urban lines - not simply extend existing lines out. |
| 10 | SFrancisco | Lower cost of transit or means tested monthly passes. Why is maintenance of existing infrastructure an "investment" rather than an operating expense. If you can't maintain, you can not afford new. |
| 11 | SFrancisco | Free or reduced fares on public transit. |
| 12 | SFrancisco | Increase the number of freeway lanes and carpoolers and bus riders: No, it has never worked - pushed for years in the Bay Area. Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes: All bicycles transport 3% of the population while reducing car lanes for vehicles. That's with gas now with electric cars, cars will transport 80% of the population, emissions free. (Not legible) |

| 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 | |
| 13 | SFrancisco | Lower the cost of transit. Raise the gasoline tax, the vehicle tax, and congestion pricing for tolls etc. Carpooling incentives. |
| 14 | SFrancisco | Develop transit passes with pre-taxed monies and parking reductions. |
| 15 | SFrancisco | Pointless without cost and benefits of each project. |
| 16 | SFrancisco | Improve bicycle access on transit. No car needed for even long trips. |
| 17 | SFrancisco | Reduce the cost of public transit. TOD to reduce auto emissions. |
| 18 | SFrancisco | Low or no cost (to riders) transit. |
| 19 | SFrancisco | Make public transportation more affordable. |
| 20 | SFrancisco | Free transportation, eliminate fare enforcement and expanding existing public transit. |
| 21 | SFrancisco | Provide fares, make transit more affordable. |
| 22 | SFrancisco | Congestion pricing |
| 23 | SFrancisco | Charge drivers more - how could you not include this? |
| 24 | SFrancisco | Complete the Regional Bicycle Network and educate and inspire people to use bikes. |
| 25 | SFrancisco | Increase bus service, if not planned. Stop densification. |
| 26 | SFrancisco | Couple new housing with job vicinity, services and transit, parks, schools, shops, etc. |
| 27 | SFrancisco | Free or reduced fares on public transit. |
| 28 | SFrancisco | Increase costs/capture "externalities of driving". |
| 29 | SFrancisco | I think free markets, and incentives and economic focus, should and will reject or support these options. Free enterprise in a free society has always made us the greater nation in the world. No dictators, no communism, no socialism, no (not legible), This is America, we the people will elect responsible government politicians who defend our freedom. |
| 30 | SFrancisco | ABAG & MTC need to put greater emphasis on direct means to reduce GHG emissions by putting serious money behind the acquisition of electric and electric/battery automobiles. Also, fund school buses for school districts that have abandoned the busing program. |
| 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 | |
| 31 | SFrancisco | Only when costs and benefits are included. |
| 32 | SFrancisco | By reducing the cost of service. Use fare enforcement. |
| 33 | SFrancisco | Expand service and reduce fares. |
| 34 | SFrancisco | By making it free and harassment free from fare enforcement and with increased service. |

| | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 35 | SFrancisco | Free or reduced fares on public transportation, as well as, trying to make system more efficient without cutting service. Less money for freeways and more for transit. |
| 36 | SFrancisco | Don't support. The two key rationales for transportation are known disasters, global warming, carbon emissions, cap and trade, is no (not legible) politically moderated, but now service has proven the intent of Al Gore and the U.N. is an effort to control, individual freedom and free enterprise, invention and not be manipulated to control society, as per Russia, China, communism. |
| | | |

| | | |
|--|--------------|---|
| 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 |
| SFrancisco | 4 | Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street. |
| SFrancisco | 11 | Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking. |
| SFrancisco | 6 | More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail. |
| SFrancisco | 5 | Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees. |
| SFrancisco | 10 | 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 | SFrancisco | How is industry involved in this? It looks like the cities' regional plans don't have much connection with retail either. These places get built but the stores may or may not choose to settle there. |
| 2 | SFrancisco | Supporting design codes. |
| 3 | SFrancisco | People do not drive less in this development in San Jose. Why transit when most people will drive? Like housing built along San Jose light rail. Most people want single family homes with gardens. Complete communities do not need transit, they need homes they want to live in. Keep new development un-subsidized and be honest that most people will drive in this development. |
| 4 | SFrancisco | For all of these, priority resources should be given to low to moderate income communities. |
| 5 | SFrancisco | Urban agriculture, community gardens, local food "pocket neighborhoods" around common spaces, shared open space. |
| 6 | SFrancisco | Complete communities that have transit, jobs, schools, recreation and stores located within walking distance are fantasies! Why would I walk if transit is in my community? This is a dumb question and irrational idea. |
| 7 | SFrancisco | Reduce parking cap at 0.5 max in San Francisco PDAs. |
| 8 | SFrancisco | I agree on the definition of a complete community. The most important aspect of this conversation is accessibility to 1) transit that is affordable and 2) jobs that keep working class folks in their homes (deeply affordable housing). |
| 9 | SFrancisco | Affordable housing and public transit are keys for developing healthy communities for all. |
| 10 | SFrancisco | 1) Zoned low-income housing for historically underserved work force, low income communities, current residents/families in Southeast. 2) Free transit, free of harassment, that gives reliable access to the city. |

| | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|
| 11 | SFrancisco | | Deep affordability restrictions to increase family housing. How can MTC and ABAG help address displacement. |
| 12 | SFrancisco | | Access to transit modes. |
| 13 | SFrancisco | | Increase neighborhood livability by making streets more neighborhood scale-- widen sidewalks, add transit, eliminate "traffic sewers" such as Oak/Fell. Preserve historic buildings--adaptive re-use. Treasure Island/Hunters Point have no or little transit. Lennar/Forest City/Park Merced has good transit. |
| 14 | SFrancisco | | Strategies for more mix use and less need to be auto dependent. "Complete" should also mean a full life without a car. |
| 15 | SFrancisco | | Increase street trees and vegetation in urban neighborhoods. |
| 16 | SFrancisco | | Public transportation system is already pretty good. The problem is US culture equals using a car. Need education, re-education to teach people how great it is not to drive. |
| 17 | SFrancisco | | Transportation should be "trigger" for densification. Transportation should control densification; if transportation is not implemented, do not increase densification. |
| 18 | SFrancisco | | Given the complete communities principles, you need all components above. Your choices confound funding versus densification versus education. False choices in many ways. |
| 19 | SFrancisco | | More fees will further discourage denser development. |
| 20 | SFrancisco | | In San Francisco, need more deeply affordable housing. Need more light manufacturing and livable wage jobs in Southeast SF. |
| 21 | SFrancisco | | In a free society, you can not ensure control of society, in education, economic opportunities, business, however, (not legible) and keep the indeed freedoms assured by our constitution, we are the home of the free, you can (not legible) progress, except in a dictatorship. |
| 22 | SFrancisco | | The categories seem false divisions, such as safer = better to walk. What are different issues you want to ease out? Is it support for lighting? For impact fees? |
| | | | |
| | | | <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> |
| 23 | SFrancisco | | <i>Not sure. Income inequity needs to be reduced - perhaps minimum wage needs to be raised.</i> |
| 24 | SFrancisco | | Yes, but I think more jobs should be concentrated on existing transit. |
| 25 | SFrancisco | | <i>Yes. Jobs and housing in Bay View is the right thing to do. Health benefits should be very high priority for new development.</i> |
| 26 | SFrancisco | | Yes, if more jobs come to east Contra Costa County with expansion of Vasco Road to a freeway so Silicon Valley manufacturers will move to east Contra Costa County. No more buildings until freeways are improved. |
| 27 | SFrancisco | | <i>Yes. Yes it is properly done.</i> |
| 28 | SFrancisco | | Yes, but it's not clear whether low and moderate income households will have access to new housing in these areas. |
| 29 | SFrancisco | | <i>It makes sense for jobs and housing to converge in the transit dense areas but I am fearful that this will cause gentrification and displacement of low-income people. No green fill! Be careful to also maintain open spaces. Extend BART.</i> |



| | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|
| 30 | SFrancisco | | San Francisco is a bedroom community for Silicon Valley high earners. At some bus stops, there are more corporate shuttles than public transit. If San Francisco did not have rent control - most renters could not afford to live here. |
| 31 | SFrancisco | | <i>Sure, jobs and housing are converging in the right places. Who is supposed to pay for low and moderate income population? Employer? Residents? How about MTC and ABAG!</i> |
| 32 | SFrancisco | | No, my neighborhood, Market and Octavia, does not have enough affordable housing. Also, too much housing is luxurious with parking for Silicon Valley commuters. |
| 33 | SFrancisco | | <i>Much more housing is needed in San Francisco. Perpetuation of low density housing makes existing housing too expensive for many residents and would-be residents.</i> |
| 34 | SFrancisco | | No. Working class people are losing jobs or never had any of the jobs that are available at higher income levels which increases the cost of living so low income people are being pushed out. |
| 35 | SFrancisco | | <i>In San Francisco, there is not affordable housing for low-income people in the Tenderloin, Mission and Bay View. In the Bay View, residents suffer from a lack of local jobs. This convergence will impact SF but we need to support low income residents so they can continue to live in their neighborhoods.</i> |
| 36 | SFrancisco | | No, there are areas in southeast San Francisco that lack truly affordable housing and a neighborhood economy that allows equal access jobs to its own residents (mostly privately funded projects). Residents in the Bay View have limited information, decision-making power and access to jobs and housing. |
| 37 | SFrancisco | | <i>We are over-developing market rate housing and severely short on deeply affordable housing in San Francisco. As a result, we consistently loose families and we have the highest displacement of African Americans in the country outside of post Katrina, New Orleans.</i> |
| 38 | SFrancisco | | Transit Corridors, Geary, that lack density. Market Street mid-market is a missed opportunity. Church Street, BART stations, 16th and 24th Streets, lack housing and jobs. |
| 39 | SFrancisco | | <i>I think so. How do I know exactly? I'm a moderate income person in San Francisco, and I commute to my job downtown. I like developing Mission Bay further.</i> |
| 40 | SFrancisco | | Generally, yes. But no density increases are planned for west side of town, which is where Muni Metro lines/light rail are. There should be more density along these corridors than planned but Muni Metro has systematic capacity/operational issues that need to be addressed. |
| 41 | SFrancisco | | <i>San Francisco County, no. SF is becoming a bedroom community for Silicon Valley workers. Housing is more expensive, the poor are being driven out or into public housing or high-crime neighborhoods.</i> |
| 42 | SFrancisco | | In San Francisco, mostly better than in most places as we allow mix-use and other kinds of development forbidden in many cities. But could be better. We need more density and more transit. The average transit mode share should increase. |
| 43 | SFrancisco | | <i>I believe so, and yes, this supports greater access to jobs and housing. Note: this question is broad and should have to address without more specifics.</i> |
| 44 | SFrancisco | | Don't know. But in general, low and moderate income population seems to always loose. Pushed out of the city, have low income jobs in city and can not pay city rents. |
| 45 | SFrancisco | | <i>It is unclear to me whether jobs and housing will materialize for low-income populations. I would like to see more development in Richmond, Sunset and Oceanside districts - not just on east side of SF.</i> |

| | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|
| 46 | SFrancisco | | No. Central and west SF could be densified in Nabe (not legible) areas but with more transportation first. Mission Street could have 3,4, 5, 6+ floors. West Portal could have housing over (not legible). |
| 47 | SFrancisco | | <i>San Franciscans seem to have great access to local professional jobs. However, I feel that it may be challenging for lower income individuals to find local housing, especially if they have families.</i> |
| 48 | SFrancisco | | No. Local housing costs greatly exceed affordability of local job wages (primarily retained in most of SF outside of downtown core). BMR housing as opposed to affordable. \$80k-\$100K income households are not existent. Western SOMA stabilization, plan is interesting idea. |
| 49 | SFrancisco | | <i>Generally, yes. The Geary Corridor should have greater density as well to support Geary Avenue BART.</i> |
| 50 | SFrancisco | | For San Francisco County both are fairly ubiquitous. Contra Costa is making great strides in the right direction especially Contra Costa Transit Village at Pleasant Hill BART and future plans for Walnut Creek BART. |
| 51 | SFrancisco | | <i>No. In San Francisco we need more deeply affordable housing (re-zoning is necessary) and living wage non-professional jobs in light of manufacturing, arts and green industries. We need more affordable public transit, it's too expensive.</i> |
| 52 | SFrancisco | | Society has, thus far, elected preponderant, private control of the economic value of the land. All public policy can do is mitigate the tendency towards less than sound land use productivities. Taxing land rents more, coupled with taxing buildings and labor less, will establish more organic and healthy land use patterns. |
| 53 | SFrancisco | | <i>New building concentrates in areas (e.g., Hunters Point) that are low-lying (subject to flooding at sea-level rises), and much is poorly served by transit.</i> |
| 54 | SFrancisco | | They are certainly not in Santa Clara county, perhaps more so in SF county. Yes, this convergence would support greater and more sustainable access. |
| 55 | SFrancisco | | <i>No. Too much housing near transit modes in SF are luxury condos. Low income housing is too often infill or put far away from transit. Such as in Hunters Point.</i> |
| 56 | SFrancisco | | Business will draw educated employees and reward them with good jobs and pay them for their performance making better jobs, housing, etc.,. Companies will migrate to states, cities, regions that enhance the company's goals and performance. Boeing wants to build a new plane in North Carolina (a right to work state with no unions) and in America, that's freedom and we should ensure it, not try to dictate, this is how freedom works. |
| 57 | SFrancisco | | <i>Yes, but some of the jobs (income -wise) do not match up with the housing costs. Yes, San Francisco can support more jobs and housing.</i> |
| 58 | SFrancisco | | I would like to know if the plan will distinguish between rental needs and ownership needs. I can't think of a place in the Bay Area I could live in without a car except for San Francisco, but there is no way I can own a home here , even making \$100k/HH. |
| 59 | SFrancisco | | Land use and transportation have come up from symposium participants several times this session. I suggest that until land values -- preponderantly a social revenue (90% of land rents) land use remains driven by private concerns. [www.thecommonsSF.org] |
| 60 | SFrancisco | | ABAG & MTC should develop strategies to restrict the cost of housing. Development in our neighborhoods must be deeply affordable to families, and low-income and very low-income families and individuals. TOD without deep affordability causes displacement in San Francisco. |

| | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|
| 61 | SFrancisco | | Why the assumption that Bay Area population growth will be 2 million people, when California is actually experiencing heavy out-migration? For the first time since statehood, in the pre-2010 Census, California did not gain a seat in the U.S. Congress. Also, over 200,000 small and medium businesses have left California since 2000, due to excessive taxes and regulation. So, the assumption of 2 million more people seems invalid. |
| 62 | SFrancisco | | Why is it assumed that higher density living will improve air quality, when observation and common sense indicate the opposite. Air quality is much worse than the Bay Area in New York, Berlin, Paris, Madrid, Rome, Tokyo, Moscow, Bangkok, Sao Paulo, etc. |
| 63 | SFrancisco | | Whose job is it to decide what the right places are for jobs and housing to converge? The free market. Not ABAG and not me. |
| 64 | SFrancisco | | I support transit-oriented development to build much more livable communities without needing to own and drive cars. Thank you. That is difficult now as things are. |
| 65 | SFrancisco | | Not to be forgotten -- 25% of the current residents are 60 years or over. Those 80 or over are the fastest growing group. 25% will grow to 40% or more by 2035. We need housing for health care workers, care takers, etc. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 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 |
| San Francisco County -- Count | | |
| 1) nineteen | 1) twelve | 1) fourteen |
| 2) two | 2) six | 2) six |
| 3) two | 3) five | 3) three |
| 4) one | 4) | 4) one |
| 5) eight | 5) five | 5) four |
| 0) | 0) two | 0) one |
| <i>If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth.</i> | | |
| Comment | | |
| 1 | Recognize that most transit is too expensive per passenger mile to have any effect on driving and high density development has worse traffic and very high costs per square foot. Instead build apartments adjoining shopping centers with good walking communication and recognize transit will have little effect, provide adequate parking and don't use subsidies to build system. | |
| 2 | <i>...as long as formal policies and incentives are put in place to guarantee low-income residents are not priced out and displaced. Prioritize the growth and resources to improve social & economic equity.</i> | |

| | |
|----|--|
| 3 | The underlying assumption of inevitable growth is self-defeating. "If you build it they will come." Whatever is built will be filled, but will not fill demand. Population growth is infinite, there is no end t it, so where do you draw the line? When do you stop building? When the megalopolis is unlivable? |
| 4 | <i>Find a constitutional basis for any of these suggestions or put these suggestions to a vote open to all citizens in San Francisco.</i> |
| 5 | B-- Build affordable housing near jobs. Preserve character of existing neighborhoods. |
| 6 | <i>All options need to include deeply affordable housing and jobs for working class. These suggestions are vague.</i> |
| 7 | The definition of "affordable" is unclear and there is no data with projection of increase in cost of living, property tax and how this can displace low-income families, current residents, especially because areas of priority development are in East/South SF. |
| 8 | <i>Definition of affordable housing is not clear. That needs to be clearly articulated before this decision can be clear. I would favor develop that secures the stability of low-income families and communities of color (30/60/80% of AMI).</i> |
| 9 | The example presented was really poor. It did not have anything to do with the questions asked. |
| 10 | <i>Just a general approach: density should reflect quality/quantity of transit. Visitacion Valley example from workshop showed very little change (west of Bayshore) in a neighborhood that will eventually have some of region's best transit outside of Market Street (Caltrain/Muni intermodal BRT). Regarding Option C (build affordable housing in existing communities that have a strong job base) Supports Strongly with caveat that space should be reserved for office/commercial (downtown SF is running out of space for both office and residential).</i> |
| 11 | Look at growth corridors, i.e., Geary Blvd. for opportunities to increase mixed-use construction. Recognize "magnet commercial" uses (theaters, Apple Store, etc.) that increase foot traffic and benefit all retail/commercial. |
| 12 | I basically agree with Option B, but the linking of that with an impossible promise that no single family neighborhoods will ever change limits my ability to fully support Option B. |
| 13 | Educate people that to live in smaller places is not that bad. Can get use to it. Other cultures do. Other comment: Scenario comparison: didn't see any differences. |
| 14 | San Francisco is zoned 2/3 "single family" so N-C should pick up one/two stories of housing above. Note: West Portal is one story NC residential runs 2, 3, & 4 stores. We build too much market rate -- mix with affordable. We could sue some fresh architecture; enough David Baker. |
| 15 | Low- and middle-income people would also like room in the single-family neighborhoods. |
| 16 | 1) Need to accommodate jobs other than retail and office -- which need changes in acceptable mixes, e.g., light industrial, repair, etc. near housing. 2) Very real issues of gentrification that are not well addressed. 3) Regarding Option B (more affordable housing near public transit...) note that this requires transit to serve more than a commute schedule. |
| 17 | Allow people to choose to live outside cities to choose to commute to jobs wherever they are available, to enjoy low density life. |
| 18 | Need to mitigate for displacement of low-income communities by incorporating high amount of deeply affordable housing and include binding local jobs provisions for development and deeply affordable transit. |
| 19 | See my remarks under Station B. |
| 20 | For Option "B" the last clause struck out allows neighborhoods to stay restrictive. Bad. Single family home neighborhoods often try to ban conversion of large multi-family homes into group/board-and care-housing. |
| 21 | I'm not, and you should not, preclude what free sector can and will do: as Steve Jobs, the Wright Brothers, Henry Ford (Mario Ginoni BofA). |
| | |
| | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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? | | |
| <p><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></p> | | |
| 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  |
| San Francisco County -- Count | | San Francisco County -- Count |
| 1) sixteen | | 1) nine |
| 2) three | | 2) five |
| 3) two | | 3) four |
| 4) | | 4) two |
| 5) six | | 5) seven |
| 0) one | | 0) two |
| 2. Why it that? | | |
| 1 | No Opinion: Room B was not well explained, the question left us confused about answering for the present or future. | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 2 | <p><i>Oppose Strongly: Without an honest assessment of costs, this plan is being made with no data and should not be completed. Put in the cost per passenger mile for driving and transit improvements. Put in the pictures of the development to show what they would cost.</i></p> | |
| 3 | <p>Support Strongly: Without a plan, there is chaos. We must plan and that plan must support sustainability. I'm disappointed that the plan presented did not meet the goal of 15% carbon reduction. And there was no roadmap to get there.</p> | |
| 4 | <p><i>Support Strongly: We need to be extremely aggressive reducing GHGs and integrating housing and transportation. Can housing and transportation actually train each other and learn each other's fields? We need to make sure equity is at the center of each strategy. With more outreach for input from low income communities.</i></p> | |
| 5 | <p>The public participation plan would be ok if it were billed simply as educational games for learning. Soliciting public opinion in an anecdotal manner is totally unacceptable and insignificant. You have sanitized and ameliorated any aspect of your plans which might be controversial.</p> | |
| 6 | <p><i>Oppose Strongly: This is an Agenda 21 plan and it is foreign enterprise against the U.S. Constitution and State of California constitution. It is a plan devised by billionaire elitists who are seeking to control the future by controlling people. The SB 375 law is a bad law and also is unconstitutional.</i></p> | |
| 7 | <p>Support Strongly: This does not go far enough. VMT must be reduced further. The goals are weak. VMT should be cut by 50%.</p> | |
| 8 | <p><i>Support Strongly if there are jobs for working class, affordable transit fares and deeply affordable housing. The plan has not been clearly communicated. I feel like this process was a waste of my time. The lack of details makes it sound nice but in reality this is most likely a plan to displace low-income people of color. We can't make informed decisions without details.</i></p> | |
| 9 | <p>No Opinion: I'm concerned about creating such a broad plan that doesn't address the needs of residents in all of their localities.</p> | |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 10 | <p><i>Support Strongly: We were sold a plan without details to make informed decisions. No predications of rises of cost of living, decline of affordable housing and displacement of low-income residents who can't afford market rate housing. Development in SF is targeted for southeast SF, which is dense family, youth, low-income, people of color. This throws red flags for me given the history of displacement. There is a lack of options that call for free transit and expansion of service.</i></p> | |
| 11 | <p>Support: I support regional planning, and really align with the prioritization and reducing of green house gases. My concern with the regional plan is the lack of clear and effective strategies that meet equity goals. If MTC/ABAG can find ways to address displacement and meet equity goals, I think the regional plan would be very exciting.</p> | |
| 12 | <p><i>Support Strongly: Individual and local choice, and lack of planning has caused the current environmental, species extinction, and social injustice apocalypse that we live in. Planning is the only way to uphold social and environmental priorities.</i></p> | |
| 13 | <p>Please use less jargon to explain development. This isn't helpful for people who don't understand planning.</p> | |
| 14 | <p><i>Support Strongly: Critical that transit /land use connection be pursued to decrease emissions and make better cities/places and more vibrant neighborhoods.</i></p> | |
| 15 | <p>Support Strongly: I read a survey report recently that concluded that Gen X and Yers want to live in denser neighborhoods. It established that the US is overbuilt in its inventory of suburban single-family housing.</p> | |
| 16 | <p><i>Support Strongly: Sustainability. Each county playing beggar if their neighbor is not sustainable. We must plan as a region.</i></p> | |
| 17 | <p>Support Strongly: So many different agencies and organizations in the Bay Area with different agendas. Good to bring them all together to have same agenda. Need multi-regional transit system and to work together.</p> | |
| 18 | <p><i>Oppose Strongly: If eliminations of garages and parking were placed on the ballot, it would lose. Citizens of SF wouldn't support it no matter what the planning industry thinks. Where and how do you live and house yourself?</i></p> | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 19 | Support Strongly: It is the only way we will remain a successful area. | |
| 20 | <i>Support: While we need a regional plan, I lack confidence in the agencies and processes. Lots of assumptions about complete communities, that are very interesting. For example, can neighborhoods serving retail actually survive in walkable neighborhoods? Evidence is poor -- look at Walmart impact on small town cores.</i> | |
| 21 | Oppose Strongly: Let people make their own choices. Don't try to force. Don't impose "equal outcomes". | |
| 22 | <i>No Opinion: Depends on if it is a good plan.</i> | |
| 23 | No Opinion: Until community determines land values are the property of the community, there will remain systematically induced friction in land use policy. I approve of long-term planning and participate in it, obviously, but property rights in land use is the question which must be resolved in favor of community or the current sort of planning is designed to stumble. | |
| 24 | <i>Support Strongly: To achieve the goal of greenhouse emission reduction, we must have a feasible plan.</i> | |
| 25 | Oppose Strongly: Presumption, political, economic society. Get Real. (not legible) Who's going to benefit from the agenda you push. I try to (not legible) that support you don't get (not legible). | |
| 26 | <i>The jurisdictions in the bay area do not function as single entities, nor would it be beneficial to anyone to do so. There needs to be a coordinated plan that addresses the relations of communities (both land use and transportation) to each other so that the Bay are can thrive as a whole.</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 | SFrancisco | Thank you so much for providing this opportunity. My main suggestion is to add quantitative indicators or information to the policies and strategies suggested in Room A (as in emissions and cost). I also think that the choice of topics were quite trite. I understand being politically safe, but I felt confused as to why I came to weigh in on such non-controversial strategies. |
| 2 | SFrancisco | <i>Changes will have to made in technology to maintain most of the existing benefits. This probably means electric cars that can pace themselves on freeways, maintain distance, etc. Recognize that most trips even in new smart growth neighborhoods will still drive to most destinations. Recognize that most pictures shown are too expensive per square foot to be viable in most neighborhoods.</i> |
| 3 | SFrancisco | This is not my lifestyle. I don't own a car, I ride a bike, I'm very low impact with energy usage in general, I live in a high density area. "Business as usual" is not sustainable. We heard in Session B "people like single family residences", much of the Bay Area is low density, and we don't want to change that (i.e., low density urban sprawl). Suburbs force people to drive. Suburbs cost excessively for forces (police, fire, etc.) and infrastructure (water, sewer, roads). We must do better planning, that is, denser development closer to urban services. General comment: If you make it difficult for people to drive, fewer people will drive. |
| 4 | SFrancisco | <i>Each community faces different issues. If you live in a violent neighborhood, increasing walking will not work. Each neighborhood will need to get the opportunity to give input and each neighborhood will need to go through major changes. I am generally in favor of policies and structural support over education and hoping for behavior change. People change when they are forced to. General comment: Can you somehow ensure greater race and economic wage and affiliation diversity in these workshops? How did the Tea Party get so much representation in these meetings?</i> |
| 5 | SFrancisco | The goal of reducing greenhouse gases is not only landable, but necessary which will require significant reduction in driving and increase in transit. Noticeable avoidance of central subway fiasco which could bankrupt Muni. |
| 6 | SFrancisco | <i>The whole subject area is so presumptuous and assumes such an attitude of superiority, it doesn't deserve an answer. The entire meeting was superficial, shallow and disgraceful to any intelligent understanding. Not useful.</i> |
| 7 | SFrancisco | I already bicycle, walk and live in high density. We need more of this and it needs to be affordable. More 3-bedroom apartments in city centers. |
| 8 | SFrancisco | <i>Change will be inevitable in whatever community one lives in. The SCS can allocate development in target areas, but whether it actually happens is another issue. I think people are getting hung up on what "change" actually looks like in their communities.</i> |
| 9 | SFrancisco | Deeply affordable housing, free local transit, reduced public transit for commuter, that's what I support. It's obvious changes need to be made and the only advise I can give is that you keep low/no income people of color in mind when you create these plans because we're the ones being put out of our homes. Hands off Bayview and East SF. |

| | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 10 | SFrancisco | <i>This question is too broad and hard for me to answer</i> |
| 11 | SFrancisco | The reality is, that the communities targeted for development are low income with families, and will be the most impacted and displaced. There was little thought to ridership education, options and impact. Development can not be market rate, private or corporate business oriented, they must be resident-oriented, community driven and accessible improvements. SF for its residents, hands off. Bayview. Change in community should not mean change in resident demographics., income, level and age. |
| 12 | SFrancisco | <i>I think all of us need to use more public transit to reduce green house gases. I am for changes that are centrally organized on meeting the needs of low-income communities and communities of color.</i> |
| 13 | SFrancisco | The plan needs to include mechanisms that de-prioritize and penalize behaviors that do lead to emissions, incomplete communities, and inefficient use of funds. The plan will need to include a way to educate children, the public and politicians on the importance of the planning and what it addresses. |
| 14 | SFrancisco | <i>It would be helpful to explain how ABAG calculated the 2 million person growth increase over the next 20-30 years. The folks at my table didn't believe that the increase was valid. I work in this kind of advocacy, and I don't know where that estimate came from. Also the videos were a waste of time as many people zoned out through them.</i> |
| 15 | SFrancisco | <i>I am lucky to live in a neighborhood that achieves goals of this plan. Don't be afraid to concentrate growth in urban core, but allocate the funding to build high-quality, reliable transit to support that growth. Suburban growth needs to be done with care (e.g., exporting jobs/homes to fringes of regions) may increase emissions because people may make homes on different schedule than jobs and suburban transit may be inadequate for many trips.</i> |
| 16 | SFrancisco | My walk score is 97 already I'd like fewer cars, though if you ask at any community meeting what the residents (urban/suburban) want is "a café I can walk to". A perfect intro into a way to educate residents about what levels of density are needed to support local services. |
| 17 | SFrancisco | <i>Yes, the Bay Area must change how people live, travel, etc., to be sustainable. My own community is already at the highest density and transit service is so unlikely to change as much as some others - but I would still support more density in my own neighborhood.</i> |
| 18 | SFrancisco | I didn't really get what you are actually planning. Please consider or include green roofs in visions. Urbanvision tool video was kind of an advertising video for them, for the company, Urbanvision. Didn't really provide anything else. |
| 19 | SFrancisco | <i>Transportation is only worth something without transportation. Solutions by parking meters is wrong.</i> |
| 20 | SFrancisco | The workshop was frustrating in that it was too general. I felt that the "questions" force-fed us answers in many places. Your speakers in the opening session also used many acronyms and didn't introduce themselves, which wasn't very inclusionary. It would have been simple to include some visualizations of cost and benefit for us to make informed decisions. I liked the GHG numbers we saw in Station A. |
| 21 | SFrancisco | <i>It's clear that changes are needed in my community. It's less clear that I need to change my lifestyle to meet objectives. I take transit or walk, most shopping and services by walking; drive less than 6,000 miles per year, with 80% of trips on routes not served by transit (out of area). Question confounds 2 items in a way that does not really offer detailed clarifications.</i> |
| 22 | SFrancisco | The place type map of San Francisco shows all of the Bay View neighborhood as "urban". However, a large part of Bay View is single family homes. Other SF neighborhood in north of city are full of apartment buildings. Concentrating all growth in people of color neighborhoods is zoning racism. |

| | | |
|----|------------|--|
| 23 | SFrancisco | <i>Advocate for community ownership of land, rents, locational value rents.</i> |
| 24 | SFrancisco | Presumptuous, lacking lessons of history. As a true American, I want to choose, support and vote for representatives who will ensure our constitution, our liberty, our free speech. At 80 years, I see (not legible) ignorant of the focuses that shape and change our society. You can connect the dots, going back in our history. How things change our situation. But you can't connect the dots to the future and predict where we will be. It's at best a guess, a hope, at best an insight but you can't know the endless factors that individuals and (not legible) wars, political shifts, economic depression, one man's growth is some one else's tragedy. |
| 25 | SFrancisco | I'm a long time Bay Area (all 28 years of my life) resident and I love that the vision seeks to increase choices -- both housing and transportation - from the singular choices we currently have. Please don't let the crazies disrupt this process. |