

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	SMateo Improve roads and signage for lower gas usage.
2	SMateo Regarding expanding bicycle & pedestrian routes -- this needs a focus on safe routes for all
3	SMateo Make sure Caltrain can keep running and increase its reliability.
4	SMateo Increase gas tax to fund transit.
5	SMateo Build a high-speed personal rapid transit demonstration system.
6	SMateo Provide subsidies for low-income families for public transit.
7	SMateo Dedicated funding for Caltrain trunkline for electrification -- Peninsula.
8	SMateo Extend commuter rail lines and maintain funding for existing routes.
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
9	SMateo Affordable housing for working families so they can live in SM County and work here; so many have to commute in such long distances.
10	SMateo Use nuclear energy to make hydrogen for fuel to power cars. Build more roads.

11	SMateo	Develop a system to change drivers for driving during peak hours.
12	SMateo	Encourage employment centers with transit.
13	SMateo	Increase public transportation options.
14	SMateo	Remove lane from each direction.
15	SMateo	Increase public transit.
16	SMateo	Build a high-speed personal rapid transit demonstration system, like Sky Train.
17	SMateo	Increase gas tax.
18	SMateo	Fuel tax surcharges
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
19	SMateo	Contract with private companies to provide bus service and eliminate union employees.
20	SMateo	Money to support Caltrain.
21	SMateo	East-West connections on 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
	S Mateo	5 Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street.
	S Mateo	10 Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking.
	S Mateo	8 More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail.
	S Mateo	6 Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees.
	S Mateo	9 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	S Mateo	Build new balanced communities and help people maximize their incomes.
2	S Mateo	Funding prioritized for those cities that have provided most affordable housing in past for working families and anti-displacement policies as a requirement for grant eligibility. Better than part of a menu of options, and projects funded by grants should be vetted by inclusive process at community/neighborhood level with focus on equity and analysis of transit accessibility.
3	S Mateo	Control spending. Balance budget.
4	S Mateo	Other suggestion: Affordable homes are important to having a complete community with a diversity of households.
5	S Mateo	Affordable housing for working families with access to reliable/affordable transportation options.
6	S Mateo	Save the money you want to spend to reduce taxes and attract businesses.
7	S Mateo	Centralized planning of the nature of the Bay Area Plan is doomed to failure.
8	S Mateo	The built environment affects our health. People should live/work in places that will encourage them to be active.
9	S Mateo	Increased transportation along El Camino
10	S Mateo	Complete community is nice in concept, but not realistic for the entire county.
	<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>	
11	SMateo	No, because in large part we have chased all the manufacturing jobs out of the area.

12	SMateo		<i>Jobs and housing are not in the right places, too many people can not afford to live in SM County and must commute long distances to get to their jobs</i>
13	SMateo		Yes, make sure to put jobs and homes near transit. Will still be difficult for low- and moderate-income folks unless we implement policies to build affordable housing.
14	SMateo		<i>There are significant areas of potential development in San Mateo County that are not along El Camino Real. These neighborhoods (Shoreview, Baywood, Coastside, etc.) also need affordable housing, employment and transportation options.</i>
15	SMateo		Along El Camino + Caltrain -- medium scale density.
16	SMateo		<i>Somewhat. There needs to be more mixed-income housing and TODs.</i>
17	SMateo		In Redwood City, yes! General Plan is putting housing in right place, not on open space baylands.
18	SMateo		<i>Yes, they're in the right places, but really need to time the transportation improvement to meet the mobility needs spurred by increased density.</i>
19	SMateo		No. Yes. Better transportation, particularly in places like East Palo Alto, East Menlo, San Mateo, etc. Most of the major roads run through by the lower income areas.
20	SMateo		<i>There needs to be more of an effort to put employers by mass transit and/or vice-versa.</i>
21	SMateo		I don't know.
22	SMateo		<i>In general, yes, or close to. However, housing is not affordable so it ends up not serving the whole community.</i>
23	SMateo		Yes, support El Camino PDA growth. Jurisdictions along El Camino can take on more development for the county, e.g., Belmont which is not now identified as a PDA or growth opty area.
24	SMateo		<i>Yes and yes. Better schools.</i>
25	SMateo		Yes, along the Grand Boulevard.

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 Mateo County -- Count		
1) nineteen	1) nineteen	1) eleven
2) two	2) three	2)
3) one	3)	3) three
4)	4) two	4) two
5) five	5) four	5) four
0)	0)	0) one
<i>If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth.</i>		
San Mateo County Comments		
1	Please do not build new slums by the transit system. Build more balanced new communities. Respect private property rights. Find clean energy sources and build more roads. Use nuclear energy to make hydrogen for fuel to power cars. Build more roads.	
2	<i>Not clear if the three [growth patterns options] are mutually exclusive.</i>	

3	Opposed C because need to think regional job shed.	
4	<i>Local communities and the free market will accommodate growth.</i>	
5	In Pacifica redo the 6 shopping centers to be suburban centers. Redo/upgrade the buildings, add 2-5 stories of housing; more people will bring transit, improved health and less pollution.	
6	<i>We need more density where services and transportation exist.</i>	
7	In "C" housing + jobs need to be built around transit. "B" seems to be skewed by incomes. All levels of housing need to be built by transit.	

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
San Mateo County		
1) eight		1) nine
2) four		2) two
3) two		3) one
4)		4) one
5) five		5) four
0)		0)
2. Why it that?		
1	No Opinion: The plan is not yet clearly designed. What specifically is Bay Area Plan? Fully build out all PDAs?	
2	<i>Oppose Strongly: Because the government doesn't best. I have been to Eastern Europe and Russia and have seen the results of top down government planning with my own eyes.</i>	

3	Support Strongly: Need to reduce greenhouse gases for more healthy lifestyles.	
4	Support: The general idea is great but there needs to be more conversations about affordability.	
5	<i>Support: I can see the opposition will (not legible) of the way so am not looking forward to the (not legible).</i>	
6	Support: Working together despite our differences is how we will sink or swim.	
7	<i>Cautiously support: still have concerns that local jurisdictions will continue to build on farmland or approve bayfill developments. MTC will not provide transportation dollars for new transit to serve this sprawl. Where is the policy that says that won't happen? Please post the language on your website.</i>	
8	Oppose Strongly: Regional transportation planning is a reasonable objective. Including social equity, low income housing, etc., is not appropriate in a transportation plan. I would like to see market based solutions to transportation issues such as charging drivers for driving during peak hours.	
9	<i>Oppose Strongly: I have no trust in the government to efficiently and constitutionally spend my tax dollars and shape my lifestyle. This plan reeks with an agenda reflective of the current government's sensibilities.</i>	
10	Support Strongly: Public transportation systems only serve 7% of daily users. Need regional unified network that does not require tax subsidies. Skytran based at Nasa Ames can do this.	
11	<i>Support the idea but don't trust the process.</i>	
12	Support Strongly: I think it's important to look at this from a regional perspective. I'm an example of someone who lives and works in different counties and would like to see a plan that makes the whole bay area work together better from a transportation perspective.	
13	<i>Oppose Strongly: It seems communistic. Our local city council made choices secretly without advertising so that citizens could attend and express opinions. No input was made from real citizens. It was railroaded.</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	Comment
1	S Mateo	Why should we be forced to change our lifestyle because of a) false science -- global warming -- wake up, it's a lie. Explain the medieval warming periods without cars or the industrial revolution and b) to make room for millions of illegal uneducated immigrants.
2	S Mateo	<i>I'd love to have my town make the changes necessary.</i>
3	S Mateo	See previous pages and leave the "quarry" alone. Improve transit in and out of Pacifica to BART -- D.C., Colma and Millbrae for Caltrain as well as replace Bus Express into downtown SF.
4	S Mateo	<i>Claim was that website for comments that influenced plan/local communities had 5,000 - 7,000 hits -- that number is miniscule and should have no influencing factor.</i>
5	S Mateo	Need to encourage biking and walking by elevating transit and raising prices on parking.
6	S Mateo	<i>The process was high jacked by the Tea Party. This was an unpleasant meeting.</i>
7	S Mateo	In general, I agree strongly. But I am a daily transit rider and so not sure how much my lifestyle will need to change to support this future.
8	S Mateo	<i>Not government controlled changes. Evolution of changes as the need occurs.</i>