

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	S Clara	More street and road capacity/balance funding
2	S Clara	Build more roads. You are using gas tax & bridge tolls. \$ should go for cars, not transit.
3	S Clara	Build more roads for private cars.
4	S Clara	Let local elected reps and local communities decide based on the United State Constitution and Bill of Rights.
5	S Clara	Bridge tolls and gas taxes should be used only for roads
6	S Clara	Use money to improve roads for private auto traffic.
7	S Clara	Fix the roads and don't raise my gas taxes
8	S Clara	Maintain highways & local roads, fix potholes and build more lanes/highways. Increase lanes -- not just carpool lanes.
9	S Clara	This money should be used for road construction and maintenance.
10	S Clara	Get the empty buses off the roads and space for more vehicles.
11	S Clara	More mass transit lanes on highway (rail) (HS)

12	S Clara	Use existing gas taxes to maintain highways and local roads.
13	S Clara	Dangerous for drivers to watch for bikers and people walking.
14	S Clara	Regarding increase transit service for low-income residents who do not have access to a car -- not if it impacts our taxes.
15	S Clara	Work to find oil on our land--USA--and make gas cheap so everyone can drive. Mass transit does not work in California, Bay Area. No new taxes; fix potholes with gas taxes already in place.
16	S Clara	Provide more frequent bus service with feeder lines. Reconsider BART instead of Caltrain down Peninsula.
17	S Clara	Meaningful investment per SB375 in protecting/enhancing resource lands and farmland -- critical for GHG reduction, sequestration
18	S Clara	Most of above suggestions are for the benefit of minority usage, but paid for by the majority. All very expensive and heavily subsidized. But we don't have ,money to indulge in such projects. Please quit tinkering, just fix the roads.
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
19	S Clara	How would we increase telecommuting? It is a private business decision.
20	S Clara	Regarding telecommuting -- companies decide. Free market should decide.
21	S Clara	More transportation infrastructure for private car use; provide more parking facilities for cars. Encourage telecommuting, but don't dictate.
22	S Clara	I reject your assumptions, therefore, I reject all of these.
23	S Clara	Leave our cars alone. This is America.
24	S Clara	This is not a government responsibility.
25	S Clara	None of your business.
26	S Clara	None of these is a government responsibility.
27	S Clara	Don't complete the Regional Bicycle Network at the expense of roads. Regarding telecommuting, it is up to private businesses, not you.
28	S Clara	Pro-choice without dis-incentives for car owners and those who choose to drive.
29	S Clara	Regarding telecommuting -- not a government responsibility.
30	S Clara	Synchronize traffic signals, widen roads
31	S Clara	More roads.
32	S Clara	Congestion pricing; car-sharing; BART
33	S Clara	Increase city subsidies/employer subsidies for transit.
34	S Clara	Completing the Regional Bicycle Network discriminates against those who do not bike. Electric vehicle strategies a waste of \$ like Soly... scam. Leave us alone and stop the "big brother" tactics.

35	S Clara	Increase public transit accessibility.
36	S Clara	Protecting resource lands will reduce GHG emissions and sequester carbon.
37	S Clara	Include car traffic plans and suburbs in your plan.
38	S Clara	This reflects far too much government control, and the need to regulate everything.
	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
39	S Clara	Less transit; more roads.
40	S Clara	None of these. We have far more important problems than public transit.
41	S Clara	Improve buses; the rest are inefficient and too expensive. We can't afford them and they lose \$.
42	S Clara	Stop telling people (me) what to do: I am an adult, if I like something I can get it myself. Thanks.
43	S Clara	Try alternatives such as taxi vouchers.
44	S Clara	Public transit in the Bay Area is a waste of taxpayer \$\$\$ -- not enough demand for it.
45	S Clara	We don't need more public transit because what we have is not fully utilized as is.
46	S Clara	None of these will make a significant difference. The people that want/need to use public transit already do so.
47	S Clara	Very strongly disagree.
48	S Clara	More roads.
49	S Clara	1) More feeder systems (small vans, zip-type cars). 2) Investment in new technology/ new research
50	S Clara	We are not a public transit state -- buses & trains are empty. We want our cars and better gas prices.
51	S Clara	Feeder lines.
52	S Clara	If public transportation doesn't go where you need it to go a better customer experience is irrelevant.
53	S Clara	Why do you resist the idea of cutting services? Public transport is a costly, inefficient system.
54	S Clara	I would love to see safety improve. I don't ride light rail because friends of friends have been accosted on the light rail. I do not know if greater police presence is the answer.

	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 Clara	4 Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street.
	S Clara	6 Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking.
	S Clara	2 More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail.
	S Clara	4 Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees.
	S Clara	4 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 Clara	MTC must stay out of this -- it's a local government issue.
2	S Clara	I disagree with regional planning. Open space is someone's private property.
3	S Clara	Let the free market answer these concerns.
4	S Clara	I disagree with everything.
5	S Clara	We have an adequate abundance of open space and parks already.
6	S Clara	We the people will vote with our money and through local representatives. I don't want non-local entities to master plan our communities.
7	S Clara	Free market should rule, to maximize benefits for all residents.
8	S Clara	Add more housing only where there is school capacity. Add jobs where there is jobs density, not where there is jobs sprawl.
9	S Clara	Not your business, not government responsibility.
10	S Clara	Disagree strongly will all of above.
11	S Clara	Get rid of central planning. Let the landowners decide how to use their own land.
12	S Clara	Free market should determine the above.
13	S Clara	Don't tell me how to live, mind your own business.
14	S Clara	Disagree will all of above.
15	S Clara	I disagree with your whole philosophy. I don't like your agenda forced on us.

16	S Clara		Open space which provides garden areas where people can grow their own food, connect with earth.
17	S Clara		Disagree. What happens if you are a rancher {not legible] lives north of Highway 580 in Livermore.
18	S Clara		Another important factor in this considers access to jobs where a large amount of greenhouse gases come from.
19	S Clara		Shared transit options to reduce automobile dependency.
20	S Clara		We don't need complete communities. Let the free market dictate communities.
21	S Clara		All of the above are too controlling. Overcrowded communities are a disaster and we don't want that. "Attract residents with a mix of incomes" sounds like forced integration -- no.
22	S Clara		Regarding "improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking" -- has no effect on health if people stay home.
23	S Clara		Most [not legible] based retail is dead to dying, except food sales. Do not push retail; what retail we have needs to provide an experience that people want.
24	S Clara		Better communities and social interaction.
25	S Clara		Enhanced business and residential environments.
26	S Clara		Financial incentives/investments for resource lands and farmland must have meaningful funding (could be 5% of total funds) to achieve GHG benefits anticipated in SB 375. Increase open space and resource lands and farmland and parks(per SB 375).
27	S Clara		None of the above will compensate for the crime, disease, and lack of privacy brought on by high density low income housing.
28	S Clara		This is 101-centralized government planning. Please butt out and leave it to the local communities to plan their own areas and decide what benefits them.
29	S Clara		First must accept assumptions in first statement. The planning must designate zoning that will allow, encourage mixed uses and incentivize moderate densities. Not in favor of high-density housing in large areas. Overall 20-25 per acre which counts open space, etc.
30	S Clara		I think this component -- help bring the community together -- is huge. Change is not possible without us all working 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>
31	S Clara		Let the free market determine locations and type of housing. Get rid of department of housing organizations in cities.
32	S Clara		Quit trying to control our lives and our economy. This is supposed to be a free country with a free market economy.
33	S Clara		Everything is as it should be right now. Change will come naturally when warranted. We do not need nor do we want social planning for our way of life. Leave us alone. This is America.
34	S Clara		When the government and paragovernment start to micromanage and guess individual lives and variables, everything converges in the hell of debt ad stripping individual liberties, under the central planning elites and special interest.

35	S Clara	Limit new housing where there is insufficient school capacity and limited new school sites. Promote jobs density near transit and housing in more residential communities. Limit jobs sprawl.
36	S Clara	Not your business -- free market should decide.
37	S Clara	This should be left to the private sector -- the free market should dictate.
38	S Clara	Why not let the market decide where to put jobs & housing? Central planning of economy = Marxist dictatorship.
39	S Clara	Let people live where they choose. No social engineering. Let the free market determine where people work, live and whether they drive and use transit.
40	S Clara	Leave us alone.
41	S Clara	Private sector -- free market should dictate.
42	S Clara	Don't want your change.
43	S Clara	Santa Clara County is different. Most jobs in the county involve technology and are located in areas that are not near affordable housing. Each community is unique and this Plan doesn't take this into account.
44	S Clara	Believe there is opportunity for jobs which complement the expanded Stanford Hospital (biotech, clinical) and a need for low- and moderate-income housing near there. At the same time, Palo Alto should receive allowance for this growth and be exempt from other density expansion.
45	S Clara	Let the marketplace dictate housing and jobs -- not government.
46	S Clara	People change jobs every 2 years so it is irrelevant.
47	S Clara	Corporate jobs are separated from housing -- not ideal, but difficult to change.
48	S Clara	Jobs and housing do not need to be immediately adjacent to each other, but should be within "commute sheds"
49	S Clara	No, jobs and housing cannot converge unless you have control over where jobs are housed and [you] mandate people who have those jobs live near them. Is that your intent, to control people's choices? Why would professionals want to live in a place that only provides low- and moderate-income jobs?
50	S Clara	<i>Jobs and housing will converge according to market needs, so stop meddling. Low-income housing does nothing to enhance a community. It does promote slum areas.</i>
51	S Clara	Not sure -- I live in a low-density area without large job centers.

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
Santa Clara County -- Count		
1) ten	1) seven	1) six
2) three	2) four	2) four
3) four	3) one	3) three
4) one	4) two	4) two
5) twenty	5) twenty	5) twenty-one
0)	0) three	0) one
<i>If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth.</i>		
Santa Clara County Comments		
1	I oppose regional planning.	
2	Let the free market dictate type of housing to be built. All housing, including houses in Beverly Hills, is affordable to the buyer.	
3	Cease over-taxing, over-spending, over-reaching government and growth will take care of itself, but you might be out of a job.	

4	Let the free market decide. It's more likely we will lose much population with our bankrupt economy. We are like Detroit, remember? Increase of 2 million is in your dreams unless they're illegals.	
5	Free market, private sector decisions.	
6	Cities are an arbitrary boundary. Add more jobs near centers of cities. Add housing in residential communities where people can get to transit, but not in jobs centers.	
7	How can you predict what will happen in 2040? Again, the private sector should make these decisions.	
8	Let the market decide where to put new housing.	
9	Again, let the free market determine housing, transit retail areas.	
10	Let local government decides that.	
11	Free market -- private sector decisions.	
12	Your forced one-sided agenda stay out of this area.	
13	Car sharing in partnership with affordable housing near public transit Give people more options to live without having to own a car.	
14	Let the market -- communities decide (elected officials).	
15	For more roads.	
16	These options are too general to object to. I support them without a real understanding of the impacts. Trade-offs need to be better explained to make the answers useful.	
17	Let the free market dictate. Abide by the Constitution.	
18	Stop illegal immigration and legal should be limited to 5,000 a year or less. Deport illegals. What do you call affordable (housing)? My property value will go down.	
19	The first rule of the Sunnyvale Land Use Plan has been that any "development" should fit into the neighborhood. This should be the general rule for future developments.	
20	Should avoid city boundaries and focus on commute sheds instead, e.g., North Santa Clara County and South San Mateo County should be considered without city boundaries.	
21	Plan to make better access to the entire city and suburbs, not move the suburbs to the city in order to eliminate car traffic.	
22	Local communities are quite capable of planning for their needs. Local control is essential -- not regional authorities dictating their utopia ideas. Who's paying for all this; where do you plan to get these funds? We have no money.	
23	We need to allow more housing types in lower density housing zones. Duplexes, apts., etc. We need lots of moderate density housing with a mix of heights. Open spaces, safe walking and bicycle routes so that biking to trains and stores and jobs is enticing. Creative open spaces. Need middle income housing also. [Terms: Instead of single family use term 'lower density.']	
24	A & B above are nice, but the public transportation system seems to be in disrepair and without funding. Forget the costs of maintaining vehicles, [you should] upgrade bike and ped ways. If you are considering growth in connection with less GHG, I would strongly support strengthening the bicycle and pedestrian networks. That way no matter where growth occurs everyone would have the opportunity (car or other transportation method) to get where they are going.	

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	
Santa Clara County			
1) eight		1) nine	
2) one		2) two	
3) three		3) one	
4) three		4) one	
5) twenty two		5) twenty two	
0) one		0)	
2. Why it that?			
1	As the Bay Area grows, we must coordinate smart transportation, smart land use planning, and strategic conservation investment. We cannot reach targets of AB 32 and implement SB 375 unless transportation, land use and conservation are linked.		
2	<i>I just visited the auto show in San Jose, the green cars get 85 MPG. This plan does not project cars improving. The buses are not green.</i>		

3	Regional agencies have little knowledge of local issues. MTC & ABAG are not a form of representative government and should not be making local decisions. The Bay Area is too big and diverse and should not be organized into 9 counties. Regional agencies seem to have (not legible) invest in local actions - must come from top (not legible) or it's not worth anything.	
4	<i>I believe we would be better off if we made conscious choices as to where and how we deal with inevitable population growth. I believe these choices are best made by the community through the democratic process.</i>	
5	Regional plan should/needs to be based on community/city plans. Regional reporting useful. Regional dictating is not.	
6	<i>A small group of bureaucrats are making laws for the people against their will. Reduce my property taxes by half and then let's talk. Put it to a vote by all residents and go with the majority consensus.</i>	
7	This is not freedom.	
8	<i>I support the development of a plan but I do wish the public meetings presented more facts and asked for more specific feedback.</i>	
9	A lot of citizens have control on general plans and the change should occur here.	
10	<i>I am concerned about conflict with San Jose's 2040 jobs/housing plan.</i>	
11	Need to reduce GHG emissions and air pollution; increase bikeability and walkability and access to transit and develop affordable housing near transit and services. All of these things will improve public health and decrease chronic disease. Need to work regionally since transportation systems are regional.	
12	<i>There is no thought given to getting rid of all the empty buses and light rail in these plans. There is no thought given to more roads. There is no thought given to single family homes.</i>	
13	I know this area needs improvement, but there was so little time for discussion.	
14	There are so many objectors, it makes it hard to focus. I believe in finding solutions and creating a plan but during my time tonight, I am not sure this is working. A lot of these people are lazy and don't want to change. Consult the people who are actually doing something to help people change now.	

15	<i>Planning should be left up to the individual cities and counties, not up to the state.</i>	
16	Having a plan is a good thing.	
17	<i>I don't agree with anymore government agency shoving more bureaucracy down my throat.</i>	
18	This urban planning did not work in Portland, Oregon. Far from curbing sprawl, high housing prices led tens of thousands of families to move elsewhere. Far from reducing driving, rail transit has actually reduced the share of travel and transit-oriented developments which only work when they include plenty of parking.	
19	<i>Costs unnecessary.</i>	
20	Do not urbanize the SF Bay Area further. Local communities should retain their diversity - some urban, single family residents, etc., Some downtowns, such as Pleasanton are not above transit and housing and should remain that way if residents choose to have it remain that way.	
21	<i>Centralized regional planning is an intrinsic violation of property owners' rights; besides, market-based solutions always work best.</i>	
22	Planning is a local responsibility.	
23	<i>No regional. Planning is local responsibility.</i>	
24	Allow communities to opt out if they have an alternative plan for reach the greenhouse gas reduction targets.	
25	<i>Planning should be local responsibility.</i>	
26	With all the facts, how can we possibly pay for this? Stop Bay Area Plan, now. We're broke!	
27	<i>You should not and do not have the right or the ability or the money to do any of this. You live in la-la land not the real world. People have the right to self-determination. Our lives are not government mandated statistics. Leave us alone! We live in America, land of the free and home of the brave.</i>	
28	Planning must be done at local area without dictates from ABAG and MTC personnel who are not accountable to the people. All these plans are based on false assumptions: 1) global warming. Not true. 2) Population growth - California unsustainable spending will make California like Michigan, so population growth assumptions are suspect.	

29	<i>I oppose Regional planning.</i>	
30	This plan does not improve the local economy. It restricts it. Subsidies are unsustainable long term. For it to work, it would require government to control where subs are located and dictate where you live. This will require forced social engineering which infringes on my individual rights and freedoms and is unconstitutional.	
31	Oppose Strongly: I like driving my car (as do you). I do not want to hang around bus/train stations, carry my purchases, get wet, cold/hot awaiting a bus, etc. The needs of S.F. residents are totally different from the Bay Area communities. It is ludicrous to suggest you can make a 30-year plan for all of us. Let the local communities decide their needs.	
32	Support Strongly: Because issues are bigger than individual cities, and we need to look at the bigger picture for solutions -- water, air, transit, etc.	
33	Support Strongly: We need to work together to provide housing, job and associated transportation.	
34	#3) In general, I support the study of what we, as a region, should prepare for. But this is a huge undertaking that might benefit from a different name. Instead of "plan" can we use "growth and transportation blueprint." I do not mind the term "plan" but it seems to frighten a lot of people by sounding very concrete and absolutely required, instead of just a guide for potential future development.	

	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 Clara	SB 375 includes consideration of financial incentives for protection of resource lands and farmland. This is critical to meet GHG emission reductions, increase carbon sequestration and help streamline transportation and land use infill projects through advanced mitigation on conserved lands. By 2050, the Bay Area's population will triple. GHG reductions cannot be met without investing in protecting/enhancing natural areas and farmland. The public land conservation agencies have a compatible vision and strategy for protecting these productive lands. The sustainable communities strategy must address inclusion or resource lands and meaningful financial incentives to accomplish the projects.
2	S Clara	<i>It never works to project 30 years into the future. Russia tried and failed.</i>
3	S Clara	We need to realize that land is a limited resource. It is needed for farmland and open space (public). Our current transportation system is ineffective and will get worse with population increases unless we move toward public transit, walking and biking. I'm pleased we are looking toward the future and planning for it.
4	S Clara	<i>I may have been the only person who voted for a 55 MPH speed limit. But this is very probably what is needed despite the fact that most do not want it.</i>
5	S Clara	No stacks and packs. Drivers are working people who pay taxes. Too much government control.
6	S Clara	<i>This is not a free society.</i>
7	S Clara	You haven't given me enough information to answer this question well.
8	S Clara	<i>Regret the destructive comments from a few people -- most of whom are not local residents -- they make the experience unpleasant and were disrespectful and not able to respect those who came to both learn and participate.</i>
9	S Clara	There is a great need to provide more connected infrastructure for biking and walking and to increase public transportation systems where buses, light rail and trains run frequently. Housing (which is affordable) needs to be placed near transportation as well as retail services, and schools. Region is too car dependent.
10	S Clara	<i>I don't understand why this a "social justice issue" and why the "community of faith" was consulted.</i>
11	S Clara	Why are the Federal (not legible) planning, (not legible)? Sounds like control to me.

12	S Clara	<i>SB375 requires financial incentives to cities and counties to consider protection of open space (not legible), habitat and farmland by protecting those areas, it will help municipalities meet GMG emissions reduction goals by (not legible) V.M.T.; store carbon in forests, rangeland and open spaces and by assisting transportation projects to be more efficient and effective. Investing in protection of natural areas and farmlands can help in reducing and meeting GHG goals by 2050. To that end, funding for land conservation is necessary.</i>
13	S Clara	More people need to be involved. The youth needs to be consulted, this plan is for them. The old people, the objectors don't want change. People need to change, but they need options and consult the people whom are actually doing something to help people change now.
14	S Clara	<i>If you really want to do something to help GHG, sync the traffic lights, widen the roads and let traffic flow.</i>
15	S Clara	But don't count on it working.
16	S Clara	<i>Stay away and listen to what the public comments disagreeing with this plan say.</i>
17	S Clara	We don't need the UN Agenda 21 dictating our lives. This "social equity" is a Marxist term for retribution of wealth and no property rights. We want to keep out sovereignty
18	S Clara	<i>We will be happier without government mandate.</i>
19	S Clara	I like my life and community the way it is currently.
20	S Clara	<i>Quit telling me and other what we can or can't do with our own property!</i>
21	S Clara	Let my city plan, not a regional board.
22	S Clara	<i>Leave my community alone!</i>
23	S Clara	Too much housing is being pushed on the city of Palo Alto through the RHNA - much more than Palo Alto can absorb.
24	S Clara	<i>My community is smart and resourceful enough to decide on its own.</i>
25	S Clara	We can not predict the future at this time. "Justice" is allowing Americans to live as they choose, not as some unelected (or elected) bureaucrats think we should.
26	S Clara	<i>The private sector will, as it has in the past, improve the quality of life. What you are doing is nothing more than social engineering! It represents a facet of Marxism.</i>
27	S Clara	Planning should be local.
28	S Clara	<i>No, I refuse to comply with a plan that takes away my freedom, space and privacy to be handed in to an inner city, low income stock yard.</i>
29	S Clara	I like my lifestyle as it is, thank you. I like my community as it is, so stop tinkering and meddling. This insatiable urge for central government to supervise and control everything must stop.
30	S Clara	I was appalled at the behavior and views expressed by the larger contingent who had already planned ahead to disrupt the workshop. I'm guessing it was an organized Tea Party effort, but don't know for sure. Attendees were rude, hostile and disruptive. The workshop personnel were amazing in the way they kept their cool.
31	S Clara	I have had different introductions to this plan and still do not understand what you are trying to do. The numbers are unclear. Why the number goals? There are mixed goals. Every community will have a say yet the goals for intensification are clear and very intense. The visualization did not help. Palo Alto will have a 50% increase in housing units. Seems high.
32	S Clara	I strongly support plans and actions to upgrade bicycle and pedestrian pathways.