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Chapter 1
Overview

A. Plan Bay Area Overview

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) jointly prepared and adopted Plan Bay Area, the long-term Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the San Francisco Bay Area as well as the region’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The plan — which considers how and where the region should accommodate growth projected for the next 28 years — conforms to federal and state regulations, including California legislation from 2008 (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg), which requires each of the state’s 18 metropolitan areas to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks. Under Senate Bill 375, the Bay Area must develop a sustainable communities strategy — a new element of the regional transportation plan — that strives to reach the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target established by the California Air Resources Board. The law also requires the region to plan for housing 100 percent of its projected population at all income levels. Plan Bay Area is the region’s first regional transportation plan subject to SB 375.

Development of Plan Bay Area was a three-year effort that began in 2010. A comprehensive public involvement program was a key part of the process. Extensive outreach with local government officials was required, as well as a public participation plan that included workshops in each county and public hearings on the draft prior to adoption of a final plan.

Thousands of people participated in stakeholder sessions, public workshops, telephone and internet surveys, and more. Befitting the Bay Area, the public outreach process was boisterous and contentious. The region’s 101
cities and nine counties also participated in the development of the plan, as did our fellow regional agencies, the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Community-based organizations and advocacy groups representing the diverse interests of the Bay Area were active participants throughout the process, as were some three dozen regional transportation partners.

The public involvement activities are organized into four phases and are documented in four volumes:

1. Phase One: Preliminary Discussions (2010) and Summary of 2010-2013 Activities
2. Phase Two: Initial Vision Scenario (2011)
4. Phase Four: Draft Plan Bay Area (2013)

B. Phase Four Overview:
2013 Draft Plan Bay Area

This report summarizes the spring 2013 public participation activities that occurred in conjunction with the release of the Draft Plan Bay Area (Draft Plan) on March 22, 2013 and its companion Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on April 2, 2013. The formal public comment period for both documents closed on May 16, 2013, and provided an opportunity for the public to comment on the policy framework laid out in the Plan for the region to accommodate future growth and on strategic investments in the region’s transportation system.

ABAG and MTC reached out to Bay Area residents and local governments to seek comments on the Draft Plan and DEIR in a number of ways that are summarized below. All of the comments were made available for review online: www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html. More than three years of dialogue and consultation culminated in a public comment period that included:

- Twelve public hearings in all nine counties, with some 1,250 residents attending and 385 speaking. Another 140 completed comment forms at the hearings. Transcripts and comments are available online and are included as Appendix B of this report. Legal notices announcing the hearings were published in newspapers in all nine Bay Area counties.
• Over 600 comment letters and emails submitted on the Draft Plan and DEIR. All correspondence is posted online and can be sorted by county and by the type of commenter (individual, government agency, stakeholder organizations, for example).
• An interactive “Plan Bay Area Town Hall” that garnered some 90 comments online from individuals who were able to review and comment on the Draft Plan from the convenience of their homes (see Appendix C).
• A statistically valid telephone poll of over 2,500 Bay Area residents that was conducted during March, April and early May 2013 to measure the general public’s opinion on issues relating to Plan Bay Area (see Appendix D).
• Presentations to local elected officials in all nine counties; notices of all meetings were mailed to the clerks of the board of all local jurisdictions.
• Consultation workshop with Native American tribal government leaders in Sonoma County.
• A series of 12 focus groups conducted in early spring 2013 — in partnership with community organizations working in low-income communities and communities of color — drew a total of 181 participants. One session each was conducted in Spanish and Cantonese.
• A briefing for news reporters to encourage coverage of the Plan and public hearings.
• An overhauled and streamlined OneBayArea.org web site with improved and more user-friendly navigation.
• Release of two news releases to Bay Area media outlets during the public comment period to encourage coverage and participation in meetings.
• A direct mail piece and five email blasts to notify residents about the release of the draft and opportunities to comment
• Five display ads in community newspapers to inform Spanish- and Chinese-speaking residents of the comment opportunities.
• Frequent updates and announcements posted online and through social media.

Note: For a comprehensive summary of all Plan Bay Area public participation activities from preliminary planning through adoption, please see Phase 1 Summary Report, Ch. 1A: Plan Bay Area Overview: Public Engagement a Key Element of Plan Bay Area.
• A special joint meeting of the full boards of MTC and ABAG on July 18, 2013, starting shortly after 6:30 p.m. and concluding six and one-half hours later, at approximately 1 a.m. The Oakland Convention Center venue had seats for 520 and nearly all chairs were full. A final public hearing for the Draft Plan included testimony from 163 speakers and lasted for three and one-half hours.
Chapter 2
Elected Official Briefings

Senate Bill 375 calls for public meetings with elected officials in every Bay Area county to discuss the Draft Plan, with prior notice being sent to each county’s clerk of the board. Per the law, one meeting per county is required, assuming a minimum attendance threshold is met that includes “representatives on the county board of supervisors and city council members representing a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county.”

Executives from MTC and ABAG attended meetings with elected officials in each county to discuss the draft sustainable communities strategy and solicit input. The attendance requirements were met at each of the nine meetings (see Table 1, below).

Table 1: Attendance by Local Elected Officials at Plan Bay Area Briefings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/County</th>
<th>Date/Time/Location</th>
<th># of Incorporated Cities in County</th>
<th># of Cities Represented at Meeting</th>
<th>% Attendance by Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Commission</td>
<td>4/25/13 at 2:30 p.m. in Oakland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Transportation Authority</td>
<td>4/17/13 at 6 p.m. in Concord</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Authority of Marin County</td>
<td>4/25/13, 5 p.m. in San Rafael</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County Transportation Planning Agency</td>
<td>4/17/13 at 1 p.m. in Napa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>4/23/13, 11 a.m. in San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td>4/11/13 at 6:30 p.m. in San Carlos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Transportation Authority of Santa Clara County</td>
<td>6/6/13 at 3:30 p.m. in San Jose</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano Transportation Authority</td>
<td>4/10/13 at 6 p.m. in Suisun City</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>4/8/13 at 2:30 p.m. in Santa Rosa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3
Public Opinion Poll

Telephone Poll Results

MTC and ABAG retained a research firm to conduct a telephone survey of over 2,500 residents to measure public opinion on various land use, housing and transportation trade-offs under consideration in the Draft Plan. The sample is statistically valid by county, and for the region overall. Appendix A includes key findings from the poll along with the top-line survey results. Cross-tabs by county are available on the OneBayArea.org web site (at http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html).

A telephone survey was conducted with a cross section of 2,516 Bay Area residents, for an overall margin of error of +/- 1.96%, with a minimum of 250 surveys completed in each Bay Area county. These surveys were then weighted to proportionally represent the overall Bay Area population by county and age (using 2010 Census data). Thus, this telephone survey provides projectable data for the region as a whole, as well as county-level results.

The telephone survey used a hybrid sampling approach that combines residential cell phone listings, Random Digit Dial (RDD), and listed residential telephone numbers for the Bay Area. This mix of sources is important due to the large share of Bay Area households that are “cell phone only.”

The survey questionnaire consisted of 35 questions, of which 3 were open-ended and 32 were multiple choice. Each survey took approximately 14 minutes to complete. Surveys were conducted in English, Spanish, and Chinese. Surveys were conducted from March 13, 2013 to May 11, 2013.

Following is a summary of key findings. See Appendix D for the full report on the 2013 Plan Bay Area survey.
Plan Bay Area Initial Reaction
After hearing a brief description of Plan Bay Area, a large share of residents indicated that this type of plan is important to the region. 84% rate it as very or somewhat important. Younger residents and transit users rate the importance even higher than others.

Plan Bay Area by County
The level of importance by individual county remains high as well, ranging from 89% (in San Francisco) to 77% (in Napa).
Most Important Components

- Three key components of the plan were initially highlighted as most important to the Bay Area’s future – improving the local economy, providing access to housing and transportation for everyone, and reducing driving and greenhouse gases.
  - Improving the local economy was considered the most important part of the plan for many (40%);
  - Providing access to housing and transportation was equally important (40%);
  - Reducing driving and greenhouse gases was lowest (18%).

- By county, providing access to housing and transportation was ranked more important among respondents from San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties.
Local vs. Regional Planning
Residents are split on whether a regional plan should guide housing and commercial
development in the Bay Area or if local cities and counties should plan for these on their own.
This appears to be a particularly divisive issue. Overall, slightly more than half of residents
(53%) think this planning should be done locally, while 44% think this should be part of a
regional plan.

Among counties, San Francisco has the highest percentage supporting a regional plan (48%),
while Napa has the highest percentage supporting local (75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By County</th>
<th>Local cities and counties should plan</th>
<th>A regional plan should guide development</th>
<th>A mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These options were not read to respondents.
Some of the key reasons that respondents oppose a regional plan for development include (multiple choice question):

- Local government knows the needs of its own citizens better.
- Unrealistic/too difficult to get counties to agree.

Some also indicate local control should stay – but local agencies/decision-makers should be able to work together to address regional issues.

**Transportation Strategies**

**Reducing Driving / Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

- Despite ranking lowest of the three key components of Plan Bay Area, reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (as a stand-alone issue) is actually supported by two-thirds (67%) of respondents. Respondents seem to support this goal even though it does not resonate as strongly as the economy or housing/transportation in general.

- Urban residents were most likely to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and were generally more favorable towards the various measures being considered to reach greenhouse gas reduction targets.

![Support, Neutral, Opposed](chart.png)

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies**

- Among the greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the most strongly supported strategy was building more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less, with 65% of respondents supporting this measure strongly (rating it a ‘4’ or ‘5’).
- The strategy opposed by most residents was charging drivers a new fee based on the number of miles driven. More than half of respondents (64%) said they oppose this idea (rated a ‘1’ or ‘2’), with nearly half (46%) strongly opposing.
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

- Build more housing near public transit for residents who want to drive less:
  - Support Strongly: 31%
  - Support Somewhat: 34%
  - Don’t Know: 22%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 7%
  - Oppose Strongly: 6%

- Limit urban sprawl by requiring most building within city limits:
  - Support Strongly: 19%
  - Support Somewhat: 23%
  - Don’t Know: 33%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 13%
  - Oppose Strongly: 12%

- Charge drivers a new fee based on number of miles driven:
  - Support Strongly: 6%
  - Support Somewhat: 10%
  - Don’t Know: 20%
  - Oppose Somewhat: 19%
  - Oppose Strongly: 46%

Express Lanes
- When asked if they support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways, 55% of respondents overall supported additional express lanes.
- There is very little difference across areas, although the more urban the area, the slightly higher the support: Urban – 56%; Suburban – 55%; and Outer Bay Area – 53%.
Funding Priorities

Among the transportation-related issues tested, the ones that were considered the highest priority for funding include:

- Extend commuter rail, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area (78%);
- Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes (77%);
- Provide more frequent public transit service (66%).
Residents’ Perception of Key Issues in Bay Area

Residents rate the Bay Area highly on open space preservation and air quality, but lower on other key issues asked about.

When asked, “How are we doing now?,” residents rate the Bay Area as excellent/good as follows:

- Preservation of open space and parks (64%);
- Air quality (59%);
- Economic growth and prosperity (51%);
- Quality of public transit (36%);
- Upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways (25%);
- Availability of affordable housing (11%).

These ratings vary some depending on the area. For example, those in the outer Bay Area rate availability of affordable housing more highly; but suburban and urban residents rate economic growth and prosperity more highly than those in the outer Bay Area.
Trade-Offs and Attitudinal Statements

The most highly rated attitudinal statements were (percent who agree shown in parenthesis):

- Government agencies should play an active role in attracting jobs and promoting the economy in the Bay Area (79%);
- I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving (77%);
- There should be a focus on walking and biking rather than having to rely on a car (70%);
- Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations (70%);
- In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid (70%).
Chapter 4
Open Houses, Public Hearings, Correspondence and Online Engagement

Coinciding with the release of the Draft Plan in April 2013, MTC and ABAG conducted a series of Open Houses/Public Hearings in each of the nine Bay Area counties. The meeting format included two parts — an open house from 6 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and a public hearing from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. Members of the public were able to view displays and ask questions of ABAG and MTC staff during the Open House. They could then offer oral comments at the public hearing as part of the official record for the Draft Plan. Those who preferred could opt to submit their comments in writing via a comment form that was provided at the open house and public hearing. Participants were able to comment on the Draft Plan, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), the Draft 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as well as a Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis on the Draft Plan and the Draft TIP. In addition to the nine county-based Open Houses/Public Hearings, the agencies conducted three public hearings specifically for the DEIR.

The goal for this round of public engagement was to provide multiple venues, methods and opportunities for the public to comment on the Draft Plan and DEIR, while meeting state and federal requirements. The meeting format was designed with input from MTC’s Policy Advisory Council and ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee.

Posters at the Open House encouraged participants to submit written comments at the Open House or offer oral comments at the public hearing, or submit comments on the Draft Plan or the Plan’s Draft EIR via e-mail or U.S. mail. Additionally, attendees were reminded to participate in an online forum called Plan Bay Area Town Hall at www.onebayarea.org.
During the public hearings, many sought clarification on aspects of the Draft Plan. Staff continuously updated the “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) on the OneBayArea.org website to answer basic questions and to address misperceptions and inaccuracies stated by some.

Staff from MTC and ABAG reviewed, analyzed and presented a summary of comments from the hearings to MTC’s Planning Committee, which met jointly with ABAG’s Administrative Committee. At the same meeting, staff presented preliminary recommendations for changes to the Draft Plan in response to comments (see Appendix A).

Table 2: County Public Open Houses and Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Estimated Attendance</th>
<th>Public Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>May 1, 2013</td>
<td>Mirage Ballroom (Fremont)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>April 22, 2013</td>
<td>Marriott Hotel (Walnut Creek)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>April 29, 2013</td>
<td>Marin Center (San Rafael)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>April 8, 2013</td>
<td>Elks Lodge (Napa)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>April 11, 2013</td>
<td>Whitcomb Hotel (San Francisco)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>April 29, 2013</td>
<td>Crowne Plaza Hotel (Foster City)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>May 1, 2013</td>
<td>Hilton Hotel (San Jose)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>April 22, 2013</td>
<td>Solano County Fairgrounds (Fairfield)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>April 8, 2013</td>
<td>Friedman Center (Santa Rosa)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Public Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Estimated Attendance</th>
<th>Public Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>April 16, 2013 at 10 a.m.</td>
<td>Embassy Suites Hotel (San Rafael)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>April 16, 2013 at 7 p.m.</td>
<td>Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter (Oakland)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>April 17, 2013 at 1 p.m.</td>
<td>MLK, Jr. Library (San Jose)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 1,256 385
A. Open House Display Stations

At each of the nine Plan Bay Area open houses, members of the public had the opportunity to view displays and maps, review the Draft Plan and Draft TIP and then ask questions of staff experts or policy makers in attendance. Following is a description of all the featured displays. Copies of the display boards are shown in Appendix E.

Welcome Station

A staffed “Welcome Station” provided visitors with information and an orientation to the evening. Attendees could pick up materials, including a flash drive loaded with the Draft Plan and the Draft EIR. Other materials included a revised and expanded “Frequently Asked Questions” hand out answering a range of questions concerning Plan Bay Area. This “FAQ” was revised and expanded to include new questions asked by members of the public at the workshops.

Station A: Where We Live, Where We Work

Participants could learn more about how the Draft Plan focuses future jobs and housing growth into areas nominated by local jurisdictions to create a network of complete communities and expand a prosperous and equitable regional economy (Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040 and Chapter 3: Where We Live, Where We Work).

Station B: Investments

Interested residents could learn more about strategies for maintaining and boosting the efficiency of the existing road and transit system, while making investments in projects that support the focused growth land-use framework (Chapter 4: Investments).
Station C: Setting Our Sights on Performance

Attendees were able to learn more about how the Draft Plan meets mandated and voluntary performance objectives to accommodate future growth in a way that preserves the character of our communities and our region (Chapter 5: Performance and Chapter 1: Setting Our Sights).

Station D: A Plan to Build On

Participants had the opportunity to learn about ongoing and future efforts to achieve the Draft Plan Bay Area vision through policies, programs and legislative advocacy (Chapter 6: A Plan to Build On).

Station E: Comment Station

At this station, meeting attendees were able to sit down and complete a comment form and submit written comments on the Draft Plan Bay Area or on one of its supplemental documents.

Station F: Partner Station

Partner agencies, such as county-level congestion management agencies and Caltrans, were invited to set up and staff an information table to showcase local programs, plans or activities.
B. Correspondence

Nearly 600 comment letters and emails were submitted on the Draft Plan and DEIR. All correspondence was posted online and sortable by county and by the type of commenter (individual, government agency, stakeholder organizations, for example). Correspondence may be viewed online at:


C. Online Engagement

Website Redesign

Since its launch in 2010 through adoption of Plan Bay Area, the OneBayArea.org web site garnered 66,000 unique visitors and some 356,000 page views. As development of Plan Bay Area continued through 2012, however, it became clear that the site was in need of an overhaul to make it easier for visitors to the site to find information on Plan Bay Area. Staff retained a web design firm to develop a content management system to streamline the interface and simplify the experience for visitors to the web site. The site’s new look simplified the browsing experience to make the navigation more intuitive. A number of new features were incorporated into the site design, including:

- A carousel at the top of the home page that includes important notices, flags new content and other items of interest.
- A modified main menu system displayed horizontally across the top of each page. Subordinate pages have additional menu options listed on the left.
- Links at the top right of each page that allow you to view web pages in languages other than English.
- A prominent Plan Bay Area button at the top right of each page. Visitors to the site can use this as a shortcut, or navigate to Plan Bay Area content using the “Regional Initiatives” pull-down menu.
- Top news headlines are displayed on the left of the home page. Web users can still use the menu system to navigate to a full list of recent news headlines, as well as a news archive.
• New interactive features on the right-hand side of the home page, such as quizzes and polls on relevant topics.
• A “What We Heard” feature distilling public comments from different rounds of public engagement.
• A “Frequently Asked Questions” feature that was regularly updated to address new questions as they were raised by members of the public.

Plan Bay Area Town Hall

A new “Plan Bay Area Town Hall” online comment forum was launched in April 2013 in conjunction with the release of the Draft Plan Bay Area. Through this forum, visitors to the site could review each chapter of the Draft Plan and then make comments from the comfort of their own homes. Most “Town Hall” comments submitted were critical of the Plan in general and expressed concern that it would lead to a loss of local control over land use decisions. A complete Town Hall report is included in Appendix C.

MTC also maintained OneBayArea Facebook and Twitter accounts, each with several hundred followers.
Focus groups were held with twelve community-based organizations (CBOs) during the spring of 2013 in preparation for the release of the Draft Plan Bay Area. The goal of working in partnership with these organizations was to engage some of the typically underrepresented communities in the development of Plan Bay Area and gather their perspective on the Draft Plan efforts.

The February through April 2013 series of focus groups was the third round of public engagement done with these partner community groups, who were selected in a competitive bid process in 2011. The majority of the focus groups were conducted prior to the release of the Draft Plan and the intent was more educational than previous rounds of outreach. The focus groups informed the communities about the pending release of the Draft Plan and prepared them to be active participants in offering their opinions about the proposed regional growth strategy and corresponding transportation investments. Participants also were encouraged to attend a public hearing and/or submit comments in some other form once the draft was released.

**Meeting Format**

During the focus group, participants were reminded that Plan Bay Area is a blueprint to coordinate land use and housing plus transportation policies and investments, and that the plan is part of California’s approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles.
The participants were briefed on what was heard from their community during the past two rounds of outreach. They were then given some background on Plan Bay Area, including information on how the document would be organized and where to look for information about various topics. They were invited to discuss pertinent issues and ask questions. The group was then given a presentation by a local planner — either from the county-based congestion management agency or from a local city — on how local plans tie into Plan Bay Area and how individuals can be involved at the local level. Finally, the group was given the schedule of meetings and opportunities to comment on the Draft Plan, and given an opportunity to ask any final questions.

**Key Comments Heard**

Even though the focus groups were largely educational in nature, comments are always encouraged. Participants were able to comment orally during the meeting and/or submit a written comment form. Below is a summary of some of the key comment themes heard from the focus group participants.

**Transportation**

- In order for people to consider getting out of their cars, public transit needs to be affordable, clean, safe and reliable.
- Transit fares for youth and seniors should be considerably lower or perhaps even free.
- Transit should be available for necessary services (such as medical appointments and court appearances) and on nights and weekends, and not just for Monday-Friday daytime work commutes.
- Transit agencies need to work together to improve service connectivity.
- Subsidies for electric vehicles do not benefit low-income residents.
- The concept of “fix-it first” is important, and participants recognize there is not enough funding; however, modern innovations (things like the Clipper card, apps and other technologies) are also important.
Housing

- “Affordable” housing as defined by Bay Area standards may not be affordable for low-income residents.
- Some Bay Area communities are not creating affordable housing in new developments, which causes low-income workers to have to live elsewhere and commute.
- There is concern that transit-oriented development will displace some current residents and businesses.
- There is widespread support for “complete communities,” meaning communities that provide a range of housing and businesses to meet the needs of local residents.

Outreach/Education

- Outreach into communities of concern is appreciated and should continue.
- More education about Plan Bay Area goals and greenhouse gas reduction efforts is needed.
- More education is needed at the local level about how regional planning connects with local plans and projects.
- Ongoing “town halls” or informational workshops are needed even when there is not a comment period in process.

Below is a graphic view of topics raised at the community-based focus groups. Based on meeting notes, the “word cloud” shows the most frequently voiced topics in red, less discussed in dark blue, and least discussed in light blue. Similarly, the word size shifts from large to small to illustrate how frequently topics were raised by participants.
### Table 3: Focus Groups with Community-Based Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>City/Community</th>
<th>Host Community Group</th>
<th>Date/ Time / Location</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Hayward/ Union City</td>
<td>South Hayward Parish</td>
<td>Thursday, February 7, 2013 6:30-9 pm Hayward</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Richmond/San Pablo</td>
<td>Richmond Main Street Initiative</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 20, 2013 6-8:30 pm Richmond</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>Concord/ Monument Corridor</td>
<td>Concord Community Economic Development Organization</td>
<td>Monday, April 15, 2013 11:30 am-2:00 pm Concord</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>Marin City and Canal Neighborhood</td>
<td>Grassroots Leadership Network of Marin</td>
<td>Thursday, March 21, 2013 11:30 am-2:00 pm Concord</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>Chinatown Community Development Corporation</td>
<td>Thursday, March 14, 2013 4-6:30 pm San Francisco</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Bayview Hunters Point/Mission District</td>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 27, 2013 5:30-8:00 pm</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>North Fair Oaks/ East Palo Alto/ South San Francisco / San Bruno</td>
<td>Housing Leadership Council; Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center</td>
<td>Wednesday, March 6, 2013 6-8:30 pm Redwood City</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Central San Jose</td>
<td>San Jose Downtown Association</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 19, 2013 2-4:30 pm San Jose</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>San Jose/Milpitas</td>
<td>Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation (VIVO)</td>
<td>Friday, March 15, 2013 12-2:30 pm San Jose</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Dixon Family Services</td>
<td>Thursday, March 7, 2013 12:30-3:00 pm Dixon</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Santa Rosa/ Roseland</td>
<td>KBBF Radio</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 12, 2013 6-8:30 pm Santa Rosa</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-county (meeting conducted in Spanish)</td>
<td>San Francisco Bayview Hunters Point and Mission District; Santa Rosa Roseland Neighborhood; and Concord Monument Corridor</td>
<td>POWER, KBBF Radio, Concord Community Economic Development Organization</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 3, 2013 6:00-8:30 pm San Francisco</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee

DATE: June 7, 2013

FR: Executive Director, MTC; Executive Director, ABAG

RE: Draft Plan Bay Area – Summary of Public Comments

Background

Attachment 1 summarizes the various ways that ABAG and MTC reached out to Bay Area residents to seek comments on the Draft Plan and DEIR. In all, a total of 588 oral and written comments were received. All of the comments are available for review online: http://www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html. The public comment period caps off more than three years of dialogue and consultation on this planning effort. A summary of all public workshops, policy board meetings and other public engagement activities dating back to the spring of 2010 is included as Attachment 2.

Telephone Poll Results
MTC and ABAG retained a research firm to conduct a telephone survey of over 2,500 residents to measure public opinion on various land use, housing and transportation trade-offs under consideration in the Draft Plan. The sample is statistically valid by county, and for the region overall. Attachment 3 includes key findings from the poll along with the top-line survey results. We will present these results at your June 14 meeting. Cross-tabs by county are available on the OneBayArea.org web site (see above link).

What We Heard: Key Themes from Comments
Attachment 4 summarizes key themes heard through public comments on the Draft Plan. A number of comments sought clarification on aspects of the Draft Plan. Staff has continuously updated the “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) on the OneBayArea.org website to answer basic questions and to address misperceptions and inaccuracies stated by some commenters. The most recent update of the FAQ is found in Attachment 5. Several comments are discussed in greater detail in Agenda Item 5(b) for your consideration for revisions to the Draft Plan.

Comments from Implementing Agencies
More than 45 local jurisdictions, all nine County Congestion Management Agencies, and several transit and other public agencies provided written comments on the Draft Plan and/or DEIR. Most of the letters address broad themes, such as growth and development patterns, transportation investments, the role of local/regional government, concerns about forecasting, and implementation of Plan Bay Area. County-level agencies and larger jurisdictions generally expressed support for the Draft Plan as proposed, given that it has been widely vetted and is
generally supported by local agencies in their respective counties. Some jurisdictions expressed concerns about aspects of the DEIR alternatives to the Draft Plan, questioning their feasibility and impact on local control.

A number of generally smaller local jurisdictions expressed support for the goals of SB 375 and Plan Bay Area, but expressed concern about the accuracy of the Draft Plan’s housing and employment forecast, the limited level of growth outside of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in their community, potential future shifts away from local control over land use decisions, and the ability of communities to implement the Plan, particularly given the loss of redevelopment authority. Many implementing jurisdictions expressed support for the Draft Plan’s Advocacy Platform, including CEQA modernization, with a few jurisdictions indicating that they did not support changes to CEQA. Agencies across the spectrum expressed significant support for expanding funding for affordable housing and transportation infrastructure.

Comments from Organizations
Written comments were received from a wide array of organizations. More than a dozen organizations signed joint letters or provided their own letters in support of some key components of the Environment, Equity, and Jobs DEIR Alternative. These organizations advocated for revisions to the Draft Plan that include: (1) shifting 25,000 housing units from PDAs to “PDA-like places” and suburban job centers; (2) increasing the regional control total for housing; (3) shifting funding from the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI), Express Lanes and the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) to transit operations in some parts of the region; and (4) modifying OBAG to condition funding based upon local anti-displacement policies.

Several organizations associated with the Bay Area Business Coalition that provided key inputs for the Enhanced Network of Communities DEIR Alternative expressed support for elements of that Alternative, including (1) a higher regional control total for housing as a means to support job growth and reduce commuting; (2) a growth distribution that is less heavily weighted to the PDAs; and (3) strong support for partnering with the regional agencies to advocate for CEQA modernization, affordable housing funding, the replacement of redevelopment funding, and expanded funding for transportation infrastructure.

A number of environmental organizations expressed support for the Draft Plan’s growth pattern that concentrates development within the region’s existing urban footprint and encouraged MTC and ABAG to take an active role relative to air quality mitigations and to assist project sponsors seeking to “tier off” the Plan’s final Environmental Impact Report. Several chapters of the League of Women Voters expressed appreciation for the process to develop Plan Bay Area, support for regional planning, and a desire for increased transit funding for both operations and maintenance. Finally, a few organizations submitted comments stating that MTC and ABAG lack the authority to develop Plan Bay Area and are in violation of both the state and federal constitutions.

Comments from Individuals
Oral and written comments from individuals focused on many of the same themes raised by implementing agencies or stakeholder groups. The majority of speakers at the public hearings opposed the plan, and some expressed their opinion that regional planning is unconstitutional. Many were concerned the plan would threaten their property rights, force them to give up their car and live in high-density housing, or force unwanted growth in their communities. Some
speakers questioned the accuracy of the population and job growth projections on which the Plan is based.

Many expressed concern about the impact of growth on existing communities, and the potential for a decline in the quality of life in the region. Some highlighted possible negative impacts of the plan on other infrastructure, such as schools, water, sewer, and police and fire services.

A significant number of commenters support the concept of PDAs, focused growth around expanded public transit, and a policy to maintain the region’s existing transportation infrastructure. A number of young people attended several of the public hearings and expressed concern about the impact of the high cost of living here, especially for housing and transportation. Many speakers requested that the plan do more to address the potential risk of displacement and several suggested that revenues from express lanes be used to increase public transit service. Many individuals also requested that more be done to provide affordable housing, support improved, more frequent and affordable public transit, and offer housing for workers in the same county as their job. A number of speakers expressed support for more bicycle lanes, and projects to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Minor Corrections to Draft Plan
The housing and employment distribution in Draft Plan Bay Area was modified to make minor corrections to the datasets used and, in some cases, adjust local jurisdiction growth based on corrections to how the distribution methodology was applied. A narrative with a more detailed description of the changes and the related distribution tables are included in Attachment 6.

At the meeting on June 14, staff will review the themes in Attachment 4 in preparation for your discussion of potential revisions to the Draft Plan under agenda item 5(b). A full evaluation of the Plan’s public engagement process will be conducted after the Plan’s adoption.

Attachments
1 – Summary of Spring 2013 Public Engagement
2 – Plan Bay Area Public Meetings: Three-Plus Years of Dialogue and Consultation
3 – Topline Summary: Plan Bay Area Telephone Survey
4 – Plan Bay Area Comment Themes
5 – Frequently Asked Questions
6 – Draft Plan Bay Area Land Use Revisions
Summary of Spring 2013 Public Engagement:
Release of Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft Environmental Impact Report

• 12 Public hearings in all nine counties, with some 1,250 residents attending and 385 speaking. Another 140 completed comment forms at the hearings. Transcripts and comment forms are available online here:


587 comment letters and emails were submitted on the Draft Plan and DEIR. All correspondence is posted online and can be sorted by county and by the type of commenter (individual, government agency, stakeholder organizations, for example). This can be viewed at this link:


• An interactive “Plan Bay Area Town Hall” garnered some 90 comments online from individuals who were able review and comment on the draft Plan from the convenience of their homes.

[http://onebayarea.org/file10069.html](http://onebayarea.org/file10069.html)

• Presentations to local elected officials were made in all nine counties; notices of all meetings were mailed to the clerks of the board of all local jurisdictions.

• Consultation workshop with Native American tribal government leaders in Sonoma County

• A series of 12 focus groups conducted in early spring 2013 in partnership with community organizations working in low-income communities and communities of color, drew a total of 181 participants. One session each was conducted in Spanish and Cantonese.

• A statistically valid telephone poll of over 2,500 Bay Area residents was conducted during March, April and early May 2013 to measure the general public’s opinion on issues relating to Plan Bay Area.

• Staff conducted a brown-bag lunch for news reporters to encourage coverage of the Plan and public hearings, and issued two news releases during the public comment period to encourage participation

• A direct mail piece and five email blasts were sent to notify residents about the release of the draft and opportunities to comment.

• Legal notices were published in newspapers in all nine Bay Area counties.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting/Event</th>
<th>Special Workshops</th>
<th>ABAG/MTC mtg. with Plan on agenda</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Summit (with ABAG Spring General Assembly)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Reduction Target Workshop: Oakland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Roundtables with Elected Officials (Summer/Fall 2010)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC’s Policy Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisory Working Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Executive Board</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011 Workshops: all nine counties (2 in Alameda County)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011 Community Hosted Meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefings for local elected officials in all nine counties: Spring 2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC’s Policy Advisory Council</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisory Working Group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Working Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribal Consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Executive Board</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Commission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012 Workshops: all nine counties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012 Community Hosted Focus Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Scoping Meetings: Fairfield, Oakland, SF, San Jose, San Rafael</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC’s Policy Advisory Council</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisory Working Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Working Group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribal Consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Executive Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint MTC Commission/ABAG Executive Board Meeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 Open Houses/ Public Hearings (all nine counties)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings on Draft EIR: Oakland, San Jose, San Rafael (April)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February - April 2013 Community-Hosted Focus Groups</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to Elected Officials (9 counties, with county CMAs)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC’s Policy Advisory Council</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advisory Working Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Working Group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Tribal Consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG Executive Board</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 111  138  249
Plan Bay Area 2013 Public Opinion Poll
Key Findings – Management Summary

A telephone survey was conducted with a cross section of 2,516 Bay Area residents, for an overall margin of error of +/- 1.96%. Over 250 interviews were completed with residents of each Bay Area county. These interviews were then weighted to proportionally represent the overall Bay Area population by county and age (using 2010 Census data). Thus, this telephone survey provides projectable data for the region as a whole, as well as county-level results.

The telephone survey used a hybrid sampling approach which combines residential cell phone listings, Random Digit Dial (RDD), and listed residential telephone numbers for the Bay Area. This mix of sources is important due to the high share of Bay Area households who are “cell phone only.”

The survey questionnaire consisted of 35 questions, of which 3 were open-ended and 32 were closed-ended. Each survey took approximately 14 minutes to complete. Surveys were conducted in English, Spanish, and Chinese. Interviews were conducted from March 13, 2013 to May 11, 2013.

In addition to the 35 survey questions, respondents were also asked demographic and transportation usage, including questions about voter registration, party affiliation, and voting frequency. Reporting will include analysis based on respondent demographics, as well as differences among likely voters and unlikely/non-voters.

Following is a summary of key findings and the topline marginal responses to survey questions.
Plan Bay Area Initial Reaction

- After hearing a brief description of Plan Bay Area, a large share of residents feel that this type of plan is important to the region. **84%** rate it as very or somewhat important.
  - Younger residents and transit users rate the importance even higher than others.

Plan Bay Area by County

- The level of importance by individual county remains high as well, ranging from **89%** (in San Francisco) to **77%** (in Napa).
Most Important Components

• Three key components of the plan were initially highlighted as most important to the Bay Area’s future – improving the local economy, providing access to housing and transportation for everyone, and reducing driving and greenhouse gases.

  o Improving the local economy was considered the most important part of the plan for many (40%);
  o Providing access to housing and transportation was equally important (40%);
  o Reducing driving and greenhouse gases was lowest (18%).

• By county, providing access to housing and transportation was ranked more important among respondents from San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties.
Housing and Commercial Development

Local vs. Regional Planning for Development

- Residents are split on whether a regional plan should guide housing and commercial development in the Bay Area or if local cities and counties should plan for these on their own. This appears to be a particularly divisive issue. Overall, slightly more than half of residents (53%) think this planning should be done locally, while 44% think this should be part of a regional plan.

- Among counties, San Francisco has the highest percentage supporting a regional plan (48%), while Napa has the highest percentage supporting local (75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By County</th>
<th>Local Cities &amp; Counties</th>
<th>A Regional Plan</th>
<th>A Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some of the key reasons that respondents oppose a regional plan for development include (open ended question):
  o Local government knows the needs of its own citizens better.
  o Unrealistic/Too difficult to get counties to agree.

- Some also indicate local control should stay – but local agencies/decision-makers should be able to work together to address regional issues.
Transportation Strategies

Reducing Driving / Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Despite ranking lowest of the three key components of Plan Bay Area, reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (as a stand-alone issue) is actually supported by two-thirds (67%) of respondents. Respondents seem to support this goal even though it does not resonate as strongly as the economy or housing/transportation in general.
- Urban residents were most likely to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and were generally more favorable towards the various measures being considered to reach greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies
- Among the greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the most strongly supported strategy was: building more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less, with 65% of respondents supporting this measure strongly (rating it a ‘4’ or ‘5’).
- The strategy opposed by most residents was: charging drivers a new fee based on the number of miles driven. More than half of respondents (64%) said they oppose this idea (rated a ‘1’ or ‘2’), with nearly half (46%) strongly opposing.
Express Lanes

- When asked if they support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways, 55% of respondents overall supported additional express lanes.
- There is very little difference across areas, although the more urban the area, the slightly higher the support: Urban – 56%; Suburban – 55% and Outer Bay Area – 53%.

![Support and Oppose Chart](chart.png)

Funding Priorities

- Among the transportation related issues tested, the ones that were considered the highest priority for funding include:
  - Extend commuter rail, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area (78%);
  - Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes (77%);
  - Provide more frequent public transit service (66%).

![Funding Priorities Chart](chart.png)
Trade-Offs and Attitudinal Statements

- The most highly rated attitudinal statements were (percent who agree shown in parenthesis):
  - Government agencies should play an active role in attracting jobs and promoting the economy in the Bay Area (79%);
  - I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving (77%);
  - There should be a focus on walking and biking rather than having to rely on a car (70%);
  - Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations (70%);
  - In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid (70%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/regional government agencies should attract jobs/promote the economy.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11% 4% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a focus on walking/biking, rather than relying on a car.</td>
<td>45% 25%</td>
<td>19% 6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life for future generations.</td>
<td>42% 28%</td>
<td>20% 6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, warnings about greenhouse gases causing climate change are valid.</td>
<td>49% 21%</td>
<td>16% 5% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support building a High Speed Rail system connecting the Bay Area with LA.</td>
<td>46% 15%</td>
<td>14% 7% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping, restaurants</td>
<td>28% 21%</td>
<td>20% 12% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better amenities.</td>
<td>25% 23%</td>
<td>23% 12% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5 a gallon.</td>
<td>26% 14%</td>
<td>22% 14% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density housing near transit could destroy my town’s character.</td>
<td>16% 16%</td>
<td>26% 20% 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents’ Perception of Key Issues in Bay Area

- Residents rate the Bay Area highly on open space preservation and air quality, but lower on other key issues asked about.

- When asked, “How are we doing now?,” residents rate the Bay Area as excellent/good as follows:
  - Preservation of open space and parks (64%);
  - Air quality (59%);
  - Economic growth and prosperity (51%);
  - Quality of public transit (36%);
  - Upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways (25%);
  - Availability of affordable housing (11%).

- These ratings vary some depending on the area. For example, those in the outer Bay Area rate availability of affordable housing more highly; but suburban and urban residents rate economic growth and prosperity more highly than those in the outer Bay Area.
PLAN BAY AREA PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY
Topline Marginals – 6/3/13
Bay Area Resident Telephone Poll in English, Spanish, and Chinese
Sample Size = 2,516  Margin of Error: +/- 1.96%

Introduction
Hello, I’m _____________ calling on behalf of MTC (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission) and the Association of Bay Area Governments. We are conducting an important survey with Bay Area residents. Your input will be used to help develop a 30 year regional plan for our area.

(INTERVIEWER NOTES: If necessary, explain:
• The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is a transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area
• The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is a regional planning agency and Council of Governments for the nine counties and 101 cities and towns of the San Francisco Bay region. ABAG is focused on advocacy, collaboration, and excellence in planning, research, and member services.
• The (regional) plan seeks sustainable regional growth to preserve the quality of life in the Bay Area. This includes: improving the economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, accommodating housing needs and growth, and other regional issues that we face.
• The survey should take between 12-14 minutes to administer
• No selling is involved
• Responses will be treated in confidence
• If Spanish or Chinese monolingual household, flag for callback.)

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

1) About how long have you lived in the Bay Area? (Read list if necessary)
   - Less than one year 2%
   - One – five years 7%
   - Six – ten years 9%
   - Eleven – twenty years 18%
   - Over twenty years 64%
   - Don’t know (do not read) <1%

2) Which county do you live in? (Read list if necessary)
   - Santa Clara 25%
   - Alameda 21%
   - Contra Costa 15%
   - San Francisco 11%
   - San Mateo 10%
   - Sonoma 7%
   - Solano 6%
   - Marin 4%
   - Napa 2%
BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

Current Perception of Region
Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate ________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area? (Randomize)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Quality of public transit services ....</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Up-keep and repair of local roads and freeways.................................</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Preservation of open space and parks ............................................</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Economic growth and prosperity ...</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Availability of affordable housing ...</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Air Quality ^ ....................................</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Bay Area – General
A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it.

9. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?
Use a 5 point scale where 5 is Very Important and 1 is Not at all important.

| 5 Very Important | 63% |
| 4 | 22% |
| 3 | 9% |
| 2 | 3% |
| 1 Not at All Important | 3% |
| 0 Don’t know (Do Not Read) | 1% |

MEAN 4.39

10. Why is that?

^ New or edited question
BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

11. Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone?* (select one)

11a. Which is next most important? (select one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Imp (Q11)</th>
<th>Next Most Imp (Q11a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Improving the local economy</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Don’t know (Do Not Read)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: If needed, re-read the options: “the first one is..., the second one is..., the third one is...”

Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities

Next I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

(Interviewer note: If asked, the funding itself is coming from Federal, State and local sources for projects related to this plan. These questions are asking how to allocate - or divide up - those funds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3</td>
<td>2 1 DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders ....  18% 22% 28% 17% 13% 1% 3.15

13) Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes .................................................  24% 26% 27% 14% 9% 1% 3.41

14) Extend commuter rail lines, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area .........................................................  53% 25% 14% 4% 4% 1% 4.20

15) Maintain highways and local roads, Including fixing potholes .................  46% 31% 17% 4% 1% <1% 4.17

16) Provide more frequent public transit service ^..............................................  37% 29% 22% 7% 4% 1% 3.91

^ New or edited question
### BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.87</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) Provide financial incentives to cities to build more multi-unit housing near public transit .......... 22% 29% 28% 12% 9% <1% 3.43

#### Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

18) The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing (the amount of) driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy? Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Strongly</th>
<th>Oppose Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know (Do Not Read)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose Strongly)

19) Build more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less .......... 31% 34% 22% 7% 6% <1% 3.79

20) Limit urban sprawl by requiring most additional housing and commercial buildings be built within current city or town limits 19% 23% 32% 13% 12% 2% 3.24

21) Charge drivers a new fee* based on the number of annual miles driven .... 6% 10% 19% 19% 46% 1% 2.11

(Note: Expansion of Express Lanes is another greenhouse gas reduction strategy. A specific question about this is being asked later in the questionnaire – Q34)

*New fee: Specifics are still being developed, this could be an annual fee using vehicle registration or a vehicle device which calculates mileage at the fuel pump

^ New or edited question
Regional vs. Local
22. Which statement do you agree with more?
   a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. OR
   b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Cities and Counties Should Plan</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Plan</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local should be equal (do not read)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know (do not read)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused (do not read)</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Why is that?
________________________________________________________________________

Trade Offs and Attitudinal Statements
Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree.  (Randomize)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24) I would be willing to live in a smaller house to be closer to work,</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping and restaurants .................</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 DK MEAN</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood amenities (restaurants, shops, etc.)^</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 DK MEAN</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) I would take public transit more often if it took less time than</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving ^ ...............</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 DK MEAN</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) I will take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5.00 a</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallon ^ ......</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 DK MEAN</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every trip .........</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 DK MEAN</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ New or edited question
BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29) Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area</td>
<td>53% 26% 13% 3% 3% 1%</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) I support building a High Speed Rail system connecting the Bay Area with the Los Angeles area</td>
<td>46% 15% 13% 7% 17% 2%</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid</td>
<td>49% 21% 15% 5% 9% 1%</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town</td>
<td>16% 16% 25% 20% 22% 1%</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Changes will be needed in my community to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations</td>
<td>42% 28% 18% 6% 5% 1%</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Express Lanes

Express lanes* are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the carpool lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

34) Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways? *(Get answer, then ask): Is that strongly or somewhat? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Strongly</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Somewhat</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Somewhat</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know (Do not read)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN 2.67

^ New or edited question
Plan Bay Area Comments by Theme
(includes oral and written comments submitted by individuals, public agencies and stakeholder organizations)

In reviewing the many individual comments submitted about the Draft Plan Bay Area, several themes emerge. The following summary is grouped according to subject with reference to responses as either provided in the Frequently Asked Questions (Attachment 5) or to be discussed in greater detail in agenda item 5(b) as potential revisions to the Draft Plan.

Plan Bay Area Purpose and Process — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions
- Comments about legitimacy of the regional planning process
- Questions about the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Protect people’s ability to live in suburban and rural communities; don’t want to be forced to live in high-density housing
- Concerns about diminished private property rights
- Support for Plan Bay Area’s approach to cleaner air, complete streets, reducing sprawl

Demographics
- Don’t agree with statements in the report about preferences of different demographic groups

Growth — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and agenda item 5(b)
- Assumptions on population and employment are flawed
- Need more information about the housing and job distributions
- Water supply for new development need to be addressed

Development Feasibility — addressed in agenda item 5(b)
- Concerns about the feasibility of the growth shown in the Plan
- Request for specific actions from ABAG/MTC to ensure that development is feasible

Land Use/Environment — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and agenda item 5(b)
- Concerns about the impact of growth on public services
- Concern that the Plan will supersede local land use planning
- Need to include other strategies to reduce GHGs in the Plan
- Need to better integrate planning around air quality, hazards, sea level rise
- Comments about CEQA streamlining
- Concern that local jurisdictions won’t get enough assistance from regional agencies to implement EIR mitigations

Affordable Housing — addressed in agenda item 5(b)
- Need for additional funding for affordable housing
- Feasibility of providing sufficient affordable housing
- Need for Plan to ensure minimal displacement of current low-income residents
• Questioned the location of high-density or affordable housing; concerned about local impacts of affordable housing

**Funding — addressed in agenda item 5(b)**
• Concern that Plan implementation is not feasible with current resources
• Need to identify additional funding sources for successful implementation of the Plan
• Suggested changes to OBAG
• Increase funding for transit operations and maintenance needs
• Increase funding for streets and roads maintenance
• Comments about possible funding sources (bridge tolls, VMT tax, state/federal sources, Infrastructure Financing District, etc.)
• Suggestions for better ways to distribute funding
• Need for policies and funding sources to support open space and Priority Conservation Areas

**Transportation — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and item 5(b)**
• Provide more public transit service
• Comments for and against funding for highways
• Redirect express lane revenues to public transit
• Invest in bike/pedestrian infrastructure

**Public Health — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions**
• Concern about health impacts of infill development near highways

**Social Infrastructure**
• Concern about growth impacts on public services such as schools, libraries, and social services
• Desire for local hire, job training, and living wage incentives
Overview

What is Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area is a state-mandated, integrated long-range transportation, land-use and housing plan that will support a growing economy, provide more housing and transportation choices and reduce transportation-related pollution in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It builds on earlier efforts to develop an efficient transportation network and grow in a financially and environmentally responsible way. It is a work in progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities. By planning now, we will create a Bay Area we will be proud to leave to future generations.

Why is there a Plan Bay Area?

By law (Senate Bill 375), all regions in California must complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SB 375 requires California’s 18 metro areas to integrate transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. In the Bay Area, this requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to adopt an SCS that meets greenhouse gas reduction targets adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Who is responsible for doing this planning?

Within the Bay Area, the law gives joint responsibility for Plan Bay Area to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). These two agencies work with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). They also partner with local communities, agencies, and a wide range of stakeholders to ensure broad public input into Plan Bay Area’s preparation.

What does the Metropolitan Transportation Commission do?

MTC is the transportation planning, financing, and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC operates the regional transportation network as smoothly and efficiently as possible now and for the future.

Under what authority does MTC exist?
The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), a statutorily created regional transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq., is for the purposes of the Political Reform Act, a local government agency pursuant to Government Code Section 82041. Federal law [Title 23, United States Code, Section 134 (d)] designates MTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. As such, MTC must adopt and regularly update a long-range regional transportation plan.

The Commission's work is guided by a 21-member policy board, with 18 of the commissioners designated as voting members. Sixteen of the voting commissioners are appointed by local elected officials in each county. The two most populous counties, Alameda and Santa Clara, each have three representatives on the Commission: the county board of supervisors selects one member; the mayors of the cities within the county collectively appoint another; and the mayors of the biggest cities in these two counties (Oakland in Alameda County and San Jose in Santa Clara County) each appoint a representative.

What does the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) do?

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the regional planning agency and council of governments (COG) serving the people who live and work in the 101 cities and towns of the Bay Area, including coastal communities, older industrial centers, rural towns and big cities. ABAG was formed by local government leaders in 1961 who recognized the need to address common issues from a regional perspective.

ABAG’s mission is promoting good planning to build a better Bay Area in order to enhance the quality of life here by supporting regional collaboration, planning, research and member services. ABAG also houses the San Francisco Bay Trail project, the San Francisco Estuary Project, and a Risk Management and Insurance Services program that provides cost effective self-insurance to over two dozen local jurisdictions. ABAG also conducts regional population and employment projections and the state-mandated Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process (Government Code Section 65584 et seq.).

Under what authority does ABAG exist?

ABAG is a joint powers agency formed in 1961 pursuant to California Government Code Section 6500, et seq., and the council of governments (COG) for the San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG is governed by a 38-member Executive Board comprised of locally elected officials based on regional population. A General Assembly made up of elected officials from every member jurisdiction determines policy matters and reviews major Executive Board actions and recommendations. Each delegate has one vote, and a majority of city and county votes are required for action.

So why are regional agencies involved in planning?

As required by State legislation (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.) and by federal regulation (Title 23 USC Section 134), MTC is responsible for preparing the RTP for the San Francisco Bay Area Region. An RTP is a long-range transportation plan, updated every four years, that identifies the strategies and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the
region’s transportation network. In 2009, MTC adopted its most recent RTP, known as the Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.

As the Council of Governments for the Bay Area, ABAG is responsible for providing a forum for local jurisdictions to work out issues with impacts that cross jurisdictional boundaries. ABAG also is required by state law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) to update the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) every eight years, and to allocate specific housing targets to individual cities and counties. State law (Senate Bill 375) also requires ABAG and MTC to plan jointly for transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks.

What will Plan Bay Area do?

State law requires Plan Bay Area to:

1. Identify “areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region” — where people will live, including all income groups, for at least the next 25 years; and
2. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by an amount specified by the CARB.
3. Meet the federal requirements for an RTP.

How does the Plan Bay Area affect me, personally?

This Plan looks ahead to 2040 and seeks to preserve what we love about our small towns, cities and farmlands; maintain key transportation infrastructure; and offer more choices in where we will live and how we will get around. As a long-range initiative, Plan Bay Area will have more of an impact on future generations than it will on those of us here today. The goal is to reduce traffic congestion, improve transit options, create more opportunities to walk or bike, strengthen existing neighborhood infrastructure and support the creation of more affordable housing options within Bay Area communities.

Will Plan Bay Area change the character of the region’s rural communities, small towns and suburban residential neighborhoods?

No. Most single-family neighborhoods will remain unchanged. Plan Bay Area recognizes the diversity of communities across our region. The Plan concentrates new growth in areas nominated by local governments, with most of the growth taking place toward the center of our region in cities like San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. Overall, over two-thirds of all regional growth by 2040 is allocated to Priority Development Areas. As a result, small cities, single family neighborhoods and rural areas throughout the Bay Area will take on a very small share of the region’s overall growth. Local land use authority is retained by the region’s cities and counties. Local jurisdictions will continue to determine where future development occurs.

How do smaller suburban job centers benefit from Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area supports growing suburban job centers such as the Tri-Valley by maximizing the amount of forecasted employment growth in these jurisdictions given the amount of housing that they deem appropriate. The Draft Plan invests in the region’s transportation network to support
job growth and housing in existing communities by focusing the lion’s share of funding on maintaining and improving the efficiency of the existing transit and road system.

The Draft Plan also includes strategic transportation investments that benefit suburban cities by addressing management, reliability and safety of the existing freeway, highway and arterial infrastructures while targeting freeway improvements to most congested locations.

Why would local governments want to support the Plan Bay Area?

Implementation of Plan Bay Area is intended to improve the quality of life of neighborhoods by providing cleaner air, improved public health, better mobility, more walkable streets, and homes closer to transit, jobs and services. Plan Bay Area redirects some regional resources to more closely align with local community development visions, as adopted in local plans. This includes funding from the One Bay Area Grant Program and assistance in meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This sounds like a big effort. Are we starting from scratch?

Not at all. For decades, the Bay Area has been encouraging more focused and compact growth. Plan Bay Area builds on this history and places even greater emphasis on the integration of transportation and land use planning. Plan Bay Area continues our traditional emphasis of investing in operating and maintaining our existing transportation system, and builds on successful regional programs centered on focused growth around high quality transit, including affordable housing, complete streets that serve pedestrians and bicyclists and well as motorists, and protection and preservation of open space.

When will the Draft Plan Bay Area be complete?

MTC and ABAG issued a Draft Plan Bay Area for public comment in April 2013, after more than two years of public dialogue and consultation. The agencies are scheduled to consider adoption of the Final Plan in July 2013. If adopted, Plan Bay Area will be updated every four years, as required by law, to reflect the region’s changing needs and priorities.

What does it cost to conduct and complete a planning process like this?

The budget for the planning portion of Plan Bay Area (that is, the costs associated with conducting the process versus the funding the plan directs toward programs and projects) is approximately $3.1 million over 3 years. This includes consultant assistance and staff costs to update the regional travel model; to create a new, integrated economic and land use model for the current Plan and future updates to the Plan; to conduct model analyses; to evaluate the performance of plan scenarios, alternatives and projects; to prepare the Draft Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report; to complete supplementary reports and to conduct public engagement. Funding comes from the region’s annual allocation of federal, state and local planning revenues.

What are some of the other regional efforts related to Plan Bay Area?
The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) are considering how to improve the region’s land use pattern and placement of public infrastructure, including transportation. To reduce air pollution (smog, particulate matter and airborne toxins), the Air District is considering how to address the air quality impacts of transportation and other sources associated with land development. BCDC is preparing for rising sea levels and storm surges affecting areas on and near the Bay shoreline. Future sea levels will have implications for the location of development and transportation infrastructure.

**About Forecasts**

**How can ABAG and MTC predict the future?**

We do not predict the future. For several decades, both MTC and ABAG have been developing and updating long-term regional plans for the Bay Area by using computer modeling to forecast transportation and housing demand, economic growth, demographics, and land-use changes, among others. These forecasts are used to inform planning and investment decisions. The forecasts are updated every two to four years to make sure they are based on the most reliable data, including locally adopted plans for development and conservation.

**How many people will Plan Bay Area need to accommodate?**

The Bay Area is currently home to about 7 million people. Data suggests that over the next 30 years the region will attract another 2 million people. The rate of growth depends on several variables, including job growth, age distribution, predicted birth and death rates, and estimated migration into the Bay Area.

**Why do the Department of Finance population numbers differ from ABAG’s projections?**

California’s Department of Housing and Community Development, the Department of Finance, and ABAG all agree that economic trends need to be addressed in Plan Bay Area. ABAG’s 2.1 million population growth projection is directly tied to employment growth. The Department of Finance’s 2013 projections do not take into account the high rate of growth in jobs, population and migration into the region. The Department of Finance population projections depict only one possible course of future population change, i.e., the one reflecting assumed trends in fertility, mortality, and migration. The model does not consider employment, which is a major driver of migration. The Department of Finance will incorporate ABAG employment forecasts in the future. The Department of Finance, and Department of Housing and Community Development agree with ABAG’s methodology and projections.

**Why are your population estimates based on one number and not a range?**

We recognize that there is a range of future population estimates; however for planning purposes we have to arrive at a single number. Based on the current population and assumptions for fertility rates, death rates and future jobs (which affects job seekers moving to the Bay Area), the Plan Bay Area estimate represents what we believe is the most likely future population. To ensure the forecast is as accurate as possible, it will be updated every four years.
Why should we have confidence in the population/demographic models used to support the plan?

The Plan Bay Area forecast was developed by ABAG with extensive assistance and peer review by a team of economists and other state agencies including the California Department of Finance. The forecast uses demographic data from national and state sources, such as the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Census, and the California Department of Finance. It relies upon standardized forecasting methods to estimate the Bay Area's share of expected national employment growth and the detailed demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) of the region’s future population. The methodology for forecasting the region’s future population is based on natural increase of the existing population (births minus deaths) and expected job growth (which draws people to the region). A detailed description of the forecasting methodology is available in the Draft Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing.

The forecast includes these inputs and is based on the best professional estimates of ABAG staff. In addition, although the SCS forecasts population growth out to 2040, by law the SCS must be updated every four years. This provides ABAG the opportunity to continually refine the assumptions and data used in its forecasts.

Why are natural hazards such as earthquakes, sea level rise and flooding not integrated more directly into the plan?

Plan Bay Area is a long-term, regional-scale plan covering 101 cities and nine counties, over 150 major transportation projects, and many other transportation and land use projects over the next approximately 27 years. The Plan and the Environmental Impact Report address natural hazards at the level appropriate for long-term, programmatic regional plans. Potentially significant site-specific natural hazards caused by projects implemented under Plan Bay Area will be addressed at the project-specific level. MTC and ABAG will continue to monitor these issues and revise Plan Bay Area in response to the changing environment every four years, as required by law.

About Transportation

How does Draft Plan Bay Area invest transportation funds?

Draft Plan Bay Area focuses the lion’s share of investment on maintaining the existing transit and road system and boosting the transportation system’s efficiency. The Plan also provides support for focused growth in Priority Development Areas, including the new One Bay Area Grant program.

How much transportation revenue is expected to be available?

The Draft Plan Bay Area forecasts transportation revenue totaling $289 billion over 28 years. However, most of this money will be needed just to maintain the existing transportation network. Of the total amount, $57 billion is “discretionary,” or available for assignment to new projects and programs.

How does Plan Bay Area invest future transportation funds?
How does the Draft Plan Bay Area propose to invest future discretionary funds?

The Draft Plan invests discretionary funds into six key investment strategies: (1) county investment priorities would receive $16 billion, or 29 percent of available funds; (2) system maintenance would receive $15 billion, or 26 percent; (3) programs to support focused growth are slated to garner $14 billion through the One Bay Area Grant program, or 25 percent of expected discretionary funds; (4) transit expansion projects would receive $5 billion, or 9 percent; (5) freeway and transit efficiency projects would receive $4 billion, or 7 percent; and (6) $1 billion (less than 1 percent) would go toward programs specifically designed to combat climate change. The plan includes a $2 billion reserve fund set aside for future rail expansion projects.

What is OBAG?

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is designed to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation process. The program totals $320 million over the next four years ($14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, which amounts to 5 percent of overall funding and 25 percent of discretionary funding in the plan). The program grants local communities the flexibility to invest in transportation infrastructure that supports infill development by providing funds for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local road repair and planning activities, while also providing funds for Safe Routes to School programs and for Priority Conservation Areas.

How does the Draft Plan propose to support bicycle and pedestrian travel?

State Transportation Development Act (TDA) and local sales tax funds committed to bicycle and pedestrian improvements total $4.6 billion during the Plan period. The One Bay Area Grant program, $14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, is another fund source that can be used to pay for ‘Complete Streets’ projects. These projects can include stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian paths, bicycle lanes, pedestrian bulb-outs, lighting, new sidewalks, Safe Routes to Transit, and Safe Routes to Schools projects that will improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and travel.

In addition to this funding, cities and counties that wish to use OBAG grant funds must adopt a ‘Complete Streets’ resolution and in the future an updated general plan element to improve the delivery of Complete Streets projects serving all road users, including pedestrians and bicyclists. During MTC’s last survey of project sponsors in 2006, over 55% of transportation projects surveyed already included complete streets elements. The resolution requirement is expected to increase the rate of complete street implementation.
What does the Plan propose to fund for the region’s Climate Initiatives Program?

The Climate Initiatives Program invests in eight programs focused on technology advancements and incentives for travel options to help the region meet the SB 375 GHG emissions targets. The programs include: implementing the Commuter Benefit Ordinance, authorized by SB 1339; expanding car sharing to ensure vehicles are available at high-demand locations and expanded to suburban communities; providing incentives to reduce the cost of vanpools; establishing discounted fees charged on new vehicles with low miles-per-gallon rating to help purchase fuel-efficient vehicles; a public education campaign and rebates for tools that encourage “smart driving”; establishing a voluntary vehicle buy-back incentive program to accelerate the removal of low-mpg vehicles coupled with incentives towards the purchase of plug-ins or electric vehicles; and investing in a regional electric vehicles charger network. In addition, the Plan calls for the expansion of the most successful strategies identified in the Climate Initiatives Innovative Grants program, which is currently underway.

About Housing and Land Use

Why do we have RHNA – Regional Housing Need Allocation?

California Housing Element law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) requires each jurisdiction to plan for housing for all income levels by ensuring that local zoning and planning support the production of a diverse range of new housing. The RHNA is the state-mandated process to identify the share of the state’s housing need for which each jurisdiction must plan over an 8-year period. Jurisdictions are not responsible for building the housing: only for demonstrating in their local Housing Element that it could be built under current zoning. ABAG oversees the RHNA process in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

How does Plan Bay Area relate to the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA)?

Plan Bay Area combines these three initiatives into a single, integrated regional plan. For example, RTPs traditionally include land use projections. Plan Bay Area’s distribution of growth is the SCS. Senate Bill 375 also stipulates that the SCS will identify areas to accommodate the RHNA. State law requires that the RHNA follow the development pattern specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Does Plan Bay Area override local land use control?

No. Cities and counties, not MTC or ABAG, are ultimately responsible for the manner in which their local communities continue to be built out in the future. For this reason, cities and counties are not required to revise their “land use policies and regulations, including [their] general plan, to be consistent with the regional transportation plan or an alternative planning strategy.” [Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(2)(J)]. The Plan’s SCS merely provides a land use vision that “if implemented, [would] achieve the greenhouse gas emission reductions targets” for the region. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21155, subd. (a) (emphasis added).) The proposed Plan will only be implemented insofar as local jurisdictions adopt its policies and recommendations.
Rather than increase regional land use control, the Plan facilitates implementation by expanding incentives and opportunities available to local jurisdictions to support growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). In addition to funding transportation and planning projects in PDAs, the Plan sets the stage for cities and counties to increase the efficiency of the development process, if they choose, for projects consistent with the Plan and other state legislation.

**What is a Priority Development Area?**

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally designated areas within existing communities that have been identified and approved by local cities or counties for future growth. These areas are typically accessible to transit, jobs, shopping and other services. Over 70 local governments have voluntarily designated some 170 PDAs, which are proposed to absorb about 80 percent of new housing and over 60 percent of new jobs on less than five percent of the Bay Area’s land. The result is a locally supported, compact and efficient growth pattern that meets CARB’s GHG reduction targets and provides adequate housing for the Bay Area’s growing population.

**What is a Priority Conservation Area?**

Priority Conservation Areas are identified in partnership with land trusts, open space districts, parks and recreation departments, local jurisdictions and property owners to preserve the region’s diverse farming, recreational, and resource lands for future generations. This process builds on a century of park development and open space protection. The purpose of designating Priority Conservation Areas is to protect key natural lands in the San Francisco Bay Area through purchase or conservation easements with willing property owners.

**If Plan Bay Area includes additional housing units in my community, does this guarantee that those units are going to be built?**

No. The pace at which new housing is built will be determined by various factors, including local zoning, the financial feasibility of building the new housing permitted under this zoning, and ultimately the decision by a city council, town council, or board of supervisors to approve each housing project. Cities and counties will continue to retain all control over local building decisions following adoption of the Plan. Over the long term, communities may change zoning, provide incentives for developers, or adjust other land use policies to increase or decrease the feasibility of building the levels of housing projected in the Plan.

**Have ABAG and MTC investigated whether Plan Bay Area’s development is feasible?**

The regional land use plan, or distribution of growth to individual jurisdictions, was developed through a variety of land use and transportation scenarios that distributed the total amount of growth forecasted for the region to specific locations. These scenarios sought to address the needs and aspirations of each Bay Area jurisdiction, as identified in locally adopted general plans and zoning ordinances, while meeting Plan Bay Area performance targets adopted by ABAG and MTC to guide and gauge the region’s future growth.

The framework for developing these scenarios is based as Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) nominated by local governments, not ABAG or MTC. ABAG and MTC incorporated local feedback from individual jurisdictions, relying on their best
assessment of feasible growth over the plan period and then applied a series of additional factors to achieve Plan Bay Area’s goals. The scenarios were then developed through an open, deliberative process, during which public input was sought at every step along the way. After further modeling, analysis, and public engagement, the five initial scenarios were narrowed down to a single preferred land use scenario.

Feasibility of this scenario was further tested by an assessment of a representative sample of PDAs from throughout the region by consultants at Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) deeply familiar with the market characteristics of each jurisdiction in the Bay Area. Overall, the study concluded that the proposed development pattern contained in the preferred scenario, while ambitious, represents an achievable level of growth with sufficient policy changes, some of which are now underway or currently being examined.

So all projects in Plan Bay Area will require further environmental review?

It’s important to note that while Plan Bay Area includes a “Program-level” EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (or CEQA), any major transportation, housing or other project included in the plan must still comply with CEQA, and in some cases the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For example, if a project to add bicycle lanes is listed in the Plan, separate environmental review specific to that project is still required under CEQA and will be conducted by the jurisdiction with approval authority over the project. Likewise, if the Plan describes new housing units or jobs within a city or county, the actual planning and development enabling any proposed project that might be brought forward to a city or county would fall under a local environmental review and still need local approval. SB 375 provides CEQA streamlining benefits that local jurisdictions can take advantage of, but it the Plan Bay Area EIR does not preclude future environmental review.

What is open space and who owns it?

Open space generally refers to undeveloped land or water that could be either publicly or privately owned.

Is Plan Bay Area consistent with Urban Growth Boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls in many Bay Area counties?

Yes. The Draft Plan accommodates 100% of new growth within existing urban growth boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls. It also emphasizes protection for the region’s farmland and scenic and natural resource areas, including Priority Conservation Areas.

How will local sewer, fire, water and other local infrastructure be impacted by housing growth? What about schools, libraries, and other public services?

Infrastructure, school, police, and fire service effects will vary in different locations, with those locations experiencing more growth likely requiring additional services. Funding for many of these services will be locally determined, as public service standards, performance measures, and policies related to police and fire are typically set by local jurisdictions and agencies; and library and recreation facilities are typically set in city and county general plans. For schools, standards
relating to class size are primarily determined at the state level, although local school districts are responsible for the planning and construction of school facilities. Additional funding may come from developer agreements, which can include impact fees to support schools and other community benefits, such as parks and libraries.

As a regional plan encompassing nine counties, Plan Bay Area cannot provide a detailed assessment of local needs. However the compact growth pattern in the SCS should allow jurisdictions to leverage existing facilities and absorb some of the increased demand with facilities that are currently underutilized. Overall, more compact urban development costs less for upfront infrastructure, saves on ongoing delivery of services, and generates more local tax revenue per acre than conventional suburban development. New employment associated with providing public services is recognized in the Plan Bay Area jobs forecast, with increases in every county consistent with population growth.

The SCS DEIR found that impacts to schools, libraries, and parks from land use development are Potentially Significant, and therefore would have to undergo environmental review during the approvals process to determine feasible mitigations. For additional information, please see the Draft EIR, chapters 2.12 and 2.14.

How are water needs for new development proposed in this plan being addressed?

Plan Bay Area is a programmatic document and the Draft EIR includes a program-level assessment of impacts related to water supply. The Draft EIR demonstrates the region faces questions regarding water supply deficiencies particularly during drought years. While numerous factors influence water demand, including employment growth, socio-economic characteristics, geographic distribution of the population, variation in precipitation levels, and water conservation practices, overall population growth is the most important factor. The projected population growth will occur with or without the Plan.

The proposed Plan Bay Area concentrates the projected growth within currently developed areas in the region, which reduces per capita water consumption. As a result, the proposed Plan should help protect the region’s water supply by reducing development pressure on rural areas; areas where per capita water use is typically higher and new water infrastructure would be needed to accommodate growth.

With a few exceptions, the areas anticipated for new development conform to local general plans and specific plans. Each of the Bay Area’s urban water suppliers must prepare an Urban Water Management Plan that assesses current and future demands for water. The potential future development would have been accounted for in the local Urban Water Management Plan.

About Greenhouse Gas Emissions

What are the greenhouse-gas reduction targets?

In 2010, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets for regions across California, as required by law. For the San Francisco Bay Area, this
means a 7 percent per capita reduction target for the year 2020 and 15 percent per capita reduction target for 2035, based on 2005 levels. CARB set the GHG emissions reductions targets for the various regions in the state as a per capita metric. The DEIR of the Plan included both this “SB 375 metric” focused on reducing per capita emissions from cars and light duty trucks related to transportation and land use planning, as well as an overall GHG emissions metric in its analysis of Plan Bay Area.

**Why is lowering greenhouse gas emissions important?**

Lowering greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions protects public health, lowers energy consumption, and reduces our contribution to global warming. More immediately, strategies to reduce emissions emphasize creating more options to take public transit, walk or use a bicycle for transportation instead of a car, when viable and appropriate. In addition, other laws require Plan Bay Area to meet federal and state air quality health standards for several pollutants.

**Why the focus on cars and light trucks?**

Transportation is the biggest single source of greenhouse gases in California. In the Bay Area, it accounts for 41 percent of our overall emissions, most of that comes from personal travel in on-road vehicles. To reduce our contribution to global warming, the region must pursue multiple transportation and land use strategies.

Plan Bay Area will:

1. Reduce the separation of land uses (jobs, stores, schools, and homes) and encourage more complete, mixed-use communities, so people can drive less and walk, bike or use more transit;
2. Cluster more homes, jobs and other activities around transit, so people can more easily use transit rather than drive; and
3. Plan land uses and transportation together, to reduce traffic congestion, improve vehicle speeds, reduce emissions from idling and other inefficiencies.

**What about low-carbon fuels, more efficient cars, and solar/green buildings? Won’t that reduce the region’s greenhouse gas emissions? Why do we even need SB 375?**

Vehicle technology and transportation pricing (e.g., parking) are likely to have a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The impact of more efficient vehicles would be significantly reduced, however, if we continue to drive more and congestion increases because of inefficient land uses. Experts agree that there is no single answer. Changes in technology as well as changes in travel behavior will be necessary to reduce emissions to healthier levels in the future. There are other planning and implementation efforts that address building energy efficiency, renewable energy production, and additional GHG reduction approaches (for example, local Climate Action Plans and Energy Upgrade California ([https://energyupgradeca.org/overview](https://energyupgradeca.org/overview)).

Further, SB 375 requires regional planning agencies in the state to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region could achieve the GHG emissions reductions targets through integrated land use and
transportation planning. The CARB Scoping Plan, developed to implement AB 32 as a comprehensive statewide strategy to reduce GHG, specifically charges CARB with implementing GHG reduction strategies related to clean vehicles and fuel efficiency. Therefore, the SB 375 targets analysis does not include the GHG emissions reductions and benefits of statewide standards that are anticipated as the result of fuel efficiency standards and the low carbon fuels standards (LCFS) as part of the region’s efforts to reduce GHG emissions through integrated land use and transportation planning. Were MTC/ABAG to include those benefits in the SB 375 analysis, the region would be taking credit for emissions reductions in the land use and transportation planning sector that the state is taking credit for as part of ARB’s responsibilities, thus double counting.

What if Plan Bay Area can’t meet its targets?

If we cannot meet the greenhouse-gas reduction targets in Plan Bay Area, then we must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) to accompany the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The APS would identify the physical, economic or political conditions required to meet the regional greenhouse gas targets.

Equity

What does “social equity” mean?

Social equity is the idea that all persons should have fair and equal access to opportunity. Plan Bay Area is designed to find housing for all persons at all income levels in the region, improve air quality in polluted areas and to make housing and transportation more affordable for lower-income households. For more information, visit the One Bay Area web page on equity.

What does “environmental justice” mean?

Environmental justice stems from a Presidential Executive Order to fairly distribute benefits and burdens for disadvantaged communities and to include minority and low-income communities in decision-making. The federal government oversees regional planning. As a recipient of federal funds, MTC is required to incorporate environmental justice principles in all its planning efforts, including Plan Bay Area.

Public Input

How are local governments and other organizations involved?

Local officials, as well as environmental, social justice, faith-based, public-health and business leaders, are engaging in Plan Bay Area through a Regional Advisory Working Group that provides input on planning and policy issues. The agencies also get input from several other interest groups through MTC’s Policy Advisory Council and ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee. These meetings are open to the public and broadcast live via streaming audio. For more details, visit OneBayArea.org.
How are you involving residents in low-income communities and communities of color?

MTC and ABAG are partnering with nonprofit groups working in low-income communities and communities of color, selected through a competitive procurement process, to involve residents in those communities in development of the Plan.

Are businesses involved in the Plan Bay Area process?

Yes. MTC and ABAG have been working with business leaders from throughout the region, especially at key points during development of the Plan.

Is my input really considered by ABAG and MTC?

Absolutely. Oral and written comments from workshops, telephone survey results, a web survey and focus groups, have been analyzed, summarized and presented to ABAG and MTC decision makers at key milestones in the development of the plan. The Draft Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) were released March 22 and April 2 respectively for public review and comment. All oral and written comments will be summarized and presented for review by ABAG and MTC board members to inform their final action on the Draft Plan, which is slated for adoption in July 2013.

How can I get involved?

Public engagement is essential to the success of all the regional planning efforts. Plan Bay Area needs the input of all stakeholders — especially the people who live and work in Bay Area communities — to build a plan that meets their vision, goals and aspirations for a prosperous future.

There are many ways to get involved. You can go to our Get Involved page to sign up for alerts about meetings and other opportunities to have your voice heard. We also encourage you to visit our Public Process page, which explains the nuts and bolts of what can be an admittedly complicated multi-year planning process.

Plan Bay Area is based on the work of hundreds of local planning efforts that have taken place around the Bay Area. We encourage you to get involved in local planning efforts, including neighborhood plans, General Plan and Housing Element updates. A second regional planning effort, the Bay Area Prosperity Plan, is engaging a broad range of community organizations and partners around the region on economic development and housing strategies to implement Plan Bay Area. You can learn more about this effort at http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/Bay-Area-Prosperity-Plan.html.

Why don’t you do more to publicize opportunities to comment on this plan?

MTC and ABAG are conducting an extensive public engagement program. Methods for publicizing comment opportunities include:
The Role of Regional Government

Some claim that Plan Bay Area is part of an ill-intended global agenda to force lifestyle changes — is this true?

Plan Bay Area is a home-grown effort to plan for future transportation and land use needs. Most of us who live here are accustomed to saying that we live in “The Bay Area.” That simple phrase speaks volumes. It shows we already share a regional identity. We have a history of joining together on issues that cross jurisdictional lines. Notable examples include working to save San Francisco Bay, set aside land for a vast system of interconnected parks and open space, and pioneer a regional rapid rail system. All these efforts have shaped our collective identity and put us on the map as a region. Our first long-range comprehensive regional plan was completed in 1964 by ABAG. MTC has been adopting and updating regional transportation plans since 1971, the most recent of which was adopted in 2009. Plan Bay Area is a work in progress that will be updated every four years. While it is done in part to meet state and federal laws that require metropolitan areas to plan for regional needs, the Plan furthers a very important conversation in the Bay Area about the quality of life we enjoy today, and how to leave a better region for future generations.

Is there any relationship between Plan Bay Area and U.N. Agenda 21?

No. Plan Bay Area is mandated by California Senate Bill 375. For more information, read the American Planning Association fact sheet “Agenda 21: Myths and Facts” available online at http://www.onebayarea.org/pdf/Agenda21mythsfacts.pdf.

Does Plan Bay Area force local governments to accept regional dictates in order to receive transportation funding?

Plan Bay Area does not require local governments to implement regional requirements in order to receive transportation funding. The majority of funding in the Plan ($232 billion, or 80%) is already committed for specific purposes. The remaining $57 billion in revenues are available for assignment through the plan. As revenues become available, MTC assigns these funds to specific projects and programs, and may, at its discretion, include specific requirements. For the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG) — which is slated to receive 5% of funding included in the Plan — MTC requires recipients to comply with existing state law by having an approved housing element. MTC directs the majority of OBAG funds to areas that local jurisdictions have nominated and have been approved as Priority Development Areas, though it is not a requirement to be designated a PDA in order to receive funding. So the Plan itself does not dictate specific requirements to local governments, rather the subsequent funding programs may
include policies to ensure scarce transportation revenues are invested appropriately and in a manner that supports implementation of the Plan.

**Will Plan Bay Area be on the ballot for approval by voters?**

Rather than asking voters to adopt the long-range transportation and land use plan, state law requires this action from ABAG (as the state-designated Council of Governments) and MTC (as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization). Both boards consist of locally elected officials.
Minor modifications have been made to the housing and employment distributions in the Draft Plan Bay Area (“Draft Plan”). These modifications take into account the considerable local input received on the land use plan to date. Specifically, the modifications reflect: (1) corrections to datasets that were used to develop the jobs and housing distributions in the Draft Plan; (2) adjustments to ensure consistency with Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA); and (3) adjustments to local jurisdictions growth based on corrections to how the distribution methodology was applied. These modifications are described in more detail below. The revised employment and housing distribution tables are attached to this document. These minor modifications do not affect the conclusions of regional significance in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, nor do they impact the regional modeling results in a significant way.

**Corrections to Data Sets**

Several errors in the data used to develop the employment and housing distributions were identified both by ABAG staff and local jurisdictions. These include: errors in the number of jobs in specific jurisdictions within the National Establishment Time Series (NETS) data set that was used to develop the job distribution, errors in the U.S. Census housing data used to develop the housing distribution, and errors in local plan data that was used to develop the housing distribution.

**NETS Corrections**

The correction to the NETS base data was made for five jurisdictions including Hayward, Lafayette, Hillsborough, Unincorporated San Mateo County (specifically the San Francisco Airport area), Saratoga and Los Altos Hills. The corrections reduced 2010 jobs for each of these jurisdictions, with the exception of the San Francisco Airport, which saw a significant increase in 2010 jobs. The 2010 job shifts were contained with each county (reductions in one city meant a proportional increase in jobs for other cities within the county). The modified base data was then used to recalculate 2040 jobs, resulting in shifts in the 2040 job distribution for all jurisdictions throughout the region. However, the bulk of the shifts were contained within the counties in which the corrections were made. At the regional level, the overall shift of jobs is negligible.

**U.S. Census Corrections**

Two fixes were made to the U.S. Census 2010 housing unit and household data set that was used in the housing distribution. These include a reduction in the 2010 housing numbers for Colma, per a statement of correction from the U.S. Census Department, and a fix to the split of housing units and households within and outside Orinda’s Priority Development Area (PDA). The result of the first correction was an increase of 2010 units to the Unincorporated San Mateo County area adjacent to Colma. The result of the second is a change only in the 2040 housing figures for Orinda’s PDA. In both cases, housing growth for these jurisdictions was not modified.

**Corrections to local plan data**

A change was made to Cupertino’s “local plan feedback” number, used to develop the housing distribution, to correct an error found after adoption of the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy in May of 2012. The result of this fix was a reduction of housing growth in Cupertino.
Adjustments to ensure consistency with RHNA
Upon development of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, ABAG found that the eight-year RHNA housing allocation for two jurisdictions, Clayton and Los Altos Hills, was higher than the housing growth for these jurisdictions in the thirty-year Plan Bay Area housing distribution. These jurisdictions received additional housing growth in the Plan Bay Area distribution so that total growth is equivalent to the RHNA number.

Adjustments to local jurisdiction growth based on corrections to application of methodology
The formal public comment period for both documents closed on May 16, 2013. A number of jurisdictions commented on the levels of employment and housing growth allocated in the Draft Plan as being too high, too low, or overly concentrated in their cities’ PDAs. Twenty jurisdictions requested adjustments to their job number, sixteen requested adjustments to their housing number, and five requested shifts in growth from their PDAs to other areas within their city.

The distribution of employment and housing growth in the Draft Plan takes into account a variety of factors—including input from jurisdictions, level of transit service, Vehicle Miles Travelled by Household, in-commuting by low-wage workers, housing values, existing employment base, and concentration of knowledge-based economic activity, among others. ABAG staff thoroughly reviewed each request for modification and the overall methodology assigning job and housing growth to each jurisdiction. Staff acknowledged that the application of the distribution methodologies in certain instances was not appropriate. Several modifications for a small number of areas are noted below.

For all other jurisdictions, staff deemed that the distribution methodology was applied appropriately and consistently. Employment and housing growth in these jurisdictions was found to be consistent with and comparable to similarly-sized cities, and could be reasonably accommodated over the thirty-year time-frame of the Draft Plan.

Job Adjustments
Upon review of the employment methodology and employment figures for Dublin and Livermore, additional job growth was assigned to these cities. Staff found that the employment distribution methodology is slightly under-allocating certain sectors of employment growth in these cities, given that the model bases growth largely on cities’ existing jobs base and does not account well for current and anticipated employment growth rates. Dublin and Livermore are currently small job centers but have growing jobs in the knowledge-based sector. These cities were assigned proportionately fewer jobs than cities with larger current job bases but less capacity and slower expected rates of growth, such as Hayward and Unincorporated Alameda County. Growth in Hayward and Unincorporated Alameda County was reduced commensurate to the increases in Dublin and Livermore.
Housing Adjustments

Housing growth for the portion of the El Camino Real Priority Development Area (PDA) in Burlingame was reduced. This is a reduction of the growth that was assigned to the Burlingame El Camino Real PDA as part of the additional housing growth allocation to several key job centers and locations along the core transit network in the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy. Staff found that this PDA was inappropriately assigned this additional housing growth given its close proximity to the San Francisco Airport. The balance of housing from this adjustment was distributed to all other cities and towns within the region per the growth distribution methodology.

Housing growth in the Plan was deemed to be quite low for Brentwood. The level of housing was adjusted upward to reflect a more reasonable rate of growth considering current development rates. The increase in housing growth in Brentwood is commensurate with the decrease in Cupertino.

Housing growth in the PDAs was reduced for the following jurisdictions: Lafayette, Walnut Creek, San Mateo, and Sunnyvale. In the case of Lafayette and Walnut Creek, staff acknowledges that a portion of the housing growth allocated to these jurisdictions’ PDAs, given their small size, could be accommodated in the transit-accessible areas adjacent to the PDAs. In the case of San Mateo and Sunnyvale, it was recognized that housing growth was somewhat over-concentrated in the cities’ PDAs in relation to the regional concentration of growth in the PDAs. Growth in San Mateo’s PDAs was adjusted to achieve a lower concentration of growth, down from 81% to 77% of total city growth, and for Sunnyvale, growth in the PDAs was adjusted down from 83% to 79% of total city growth. The total growth for all four of these cities was not modified.

Conclusions

These changes do not affect the regional significance conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, nor do they result in significant changes in the regional modeling results, including the conclusion that the Draft Plan achieves the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

Appendix: Employment and Housing Distribution by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

---

Appendix: Employment and Housing Distribution by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area
# Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

**KEY**

**Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)**
- Priority Development Area or
  Investment Area

## Alameda County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Jobs 2010</th>
<th>Jobs 2040</th>
<th>Jobs 2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>33,220</td>
<td>9,160</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Air Station</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterfront</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue &amp; Solano Avenue</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>77,110</td>
<td>99,330</td>
<td>22,220</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeline Street</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Truman Neighborhood</td>
<td>15,210</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue *</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shattuck</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Avenue</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue *</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>16,810</td>
<td>31,650</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>16,070</td>
<td>23,610</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Core</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>11,280</td>
<td>18,450</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>90,010</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>29,990</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>18,770</td>
<td>24,660</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington District</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fremont/Warm Springs</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>12,890</td>
<td>28,980</td>
<td>16,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>68,140</td>
<td>87,820</td>
<td>19,680</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hayward BART</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hayward BART</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cannery</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>38,450</td>
<td>53,210</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>16,370</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>17,930</td>
<td>23,150</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Mixed Use Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>190,490</td>
<td>275,760</td>
<td>85,260</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum BART Station Area</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>12,430</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown &amp; Jack London Square</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>88,260</td>
<td>127,710</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmont Town Center</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale &amp; Dimond Areas</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Transit Village</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>10,650</td>
<td>12,880</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>33,560</td>
<td>41,830</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oakland</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>54,340</td>
<td>69,640</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>39,980</td>
<td>58,920</td>
<td>19,940</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Fair BART Transit Village</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development *</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 14th Street *</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>9,010</td>
<td>15,680</td>
<td>6,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Station District</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Unincorporated</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley BART</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 14th Street and Mission Street</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meekland Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

#### Contra Costa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>19,090</td>
<td>25,530</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest eBART Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivertown Waterfront</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,640</td>
<td>69,450</td>
<td>21,810</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reuse Area</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>14,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reuse Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,460</td>
<td>17,620</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Danville</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cerrito</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>6,440</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Hercules</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront District</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,940</td>
<td>12,430</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,320</td>
<td>22,490</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga Center</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>6,680</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Planning Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Planning Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orinda</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinole</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>8,490</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue eBART Station</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>7,930</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>22,940</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buskirk Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo Valley College</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,780</td>
<td>42,320</td>
<td>11,530</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Richmond</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td>9,360</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,470</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue &amp; 23rd Street</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumrill Boulevard</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td></td>
<td>43,960</td>
<td>58,320</td>
<td>14,370</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Camino Ramon</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>14,460</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,720</td>
<td>57,380</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Downtown</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County Unincorporitated</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,220</td>
<td>54,040</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Centre</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown El Sobrante</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Richmond</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Marin County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere</td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corte Madera</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>8,260</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>7,810</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novato</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,890</td>
<td>24,390</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Anselmo</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center</td>
<td>37,620</td>
<td>44,960</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>10,480</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sausalito</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiburon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County Unincorporated</td>
<td>Urbanized 101 Corridor</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>19,360</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 29 Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Downtown Napa</td>
<td>33,850</td>
<td>44,520</td>
<td>10,670</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soscol Gateway Corridor</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>6,230</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,630</td>
<td>30,010</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Francisco County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>19th Avenue</td>
<td>568,720</td>
<td>759,500</td>
<td>190,780</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>9,980</td>
<td>13,570</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayview/Hunters Point</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipyard/Candlestick Point</td>
<td>19,590</td>
<td>29,820</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown-Van Ness-Geary</td>
<td>315,570</td>
<td>368,150</td>
<td>52,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods</td>
<td>61,070</td>
<td>70,890</td>
<td>9,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market &amp; Octavia</td>
<td>31,850</td>
<td>34,790</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>24,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission-San Jose Corridor</td>
<td>12,680</td>
<td>18,760</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>18,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with Brisbane)</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>37,660</td>
<td>29,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

## San Mateo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>10,450</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages of Belmont</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>7,670</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,540</td>
<td>37,780</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame El Camino Real</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>12,280</td>
<td>17,820</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,760</td>
<td>26,580</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>3,770</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>17,350</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,890</td>
<td>34,980</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Station Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>58,080</td>
<td>77,480</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway-Veterans Boulevard Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>Transit Corridors</td>
<td>12,710</td>
<td>16,950</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>15,870</td>
<td>19,370</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Corridor</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>52,540</td>
<td>72,950</td>
<td>20,410</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>53,790</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,570</td>
<td>31,180</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcosit</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,960</td>
<td>95,590</td>
<td>28,660</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>29,080</td>
<td>11,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>10,040</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,360</td>
<td>9,670</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fair Oaks</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cupertino</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilroy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Altos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Altos Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milpitas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monte Sereno</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morgan Hill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,570</td>
<td>22,140</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain View</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Whisman</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>12,420</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bayshore</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Center</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisman Station</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palo Alto</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Jose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>377,140</td>
<td>524,510</td>
<td>147,380</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bascom TOD Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>11,530</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bascom Urban Village</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Station</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Urban Village</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor Urban Villages</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol/Fully/King Urban Villages</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Hill</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottle Transit Village</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown “Frame”</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>26,930</td>
<td>31,320</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Clara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Focus Area</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Station Focus Area</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>10,070</td>
<td>18,820</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>14,580</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Clara County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Santa Clara County (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>11,640</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,810</td>
<td>95,600</td>
<td>20,790</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown &amp; Caltrain Station</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>9,260</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Station Transit Village</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffett Park</td>
<td>Enpl. Investment Area</td>
<td>11,450</td>
<td>19,090</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peery Park</td>
<td>Enpl. Investment Area</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reamwood Light Rail Station</td>
<td>Enpl. Investment Area</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Station ITR</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,160</td>
<td>47,940</td>
<td>8,770</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

#### Solano County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benicia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Gateway</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>10,930</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairfield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown South (Jefferson Street)</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas Street Core</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Texas Street Gateway</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>2,890</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Vista</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suisun City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown &amp; Waterfront</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacaville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vallejo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront &amp; Downtown</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sonoma County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cloverdale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/SMART Transit Area</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotati</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown and Cotati Depot</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healdsburg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>8,330</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rohnert Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Mountain Village</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Rosa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Station Area *</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>13,820</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor *</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>23,230</td>
<td>30,080</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Rosa Station *</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Road Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebastopol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexus Area</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>7,010</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonoma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonoma County Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,150</td>
<td>60,470</td>
<td>13,320</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates PDAs that overlap within a jurisdiction. Job totals for the overlapping areas are assigned to one PDA only, with no duplicate counts.

** Indicates C/CAG El Camino Real PDAs that overlap with another PDA. Job totals may duplicate jobs already listed in that city.
## Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Alameda County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Naval Air Station Transit Town Center</td>
<td>32,350</td>
<td>38,250</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30,120</td>
<td>36,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Waterfront Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>San Pablo Avenue &amp; Solano Avenue Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,890</td>
<td>9,060</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Adeline Street Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>49,450</td>
<td>50,740</td>
<td>9,280</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46,030</td>
<td>55,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown City Center</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>6,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Pablo Avenue * Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>179%</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Shattuck Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telegraph Avenue Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avenue * Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>125%</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan Area Suburban Center</td>
<td>15,780</td>
<td>24,320</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>23,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town Center Suburban Center</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>5,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Center Suburban Center</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>467%</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>3,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Core City Center</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>12,110</td>
<td>5,470</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>11,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Centerville Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>73,990</td>
<td>91,620</td>
<td>17,630</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>89,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Center City Center</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>10,210</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>9,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irvington District Transit Center</td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td>10,260</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6,910</td>
<td>9,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Fremont/Warm Springs Suburban Center</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Downtown City Center</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td>60,610</td>
<td>12,320</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45,370</td>
<td>58,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Hayward BART Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>640%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Hayward BART Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Cannery Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>234%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Corridor Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>140%</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>Downtown Suburban Center</td>
<td>30,340</td>
<td>40,040</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29,130</td>
<td>38,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Side Suburban Center</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>170%</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area Suburban Center</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development Transit Center</td>
<td>13,410</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12,970</td>
<td>16,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Town Mixed Use Area Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Coliseum BART Station Area Transit Center</td>
<td>165,710</td>
<td>221,160</td>
<td>55,450</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>153,790</td>
<td>212,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown &amp; Jack London Square Regional Center</td>
<td>11,910</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td>14,290</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>10,630</td>
<td>25,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastmont Town Center Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruitvale &amp; Dimond Areas Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>14,310</td>
<td>18,580</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>17,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacArthur Transit Village Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>8,850</td>
<td>13,910</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>144%</td>
<td>8,030</td>
<td>13,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transist Oriented Development Corridors Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>67,370</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60,970</td>
<td>74,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Oakland Transit Center</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>6,870</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>16,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>Hacienda Suburban Center</td>
<td>26,050</td>
<td>33,160</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td>32,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Bay Fair BART Transit Village Development * Transit Center</td>
<td>32,420</td>
<td>39,630</td>
<td>7,210</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>38,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East 14th Street * Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>117%</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>7,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East 14th Street and Mission Street Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meekland Avenue Corridor Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Unincorporated</td>
<td>Castro Valley BART Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>51,020</td>
<td>56,470</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48,520</td>
<td>54,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East 14th Street and Mission Street Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,190</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hesperian Boulevard Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meekland Avenue Corridor Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key**

**Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)**
- Priority Development Area or Investment Area

---

**NOTE:** Percentages may not add up due to rounding.
# Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

## Contra Costa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antioch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest eBART Station</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>34,850</td>
<td>40,340</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32,250</td>
<td>38,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivertown Waterfront</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>3,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,520</td>
<td>19,420</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16,450</td>
<td>18,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>4,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concord</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reuse Area</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>47,130</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44,280</td>
<td>63,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Reuse Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Danville</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>15,930</td>
<td>17,440</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>16,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Cerrito</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10,140</td>
<td>11,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hercules</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Hercules</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>13,070</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8,120</td>
<td>12,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront District</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lafayette</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>11,020</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>10,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martinez</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>16,240</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14,290</td>
<td>15,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moraga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga Center</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>6,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10,730</td>
<td>16,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Planning Area</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orinda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>7,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>21,130</td>
<td>28,520</td>
<td>7,390</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19,530</td>
<td>27,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pleasant Hill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buskirk Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>15,530</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13,710</td>
<td>15,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diablo Valley College</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richmond</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>39,330</td>
<td>49,020</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36,090</td>
<td>47,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Richmond</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>4,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Pablo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue &amp; 23rd Street</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>9,570</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>11,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Ramon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>26,220</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25,280</td>
<td>30,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Camino Ramon</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walnut Creek</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Downtown</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>32,680</td>
<td>40,050</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30,440</td>
<td>38,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contra Costa County Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Centre</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>62,400</td>
<td>67,090</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>57,710</td>
<td>63,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown El Sobrante</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Richmond</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>2,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table includes data for various jurisdictions and PDA/Investment Areas within Contra Costa County.
- The data shows the number of housing units and households, along with their respective growth percentages from 2010 to 2040.
- The growth in housing units and households is calculated as a percentage of the 2010 values.
- The jurisdictions listed include Antioch, Concord, Danville, El Cerrito, Hercules, Lafayette, Martinez, Moraga, Oakley, Orinda, Pinole, Pittsburg, Pleasant Hill, Richmond, San Pablo, San Ramon, and Walnut Creek.
- The table also includes data for specific sub-areas such as Hillcrest eBART Station, Rivertown Waterfront, Downtown Danville, Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station, and Buskirk Avenue Corridor.
- The data is presented in a clear and organized manner, making it easy for readers to understand the growth trends across different areas.
### Marin County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corte Madera</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,380</td>
<td>6,770</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novato</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,160</td>
<td>22,320</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20,280</td>
<td>21,450</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Anselmo</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>5,530</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,010</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22,760</td>
<td>26,490</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sausalito</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiburon</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>30,550</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25,190</td>
<td>27,580</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanized 101 Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Napa County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 29 Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calistoga</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>33,430</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28,170</td>
<td>33,020</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Napa</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soscol Gateway Corridor</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yountville</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,280</td>
<td>13,030</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9,580</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Francisco County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td>376,940</td>
<td>469,430</td>
<td>92,480</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>345,810</td>
<td>441,350</td>
<td>95,540</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>147%</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>159%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview/Hunters Point</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>28,820</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipyard/Candlestick Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>28,820</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>145%</td>
<td>10,470</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>108%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown-Van Ness-Gear</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>101,530</td>
<td>128,660</td>
<td>27,130</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>89,850</td>
<td>121,620</td>
<td>31,770</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>34,270</td>
<td>45,690</td>
<td>11,420</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31,650</td>
<td>43,920</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market &amp; Octavia</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>18,160</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11,130</td>
<td>17,540</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission-San Jose Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>31,230</td>
<td>32,490</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29,360</td>
<td>30,880</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>170%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with Brisbane)</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>322%</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>341%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Terminal</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>963%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>968%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>7,960</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>1066%</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>1220%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### San Mateo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Household</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,030</td>
<td>12,150</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages of Belmont</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco)</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,030</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame El Camino Real</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,580</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayshore</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Boulevard</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,820</td>
<td>8,670</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,370</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Station Area</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>15,120</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,170</td>
<td>37,890</td>
<td>8,720</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>19,820</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Corridors</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,020</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Corridor</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,010</td>
<td>50,500</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,810</td>
<td>26,740</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,510</td>
<td>27,470</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midcost</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City County Association of Governments of San Mateo County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,710</td>
<td>71,390</td>
<td>24,690</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>7,230</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>13,180</td>
<td>19,990</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>12,490</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>6,910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>7,020</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park **</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Daly City</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fair Oaks</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>3,640</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated County</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040 % Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campbell</strong></td>
<td>Central Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>1,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cupertino</strong></td>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gilroy</strong></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Altos</strong></td>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Altos Hills</strong></td>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Gatos</strong></td>
<td>13,050</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12,360</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milpitas</strong></td>
<td>Transit Area</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>7,080</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7,730</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monte Sereno</strong></td>
<td>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morgan Hill</strong></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mountain View</strong></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>6,030</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Whisman</strong></td>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>8,740</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitol Corridor Urban Villages</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Bayshore</strong></td>
<td>San Antonio Center</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whisman Station</strong></td>
<td>Whisman Station</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palo Alto</strong></td>
<td>28,220</td>
<td>27,410</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26,450</td>
<td>34,370</td>
<td>7,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Jose</strong></td>
<td>California Avenue</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bascom TOD Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bascom Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berryserry Station</strong></td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>7,990</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambden Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capitol Tully/King Urban Villages</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications Hill</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>6,790</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>6,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cottle Transit Village</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>6,810</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>3,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown “Frame”</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>10,090</td>
<td>16,980</td>
<td>27,410</td>
<td>10,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>13,380</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>6,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greater Downtown</strong></td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td>15,160</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>19,310</td>
<td>15,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Business Park</strong></td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North San Jose</strong></td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>10,880</td>
<td>43,740</td>
<td>32,860</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>42,830</td>
<td>32,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>7,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Edenvale</strong></td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saratoga TOD Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stevens Creek TOD Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>5,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West San Carlos &amp; Southwest Expressway Corridors</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>20,960</td>
<td>8,810</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>20,480</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village</strong></td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas</strong></td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>25,920</td>
<td>30,950</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>24,880</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>5,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Santa Clara County             | Mixed-Use Corridor                 | 45,150| 58,930| 13,780| 31% | 45,020| 57,260| 14,240| 33% |
| El Camino Real Focus Area      | Mixed-Use Corridor                 | 1,840| 5,400| 3,560             | 1,650| 5,220| 3,580              |
| Santa Clara Station Focus Area | City Center                        | 480  | 3,880| 3,410             | 450  | 3,810| 3,360              |
| VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas | Mixed-Use Corridor               | 2,080| 3,540| 1,460             | 1,970| 3,440| 1,480              |
## Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

### Santa Clara County (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,120</td>
<td>11,760</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10,730</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,790</td>
<td>74,820</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>53,380</td>
<td>72,800</td>
<td>19,410</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown &amp; Caltrain Station</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>4,280</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>15,410</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>14,940</td>
<td>4,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Station Transit Village</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffett Park</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peery Park</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reamwood Light Rail Station</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasman Station ITR</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,690</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28,080</td>
<td>31,070</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOUSING UNITS**  

**HOUSEHOLDS**
### Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

#### Solano County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benicia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>12,690</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10,690</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Gateway</td>
<td>Empl. Investment Area</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dixon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairfield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown South (Jefferson Street)</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>37,180</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td>11,120</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34,480</td>
<td>46,430</td>
<td>11,950</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rio Vista</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suisun City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/and Waterfront</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>9,450</td>
<td>10,820</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacaville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down town</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vallejo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront &amp; Downtown</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solano County Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>8,950</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sonoma County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction or Area Name</th>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>2010-2040</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cloverdale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/SMART Transit Area</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotati</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown and Cotati Depot</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healdsburg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petaluma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>22,740</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21,740</td>
<td>24,620</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rohnert Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Transit Town Center</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>20,160</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15,810</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Rosa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Station Area *</td>
<td>City Center</td>
<td>67,400</td>
<td>83,130</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>63,590</td>
<td>80,580</td>
<td>16,990</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor *</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Santa Rosa Station *</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>6,280</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland</td>
<td>Transit Neighborhood</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Road Corridor</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Corridor</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>6,290</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebastopol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexus Area</td>
<td>Rural Investment Area</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonoma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>6,140</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonoma County Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td>Suburban Center</td>
<td>67,970</td>
<td>73,400</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>63,590</td>
<td>68,970</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates PDA that overlap within a jurisdiction. Housing totals for the overlapping areas are assigned to one PDA only, with no duplicate counts.

** Indicates C/CAG El Camino Real PDAs that overlap with another PDA. Housing totals may duplicate jobs already listed in that city.
TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee  
DATE: June 7, 2013

FR: Executive Director, MTC  
Executive Director, ABAG

RE: Draft Plan Bay Area – Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations

MTC/ABAG received a large volume of written comments from public agencies, stakeholder organizations, and members of the public during the comment period for Draft Plan Bay Area in addition to oral comments received at public hearings. This memo provides staff’s recommendations for: (1) potential revisions to the Draft Plan in advance of the adoption of the Final Plan and Final EIR on July 18, 2013 and (2) Plan implementation-related issues identified in the comment period that staff believes would serve to advance successful implementation of Plan Bay Area. Staff is seeking committee direction on these recommendations.

Cap and Trade Revenue in the Investment Strategy

The Draft Plan does not account for revenue from Cap and Trade that the region may be granted to administer by the Legislature. These revenues will be available starting in 2015 and the program is currently set to expire in 2020. State legislation has not yet been enacted to establish a framework for how these funds will be administered by state and regional agencies and what types of projects would be eligible. However, AB 574 (Lowenthal) includes eligible uses for transportation and affordable transit-oriented development consistent with the investment strategies proposed in the Draft Plan Bay Area. Staff recommends that the Plan revenue estimates be revised to include $120 million per year over the life of the Plan, for a total of $3.1 billion. This estimate assumes that the program will be extended after 2020, similar to the Plan’s assumption that existing county sales tax measures will be extended by voters before they expire.

Corrections/Clarifications

In some cases, comments about Draft Plan Bay Area encompass information and statements regarding the purpose and intent of the Plan and/or implementing authority of MTC/ABAG that require clarification prior to discussion about potential changes to the Plan:

Statement: “Plan Bay Area usurps local land-use authority”
Correction: Per Senate Bill 375, “Nothing in a Sustainable Communities Strategy shall be interpreted as superseding the exercise of the land use authorities within the region.” Plan Bay Area does not regulate local land use authority or preclude a local jurisdiction from planning or approving growth that is different than the level or location of growth described in the Plan.
Statement: “All transportation funding is being shifted to the urban core because of the Plan”
Correction: In Plan Bay Area, MTC continues its long-standing Fix-It-First Policy by dedicating 88% of the plan’s $289 billion in funding to maintaining the region’s existing transportation system across our urban, suburban, and rural communities. The vast majority of these maintenance funds flow by formula or long-established policy to the region’s transit operators and local governments, which is unaffected by any changes in Plan Bay Area. The Draft Plan invests 5% of total revenue ($14.6 billion) in the new One Bay Area Grant Program which supports focused growth by requiring that 70% (Central and South Bay) or 50% (North Bay) of program funding is invested in or proximate to Priority Development Areas.

Statement: “The Draft Plan puts 95% of housing growth into 15 cities with PDAs”
Correction: The Draft Plan directs 64% of housing growth to the region’s top 15 employment centers. The Draft Plan directs 62% of housing growth to the region’s 15 largest cities.

Statement: “The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) does not adequately address the impacts of individual projects.”
Correction: Any transportation project or development proposal in the region will face more public review and, if applicable, will be subject to additional project-level CEQA review before being approved at the local level. The Plan’s EIR is a programmatic review of the plan itself.

Statement: “The EEJ scenario significantly outperforms the Draft Plan.”
Correction: CEQA requires lead agencies to identify the environmentally superior alternative. The EEJ alternative developed as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, predominantly due to slightly greater Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emission reductions than the proposed project, the Draft Plan. However the overall differences in environmental impacts are minimal at the regional scale and in some respects the proposed Plan performs better than the EEJ alternative.

Statement: “The Plan should focus on technological advancements that result in more sweeping reductions in greenhouse gas emissions than land-use changes and public transit that people do not want.”
Correction: SB375 calls for the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of Regional Transportation Plans in California to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks through integrated land use and transportation planning and to identify locations for a region’s future housing growth. The purpose of the SCS is to provide a tool for regional governing bodies, such as MTC and ABAG, to meet CARB’s GHG reduction targets specific to the land use and transportation planning sector. The land use and transportation planning sector accounts for a small portion of overall Scoping Plan GHG reductions, but it is still an important contribution to the State’s GHG emissions reduction efforts and is entirely separate and
in addition to other Scoping Plan measures, such as vehicle efficiency and clean fuel technologies. In meeting GHG emissions reduction targets for the land use and transportation sectors, MTC and ABAG must follow CARB direction to exclude regulation-driven changes to vehicle fuels and performance from our modeling in meeting SB375 emission targets. The plan does support and assume technology changes and other advancements to reduce green gas emissions within the requirements of the law.

**Key Issues and Policy Alternatives**

A number of key issues and policy alternatives were identified and highlighted by various entities and individuals during the Draft Plan Bay Area comment period. Staff has prepared analysis and developed recommendations about the following issues for your consideration, as outlined in Attachments A-F:

- Regional Population and Housing Forecast (Attachment A)
- Housing Redistribution to Suburban Locations (Attachment B)
- Affordable Housing (Attachment C)
- Reducing Potential Risk of Displacement (Attachment D)
- Transportation Investments (Attachment E)
- Regional Express Lanes Network (Attachment F)

**Additional Initiatives and Priorities for Plan Implementation**

A number of implementing agencies or organizations identified priorities as we work together to advance the implementation of Plan Bay Area. Some of these issues to be explored further are already identified in the Draft Plan, such as sea level rise, climate adaptation, and earthquake and hazards resiliency. However, the comments also identified new implementation issues that were not directly addressed in the Draft Plan. Staff recommends that the following key initiatives and policy-related efforts be added to the final Plan Bay Area as key areas for additional work by ABAG and MTC. That work will permit these issues to be considered more fully in the 2017 update of Plan Bay Area.

1. **Goods Movement and Industrial Lands**: The movement of freight and the protection of production and distribution facilities has important environmental, economic and equity implications for the region. Building on MTC’s *Regional Goods Movement Study* and related land use analysis, MTC/ABAG will evaluate the needs related to the development, storage and movement of goods through our region and identify essential industrial areas to support the region’s economic vitality. This issue will also be considered as part of MTC’s participation in the update of the State of California’s freight and rail plans and as MTC/ABAG prepare for the update of Plan Bay Area.

2. **Inter-Regional Coordination**: The nine-county Bay Area is closely connected with its adjacent counties and metropolitan areas through issues such as inter-regional commuting, housing needs, and job access. To advance the goals of Plan Bay Area and ensure that the region is planning efficiently with adjacent regions, MTC/ABAG staff propose to advance coordinated planning and modeling efforts with MPOs in key
neighboring counties, particularly SJCOG (San Joaquin), SACOG (Sacramento), and AMBAG (Monterey/Santa Cruz).

3 **State of the Region Report**: Plan Bay Area is a performance-based plan. MTC has long tracked the state of the region’s transportation system, while ABAG has monitored housing growth and development. In 2015 at the mid-point between release of the first Plan Bay Area in July 2013 and the update of the Plan in 2017, MTC/ABAG staff propose to release a State of the Region Report that examines a variety of relevant issues directly related to Plan Bay Area and more broadly to quality of life in the region.

4 **Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program Expansion and Refinement**: MTC/ABAG will expand and refine the PCA program to strengthen regional coordination around open space preservation and maximize the impact of available funding. This will involve defining the role of different kinds of PCAs in supporting agriculture, recreation, habitat, and other ecological functions and using this analysis to seek additional funding for PCA conservation efforts.

5 **Integration of Economic Development into Regional Planning**: MTC/ABAG will consider relevant findings from the Regional Prosperity Plan, and the Bay Area Business Coalition-led economic development strategy to craft policies for the update of Plan Bay Area. This will include both worker-based strategies for career pathways, model land use guidelines for growing industries, and place-based strategies to support the growth of different kinds of Priority Development Areas, including small towns, mixed use corridors and existing office parks.

6 **Local Project Consistency with Plan Bay Area**: To provide greater clarity to local jurisdictions and other stakeholders about the process for utilizing the environmental review provisions of SB375 and CEQA streamlining provisions for infill projects, per SB226, MTC/ABAG will prepare guidance for local municipalities to determine the consistency of projects with the plan and ensure that SB375 CEQA streamlining provisions are readily available to local jurisdictions.

7 **Regional Planning**: As outlined in SB792 (DeSaulnier), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) should join with MTC and ABAG in preparing and adopting the 2017 update of Plan Bay Area with the Air District taking the lead on planning issues related to criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants. Likewise, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) should join its three regional agency partners in preparing and adopting the update Plan by taking the lead on planning issues related to sea level rise and adaptation to climate change.

______________________________   __________________________________
Steve Heminger     Ezra Rapport
Attachment A

**Key Issue/Policy: Regional Population and Housing Forecast**

**Issue Area:** A number of organizations and local jurisdictions have suggested that the population and housing projection in the Draft Plan be either increased or decreased. This stems from concerns about the validity of the methodology used to create the forecast on the part of some jurisdictions and members of the public, and about the adequacy of the forecast’s projection of housing growth to meet the region’s long-term housing needs on the part of some developers and housing advocates.

**Key Considerations:** The population and housing forecast included in the plan has undergone significant scrutiny and has been validated by the California Departments of Finance (DOF) and Housing and Community Development (HCD). The methodology used to create the forecast starts with projected regional job growth, which is the main determinant of ABAG’s regional population and housing growth forecast—consistent with other major regional forecast models in California and the models used by the three major national economic forecasting firms.

Forecasted job growth to 2040 is estimated as a share of U.S. projected job growth, based on an assessment of regional competitiveness by major industry sector. The Bay Area’s strength in industry sectors that are expected to grow, such as professional services and information, results in a higher rate of projected job growth than the rate for the nation as a whole. While the expected economic growth by 2040 is lower than in previous decades, it still reflects a healthy regional economy. During the economic recovery over the past two years, the region has experienced employment growth at a faster rate than the Plan forecast.

Population growth is projected in terms of natural increases from births and deaths and migration into the region. The ABAG forecast uses California Department of Finance (DOF) fertility and mortality assumptions to determine the amount of natural increase in the population to develop a population profile. Migration, rather than being tied to recent trends, is forecasted as a function of job growth. From population growth, a forecast of households and housing units is developed. The final forecast incorporates all of these factors, as well as assumed availability of funding to support affordable housing.

This regional forecast was used as the basis for developing the employment and housing growth pattern adopted by the MTC and the ABAG Executive Board in May 2012 as the Preferred Alternative and included in the Draft Plan. Changes in the regional forecasts that occurred prior to the selection of the Preferred Alternative reflected changing data regarding national, state, and regional demographic and economic conditions, most notably the sustained economic recession.

The population projections incorporate the most recent data and trends, and were developed through sound methodology in collaboration with DOF and HCD. Plan Bay Area and its related forecast will be updated every four years.

**Recommendation:**

1. Retain the population and housing forecast utilized in the Draft Plan.
Key Issue/Policy: Housing Redistribution to Suburban Locations

Issue Area: Housing advocates, developers, and some stakeholders raised concerns about the concentration of future housing production in core urban areas in the Plan. From one perspective some argue that, the Plan does not provide enough low and moderate income housing in locations with strong job and transit access and high quality amenities including schools. From another, the Plan does not distribute enough housing, including market rate housing to greenfield suburban locations with untapped development potential that can help meet the region’s future demand. These questions have led some entities to question the “feasibility” of the Draft Plan.

Key Considerations: The distribution of housing in the Draft Plan was adopted in May 2012 by the ABAG Executive Board and the Commission as the Preferred Alternative. This followed extensive consultation with local jurisdictions, stakeholders, and the general public. The Draft Plan’s housing distribution identifies the locations that can accommodate future growth, including the scale and type of growth most appropriate for different types of locations. It provides a more focused growth pattern for the region than historic trends, identifies locations for future housing growth while recognizing the unique characteristics of the Bay Area’s communities. Relative to the assertion that the Draft Plan’s land-use pattern is not feasible, the consultant team responsible for the PDA Readiness Assessment that was developed to evaluate the distribution of future growth in PDAs believe that the Draft Plan’s growth allocations represent an achievable, if not easy, outcome consistent with the scope and purpose of a comprehensive regional plan. The team also has stated that in their opinion, it is not at all certain that non-PDA areas are more “ready” for significantly more growth than has been allocated to them under Plan Bay Area.

Shifting the distribution of housing growth in the Plan to more suburban locations would have ripple effects across the region. In addition to increasing the number of housing units distributed to suburban communities without any prior consultation, it would create major distribution changes in other jurisdictions. In the case of shifting low and moderate income housing to job and transit rich suburbs, it would also likely require a dramatic increase in housing subsidies for which no funding source has been identified. Redistributing housing to greenfield suburban locations would likely increase pressure on open space, and create a host of other environmental impacts. Redistributing housing to suburban locations also conflicts with SB 375’s requirement to “utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors.” (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B).)

Recommendation:

1. Retain the housing distribution in the Draft Plan.
Key Issue/Policy: Affordable Housing

Issue Area: A large number of comments on the draft Plan Bay Area cite concerns about the lack of financial support for affordable housing. Given today’s soaring housing costs, housing production costs in the Bay Area, and the complexity of developing housing in locations near transit, additional resources are needed to facilitate the preservation of currently affordable housing and the construction of new affordable homes in the future. The loss of redevelopment funding combined with reduced funding levels at the state and federal level leaves a structural financing gap of at least 10-20% on most affordable housing projects in the region after accounting for typical equity investments from banks, local trusts and fees, and other lenders.

The success of Plan Bay Area implementation hinges on increasing the availability of affordable housing. Production of affordable housing and community stability have been raised as critical issues to retain and improve the quality of life of existing neighborhoods, accommodate future growth, and address the labor needs of our business community.

Key Considerations: For the 1999-2006 Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) period, the region produced 44% of its Very Low and 75% of its Low Income housing units needed, leaving approximately 23,000 very low and low income units un-built. The current RHNA period includes 78,000 very low and low income units. Production is again expected to fall short of the region’s needs unless new funding sources and strategies are identified. Also, a substantial amount of otherwise affordable housing is in need of rehabilitation.

The Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund established with $10 million from MTC created a $50 million fund by leveraging investments from banks (Citi and Morgan Stanley), community development financial institutions (CDFIs), two community foundations, and two national foundations. An additional investment of $10 million set to take place in late 2013 will grow the fund to at least $90 million, a leverage of 3:1 on this second investment.

Funding for the production and rehabilitation of affordable housing will require local planning and entitlement processes that support this effort. Coordination with Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as well as the provision of incentives for local jurisdictions will be essential. Priority Development Areas (PDAs) provide a policy framework that can support investments in disadvantaged communities as well as encourage housing production in communities with access to employment and educational opportunities based on regional and local collaboration.

CMAs are providing a new level of support through their PDA Investment and Growth Strategy reports. Most CMAs already have compiled an inventory of affordable housing and displacement policies by local jurisdictions.
Recommendation:

1. Reserve $600 million over the life of the Plan from Cap and Trade revenues to a regional affordable housing fund. Based on the experience with TOAH and local jurisdictions’ contributions to affordable housing production and preservation, this $600 million can be leveraged to a large degree to support the creation and rehabilitation of affordable housing units. The fund can support the preservation of currently affordable units and assist with the development of new affordable units. The specific provisions and identification of partners in the fund and leveraging opportunities will be determined following adoption of Plan Bay Area.

2. Continue the use of Regional PDA Planning funds to facilitate the entitlement of affordable housing in transit corridors.
Attachment D

**Key Issue/Policy: Reducing Potential Risk of Displacement**

**Issue Area:** Cities, housing organizations and individuals have raised concerns about the potential for involuntary renter displacement associated with the transit oriented growth pattern in Plan Bay Area, especially in the region’s low and moderate income neighborhoods. While cities have actively supported planning and funding for PDAs, investments in neighborhoods with transit access and urban amenities may increase rents and result in a net loss of unrestricted affordable housing. At the same time, low-income neighborhoods are in need of investments and increasing income diversity that can support a broader range of services and amenities as well as provide economic mobility.

**Key Considerations:** The Plan’s goal is to house the region’s current and future population without displacement. The Plan’s sustainability strategy is to increase affordable housing near transit. The Plan has assessed the potential risk of displacement by location based on areas of major growth where people pay more than half of their income in rent. This includes approximately 30,000 households or about 1 percent of the total Bay Area households. Displacement risk does not affect all or even the majority of PDAs. However, the effectiveness of the Plan relies on the social, cultural and economic vitality of our existing neighborhoods, which could be disrupted through displacement.

Displacement risk can be primarily addressed by increasing resources for the creation and preservation of affordable housing (as described in Attachment C “Affordable Housing”) and improving economic opportunities for current residents.

To ensure that growth and investments support vertical mobility for existing residents rather than horizontal displacement, the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program provides a framework for local government and Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to adopt appropriate neighborhood stabilization and affordable housing policies through the OBAG-related Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategies. The success of this effort will require monitoring and appropriate revisions as well as the development of additional regional initiatives. These initiatives will need to recognize the unique qualities of each neighborhood and the need for policy interventions that are locally defined.

In March 2012, MTC and ABAG launched the HUD-funded Bay Area Regional Prosperity Plan. The Prosperity Plan is envisioned as an implementation component of Plan Bay Area. The Prosperity Plan’s Housing Initiative will support capacity-building and knowledge sharing, community-response, policy and tool development, and funding analysis activities across the region to address the potential risk of displacement of low- and moderate income households.
Recommendation:

1. Target neighborhood stabilization investments, including housing rehabilitation, small site acquisition and land banking, in the allocation of projects funded by the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund. All of these uses are currently eligible for funding.

2. Based on local input gathered in the CMA’s Investment and Growth Strategies and ABAG’s housing development and policies inventory over the next 24 months, ABAG/MTC will provide a menu of affordable housing and anti-displacement policies for consideration in the next round of One Bay Area Grant funding. This strategy will provide the flexibility to address unique local conditions as well as incentives for local jurisdictions to guide and direct resources to affordable housing production.

3. Consider implementing and funding best practices with regard to neighborhood stabilization and anti-displacement efforts that emerge from research projects funded by the HUD Regional Prosperity Grant
**Attachment E**

**Key Issue/Policy:** Transportation Investments

**Issue:** A large number of comments addressed the level of investment for public transit and local streets and roads. Many stakeholder organizations and individuals requested more funding for transit, specifically funding for local bus operations and youth bus passes. In addition, letters from several agencies flagged the need to address the remaining unfunded transit capital needs. Many others questioned the cost-effectiveness of additional transit services and emphasized the importance of maintaining the existing infrastructure, both transit and streets and roads. Others called for a larger investment in the region’s road network to better maintain the roads and expand them, alongside comments from many stakeholder organizations critical of roadway expansion.

**Key Considerations:** After accounting for the transit and local road investment proposed in the Draft Plan, the region faces a $17 billion transit capital shortfall and a $20 billion shortfall in local street and road rehabilitation needed to achieve the Plan’s adopted performance targets for this critical infrastructure. The Draft Plan fully funds the operating shortfalls of the existing transit system but also recognizes the importance of controlling costs, improving service and attracting new riders. The Transit Sustainability Project seeks a five percent drop in operating costs by 2018, and then indexes those costs to inflation. The Draft Plan also assumes an investment of $500 million over the Plan period to support infrastructure improvements in ridership and service productivity.

Cap and Trade revenues will be available starting in 2015 and staff is recommending that the Plan revenues be increased to reflect a total of $3.1 billion from this revenue source through 2040. After accounting for an investment of $600 million of these funds for transit-oriented affordable housing (see Attachment C), the balance of funds totals $2.5 billion.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends that the balance of Cap and Trade revenues ($2.5 billion) be reserved for transit operating and capital rehabilitation/replacement, and for local street and road rehabilitation, consistent with the focused land use strategy outlined in Plan Bay Area. The share of funds reserved for these purposes, the specific project sponsors, and investment requirements (i.e., consistency with the goals of Transit Sustainability Project and complete streets elements, etc.) would be subject to further deliberation and public outreach following adoption of Plan Bay Area.
Key Issue/Policy: Regional Express Lanes Network

Issues Area: The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Plan Bay Area included three versions of the Regional Express Lanes Network (see attached map).

1. **Regional Express Lanes Network:** The Draft Plan includes a Regional Express Lane Network of approximately 350 miles that aims to close gaps within the existing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane system on I-80, I-880, I-580 and I-680 to increase travel time savings and reliability for carpools and buses in those corridors. The Express Lanes Network converts existing carpool lanes to express lanes and uses the revenue generated to finance completion of the carpool/express lane system.

2. **Reduced Scope Express Lanes Network:** A Reduced Scope Express Lanes Network, as evaluated in Alternative 3 of the DEIR, includes HOV lane conversions and HOV lane gap closures in the inner Bay Area for a total of approximately 300 miles. This alternative removes the proposed expansion express lanes on I-580 and I-80 at the outer edges of the Bay Area (shown in red on the attached map).

3. **Committed Express Lanes Only:** Alternative 5 of the DEIR includes only Committed Express Lanes. This alternative removes express lanes on I-80, I-880 and portions of I-680 and I-580. It includes only the existing express lane on I-680 and express lanes on I-580 east of Livermore for a total of approximately 40 miles.

We received a significant number of comments requesting changes to the Regional Express Lanes Network, as defined in the draft Plan. The requests include:

- Limit Express Lanes Network to only include segments that are conversions of existing HOV lanes.
- Include expansion express lanes (those segments where no HOV lane currently exists) only if they are conversions of a general purpose lane to an Express Lane.
- Modify the network approach to allow toll revenue to fund expanded transit operations and other non-single occupant transportation choices in each corridor concurrent with the opening of each new express lane.
- Ensure low income families receive an equitable share of the benefits of express lanes.

**Key Considerations:** Closing the gaps in the HOV network is a critical aspect of the express lanes strategy because of the benefit provided to carpools and express bus services in the affected corridors. While state and federal laws do not currently allow conversion of an existing general purpose lane to an express lane, there is no prohibition on studying this approach. Plan Bay Area already reflects a significant regional commitment to funding transit operations and maintenance as well as expansion. In addition, as described in Attachment E, staff is recommending additional revenue for transit investments.

Data from other regions, including Minneapolis, San Diego, Orange County and Seattle, indicates that low-income travelers use express lanes and value having the choice to use them.
This finding is reinforced by initial outreach to low-income travelers in the Bay Area.\(^1\) Implementation of the Regional Express Lanes Network will include project-level environmental clearance that will comply with all applicable requirements for environmental justice analysis. In addition, focused outreach will be conducted with low income communities as part of the Express Lanes network roll out.

**Recommendation:**

1. Continue to include the full Regional Express Lanes Network in the Final Plan
2. MTC/BAIFA should study the potential benefits and impacts of converting general purpose lanes to Express Lanes in order to inform implementation of the express lanes network and future long-range plans.

---

\(^1\) Staff presentation to the MTC Policy Advisory Council, March 13, 2013.  
http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_2008/5_Express_Lanes.pdf
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METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING ON
THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA
ALAMEDA COUNTY
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ATTENDEES

RICHARD VALLE, Alameda County Board of Supervisors
BILL HARRISON, Mayor of Fremont
TIM SBRANTI, Mayor of Dublin

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the hearing, and on May 1, 2013, 7:00 p.m., at the Mirage Ballroom, 4100 Peralta Boulevard, Fremont, California, before me, AMBER EMERICK, CSR NO. 13546, State of California, there commenced a Public Hearing.

MEETING AGENDA

INTRODUCTION BY SUPERVISOR VALLE

SUPERVISOR VALLE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call the meeting to order. I would ask our host, Mayor Bill Harrison -- You can't hear? Testing.

Again, I would ask our host, Mayor Bill Harrison, to lead us in the pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

SUPERVISOR VALLE: My name is Supervisor Richard Valle, Alameda County Board of Supervisors, District 2. I'm also an Executive Board Member of ABAG. My colleague, Supervisor Scott Haggerty, sends his regrets. He's suffering from severe allergies and just can't make it this evening. But he sends his regrets and hopes that we have a successful and fruitful evening.

I'd like to introduce -- In addition to Mayor Bill Harrison, to my left is Dublin Mayor Tim Sbranti. We have several other electeds. We -- the three of us -- will be convening the meeting this evening.

I'd like to publicly acknowledge other electeds:

Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci from Union City; Anu Natarajan, Vice Mayor of Fremont; Robert Raburn, BART Director; Mayor Al Nagy from Newark; and then from Sacramento, Michelle...
Thomas, Senator Corbett's office; Rocky Fernandez, Assembly Member Wykowski's office. And then from Supervisor Haggerty's office, Dawn Argula. Dawn. And Eileen Ing, from Supervisor Nate Miley's office.

MAYOR HARRISON: And Chris from your office.

SUPERVISOR VALLE: And Chris Miley from Supervisor Valle's office.

As we've very honored to have our newly-elected Ohlone College Board Trustee, Kevin Bristow. All right. I think I covered the bases on the electeds. I have some opening remarks that have been prepared for me by Ellen Griffin. Thank you, Ellen. And this will talk you through the process, and what we hope to accomplish this evening, so bear with me.

We all know how valuable your time is. I sincerely appreciate your being here. Fortunately there's no Warrior game tonight.

As elected officials, we often want to hear and have to make difficult decisions about planning in our respective jurisdictions. And these are great opportunities for the public to weigh in and talk about what concerns you have and specifically with regard to the growth of the Bay Area.

As you all know, Alameda County is a very special place. That's why we are all here. And so many people would love to be here. And so what we are planning to do this evening is hold a public hearing about the future growth of Alameda counties; growth and priorities with regard to housing, transportation, and many other issues that come along with that.

There's a lot of equity issues that we also need to talk about, and social justice issues that we need to talk about. So those are all part of this Draft Plan Bay Area, which is now out for public review. Plan Bay Area offers a long-range transportation and land-use vision for the very diverse, unique, and wonderful region that all of us call home. And this is a very special place.

The dialogue in the past has been heated at times, but we believe and sincerely endear people to come up and give us their honest opinions because if we all agreed on everything, then these meetings would be very boring. So we really look forward to hearing your comments.

And for those of you who have extended comments beyond the public comment portion of it, you can write your comments down and put them out. And those forms are out in the lobby; and submit them in writing to us. You can also go online and submit those comments.

Tonight we have two court reporters, Amber and Julie to our left. They are here to transcribe your remarks. Please speak clearly so that in case they need to, they may ask you to repeat your name, or if they can't quite understand what you said, they may ask you to repeat what you've said because we want to be sure that you are on the record.

If you haven't already done so, we have blue speaker cards. And please turn those in to our staff. We have currently about 19 cards that we're going to call forward. I will call up the speakers in the order we receive them. Public comment will be limited to two minutes per speaker. My fellow mayors may be more liberal. We've -- Again, the written comment sheets are at the table located outside.

It is worth noting, while this Plan is slated for adoption this summer, it is a work-in-progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities, resources, and new approaches. All the comments that we hear tonight will be shared with decision makers that serve on MTC or ABAG. Results from all the public hearings, as well as online comments or -- and from the telephone survey will be summarized and shared with the Boards of MTC and ABAG in June.

We expect to adopt a final version of Plan Bay Area in July. You can view the Draft Plan and comment online as well at OneBayArea.org. The public comment is due close on Thursday, May 16th, at 4:00 p.m.

Also, I want to acknowledge we have a couple of key staff here: Ezra Rapport; Ken Kirkby, who are also here but will not be addressing or answering questions. That opportunity was earlier in the evening. And maybe you can catch them if they are still here.

So with that said, I will ask the mayors to my left and right -- I'll give them half the cards, and they'll call up the participants in the order that they receive them. And I'll let them take it from there.

Thank you.

We'll start with -- Why don't we flip from one mayor to the other, and each of you can call the participants up.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Speaker number one is Chris Pareja.

CHRIS PAREJA: Again, I'm Chris Pareja. I am from Hayward, and I have read a large part of the Plan, and it will actually limit choices as oppose to increase choices, and it will ruin quality of life for people like me. I often walk a mile-and-a-half to three miles round trip to get coffee, groceries, tacos or -- God forbid -- doughnuts. And I know this may be hard to believe, but I am perfectly capable of defining for myself how walkable my community is.
And I know we're being told that we need to use more mass transit, but that will actually double or triple the time that it would take to complete most of the trips I take, which means less time with my family, and a lower quality of life. Speaking of my family, my wife and kids like to plant carbon offsets in the backyard in the dirt. You could also call those things fruits and vegetables. And corn, beans, and squash don't work so well in pots on balconies, if we are even allowed to have balconies in these new high-density homes.

Honestly, if we had money to afford it, I'd buy a plot of land, and we would be free-range humans. But since we have too many politicians and bureaucrats around here that believe in excessive taxation, regulation, and central planning, we can barely afford to be limited-range humans. I know for sure, though, that I don't want to have to move my family to one of these pretty little human kennels, even if there is a restaurant downstairs.

In the Contra Costa meeting, I talked about this being terrible for minorities. At the San Mateo meeting, I explained that the assumptions are based on faulty numbers and vapor. And tonight I'm here to say that this Plan will be horrible, generally, for life quality and should be rejected in its entirety.

Many of the other speakers at the other meetings, however, said that it should go to a vote of the people. And if it does, I think that there's going to be a lot of work to do to drive up support. I jokingly said that you may want to give voters a coupon to stop by the local marijuana dispensary on the way to vote. You could call the whole operation "poll pot." Why would I joke like that? Because if people actually read the Plan and understood what was in it, the only ones who would support it are people who are getting gifts from it or paychecks or are high out of their minds.

Thank you.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Next speaker, Lloyd Salsbery.

LLOYD SALSBERY: Hi. My name is Lloyd Salsbery; born and raised in the Bay Area. I'm currently living in Castro Valley. I guess I am here to congratulate you tonight on your new building. You know, it's really going to be nice, I'm sure. I have a few numbers here, but I don't have to share them with you because everybody knows it. But, you know, these are the people that need to know the numbers because it's their money.

So we bought this old Post Office. This is the artist-rendering of what it will be. Believe me, it is not that now. Okay? So we, the people, bought this for 175 million. I think it's -- No. On their Web site, their current estimate for the seismic retrofitting and all that -- it's actually 218 million, but I just use 220 to round it off.

And then I did a little map of my own, knowing how government things tend to grow; Bay Bridge, the estimate is this, but (indicating). So I would be willing to take bets. Before this is occupied, 300 million dollars would be a very -- probably conservative figure for what it will cost you, the people. It's a nice building. Look at all the corners. Think of the corner offices available in this building. You can have more executives because we've got corner offices all over this thing, you know. I mean, you know, this isn't the best use of the people's money.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be David Erlich.

DAVID ERLICH: My name is David Erlich. I'm from San Leandro, California; formerly of Lancaster, California, where they've done this. That's why I moved. We have our mixed-use housing with the mix-use part still empty, and the affordable housing is well -- well occupied. Look, I just want to -- Let's let it be known that there's more staff here than there are citizens basically. Let it be known that you're not going to make the decision for 9 million people. The people in this room, they are the only ones that can put this together right now, you guys, which -- Mayor, Mayor, Mayor -- you guys have been elected, but you weren't elected to do this. Trust me. You were not elected to do this.

You need to go back to your city councils. You need to tell them exactly what Plan One Bay Area is. It's an overwhelming -- Have you read the book, "Animal Farm"? We all read the book, "Animal Farm." The pigs didn't -- they didn't end up too well.

And also 1984. That's another direction we are headed. 1984. They keep us in our little domiciles. TV telling us what to do; how to work; how much to work for. Well, let me tell you something: The answer to 1984 is 1776.

Ladies and gentlemen, have a good night.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Celeste Paradise.

CELESTE PARADISE: A little short. Hi, you guys. Thanks for having me. I used to live in Fremont; went to James Leitch for primary school. Nice place out here. So, yeah.

There's some people believe in global warming; some don't. I won't debate all that. It – Just suffice it to say, some people want to live one way, and some...
people want to live another. And it would be maybe nice
to do what the committee would like to do; have more space
for the animals, and maybe it is prettier for the
neighbors, and some people might like that.
And I would just say, it is my life, and I want
to spend my money on what I want to spend. I don't miss
the days when I didn't have a car. I like my truck. I
like driving in my truck to work; listening to Mark Globin
(phonetic). And so I would just say, anybody in this room
who has ever been approached by a homeless person who has
asked for money, and you said "no" is no different than I
am. You know, you may have your reasons. Maybe you
didn't have the money. Maybe you did have it, but maybe
you wanted to spend it on something else. I wouldn't
judge you for that. You are no different than I am,
except that you might use the machinery of government to
try and make me spend the fruit of my labor on something I
don't want to spend it on.
So basically I stand for freedom, the kind of
freedom this country was supposed to protect. Or put
another way: (Singing.) Oh, say, did you know? A couple
centuries ago, were there men and so sound, the best
country did they found. Where a man would receive, from
another way: (Singing.) Oh, say, did you know? A couple
centuries ago, were there men and so sound, the best
country did they found. Where a man would receive, from
another way: (Singing.) Oh, say, did you know? A couple
centuries ago, were there men and so sound, the best
country did they found. Where a man would receive, from
another way: (Singing.) Oh, say, did you know? A couple
centuries ago, were there men and so sound, the best
country did they found. Where a man would receive, from
another way: (Singing.) Oh, say, did you know? A couple
centuries ago, were there men and so sound, the best

The biggest problem here that we are addressing,
I believe, is greenhouse gases. That seems to speculate
on agriculture, transportation, industrial. It all boils
down to greenhouse gases. So what we -- what I am
advocating is that we have our youth fully participating
in the conversations, such as we are having today, so they
can be making the choices themselves also. Even though
they are not able to vote because they are not 18, we
still need to have their input because regardless, in 40
years, they're going to be the change makers. They are
going to be the workers that are going to be carrying out
the plans that we're coming up with today.
So I just want to, like I said, encourage our
investment in the youth to be the drivers for the
sustainable future that we're collectively all working
together as one team. If we work against each other,
we're not going to be able to progress and get what we
want accomplished. So I would just encourage everyone;
make sure we include our youth in the investments for
tomorrow.
Thank you. Have a beautiful day.
MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.
Our next speaker, who probably will not be
singing, is Rob Stoker.
ROB STOKER: Yes. Lucky for you.

Good evening. My name is Rob Stoker. And I'm
with Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104. We represent over
9,000 sheet metal workers living and working in Northern
California. And our members, perhaps, have a greater
stake than most in the final version of the Plan Bay Area;
both the quality of the communities that they live in, and
the capacity to earn a decent living is at stake.
Our members adopted a set of principles we call
"A Livable Communities Initiative." Much of the Plan Bay
Area supports this initiative. For example, providing our
open space as it does, pushes construction towards in-fill
development, providing us work, and reducing greenhouse
gas emissions. However, we are concerned that not enough
is being done to provide housing that is affordable to our
members.
A union sheet metal worker building the
thousands of affordable units envisioned by this Plan
makes less than $40,000 a year; not enough to pay the
$2,800 a month for a two-bedroom apartment. That's the
going rate in most of our cities.
We are very concerned that the Plan Bay Area is
completely silent on the thousands of construction jobs
that will result from the build-out of this Plan. We are
concerned because the current business model for
developers building an in-fill development is based on
creating a low-wage workforce imported from the Central Valley. BRE is a perfect example of that. On two of their Sunnyvale projects that they have currently, sheet metal workers there are paid $12 an hour, and they are imported from Sacramento.

Why is there nothing in the Plan encouraging the use of local workforce, and paying those workers area-standard wages? Why is there nothing in the Plan of the benefit of having several billion dollars in construction wages recirculated within the local economy, resulting in millions in local sales tax revenues?

Why isn't there anything in the Plan about the thousands of new middle class careers that could be the result of the build-out of this Plan.

These apprenticeship opportunities for our youth and returning veterans will not happen if no in-public policy encourages that. Without guiding public policy, huge profits will be extracted from the build-out of this Plan, partly at the expense of improvising tens of thousands of construction workers. We must not allow that to happen.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.

Next speaker is Mimi Steel.

MIMI STEEL: Hello. I'm Mimi Steel, and I'm a resident of Castro Valley. Today I am not going to talk about the fact that there has been no global warming for the past 17 years, and Russian scientists have just come up with a theory that there is going to be actually global cooling for the next 200 years. So that really brings up the issue of what's going on with this Plan. And when I look at this Plan, I see a lot of lies, and a lot of misinformation. And I also think that you guys need to understand, as elected officials, you are going to be out of a job. You are basically going to be just figureheads because all of the power is flowing to the region. We are taking local control away from the cities, and that's not right.

So I would like to talk about a couple of the lies in your statements. First of all, Mark Loose (phonetic) has made a statement on your -- on a Web site saying that this is a grassroots plan. This is not a grassroots plan. This is top-down, central planning. And the people that are most affected by this are not being involved in the process.

You have a statement in one of the articles that came out about the Plan that this is a plan that is great for Asians and Hispanics because they really love to live in high-density housing. That's pretty insulting actually. And I think you need to take another look at that.

There was just an article that was published recently called, "The Triumph of Suburbia." And this is another lie that you put out. Your lie is that people don't want the suburbs anymore. They want to live in these high-density, stack-and-pack housing. That is an absolute lie.

And let me quote from this notice that I got.

First of all, this was a Brookings Institute study that said that most jobs within three miles of downtown have declined in the year 2000. They also state that new low-cost suburbs are where people want to live because they like privacy, mobility, and choices that were once available only to the wealthiest people. You are cutting that off.

I think I want to end with this final statement that -- Oh. There is another lie here in your thing: Aging baby boomers continue to show a preference for suburbia; not for high-density housing.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you. If you can wrap it up.

MIMI STEEL: Yeah. Nowhere are these changes more remarkable than by looking at what's actually in the Plan. And I want -- My final comment is Ezra here, who is one of the top people at MTC, drove his car to this meeting, as probably most of you have done.

Thank you very much.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Clarrissa Cabansagan. Sorry for butchering that.

CLARRISSA CABANSAGAN: That's okay. Hi. My name is Clarrissa Cabansagan. I am a transportation advocate at Transform. I am a long-time Alameda County resident. I went to Cal. I grew up in San Francisco and Daly City, and I want to say that I agree with what the Plan Bay Area is trying to do; trying to get us all to drive a little less and preserve our beautiful Bay Area.

I went to transportation planning school because I realized how much of my life was determined by the choices that decision makers like you will be making in a few months. I'd like to say that I was pleased to see that the Environment, Equity, and Jobs scenario came out as the environmentally superior alternative. And I would like to urge MTC and ABAG to really look at what was modelled in that scenario, that increased transit operations funding, it reduced the scope of the highway network, put more affordable housing in communities where, you know, they weren't being planned for, and also put stronger anti-displacement measures.

And I feel that, you know, we have the future of
the Bay Area to look at. I feel that as someone who has lived here, who calls this place home, I work really hard to make sure that it works for everyone. So many of the people that I know are tripling -- doubling up in apartments. And that's kind of a testament to see the great need that we have.

I'm proud to say that I got here on BART, and I biked from the BART station to here. And I think that's why it's so important for us to invest in our existing transportation system, and to also improve transit and housing for everyone; not just people that can afford to live the way that they have been for so long.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Okay. Our next speaker is Myesha Williams.

MYESHA WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Myesha Williams, and I am here mainly to support two young activists that -- advocates that I've been working with for years, who are trying to make a way for themselves at this table. I just want to quickly say that I support --

I would urge you to include the measures around transit operation funding and anti-displacement measures that are currently in Alternative 5; the Environment, Equity, and Jobs alternative.

Transit is really important to the communities that we come from, and especially to these guys that will be speaking today.

Thank you very much.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you. Patty Leal.

PATTY LEAL: My name is Patty Leal. I live in Union City. I've been a Bay Area resident my whole life, over 50 years. I have watched as this area has grown and developed. I'm sad about the fact that there are no more Gladiola fields welcoming you to Union City, but I do appreciate the opportunity to walk to Union Landing and take advantage of the things that are offered there.

I also enjoy having a park near my house where my husband walks our dogs on a regular basis, where my kids used to practice soccer, and where it is just nice to be outdoors close to home.

I want my adult children to have the option to stay in the Bay Area. Their roots are here. Their extended family is here. I don't want them to be priced out of the area. My neighbor's daughter teaches in Hayward, but because of house prices, she has been forced to move to a farther-away city and now spends at least two-and-a-half hours a day commuting. So I -- And there is no easy public transportation from where she lives to her job. So either her kids are going to have a tired teacher, and when she starts her family, she will have less time at home. And she has a lower quality of life because she can't afford to live in the neighborhood where she teaches.

So I'm excited about a plan for the region that will be sustainable and equitable. I really appreciate the fact that they're going to protect the open spaces, and I would just encourage you to ensure there is affordable housing, and again, public transportation is wonderful.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Pamela Tapia.

SUPERVISOR VALLE: And while Pamela is coming up, I just want to announce that Mayor Jean Quan from the great city of Oakland has just entered.

PAMELA TAPIA: Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at the Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about the Plan Bay Area.

I am here to urge you to modify the proposed Plan to increase the level of funding for transit and for affordable housing included in Alternative 5, and to also adopt the other anti-displacement measures in Alternative 5. Without more investment in affordable housing and other anti-displacement policies, displacement will occur.
At a rate of $8 an hour, working 8-hour shifts, she would make an approximate of $64 a day. She would spend $60 on transportation just a day. She literally could not afford to work.

To avoid spending so much money traveling, she determined she would have to stop traveling. During weekdays, she would sleep in BART trains, riding the train until the end of the line, getting off and riding back down in the opposite direction; even sleeping on her job's cafeteria or on somebody's couch.

I felt awkward writing this and even weirder reading this to you. I'm not asking for your pity. That is not my goal, but these are the facts. This happens.

The proposed Plan assumes displacement will not result in increased rates in commuting from outside Bay Area or cross-commuting between counties. This assumption is not supported by historical trends and does not agree with my own experience.

Thank you.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Adam Garcia.

ADAM GARCIA: Hello. My name is Adam Garcia. I am 32 years old. I was raised in the East Bay in Castro Valley for elementary school and to the end of high school. I hold a degree in environmental science and urban planning and currently reside in car-free San Francisco.

We are confronted with a new understanding of how our lives -- our daily lives -- impact the world. We are all connected to each other in ways we don't acknowledge or can't understand. In the Bay Area, about 10 percent of the air pollution comes from China, while about 40 percent of the pollution we generate is pushed into the Central Valley, the location of five of the countries' most polluted cities.

In America, 5 percent of the population consumes a quarter of the world's resources. Many of your precious metals will run out in the next 40 years. There are serious indicators that the effects of this march towards progress will compromise our well-being. Red flag current assumptions about our world must be questioned. Obesity rates are at their highest level from our poor diets and lack of exercise, forcing higher insurance rates.

The northwest passage to the arctic is open for the first time in recorded history from melting ice; a boom to shipping, but a threat to our local cities. And our co2 levels are at the highest they've been in 3 million years, reaching 400 parts-per-million this month.

Many people understand that we can no longer maintain the same patterns of growth and consumption that prevailed in the decades since. It is for this reason that I support Plan Bay Area as it addresses a new understanding of how we need to work together to ensure that my five-day-old niece and your grandchildren do not inherit a climate that threatens to be the end game for their quality of life.

I actually believe the Plan does not go far enough to ensure we play a role in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Roughly 35 percent of these emissions come from cars and light trucks, from urban development patterns that nearly mandate carbon shift as a requirement to partaking in society's benefits.

In combination with smarter focus development patterns, I want to leave you with three suggestions for Plan Bay Area that will help move the needle to reducing emissions, improving energy efficiency, and enhancing our health. At the neighborhood level, cities and counties must create complete protected bicycle lane networks that allow safe movement of people to and from their work, home, school, and play. Bicycles require no emissions to operate, have lower impact on the pavement, requiring less road maintenance than cars --

MAYOR SBRANTI: Get to the last two really quick.

ADAM GARCIA: -- lower health and give more money for local shops. I encourage including a casual carpool system across the region, as well as --

MAYOR SBRANTI: So that's number two.

And the third.

ADAM GARCIA: And the third one is establishing a region-wide single transportation provider. There are 22 providers across the Bay Area, and I want to see a program that utilizes the highway network to expand this.

Thank you very much for considering these comments.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Devilla Ervin.

DEVILLA ERVIN: So, hello. My name is Devilla Ervin. I was born and raised in Oakland. I urge you to adopt the transit operations funding and funding for affordable housing and other anti-displacement measures in Alternative 5. As a young man looking to live on his own, I am deeply troubled by the threat of displacement in my community and other areas slated as Priority Development Areas. By underestimating the impact of displacement, I feel we are doing a disservice to the entire purpose of the Draft Plan. Displacement needs to be at the forefront of this conversation because you cannot cut down VMT and/or greenhouse gas emissions without dealing with this threat.
Living in Oakland, I have known many people who find themselves being forced to leave their homes and communities that hold a sense of history and family to find housing that is less expensive. One example of this is my foster mother. My junior year of high school, she found a place that was affordable, but it was in Sacramento. She was still working in Hayward and was commuting up to five hours a day just to get to and from work. This is what I fear for thousands of other low-income families with the adoption of this proposed Plan in the absence of additional mitigation.

By increasing investment in public transportation, affordable housing, and strategies to retain and build businesses that serve the existing community, the Equity, Environment, and Jobs alternative -- or Alternative 5 -- will go a long way towards addressing these concerns and mitigating the impacts of displacement. Without careful, conscious, and deliberate planning, more low-income residents will be pushed out to less-attractive, and more polluted parts of the city, while attracting persons who have not historically found these areas attractive.

Plan Bay Area should not add to the list of issues residents already have to deal with. Plan Bay Area should be providing solutions and incorporating the strategies in Alternative 5 that makes it the environmentally-superior alternative, thus leading to a more sustainable and resilient Bay Area.

Thanks.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

URI PACHTER: Hello. My name is Uri Pachter, and I live in Oakland. I love where I live. The apartment building my partner and I live in has a lush courtyard, grilling area, great management, and we are in a quiet residential block two streets from Lake Merritt, and a few minutes away from exciting bars, restaurants, and theaters in downtown Oakland.

Additionally, since we live a short walk from BART, I have a really easy commute to work where I can listen to music, do the crossword puzzle, and -- or even take a quick nap. The one car we own is great for occasional errands and weekend trips, but almost everything we need is accessible by foot, bike, or transit.

I have seen the unbelievable backup that exists on a typical weekday to take the Bay Bridge into San Francisco. I can't imagine that inside these cars that are inching along, approaching the toll plaza, people are enjoying their commute. Most people are making the best of it, but probably wish they could spend this lost time being productive at work or with their families.

I strongly support Plan Bay Area because it envisions a future where Bay Area residents will have more options. Ideally, people should be able to decide whether they want to spend their money on a larger home, yet a longer commute; or on a vibrant neighborhood and a smaller home. Currently there are plenty of the former on the market -- larger homes and longer commutes -- but very few housing options in vibrant neighborhoods, especially ones that I could afford. Shouldn't everyone at least be able to make that choice?

Our current apartment has one bedroom, which is sufficient for now. However, eventually we would like to move into a two-bedroom apartment without having to move out of the neighborhood. Plan Bay Area encourages housing options in vibrant places and gives my partner and I hope that we will be able to continue to love where we live.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Cody Galletti. I apologize. Is that -- I couldn't read the first name. So --

JUDY GALLETTI: That's okay. I like "Cody."

I just want to say that I pray for your youth that they get to one day own their own garden. The US government is a republic. The people are the most crucial arm of our government, and the leaders answer to them in our land.

Today you pretend that your style of government actually exists in our Constitution, and that this totalitarian regional government can legally place people in sediments as described by One Bay Area. At least your old name exposes what you are doing. "One Bay Area."

On Page 131 of the Plan Bay Area, you talk about changing our voting threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent. Why stop there in your pretend world? If the ends justify the means, and your end is that everyone will always vote your way, instead of 55 percent, why not 40 percent? Or 25 percent? Or 10 percent? Or even .10 percent? How far are you willing to go to win?

You pretend that your emission numbers are true, and your buses are not empty, and your settlements are sustainable. You pretend that people are staying in the Bay Area and some are actually moving in. You pretend that in 2040, the Bay Area will actually have a couple of residents left to pay taxes.

Let's pretend that your future numbers are accurate. What will the tax rate be for these few 2040 taxpayers left here? In a republic, regional government doesn't exist. These people behind me are the reality of
of the Bay Area's growing population, or to restore
service cuts made during the last few years, especially to
AC Transit. The Plan specifies that transit agencies are
to be given funds as rewards for increasing ridership and
improving productivity, goals that do not take into
account the diverse needs for many residents for
affordable transit. Excuse me. The focus on a narrow
mission of cutting operating costs threatens the public
service goal of meeting the needs of all residents.

We urge you to consider shifting Draft Plan
funding from high cost -- low-cost effective projects to
transit operations and system maintenance. Alameda County
voters' rejection of Measure B extension places more
pressure than ever on funds for maintenance. Transit
services are needed in off-peak hours and to many
different destinations to serve the needs of a diverse
population.

As you've been hearing from previous speakers,
transportation costs for low-income households will rise
steeply when combined with housing costs under the Plan.
A vision for transit, limited to cost cutting is too
narrow to ensure that the Bay Area will have a top-notch
transit system that will act as an incentive to drivers to
leave their cars at home.

You want me to --
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 38</th>
<th>Page 39</th>
<th>Page 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: Okay. Go to <a href="http://www.I">www.I</a> -- I --</td>
<td><strong>Mayor Sbranti</strong>: Thank you very much.</td>
<td>throughout the Bay Area are paying to sustain family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIPCC.org</strong>: NIPCC.org.</td>
<td><strong>Sharon Cornu</strong>: Good evening. I am Sharon Cornu.</td>
<td>housing makes it impossible to make other investments in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: Thank you. And you can put the</td>
<td><strong>I am a long-time resident of Oakland. I know several</strong></td>
<td>education and in our communities. And so that’s an effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest of your stuff in writing, please.</td>
<td><strong>people here on behalf of my advocacy on behalf of working</strong></td>
<td>that the equity alternative needs to be expanded. That’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: Okay. The other thing is, I</td>
<td><strong>families. I’m here tonight as a consultant on transit,</strong></td>
<td>the alternative to work from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t like diversity.</td>
<td><strong>housing, and food access. And I had not planned on</strong></td>
<td>Thank you for your service on Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: Wait. You need to sit down.</td>
<td><strong>speaking, but I am moved to speak by some of the comments</strong></td>
<td>Transportation Commission. I understand the role that you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m sorry.</td>
<td>that have come before.</td>
<td>play here. Thank you for being here tonight, and for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: I like the melting pot that was</td>
<td><strong>I want to make four quick points. First, and</strong></td>
<td>work you do in so many arenas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America. We have time. We have time.</td>
<td><strong>This -- Those who fail to plan, plan to fail. If we do</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: It is not fair --</td>
<td><strong>not as a region plan for continued growth, we would simply</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bob Fulton</strong>: Anybody? How was it noticed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: I like the melting pot. I grew</td>
<td><strong>have traffic. And it used to be one of the tenets of even</strong></td>
<td><strong>BOB Fulton</strong>: Did you say, “Bob Fulton”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up in the melting pot. All this diversity is meant to</td>
<td><strong>the most conservative ideologies that planning around</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mayor Fulton</strong>: Yes, sir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separate us.</td>
<td><strong>transportation and water quality and air quality was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mayor Fulton</strong>: Yes, that’s me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: I’m sorry. We have other</td>
<td><strong>something we did as a society. So I salute the commission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mayor Fulton</strong>: Thank you, sir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers, ma’am.</td>
<td>for planning.</td>
<td><strong>Bob Fulton</strong>: Just a couple of procedural -- I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: We all should be able -- My time</td>
<td><strong>Second, climate change is a fact. The question</strong></td>
<td>have some questions for you guys. I noticed earlier -- I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is out?</td>
<td>has been asked and answered. Climate change is a fact.</td>
<td>heard one of the people mention that there seems to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Sbranti</strong>: Yeah, it is.</td>
<td><strong>The third --</strong></td>
<td>very few just plain old citizens here tonight, and an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: Yes. Your time is out. Thank</td>
<td><strong>Audience Member</strong>: It’s a theory.</td>
<td>awful lot of people that are sort of imbedded right into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you, though. Please submit everything in writing.</td>
<td><strong>Sharon Cornu</strong>: Third, the Equity, Environment</td>
<td>this One Bay Area Plan. Also, how is this meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pat Ferguson</strong>: If you have time at the end, I</td>
<td>and Jobs initiative -- alternative is an excellent plan,</td>
<td>noticed? Anybody know? And you -- “I don’t know” is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would love to continue talking. And you have a very nice</td>
<td>but still doesn’t take us to where we need to be, in terms</td>
<td>okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new Assistant Director, or Deputy Director Paul.</td>
<td>of affordable housing. The cost that working families</td>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: I don’t know specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayor Harrison</strong>: Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bob Fulton</strong>: Anybody? How was it noticed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Page 39**

**Bob Goodwill**: My name is Bob Goodwill. I am a lifelong resident of Hayward, California. And I came to talk to you about BART. BART runs on electricity, and we burn coal to make electricity. Coal exhaust contains uranium 235, uranium 238, thorium, cadmium, and mercury. It doesn’t go into a leaded vault in a cave in the middle of nowhere. It goes into the air, where we breathe it. A lot of BART cars have the aerodynamics of a brick. We can save a lot of electricity and not burn a lot of coal if we would merely make BART cars more aerodynamic. By reducing the coefficient drag, we would also use less electricity, which would reduce the demand on electricity, which would benefit everybody. I think it is time we did something about that. Thank you very much for your time. **Mayor Harrison**: Thank you.

---

**Page 40**

**Mayor Sbranti**: Thank you very much. **Sharon Cornu**: Good evening. I am Sharon Cornu. I am a long-time resident of Oakland. I know several people here on behalf of my advocacy on behalf of working families. I’m here tonight as a consultant on transit, housing, and food access. And I had not planned on speaking, but I am moved to speak by some of the comments that have come before. I want to make four quick points. First, and this -- Those who fail to plan, plan to fail. If we do not as a region plan for continued growth, we would simply have traffic. And it used to be one of the tenets of even the most conservative ideologies that planning around transportation and water quality and air quality was something we did as a society. So I salute the commission for planning.

Second, climate change is a fact. The question has been asked and answered. Climate change is a fact. The third -- **Audience Member**: It’s a theory. **Sharon Cornu**: Third, the Equity, Environment and Jobs initiative -- alternative is an excellent plan, but still doesn’t take us to where we need to be, in terms of affordable housing. The cost that working families throughout the Bay Area are paying to sustain family housing makes it impossible to make other investments in education and in our communities. And so that’s an effort that the equity alternative needs to be expanded. That’s the alternative to work from. Thank you for your service on Metropolitan Transportation Commission. I understand the role that you play here. Thank you for being here tonight, and for the work you do in so many arenas. **Mayor Harrison**: Thank you. **Bob Fulton**: Did you say, “Bob Fulton”? **Mayor Fulton**: Yes, sir. **Mayor Fulton**: Yes, that’s me. **Mayor Harrison**: Thank you, sir. **Bob Fulton**: Just a couple of procedural -- I have some questions for you guys. I noticed earlier -- I heard one of the people mention that there seems to be very few just plain old citizens here tonight, and an awful lot of people that are sort of imbedded right into this One Bay Area Plan. Also, how is this meeting noticed? Anybody know? And you -- “I don’t know” is okay. **Mayor Harrison**: I don’t know specifically. **Bob Fulton**: Anybody? How was it noticed?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 42</th>
<th>Page 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 SUPERVISOR VALLE: There were several notices.</td>
<td>1 representing other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 This is a public hearing, sir. If you would like to,</td>
<td>2 MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 after the hearing, you can ask the staff those questions.</td>
<td>3 BOB FULTON: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BOB FULTON: Are you saying, &quot;I don't know&quot;?</td>
<td>4 MAYOR SBRANTI: Our next speaker is Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Because that's okay. That's all right.</td>
<td>5 Balderree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SUPERVISOR VALLE: We know, but we are here to</td>
<td>6 LAURA BALDERREE: Hello. I live in Emeryville,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 listen to you, sir.</td>
<td>7 and perhaps one of the reasons why there aren't more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 BOB FULTON: Well, you are listening. That's</td>
<td>8 people here is because this event is not terribly transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 what you're listening to, is me, and I am asking you a</td>
<td>9 accessible. And the bus that I rode here from the BART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 question. Very simple: How was the meeting noticed</td>
<td>10 station was far from empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 because we don't have many people here? We have a lot of</td>
<td>11 I live in a community that has densified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 staffers, a lot of you guys; not too many citizens.</td>
<td>12 incredibly. It's doubled in size, at least in the 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The answer I guess is solid. Would this be the</td>
<td>13 years that I've lived there. The congestion has not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 same answer if we talked about the previous meetings?</td>
<td>14 doubled because they made investments in transit. We tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I've been to some of those also; seem to be kind of devoid</td>
<td>15 ourselves to pay for the free Emery Go Round. It takes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 of a lot of people that were just interested in coming and</td>
<td>16 people to BART. There are bike paths. There is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 hearing it; understanding what One Bay Area is all about.</td>
<td>17 Amtrak station. It is a very livable community. But I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I see all your charts and everything else out there; the people you've contacted, and so forth. I just</td>
<td>18 a little tired of other communities not stepping up to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 wonder how our previous meetings were noticed. Anyone know? No. Okay.</td>
<td>19 plate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Next question: Who pays for the consultants</td>
<td>20 So that's why I really support One Bay Area, to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 that you hired to put together the Plan? Anyone know that? I'm going to accept silence as &quot;I don't know.&quot;</td>
<td>21 try and get everybody onto the same page. It just isn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 How about for the Plan implementation? Who is</td>
<td>22 sustainable for people to continue to move out to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 going to pay for that? How about local government? State</td>
<td>23 Central Valley and insist on having a larger home. But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 government. Federal government? How about the taxpayers?</td>
<td>24 the fact that even a small home is not affordable to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Taxpayers.</td>
<td>25 middle class is a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SUPERVISOR VALLE: Sir, these are your two minutes. Use them any way you want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BOB FULTON: Last question. I've asked this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 before and didn't get an answer either. A lot of people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 interested -- even this young fella. Anybody here know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 what the greenhouse gases are? Can you name them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Anybody? Staff too. Even somebody from the crowd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Carbon dioxide. Methane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Nitrous. Chlorinated gases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 BOB FULTON: And what's the most -- the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 greenhouse --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Carbon dioxide; 84 percent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 BOB FULTON: Okay. I hate to tell him, but it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 happens to be water vapor. Never mentioned. It is by far</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 the greatest. And the very smallest one is man-made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 carbon dioxide that you guys hang your hats on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Incredible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I suggest a reading, by the way, someone else --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 I suggest you read the Declaration of Independence,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 particularly the first several paragraphs. And I would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 invite everyone here who hasn't read the Declaration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 recently to read it, particularly the people here who are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So we need good investment in transit to avoid increasing congestion as we densify. And we need some relief for the middle class that are priced out of even small homes. I mean, "small homes," meaning condos, that sort of thing.

Thank you.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Joe Leal. Joe Leal.

JOE LEAL: Hi. I'm Joe Leal from Union City.

And I just want to say a few things about air quality. I had the opportunity to be in Costa Rica a couple years ago for work. And I was -- This was about 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and the guys that I worked with -- We were sitting at a little restaurant there just watching the people queue up for the bus. Our eyes were watering, and you could really choke on the amount of smog that was in the air. And it made me appreciate that we have had planning since the '70s, when I started driving.

I think we probably have two -- maybe three times the number of cars on the road, but the air is cleaner than what I remember growing up. We don't have as many brown days -- that brown cover across the Bay Area, as I recall. Yes, we do still have those smog days, but they're not as bad.

Anyway, one last thing. I -- in fact, I had
Richard's son on my soccer team a number of years ago in the '90s. And I coached for -- I think -- about 12 years. And I had one child bring his inhaler one time. So I made sure that I told parents, "If your child has an inhaler, make sure that they bring it and set it on the sidelines."

Anyway, one of the years, I had half my team with inhalers show up. Okay? And, again, this was back in the '90s. I do think that the air has cleaned up a lot since the '70s, but I think we can do a better job. And that only comes through proper planning.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Fernando -- it looks like Navarro. But I apologize if I didn't say that correctly.

FERNANDO NAVARRO: Good evening. I am glad I got a chance to come to one of these meetings. I have heard about these meetings and whatnot. But I do want to stress one point -- and forgive me for my appearance. I am just an average Joe. I don't have anything prepared. Right from the cuff.

They say that when the government fears people, that's democracy. But when the people fear the government, that's tyranny. Okay? I hate to burst your bubble, but this monopoly that guys have been running for a couple of years now -- if an average guy like me can find out about these meetings -- and I can see from back there, the level of arrogance I am getting from politicians is ridiculous. Okay? And if you think that stacking these meetings with a monopoly of crisis actors and people that are coming here on a regular basis is going to push this, you are wrong.

MAYOR HARRISON: Now, it can be --

FERNANDO NAVARRO: So the fact that an average guy like myself is finding out about this, start shaking.

Okay? Agenda 21, you guys can't get away with it. It is not going to work.

The science is coming out in waves. Global warming is baloney. It's a fertilizer. Okay? All right? You guys can, like, hem and haw, but it is "We the people." I am just going to talk to you guys (indicating). All right?

If you think that history is going to allow you guys to build concentration camps and drag us with boxcars into these stack 'em and pack 'em, and if you think we are just going to sit there and have you build it around us, you are nuts. And that's all I have to say.

Thank you very much.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

AUDIE BOCK: Good evening, everyone. My name is Audie Bock. I live in unincorporated Alameda County. I am a former state legislator, and I am currently an elected official in Alameda County on a Fire Protection District Board. But I am here as a citizen; not representing my elective office.

I am concerned because I focused on Chapter 4 of the One Bay Area Plan because it is called "Investments."

And I'm questioning what government means by "investments" because the basic concept of an investment is, it's something that you put capital into with the expectation of a return on your investment.

So when you are using nothing but taxpayer dollars, that's coerced capital. And who gets the return on your investment? It's not necessarily the people that have been forced to give you the money. And I hope that as elected officials, which most of you are, that you remember that, and that what we need to focus on now is how to make do. That is to maintain what we have because we are in a situation of declining economy. And I don't think anybody disputes that.

But this Plan says that it's going to rely on performance -- a performance assessment of scenarios. What the heck does that mean? What is a performance assessment of a scenario? I really wish that you could produce these things in language that ordinary people like me could understand.

And going on, it makes assumptions on the investment strategy. And the assumption is a continuing increase in revenues from local taxes, from bridge tolls, from sales tax, from transit fares, and 3 percent growth in federal funding.

Everything is predicted to increase, including 1.5 billion dollars from the happy train. We don't even get the happy train. So I don't understand how these projections are relying on anything real. The most important thing is that you are basing your new strategies on the more flexible federal requirement of revenues that are, quote, "reasonably expected to be available." In other words, you don't have to plan things the way you used to based on reality. You can use federal government fiction; things that don't exist as the basis for your financial planning. That is wrong. And I think you can be very innovative by not following federal directives.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Okay. Thank you for your comments.

AUDIE BOCK: We hope that you will do that.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Liz Manning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 50</th>
<th>Page 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they all are. This gentleman over here (indicating), who</td>
<td>If you want to eliminate vehicles, it is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comes to all of them -- Mr. Kirkby, I think your name is.</td>
<td>going to happen unless you force people out of their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is just a show.</td>
<td>vehicle. Call it nudging if you want. But in the future,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But since I am here, I want to say this: That</td>
<td>it will be force. And by the way, with this Plan -- They</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after having attended Plan Bay Area meetings in all of the</td>
<td>are doing the same thing in Russia, but they are a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine counties, I know the majority of the public comments</td>
<td>ahead of you right now. If you ride a bike, what do you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oppose it. The problem is not just that our towns will</td>
<td>exhale? Oops; co2. Plants love it. I consider people in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose their individual character to the bland uniformity of</td>
<td>this country as individuals; not part of a group. But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regionalism, this plan will eventually deny new homeowners</td>
<td>what you are trying to do is make everybody one big group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the choice of traditional housing, gradually forcing most</td>
<td>Teachers are teaching everybody that it's one big group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residents into high-density living conditions in the</td>
<td>I've got a lot more of it, but that will do for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest of what's called &quot;social justice.&quot;</td>
<td>now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should mention that I'm a Berkeley-trained social worker;</td>
<td>MAYOR SBRANTI: Our next speaker is Nicholas Stewart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked in the Bay Area for 40 years. The historical</td>
<td>NICHOLAS STEWART: Good evening. I would first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem with incremental socialism is that it</td>
<td>of all just like to thank you guys for having meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradually cripples the spirit and extinguishes the joys of</td>
<td>like this. Whether or not I agree with all of you guys,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the individual's pursuit of happiness.</td>
<td>I'm glad the citizens are participating. Whether or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given sufficient study of this Plan, the end</td>
<td>you guys believe in global warming or not; whether or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals are obvious. One Bay Area -- or whatever it's</td>
<td>you know what a republic actually is; whether or not you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>called across the nation -- over time robs the family of</td>
<td>like stack and pack or not, the reality is that things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the American dream. Within a few generations, single home</td>
<td>change over time. Sorry. We need to be prepared for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privacy will be considered a selfish luxury, except for</td>
<td>future. I think that's obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those bureaucrats who have clawed their way up the</td>
<td>And regardless, again, of your feelings, I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional political ladder to the ridge-top properties with</td>
<td>glad that there are citizens participating in these,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the views and the good cars. You know they are going to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60s and the 70s. So, you know, that's interesting; he doesn't like planning commissions.

Also, for me, there's an additional thing I don't like. And that's the idea that some folks who would take my tax money and then mandate to me where I would live, how I live. And just the idea that these many abstractions where you take my money and you plan these communities and then you get the architecture -- architects, I should say, and the design plans and all that. You actually increase the costs of this kind of stuff.

So where I might want to go out and look for a more sustainable house; maybe something that is post and beam, not the concrete pad, you know, whatever, with some nice backyard that I could terrace and put some gardens on and stuff, you guys make all that stuff more expensive.

And we want to talk about transportation.

Everybody wants to talk about air quality. Cafe standards did their own damage to alternatives for building materials and cars, the size of vehicles, and engines; especially engines. So I know you guys think, well, you know, we are going to plan for this new carbon-free life, but I would prefer it if you would say -- persuade me -- maybe ask me, maybe form some companies, get some marketing going, and sell me some products because I am interested in buying more green products.

What I am not interested in is waking up and being forced to go to this little utopia, which you think you are building, which might absolutely be the opposite. But you won't know until you get there.

MAYOR SBRANTI: The next speaker is Deborah Taylor.

DEBORAH TAYLOR: Good evening. My name is Deborah Taylor. I live in the city of Oakland, and I am here to comment on the Plan's goal to provide housing for all of Bay Area residents. My question -- or what I would like to ask the commission is that in your investment area, if there could be an investment for housing in the Plan -- I know you have discretionary investment income, and it's all transportation orientated. But if this goal is to have sustainable communities by providing housing considering the fact that we develop the funding for affordable housing and for housing for middle-income people, has been cut or eliminated, there needs to be some sort of source.

So I would like to encourage you to think about adding at least a goal or designate some of that discretionary income towards housing that, you know, you are building towards these transit areas. And I think that will, you know, help encourage affordable housing and make it much more equitable.

Thank you.

MAYOR HARRISON: Thank you.

Linda Harelson, Harmeson --

LINDA HARMESON: You got it.

MAYOR HARRISON: Close to Harrison, so... Thank you.

LINDA HARMESON: Good evening. My name is Linda Harmeson. I live in Pleasanton. I was born and raised in Illinois. And about 1980, drifted out to California as one of my life-long dreams. I just want to say something to the youth and address the comment about planning. My mother passed away last year at 96. She lived in 80 square feet in a skilled nursing facility at $7,000 a month. So start planning. We could talk -- That's a whole 'nother subject for a whole 'nother time.

What is interesting -- So in 2010, I was not focused on this subject at all. And then I drifted into here. And I've been looking at this, and all I can tell you is that the assumptions here are wild and crazy. You have some interesting perspectives.

Let me just tell you mine: I've worked for a dot com that's still in business; over a hundred years.

In 2000, they started a plan to have workers work from home. I'm the only one in the office because I have to be there. I work in a virtual ghost town. So sometimes when there are things about getting out of your car, hello, I don't get this.

The other one is, I need exercise. Well, talk to my boss because he wants me to work, work, work, work. But if I took the bus to and from -- I went out to the schedule, and I figured it out. It is going to take me two -- two-and-a-half more hours to get to and from work. And it's going to cost me $8.50 a day. I don't spend that on gas right now. So -- And guess what? Could I make a deal with you guys? Could I drive to work and promise that I'll walk 17 minutes a day?

So anyway, I talked about my mother. I'll talk about my father. B-17 pilot during World War II; shot down over Swinefurt, Germany. The German government gave him a home for two years. But I will say this about Yankee ingenuity: If you saw the movie Stalag Luft III -- Those guys tried to dig their way out. So I'm hoping he's gonna channel to me to help me figure out how to help you guys say that this is a stupid plan, and we've got to come up with something else.

Thank you.

MAYOR SBRANTI: Next speaker is Linda Ross.

LINDA ROSS: I'm Linda Ross, and I live here in Fremont. I raised my kids here, and they are all grown up...
Supervisor Valle: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. We have no more speaker cards. We will be going nuts.

And we have to move out of the area because we can't afford to live here. But I wouldn't want to raise my kids in a little apartment; two by -- You are talking maybe adults.

What about the families? You know, people want to have houses where they can let their kids run out in the little backyard. You can't let them go to the park anymore. It is not safe. They get kidnapped. So to have your own house with -- for your kids to go out and play in the backyard or the front yard, where you can keep an eye on them -- I don't hear anything for the families. It is all about, like, this is supposed to be for the adults supposedly because there's no -- kids would not want to be cooped up in a little area.

They -- it's hard to raise kids in a house or an apartment. Even people that are in apartments, I don't think they want to be there with kids. And then they like to have pets. You know, pets and all these getting crammed in these little areas, it is not workable. This is why society is going crazy. There is just too much. Everybody's stuff intruding on everybody else's freedoms because you just don't have the space. And people are going nuts.

Supervisor Valle: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. We have no more speaker cards. We will be here for a while longer. I would ask my colleagues if they would like to make any concluding remarks.

Any of you? Mayor Jean Quan: Well, I haven't -- I am a new member of the MTC Oakland. I just got the seat recently, and this is the first hearing I've gone to. And this is the first Plan that I will go through as an MTC commissioner. I was on ABAG -- And this is a joint ABAG and MTC project.

During the last time we discussed the numbers, and so, about half of you seem to be from Oakland, anyhow. I tried to get and will see if I can get some kind of meeting in Oakland that's a little closer to the urban core because it seems most of these meetings have been out here in the suburbs. And there's a different perspective. So I'm not going to take the bait on certain people's descriptions of Oakland and urban living. Right now Oakland is supposed to be, like, one of the fifth places -- best places to visit in the world. And we're definitely a city that has everything from redwood forests to estuary bayside homes, and everything in between. We're a city from rich people, poor people, and everything in between. And we actually sort of like our diversity, and we like our mix.

And in the last fight over this -- And I do believe in global warming. It was not just the issue of global warming, but it was the issue of how do you have a diverse economy and diverse life and one that you don't have to drive so much? That's a great thing about America: got lots of different choices.

I grew up in the valley -- the Tri-Valley -- for part of my life. I spent a lot of time with my aunts and uncles -- because my mom was a single mom -- in Berkeley, San Francisco, Oakland. And the Bay Area has an amazing number of choices. And one of the things that we've looked at -- the last Plan was, does it make sense to put housing where public transportation is, particularly with an aging population?

A lot of the people who are refugees into San Francisco come from two places: They come from people who can't afford San Francisco because it's become so expensive, and my friends who went to Berkeley with me, who decided they don't need the four-bedroom house anymore, and would like to be in the city where sometimes there are more things happening in one day in Oakland than is happening in their town in one month, and so that's, again, the choices.

It's a national migration of seniors back to cities and closer to the public transportation because even though baby boomers thought we would be the generation that would rule forever, some day, which some of us can see in 10 or 20 years, where the kids take the car keys away. And we still want to live independently, and we still want to have opportunity to do all the things we expected to do.

Personally, I now live in the Oakland Hills. I keep my eye out for that house near the lake so that when I get older, I can walk to Chinatown for dim sum and walk around the lake every day.

So when we looked at the issue of the housing, it, one, made sense to put housing where transportation already was. And Oakland's General Plan calls for building more density along all of our corridors. By building more density in places like West Oakland, we've actually stopped some of the gentrification push-out because we built a lot of affordable senior housing that has sort of a good mix of seniors on both low-income and working class and middle class seniors. And they're pretty vibrant communities.

If you have any doubt -- If you get cable or you want to watch video, watch us on streaming video. Watch the seniors; video the seniors; come down to the city council meetings.

The other thing that we looked at is that some cities, because of affordable housing, had higher
concentrations of poverty, and that we are trying to
develop neighborhoods that are more mixed in income. And
so we tried to make sure -- I had the first -- As a
council member, I had the first affordable housing
buildings above MacArthur, and they are two of the nicest
in my entire district; very well built, attractive places
to live, places where a lot of seniors are on the waiting
list of varying incomes in particular.
And we also thought that if Oakland and San
Francisco and San Jose under this Plan take more housing,
that we should get a bigger share of the state and federal
funding. And we generally have. And so that's fair. If
we do more of the housing -- and particularly since we
make a point to integrate in low- and moderate-income
housing into our city, that we should get state bonds.

Now, there is no -- someone said that there is
no ongoing revenue source right now. I think that's a
problem for the state. I'm hoping that the legislature
eventually fixes that. But it also means that we ask the
cities around the Bay Area also to build affordable
housing. Oakland and San Francisco and San Jose -- and I
know that's more controversial that people have a right to
live in different places. And some cities have really
stepped up. Walnut Creek, Dublin have built mixed-income
housing, which makes those communities more interesting.

I think more -- more mixed. And that is an interesting
issue.

And so the Plan is not that radical. It really
isn't, despite the fear. And there's a lot of politics in
fear in our country. It is really not that radical,
what's beginning to happen, just because that's what makes
sense. And a lot of the young people that you heard from
here today, I see them every day. We are having a flood
of people -- particularly young, talented people -- move
to Oakland.

If you want to take a look at that, I invite you
to the Art Murmur on Friday. It is an amazing mix of
people. It's a little bit like Mardi Gras. It happens
the first Friday every month in our city. And we have a
lot of creative and interesting people coming to Oakland
because of the affordability housing.

And I'll just end with this: It is a joke
between me and Ed Lee, who is a friend of mine. San
Francisco Guardian had a cover, and it said, "Is Oakland
cooler than San Francisco?" Now, they did mean global
warming cooler, but I have to say, I've never seen such a
hot week in May as we did today. But what they were
talking about is that because the housing -- Oakland's
more affordable; that more of the artists, more of the
young people, more of the creative people are moving to
Thank you very much.  It is really closing, just echoing the mayor's comments.  It is really

MAYOR SBRANTI:  And I just want to say in going forward.  I am looking forward to hearing.  I want to encourage everyone to put all of your comments in writing and submit them because that's what is going to be part of the document as it goes forward.  Thank you very much.

MAYOR HARRISON:  Thank you, Dolores.  And I

Thank you, and have a good evening.  We are adjourned.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.)

And I really also want to commend how respectful everyone was.  I know at times, you know, people were hearing things that maybe you passionately disagree with, but everybody was really respectful.  And I really appreciate that.

SUPERVISOR VALLE:  And ladies and gentlemen, just a reminder: Thursday, May 16th, 4:00 p.m. is the deadline for getting your comments in.

Thank you, and have a good evening.  We are adjourned.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.)

--o0o--
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MAYOR PIERCE: Good evening, everyone. I'd like to welcome you to our public hearing for Contra Costa for Plan Bay Area.

I'm Julie Pierce. I'm the mayor of Clayton and the vice president of ABAG. With me tonight are Amy Mitchoff, who serves with me on ABAG.

We’re also welcoming Mayor Cindy Silva from the city of Concord is here as well, right up here in the front. I think Laura Hoffmeister is in the house somewhere. I've heard she's here, but I haven't seen her.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOFFMEISTER: I'm here.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, all.

Pledge of Allegiance, please.

With that, I'd like you to join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, all.

Council Member Eddie Berson from the city of Concord is here as well, right up here in the front. I think Laura Hoffmeister is in the house somewhere. I've heard she's here, but I haven't seen her.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOFFMEISTER: I'm here.

MAYOR PIERCE: There she is. She just walked in.

Okay. So thank you for coming to tonight's public hearing. I know your time is valuable, and your attendance tonight is an indication of how much you care about the future of our cities, towns, and our region.

As a local elective official, I'm frequently in the position of having to make very tough decisions about how our city should or shouldn't grow. So anytime I can hear directly from you, our citizens, about your vision for the community and the region, I welcome that opportunity.

What's been helpful about the Plan Bay Area process is that it is local, elected official recalls from throughout Contra Costa who are at the table making the decisions, not officials from Sacramento. And not even the folks at ABAG or MTC, your local decisions are going to stay local with your city counsel excuse me, I will honor you when you are speaking. I would appreciate it if we would all honor each other when someone else is speaking. Thank you.

Contra Costa is part of the Bay Area, but we've always considered ourselves a little bit distinct. The plan respects that distinction. It emphasizes different kinds of development for different parts of the region; that means our county's homegrown shaping of our future, which we completed nearly ten years ago, has been the model for growth in our county, not anything imposed from outside. And in fact, that process serves somewhat as the model for this regional effort.

Our hearing tonight is your opportunity to comment respectfully for the official record about draft Plan Bay Area which is now out for public review. Plan Bay Area offers a long range transportation land use diversion for the unique and wonderful region that we call home.

As you know, the dialogue has been heated at times, but I think it's been an important conversation to count. We have been listening. By looking ahead over the long-term, we can provide a foundation for us to build a future that we're proud to pass along to the next generation.

A court reporter is here to transcribe the remarks. You're going to be asked to please speak clearly. Our court reporter here may ask you to repeat something so that we have a good record of your comments.

If you haven't already done so, please fill out one of these blue "request to speak" cards and turn it into one of our staff members.

Who is collecting them? Right over here.
In representative democracy such as ours, the interests cited in the plan as stakeholders.

and fair, providing parity between the public and those extended release of both documents by three months for plan for many years. Most recently, your bodies Staff and consultants have been working on the technical reports. Draft EIR is over 1,300, with many supplementary time for both the Draft Plan and its Draft EIR. request for ABAG and MTC extend the public review same residence in Lafayette for 43 years. I am Gentlemen, my name is Avon Wilson. I have lived at the AVON WILSON: Chairpersons, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Avon Wilson. I have lived at the same residence in Lafayette for 43 years. I am requesting that ABAG and MTC extend the public review time for both the Draft Plan and its Draft EIR.

As we know, the plan is a 160 pages. The Draft EIR is over 1,300, with many supplementary technical reports.

Staff and consultants have been working on the plan for many years. Most recently, your bodies extended release of both documents by three months for fine-tuning, allowing an equivalent amount of time for what could be the most important public review is right and fair, providing parity between the public and those interests cited in the plan as stakeholders.

In representative democracy such as ours, the primary stakeholders are the folks who elect the local, state, and state federal representatives, the folks who pay the bills, the public.

We elect representatives to govern in our place so that we might do the other tasks necessary to producing a viable country.

As follow-up, we are charged and required to review and approve our elect elected representatives’ job performance and work products.

Properly, a plan of this magnitude should be submitted to the public for a vote. Short of that -- short of that, an extended public review time of these documents is essential. It is self-evident. ABAG and MTC should provide for no less.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Avon.

I understand that you are passionate about this, but I'd like to ask you to hold your applause because you're stealing someone's time and we have a lot of people here who want to speak.

The next speaker is Richard Ebar from Concord, followed by Richard Colman.

RICHARD EBAR: Hi. My name is Richard Ebar. I'm representing the blog Halfway to Concord, for which I write a column every week of which I've written six articles recently concerning what's going on today in urban planning in the area.

I just have a couple of comments because there's a lot of people that want to talk.

One of my biggest concerns having read the report, it's almost like trying to figure out Obama medicine plan because it's very complicated. And I agree that the review process needs to be far longer than 45 days for spending all these billions of dollars for the plans over the next 30 years.

One of my concerns is that in reviewing the revenues that are being derived for the Bay Area for this plan, Contra Costa seems to be getting the short end of the stick.

Of the discretionary funds, which amount to $57 billion -- this is in the report -- Contra Costa is not receiving very much bang for their buck, while San Francisco and San Jose are getting 90 percent, approximately, of the funds.

My other comment is the whole premise of this report is complying the Senate Bill 345, which relates to reducing greenhouse gases, carbon footprints, global warming, all of the above.

And one of the questions that I'm asking is ABAG and MTC thinks that it's very critical and it's
I realize that Sacramento has given you a variety of visioning sessions. One of the things that is said in these documents, this -- I only talk about the document that we have. I've always said we're trapped.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Richard Colman, followed by Janet Maiorana, followed by Vince Maiorana, and Daniel DeBusschere.

If you'd like a line up so that we can keep this moving, that would be very helpful.

Go ahead, Richard.

RICHARD COLMAN: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen.

My name is Richard Colman. I'm a resident of Orinda. I'm here representing myself.

I'd like to read you a one-sentence quotation: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent here a swarm of officers to harass our people and eat their substance."

Who wrote that? It was Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson was referring to the King of England.

On the line followed by Daniel DeBusschere, my question is, where are the jobs. We want us to build houses in the PDAs, and we need local control over those PDAs and those houses.

MAYOR PIERCE: Okay. Vince Maiorana, and add to the end of the line followed by Daniel DeBusschere.

No one on the Board of the Metropolitan Transportation Counsel, or Commission, or the Association of Bay Area Governments has been directly elected by the people. This is the kind of nonsense that has to stop.

California has the highest statutory state sales tax in the United States. California has the highest state income tax bracket in the United States, 13.3 percent. California has the seventh highest corporate income tax in the nation.

My question to you is, where are the jobs. We are being overtaxed and overwhelmed by spend-thrift government. ABAG and MTC are job killers. The time has come to abolish MTC and ABAG, and that time is now.

Do you agree?

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Janet Maiorana, followed by Vince Maiorana, followed by Daniel DeBusschere. And after that K. Jenkins, followed by Brian Masters.

So if you just line up; keep it moving.

JANET MAIORANA: Okay. I'm an Orinda resident, and my comments are of a general nature about local control. And I've expressed many of these at various visioning sessions.

I realize that Sacramento has given you a mandate, but it appears that's evolved into empire-building. Our tax dollars are intended for our benefit, and I consider the salaries, benefits, and pensions for MTC, ABAG, and CCTA obscene.

MTC actions to purchase a building in San Francisco, the proposal of a bridge party, and the Plan Bay Area proposal are improper use of our taxes. I would like to abolish ABAG, and I would like MTC to downsize.

MTC should stick to transportation and get out of the real estate business. That way we could expend our existing taxes on roads.

I am offended that you would fine us if we want to use local control or blackmail us in order to get us to accept your plan. Either way, it's the same.

We should keep in mind that our nation has a long history of opposing dictators or anyone who has taken away our property rights and local control.

And I do disagree with you in saying, "Oh, we have local control." We don't have local control if you're going to fine us or if you're going to blackmail us and keep our taxes.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.
I submitted a question, trying to be positive. 

DANIEL DEBUSSCHERE: Okay. Great.

MAYOR PIERCE: We have it on the card. Do you need the spelling?

Dan DeBusschere.

DANIEL DEBUSSCHERE: Good evening. My name is followed by Evelyn Stivers, followed by Ralph Hoffman.

MAYOR PIERCE: Next is Daniel DeBusschere, followed by K. Jenkins, followed by Brian Masters, followed by Evelyn Stivers, followed by Ralph Hoffman.

DANIEL DEBUSSCHERE: Good evening. My name is Dan DeBusschere. Do you need the spelling?

MAYOR PIERCE: We have it on the card.

DANIEL DEBUSSCHERE: Okay. Great.

I submitted a question, trying to be positive about the plans, and the EIR and the question was phrased like this: 'I did a word search on the digital copy of the plan. And I word-searched for BART parking. There was none. This kind of gave me the impression that the plan is slightly slanted to someone's vision on how all the MTC funds should be spent for the next 30, 40 years.'

Now, I live in Orinda. I live in a 3000-foot home on a half-acre-zoned house. I'm very happy. And when I read in the plan that you want dense -- multi-density-type of housing is because of the rising population of Asians and Latinos seem to favor this modality. Well, I can assure you, if you gave them the choice of that versus what I have, the answer is simple. The reason that you're going to the dense multi-family, 20-units-per-acre-type of planning as defined in SB 375 is strictly an economic thing.

And, quite frankly, it's driven by development efforts and development people who were in the Speaker of the House's office when 375 was drafted. So that's the special interest stakeholder.

Now, I think you need to broaden the plan. You need to put quality of life in what it is you're doing. This stack-and-pack is only serving one interest. And it's not serving your clients and it's not serving us who live in the communities who have to accommodate these things.

Thank you very much.

MAYOR PIERCE: Next is K. Jenkins, followed by Brian Masters, followed by Evelyn Stivers, followed by Ralph Hoffman, followed by Ed Gorzynski.

KATHLEEN JENKINS: Hi. Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Kathleen Jenkins. I live in Orinda and have been a proud member of Orinda for 17 years. I'm one of these people that are firm believers in free market economy.

What does this plan presume? There is a plan for stack-and-pack housing in Orinda. If there was an interest, wouldn't these already be built? Because they're not already there, this means there's no market demand for this type of housing. If there's no demand, this means people don't want the type of housing you are suggesting. And that means that these will need to be heavily subsidized with public funding.

If you put the stack-and-pack housing close to our Orinda public transportation, this suggests that you'll need to replace existing land use, which leads us to the need for eminent domain.

Why would any city allow others to take the power to decide land use away from other cities and
which is called Livable Communities Initiative, which is the first building trades union in the nation to do so.

Much of the Plan Bay Area supports this initiative; for example, protecting our open space as it does push construction towards (inaudible) development providing us work with reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Having housing placed in long transit corridors and having lots of choices for transit will help our members and families get to their needs to go and make transit less costly.

We are concerned that not enough is being done to provide housing that's affordable. A union sheet metal worker building thousands of houses, units envisions plans makes less than 40,000, a year, not enough to pay for 2,800 or more in apartment rent.

We are concerned that the Plan Bay Area is completely silent on thousands of construction jobs that will result from the building of this plan.

Here's why we are concerned: The current business models for developers building in-filled development is based on creating a low-wage workforce imported for Central Valley; for example, a developer by the name of Bree has two projects in Sunnyvale totaling over 600 units. At this site, 17 of the 34 contractors were based outside the region. Sheet metal workers were paid $12 an hour and brought in from Sacramento.

Why is there nothing in the plans encouraging to use local workforce and paying these workers area standard wages.

Why is there nothing in the plan benefit of having $7 billion construction dollars circulated in the local economy.

Thank you.

EVELYN STIVERS: Thank you so much for all of your hard work.

The next speaker is Evelyn Stivers, followed by Ralph Hoffman, followed by Ed Gorzynski, followed by Jack Paulus.

Thank you very much for all of your hard work.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

The next speaker is Ralph Hoffmann, followed by Ed Gorzynski, followed by Jack Paulus, followed by H. Pruett.

RALPH HOFFMANN: Elected Chair Pierce, I believe you were a elected member of the Clayton City Counsel; Elected Chair Worth, I believe you were an elective member of Orinda City Counsel; and Elected Supervisor Mitchoff, I'm Ralph Hoffmann and I live at the luxurious Mercer Condominiums here in downtown Walnut Creek, just two blocks from BART. And I own a condominium there. I took the free trolley and walked the rest of the way for good exercise.

I am a member of the Advisory Council on Aging and the Senior Mobility Acts and Council.

But what I would like to ask today is, when will the additional half cent sales tax be put on the balance similar to Measure J both in Contra Costa and Alameda County, where it nearly passed, so that we can improve the roads and public transit in our county.

And, finally, I might say, we definitely need to reduce the influence of gas. And gas, by the way, can be spelled G-a-s, with a first name of Heather as to reduce the influence of gas. And gas, by the way, can be spelled G-a-s, with a first name of Heather as an alternate way of looking at it.

Thank you.

HEATHER GASS: I consider that an honor.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Okay. Ed Gorzynski, followed by Jack Paulus, followed by H. Pruett, followed by Patty
Lessening emissions is one of the mandated targets of this plan. Yet my ability to do this is only possible because I have a roof on which I can have solar panels.

If the high-density housing route is pursued, then future options for many people for decades in the future will be limited in that they will not be able to do what I am doing today.

My concern is that if we create plans considering only last century's transportation technologies, we will end up preventing such efficiencies in the future, and we will actually be creating more emissions than we would have otherwise as even the best laid plans can have large, unintended consequences like these.

And in terms of equity, even today there are many lease options available with no upfront money required making solar panels available to persons of all income levels, but not if they live in high-density housing with no place to put them.

The trend of zero emissions residential solar power is also accelerating, which decentralizes power generation making the entire system more robust as well, and yet the present plans for high-density housing will prevent others from living emissions-free because they will have nowhere to put the panels.

So my question is, even if this plan is largely driven by reducing emissions, why would you choose, especially in spite of the accelerating trends, both in electric vehicle use and solar power adoption, to make the combination of emissions-free commuting and emissions-free power generation impossible for so many future homeowners.

It seems to me that we may be trying to deal with 21st century issues with 20th centuries solutions.

MAYOR PIERCE: H. Pruett, followed by Patty Strong, followed by John Doe, followed by Heather Gass.

HEATHER PRUETT: My name is Heather Pruett and I live in Orinda; been a resident there for about 13 years, and I have two points to make. They're both fairly concise.

The first has already made, but I want to make it again because it's very important.

A very short time ago, in late March, ABAG released the Bay Area Plan, Plan Bay Area, it's development plans.

One comment people may be aware of, it's 160 pages long, and along with it comes the 1,300-page Environmental Impact Report. ABAG putting a deadline for concerned citizens to read all of that and respond by May 16th is completely impossible; it's unreasonable.
The citizens of Orinda voted to incorporate transit. I interpret this to mean that eminent domain would be used to force our families and businesses near transit to meet this requirement.

For housing blight and search out the residential areas for housing, we citizens do not have a clear idea of where space to build low-income, high-density stack-and-pack housing. This plan will also reduce the number of cars that can park in the downtown area. Orinda has limited this cost. This is the worst possible time to be adding mass development stack housing when people are leaving, a lot of them are. We've seen the trend. We don't need more housing. We drive our cars to work, to schools, to shopping. Most of us do not ride bicycles or walk to downtown Orinda. Plan Bay Area wants us to give up cars and use bicycles or walk.

This plan will also reduce the number of cars that can park in the downtown area. Orinda has limited space to build low-income, high-density stack-and-pack housing. We citizens do not have a clear idea of where we would build this housing. And according to the Orinda City Counsel minutes, we might be required by the Housing Element of the Bay -- Plan Bay Area -- to look for housing blight and search out the residential areas and businesses near transit to meet this requirement. I interpret this to mean that eminent domain would be used to force our families and businesses near transit.

The citizens of Orinda voted to incorporate the city of Orinda so that we can make our own decisions. We did not vote for the Plan Bay Area. I believe this plan cannot and will not work.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: And you are John Doe, followed by Heather Gass, followed by Susan Edward, followed by Roger Acuna.

JOHN DOE: I oppose Plan Bay Area, including but not limited to, all low income, high density stack-and-pack housing projects.

Organizations such as OrindaWatch.org and Pleasant Hill Citizens for Responsible Growth have identified a plethora of community population growth, overcrowding, crime, police, educational, land use, vehicle use, tax, funding, and environmental issues, which are not adequately addressed by Plan Bay Area.

So I have several questions related to this, and one of them was identified by Evelyn, the first speaker, and that is, why is Plan Bay Area, a plan of such great magnitude, not being presented to the citizens of the Bay Area, including Contra Costa County, for their vote.

Governor Brown put on all those tax increases in the last election on the ballot. Why can't this, if it is such a great plan, be put on the ballot for the citizens to decide?

I realize it's not required by law, but if all of you believe in this plan as you specify, why can't you put it on the ballot for us.

Plan Bay Area requires 80 percent of all new houses to be stack-and-pack. Where is empirical peer-reviewed evidence that 80 percent of Bay Area citizens want to live in high density stack-and-pack housing.

SB 375 requires unfunded mandates on counties and cities to be identified. Where is the analysis in the plan and the Draft EIR that would cost the continues and cities of these unfunded mandates and the impact of this cost.

Why is there zero funding in Plan Bay Area for more schools, police, and fire protection needed for the population growth identified in the plan.

Where in Plan Bay Area is the analysis of the impact of low-income, high-density stack-and-pack housing on the property values of surrounding properties and the crime rates of applicable Bay Area communities.

Since the plan impacts all nine Bay Area counties and all 101 cities of the Bay Area, why doesn't Plan Bay Area include city by city as well county by county economic and environmental impact analysis.
HEATHER GASS: We get the run around, and then you bring in police officers because you're afraid of the real public input. Tell the truth. This is not a mandate. Regional, unelected bodies are not going to control our lives.

MAYOR PIERCE: The next speaker is Susan Edward, followed by Roger Acuna, followed by Byrne Mathisen, followed by Reed Robertson.

ROGER ACUNA: I believe Susan Edward's is going to defer. She had a written statement.

My name is Roger Acuna. I'm with the Concord Independent Living Resources for Contra Costa and Solano County. We're an agency that provides advocacy support services for people with disabilities.

And one common theme that we've run across over time is that our clients are looking for accessible housing.

As you know, we're currently into the baby boomer phase. We are also fighting a war we can't win with our war vets that are coming from overseas. Guys are coming home in body bags, coming home without legs, coming home without arms, without sight. And I get these calls all the time, and we need to have a community that's accessible.

And what I'm talking about is the concept --

this is not about a state-mandated legislation. And Mark Desonia was on the ABAG board and he is a co-author of SB 375.

So that is a lie. The people of the Bay Area deserve to know the truth, that this has been worked on behind the scenes without a vote and approval of the people of the Bay Area. And this is going to socially re-engineer all of our lives over the next 40 years.

And you guys know this, and you are exposed now for the truth. Stop lying to the public. This is not about saving the planet; this is about socially re-engineering our lives.

You have no right to do this. You are an unelected body. I don't care if you are elected officials; you were not elected to do this.

There is no such thing as regional government. And I come up here over and over and over again. And I'm sick of being lied to. Out of all the input we have given, we've never gotten our questions answered.

How much is this going to cost? What is this going to do to our schools, fire, safety.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Heather.

HEATHER GASS: None of us have been given answers about this.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Heather.
BYRNE MATHISEN: My name is Byrne Mathisen, Lafayette resident for 34 years; currently vice president of the Happy Valley Improvement Association, refer to the Happy Valley Home Improvement, Lafayette Homeowners Counsel.

Happy Valley Home Improvement has been in existence for over 65 years, representing the 1,100 households north of the Lafayette BART station. We meet nine times during the calendar year with an additional annual meeting to discuss issues of the day. We also send out an newsletter in advance of the annual meeting.

One year we had the fire chief come and go over with what we could do to make our area of the city safer. We are a neighborhood of older narrow winding roads in a hilly environment with few ingress and egress points, what you would call a firetrap.

Actually, all of Lafayette neighborhoods are within valleys - Acalanes Valley, Burton Valley, Releiez Valley, and Happy Valley, all of which have the same constraints.

Plan Bay Area will change our way of life irreversibly. We vote for relatively minor changes in our life, like a quarter percent sales tax increase.

Whether or not a vote is statutorily mandated, why on earth is this plan of such a magnitude not being presented to the citizens of the Bay Area for a vote?

The city of Lafayette has a general plan. I served on the Citizens Advisory Commission. I also attended every Shaping Our Future meeting, and Saving Our Future didn't fly.

Do you remember that?

We also have a downtown specific plan; plus five years in the making. I attended 80 percent of the meetings.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Ms. Mathisen.

BYRNE MATHISEN: Oh, okay. Well, I've got more to say. I'll send it to you in writing; don't worry about it.

MAYOR PIERCE: Please do.

The next speaker is Reed Robertson, followed by Nyna Armstrong, followed by Adam Garcia, followed by Erica Hann.

REED ROBERTSON: I'm Reed Robertson from Orinda.

Recently, in the last ten years or so, Antioch has brought several thousand affordable income-sponsored tenants into their city. Over the last, say, five years, combined with the housing collapse, houses that were selling for $700,000 are now selling for less than $200,000.
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11 I mean, if something like that was to happen in Orinda, I don't know any of your constituents that would stand for it.
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1 With the recent complete collapse in land values and tax revenues to the city, they cannot improve their schools, their infrastructure; all they do now is try to hire more police to stop the rising amount of violent crimes.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. Robertson.

Next is Nyna Armstrong, Adam Garcia, Erica Hann, and Amie Flemming.

NYNA ARMSTRONG: Hi. I'm Nyna Armstrong, and I'm a resident of Orinda.

Your plan calls for high-density housing next to the freeway. You must not be aware of the following key studies on air pollution and health effects near high traffic areas.

This list was put together by the Environmental Law and Policy Center and the Sierra Club:

Air pollution from busy roads linked to shorter life spans for nearby residents.

Truck traffic linked to childhood asthma hospitalizations.

Pregnant women who live near high traffic areas are more likely to have premature and low birth weight babies.

Traffic-related air pollution associated with respiratory symptoms in two-year-old children.

People who live near freeways exposed to 25 times more particle pollution.

Asthma more common for children living near freeways.

Children living near busy roads more likely to
We were all from different backgrounds with parents that worked in other cities and counties, but we all saw that little street as our home. We were all from different backgrounds with parents that worked in other cities and counties, but we all saw that little street as our home. We were all from different backgrounds with parents that worked in other cities and counties, but we all saw that little street as our home. We were all from different backgrounds with parents that worked in other cities and counties, but we all saw that little street as our home.

Your plan is unhealthy for citizens and for our communities. You are favoring the developers over the most vulnerable. I stand with the most vulnerable. I stand against Plan Bay Area.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Adam.

Next is Erica Hann, followed by Amy Flemming, followed by Rusty Snow, followed by Robert Ring.

ERICA HANN: Hi there. My name is Erica and I grew up in Moraga. I went away to college but am back in this area now, and I am here supporting Plan Bay Area.

And related to what Adam just mentioned, I think it is very important to think about the connections between places, rather than just individual jurisdictions. One example that I can give of that, I ride my bike a lot for transportation, for recreation, because I love it, and I have family that lives in Danville, which they live very close to the Iron Horse Trail. And so I thought, Oh, great.

I can ride on the bike trail from Moraga to Lafayette and then from Walnut Creek all the way to down to Danville, which was wonderful, except for the one section connecting those trails. I was in the middle of Walnut Creek and there’s cars zooming around, and it’s very, very unsafe. So I think it’s critical to think of this sort of holistically and think of those border areas rather than just individual statements.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you very much.

Amie Flemming, then Rusty Snow, then Robert Bing, then Tom Collins.

AMIE FLEMMING: Good evening. Thanks for having us.

My name is Amie. I’m 24 years old, and I think that’s important because this plan is going to
address some pretty important years of my life between
being 24 and being in my 50's.
And when I think about that, I grew up on the
East Coast and I moved here for a reason, because I love
the Bay Area. Everyone in this room loves the Bay Area.
There's a lot of passion for this place, and I wanted to
be in a place where people were passionate about where
they lived.
Part of why I love it too is because I don't
need to own a car, which I can't afford because I'm 24.
And I love that I can live here, I can be outside with
friends, I can go to my community without a car, and I
can also go up into the beautiful parks of the East Bay
and recreate here, and I can truly find some sort of
community that is really meaningful to me and why I
moved here.
And so when I think about this plan -- and I
know it's driven by transportation -- I think it's
important to consider how important my generation is
going to be in the shaping of this whole region.
And, for me, a lot of that's going to be how
do we find alternatives to cars. I'm not saying that
anyone shouldn't have one, but if I can't afford to have
one or choose not to have one, I'd still like to be a
part of this community.

So thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Rusty Snow, Robert Bing, Tom Collins,
and Chris Engl.

RUSTY SNOW: Hello. I am Rusty Snow. I'm a
member of the non-partisan group called Orinda Watch.
Last month, Orinda Watch had a very large town
hall meeting with over 325 people. From that meeting,
our surveys indicated the majority of citizens opposed
losing local control of their small towns. It appears
the majority of citizens opposed the Plan Bay Area and
its concepts of regionalism.
Should policies like the Plan Bay Area be
decided by the citizens and through Democratic process
or should the fate of its existence be decided by an
outside agency.
Would the administrators of the Plan Bay Area
do the right thing and allow the Plan Bay Area to be
decided by popular vote.
No. 2, I agree with the other people that the
plan and the EIR should be extended to allow people to
have time to review it and to make comments.

Our concern with the Plan Bay Area is that we
do not believe in many cases that is based upon logical
assumptions or accurate facts. Concerning this, I have

the following questions:

What right does ABAG have to mandate that the
stack-and-pack housing be built if this ruins the
character of our small towns.
The plan calls for housing near mass transit.
Why would anyone want to live next to BART.
Have you ever tried to take a nap next to a
BART train.

That's kind of a loose comment, maybe a little
simplest. But I think that's a quality of life, is
being able to take a nap during the day, etc., and BART
is extremely noisy and not good for living next to it.

Wouldn't it make more sense for businesses to
be located next to mass transit like BART and housing
located away from BART.

The Plan Bay Area poses the exact opposite of
this.

Would stack-and-pack housing have an impact on
adjacent property values? Has this been carefully
analyzed.

If the joining properties are negatively
affected how are the property owners going to be
compensated.

Are there not laws that address the
responsibility on governments if their actions cause
property values to drop?

So thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Rusty Snow, Robert Bing, Tom Collins,
and Chris Engl.

RUSTY SNOW: Hello. I am Rusty Snow. I'm a
member of the non-partisan group called Orinda Watch.
Last month, Orinda Watch had a very large town
hall meeting with over 325 people. From that meeting,
our surveys indicated the majority of citizens opposed
losing local control of their small towns. It appears
the majority of citizens opposed the Plan Bay Area and
its concepts of regionalism.
Should policies like the Plan Bay Area be
decided by the citizens and through Democratic process
or should the fate of its existence be decided by an
outside agency.
Would the administrators of the Plan Bay Area
do the right thing and allow the Plan Bay Area to be
decided by popular vote.
No. 2, I agree with the other people that the
plan and the EIR should be extended to allow people to
have time to review it and to make comments.

Our concern with the Plan Bay Area is that we
do not believe in many cases that is based upon logical
assumptions or accurate facts. Concerning this, I have

property values to drop?
California's economy is anemic. People are fleeing California right now. How is this plan going to help? Where are the jobs? Where are the jobs with these houses? How is it good for the environment? How is it good for our schools, our police, our fire, who are already overworked?

California is already ramming to a high speed rail, a cylinder on rails. It's a joke. Now they're trying to ram through -- now ABAG and MTC are trying to ram through this Plan Bay Area; again, a joke.

Give the local voters a chance to decide. It's time for you to stand up for your constituents.

Thank you.

And not sell them out. What is the rush? Do we have to pass the plan before we know what's in it.

MAYOR PIERCE: We have Tom Collins, followed by Chris Engl, followed by Peter Singleton, followed by James Bennett.

TOM COLLINS: Hi. My name is Tom Collins. I've lived in Martinez now for about ten years. I oppose this plan, this One Bay Area plan. I oppose it. I ask that you extend the voting to another 90 days.

I also oppose this force-fed of socialism, and that's all I have to say.
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MAYOR PIERCE: Chris Engl.

CHRIS ENGL: Good evening. My name is Chris Engl, and I'm an Orinda resident.

In February of this year, MTC's executive director, Steve Heminger told the public the forecast for buying and improving their beautiful new headquarters, complete with a $3 million atrium that was added after the fact, was off by just $48 million.

By the way, I wonder how many atriums we'll see in these stack-and-pack projects. The price tag went from $167 million to 250 million, just a 30 percent mistake on the cost of the building.

The Bureau of State Audits said the building is expected to lose 14 to $20 million over the next 30 years.

And that's a conservative estimate. Heminger joked, "I consider that a good day's work."

Amazing how Mr. Heminger thinks it's funny to joke about under-budgeting with the public's money.

What's my point about the building as it relates to MTC and ABAG and Plan Bay Area? As an unelected collection of officials and staffers, you have created alternative modeling assumptions completely out of line with the traditional method of forecasting that's all I have to say.
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population growth using immigration and birth/death adjustments. You have purported to be able to forecast growth for the next 30-odd years, something not even a Wall Street forecaster would be bold enough to attempt.

Original ABAG estimates for the number of new units needed were almost 40 percent higher. They were a million units and now 660,000 units. And that was due in large part to improperly accounting for the re-absorption of existing and ongoing number of foreclosures.

Your forecasts are wildly out of line with the Department of Finance's projections. In Contra Costa alone, your numbers differ by thirteen percent.

Expert reports show that people have actually been migrating out of California in droves since about 1990 due to high taxes on transportation, individuals and businesses, increased density, and higher than average unemployment.

You're increasing housing supplied at exactly the wrong time as California has the highest number and percent of all U.S. baby boomers who will be retiring between 2012 and 2030 rushing to get these massive subsidies of 300 to 500,000 per unit and crimping demand and putting downward pressure on home prices.

I'm almost finished.
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Even the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority, the congestion management agency charged with distributing One Bay Area grant moneys balked at Plan Bay Area's premise at the February 15th, 2012, meeting citing that, changes in regional land use patterns offer relatively small contributions to the overall strategy producing greenhouse gas emissions and called your population forecast anything but constrained and highly speculative.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Chris.

We have Peter Singleton, followed by James Bennett, followed by David E something; r-h-i-c-h.

Can't read the writing -- sorry -- followed by Terry Thompson.

Thank you, Peter.

PETER SINGLETON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Peter Singleton.

While this isn't a hearing on the Draft EIR, I wanted to point out that one of the greatest deficiences in the environmental review process is a sham process with a predetermining conclusion. And, with that in mind, I'd like to share with the public here where the Plan Bay Area exactly came from.

The plan itself on page 3 says that it comes
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from SB 375 and that the plan's policies elements were
developed by consultation and through the input of the
public, the Bay Area citizens. This is not entirely
correct.

Plan Bay Area, in all essential policy
elements, came from the Compact for a Sustainable Bay
Area that was released July 29th, 1999, the Draft Plan.
That's 14 years ago by the Bay Area Alliance for
Sustainable Development.

And the Bay Area Alliance was a collection --
a coalition of very powerful corporate interests,
nongovernment organizations, and it was run by ABAG and
MTC, but each policy element of Plan Bay Area; so the
need to live in high-density housing, the need to take
transit, the requirement that all cities be
demographically even and that we need to move toward
regional governance.

Those were all part of the draft compact. The
only thing that's missing from the draft compact is
anything about greenhouse gas emissions or climate
change because that rationale had not been discovered.
So it's not entirely correct for the Plan to
say on page 3 that it comes from SB 375. Actually,
SB 375 comes from the compact.
And, further, the plan did not -- the policy

elements in the plan did not come from the public
whateoever.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: We have James Bennett, David
Erlich, Terry Thompson, and Chris Pareja.

JAMES BENNETT: My name is James Bennett. I
am a businessman and an activist from Sonoma County.
I'm part of the Post-Sustainability Institute, which is
lodging a legal case against this tyranny. I've also
had to teach myself to publish a newspaper to tell my
fellow citizens about this plan.
Now, it's very easy to figure out why the
citizens don't know about the plan because if they did,
and understood its ramifications, they would be
sharpening their pitchforks.

Now, I think we all know that the UN is a not
a warm and fuzzy peacekeeping organization like we
thought when we were kids. It is the organization and
the vehicle, along with an alphabet of other NGO's and
colleations and agencies, that carry out directive and
synthesized consensus for their totalitarian tyranny,
spelled out in a complete plan for complete control
called UN Agenda 21 Sustainable Development.
This is the hard scape as dictated by these
globalists. This is starting to remind me of another
part of the history around 1930 that didn't go very
well.

Forgive me, containing the people next to
rail, taking away their guns, fluoridating the
populists, indulging in propaganda, and indoctrinating
our children. It's like a duck. If it looks like a
duck and walks like one and quacks and it has all of its
 earmarks, it's a duck.

Now, these globalists employ a postulate that
works real good. It works good on an individual surf.
It works good on somebody in ag. It works good on
Petaluma; it works good on Portugal. You provide for
their impoverishment. And then, in the wake of that,
you say, "If you play ball our way, we'll give you
money."

And they go along. Well, make no mistake,
there's a lot they want us to go along with, and we will
not.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, James.

Next is David Erlich, Terry Thompson, then
Chris Pareja, and Lenore Krause.

DAVID ERLICH: My name is Dave Erlich. I'm
from San Leandro, California; originally from Lancaster,
California, where this was implemented about six years
ago. That's why I moved.
I said, you know, we want local control. And my personal favorite was called "No Project."

We're doing this now over in Danville. They're going to agendize it. Corte Madera has already done this. I recommend that all of you get out your pitchforks and your torches and go to your town councils and get us out of ABAG.

CHRIS PAREJA: It's Pareja.

I was born in Richmond and I live in Hayward.

MAYOR PIERCE: That's a J. Okay.

CHRIS PAREJA: I oppose the Bay Area plan. It talks about the three E's of planning being environment, economy, and equity. And, specifically, equity is called out as being particularly important. And I'd like to clarify something for the designers of the One Bay Area plan; and that is, just because someone is a minority doesn't mean they need assistance from the government to be equal to others. That's a racist philosophy and it's insulting.

The One Area Plan also highlights the desire to put high-density or multi-family homes near mass transit. And part of the justification cited is that we have growing demographics of Asian and Hispanic households and on page 33 of the plan, you basically say brown people like to live in multi-family homes.

As an Asian that looks Mexican, I'm offended twice.

Multi-generational households may be both partially cultural but also partially economically driven. The lack of high paying jobs, the ones being chased out of the Bay Area, is large factor reliance on multi-family homes and dependence on mass transit.

The current economy is driving more families into multi-generational housing arrangements and roommate situations. There's currently an excess inventory in the Bay Area, is large factor reliance on multi-family homes and dependence on mass transit.

The current economy is driving more families into multi-generational housing arrangements and roommate situations. There's currently an excess inventory in the Bay Area, is large factor reliance on multi-family homes and dependence on mass transit.

The current economy is driving more families into multi-generational housing arrangements and roommate situations. There's currently an excess inventory in the Bay Area, is large factor reliance on multi-family homes and dependence on mass transit.
The plans have highlighted retail and restaurant jobs in walkable communities. These are typically low paying and entry level jobs. It’s almost as if you believe the majority of brown people want to work in restaurants and retail.

You’ve offended me again, especially since these jobs are statistically occupied by teenagers and middle income families or other currently employed individuals needing additional income. They’re typically not taken by members of lower income families or people needing a single job with a lifestyle-supporting income.

Not only that, the priority development areas are often in polluted, undesirable parts of towns, especially in the inner cities. And this desire to put high numbers of income disadvantaged families in unhealthy environments is criminal.

The One Bay Area plan is not going to make minorities more equal; it is going to trap them in slums and reduce their chances to get out.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

CHRISS PAREJA: Here’s my request for you: If you really care about equity, please stop adding amenities to the plantation and free the workers to pursue their own versions of happiness.

LENORE KRAUSE: The elected officials of our county, Contra Costa; state, California; federal, the United States of America.

I'm from Pleasant Hill. In this state we think of the levels of government to be city, in my case, Pleasant Hill; county, Contra Costa; state, California; federal, the United States of America.

ABAG and MTC are like another level of government that we do not need and we do not want. When ABAG and MTC tell me how to live and where to live, they are enabled with way too much power.

When they blackmail cities into doing their command by withholding transportation funds from the city if the city does not do as ABAG and MTC demand, this is a level of power I cannot comprehend. If we would have to have this level of government, we should at least be able to elect the officials of this government directly.

We elect our representative to other governmental bodies in this state directly. You might stay to me that city councils and other governmental bodies select their dually-elected officials to serve on subcommittees, etc. This is true, but none of these

indicate State legislation is explicit that neither ABAG nor MTC has the legal authority to supercede the land use authorities of cities and counties; but then I have this form of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation which tells me how many more housing units are going to come into my city of Concord, and I think I don’t have a choice in that.

I’m really concerned -- my second point is -- that this is just a reaction to the overstimulation of what we’ve seen at the alarmists about global warming. So therefore, we have to go back to AB-32, which was the companion bill to SB-375.

And I think there has been in the interim of these years much more to be concerned about but not on the alarmists’ side, on the side that we aren’t having global warming. So I think what we are trying to produce here is something that is based on faulty documentation and data.

And recently, we have even seen this information, maybe not all of us have seen it. But there are two things just quickly I would like to tell that have been noted in the media.

In The Australian recently, it said: There’s been a 20-year hiatus in rising temperatures and it has climate scientists puzzled. Then, in The Economists of
Thank you.

So once again, I ask that you stand up and you put it to a vote of the people.  Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE:  Eliza Pesuit is next.

---

March, there was a lengthy article in which it said:  If climate scientists were credit-rating agencies, climate sensitivity would be on negative watch but not yet downgraded.  So I would urge cities to withdraw from ABAG.  Thank you.

Next is S.P. Callister, followed by Eliza Pesuit, followed by John Chapman, followed by Bill Legler.

SUSAN CALLISTER:  Good evening.  My name is Susan Callister.  I live in Lafayette.  I'm a member of the Happy Valley Improvement Association board and part of the Lafayette Homeowners Council.  I was a little bit concerned at the beginning of this evening when someone up there said that this particular thing was going to be going through in July.  I do remember smart growth about nine or ten years ago, attending a meeting, and thinking, "Oh, God, I hope this doesn't go through," and it didn't.  So I think a lot of the people that were up there this evening that asked you to sort of stand up to the plate and put this up for a vote -- and I'm sure there's money to be found in some of the grant money that's dangled around the communities that are designated PTAs, and you can use that for a vote in Contra Costa County.

The EIR and your Plan have some unrealistic forecasts for jobs, households and, you know, you refuse any kind of independent analysis.  You know, I believe there's global warming.  I believe we need to have housing for everybody in our community and help those that need help, but I don't believe that you're the decider of that.  We are.  Our communities are.  Our downtown plan, our general plan, not this one Bay Area thing.  So I urge you to listen to some of the people that spoke tonight and put it up for a vote of the people.

And then a second thing on the PTAs, at least for our community, it seems as though our staff gets grant money dangled at them.  So last year we had our street torn up for almost a year to get pink sidewalks and some trees torn down, and I don't know why we did it.  It did put some people to work, but not for very long, and the outcome wasn't good.  So once again, I ask that you stand up and you put it to a vote of the people.  Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Eliza Pesuit is next.

---

JOHN CHAPMAN:  I think she passed.

MAYOR PIERCE:  Okay.  Then John Chapman, then Bill Legler, and then Jordan Fruchtman.

JOHN CHAPMAN:  Yes.  John Chapman, I'm a resident of Danville.  Good evening.

COMMISSIONER WORTH:  Do you want to pull the mic up a little bit?

JOHN CHAPMAN:  Hold it up?

MAYOR PIERCE:  You're a little taller than the last speaker.

JOHN CHAPMAN:  I'll take it.  Thanks.

So a lot of interesting comments tonight.  I think they're all worth considering carefully, but there is something I think we must really think carefully about.

The big issues we face, the big planning issues we face:  Housing, transportation, air quality, open-space protection, these are all regional issues.  And if you look at 110 jurisdictions and expect them to solve these problems alone, it won't happen, and we'll get into a much, much worse situation.  We have to have a way to do this together, because it's 110 jurisdictions working that need to work together -- 109, okay.

So I like the attempt of what this plan is trying to do to find a way to work together to solve the problems.

I also like the Plan because it's an important step to implementing AB 32, which was brought to us, as you may remember, by a republican administration and a republican governor.  It's a good bill.  It's worth fighting for.

I like the Plan because it provides housing choices for a variety of people, and particularly I like it when it proposes to build close to transit so that people don't have to own a car for every family member.  They'll have choices.  They can take their car or they can take transit.

I like the Plan because it holds the limit on urban sprawl for the next 30 years.  There's room enough, as studies have shown, to build within the existing 110 cities.  We don't have to push out further.

I love the Plan because it protects wildlife and working family farms.  And local family farms are a really important national security issue, because without local food, then what happens is a geopolitical event occurs.

And finally, I like it because it brings clean air and water.

Thank you.
MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.
The next speaker is Bill Legler, followed by Jordan Fruchtman, followed by Barbara Hodgkinson, followed by Pam Jones.
BILL LEGLER: Hello. I'm just a little old senior living in Orinda for 37 years. I enjoy the city. I enjoy the rural atmosphere. I find the Plan Bay Area to be flawed, incomplete, and needs to be rewritten; so therefore, I hope that it is not adopted in its present form. And let me give you some specific things: Number one, the Plan called for the same demographic characteristics among all the cities. I don't think we want to do that. We don't want sameness. We want individuality.
The second thing the report failed to mention and deal with, that's single-family housing. That's a big source of housing, and it should be integrated into any housing plan, and it was not incorporated. The notion that people want to live life, spend their whole life in high-density housing is unrealistic, to say the least.
And third, the DOF, Department of Finance, has statisticians to project population. ABAG has statisticians to project populations. They totally disagree. Why don't we use one or the other? Why don't we use the State's, since it's been around for so long and it's very respected. So we should use that as a base rather than -- you know, is the ABAG's statisticians better than the State's statisticians? Okay. One suggestion, since you're having housing mandates, there ought to be a way to have offsets to the State mandates. And the off states (phonetic) could include such things as no land available for building, it could be that -- an offset could be given for large houses, because they have many children and family. An offset could be given to senior housing, and that would reduce it.
And I have one last point, and I'm done. The last point is cost-benefit analysis. There has to be a cost benefit. We are spending public money. We ought to do it in a very reasonable and wisely way.
MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you. BILL LEGLER: So therefore, I hope you don't approve the Plan as it is written. Thank you.
MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Bill.
Next is Jordan Fruchtman, followed by Barbara Hodgkinson, followed by Pam Jones, followed by Eric Stuffmann.
JORDAN FRUCHTMAN: Hi. Thank you so much for listening to all of our comments and for being here tonight and spending so much time.
I grew up here in the Bay Area. I'm 31 years old and, you know, I came here because I wanted to tell you all about my experience here going to summer camp at the Lafayette Reservoir every single summer, being able to experience the nature and wildlife there and be in those spaces.
And now I've been married for two and a half years, and my wife and I are ready to start a family and settle down. We've been saving up to buy a home and the only place my wife will look is here in the Walnut Creek area. She was just shopping, unfortunately for me, in, you know, this awesome district here.
So, you know, we're really excited, but it's really -- only is it incredibly hard to find affordable homes for us but, you know, to another gentleman's point, we do want to live near BART.
We would love to live near a transportation hub so that we could actually use that to get to work instead of having to be stuck in traffic. So that would be really a fantastic thing, and I came here because I wanted to tell you about that.
I wanted to tell you about the hope that I have for open space and connected biking routes and affordable housing for people, and unfortunately what I heard was talk about Nazis and communists and tyranny and totalitarianism.
And I'm -- you know, I'm a young guy in my 30s, and I'm actually trying to approach this country with a lot of hope. I'm hoping that we can change, that we can grow together and make Walnut Creek and Contra Costa a better place for all of us to live.
And, you know, my grandparents were in the Holocaust and I just wanted to say that's a completely ridiculous thing that I take offense to, and I hope that we can really all come together to make a better Contra Costa together and to make this whole Bay Area a better place together.
Thank you.
MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.
Next is Barbara Hodgkinson, followed by Pam Jones, followed by Eric Stuffmann, followed by Rosa Koire.
BARBARA HODGKINSON: Hi. I'm Barbara Hodgkinson. I've been a homeowner in Orinda for 30 years, and I'm a member of Orinda Watch.
The ABAG vision is contrary to the
semirural-village character of Orinda. Orinda homeowners and taxpayers cherish its quiet suburban nature and do not want the city to be transformed.

I personally reject the social engineering agenda upon which ABAG’s vision is based. I think it’s far too radical.

I do not believe that all people should live in densely packed, multistory-attached units in urban centers rather than in single-family homes.

I do not believe that care use should be discouraged in favor of transit. I believe that care use should be made cleaner and greener and emission free.

I do not believe that all suburban downtowns should be rezoned from multistory developments with upper-story housing and ground-floor commercial, but I do believe that Orinda must get out of ABAG.

MAYOR PIERCE: Okay. We have Pam Jones, followed by Eric Stuffmann, followed by Tom Morehouse.

PAM JONES: I have been coming to these Plan Bay Area meetings since March 2011. You guys always look so bored when people talk about freedom. And then when they talk about riding bike trails and taking bags places, you look so excited. It just always cracks me up. I couldn't help but comment on it.

The frequently asked questions. Since March 2011, I have been asking a frequently asked question, and I have never gotten the answer, and that is: Why do you only have one population number.

It behooves me (sic) that you can't come up with maybe a low, medium, and high number, like most people would do when they're trying to transform an entire region. You know, just guessing a population number doesn't mean it's actually going to happen, like we are going to grow by -- I don't know what it is now, but it started at I think about 3 million.

And back in March 2011, when I questioned the people, they looked perplexed that we weren't growing. And we continue to decline here in California, and you never look at the numbers. You never take another look.

And I can't believe you sit there at every one of these meetings and look like you care when you don't even care enough to look, take another look at population numbers. That's an important aspect when you're talking about changing a region.

So if you would finally please at least put it on the frequently asked questions that it's been asked a dozen times. You don't need -- I guess we're never going to get the answer, so at least put it on the questions.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Next is Eric Stuffmann, followed by Rosa Koire, followed by Tom Morehouse, followed by Steve Herrin.

ERIC STUFFMANN: Good evening. My name Eric Stuffmann, and I'm a resident of Orinda for the last three and a half years. My wife has lived in Orinda her whole life, and we love it there. We love it as it is right now.

And I have a couple points to make. I guess at this point I'm echoing some earlier points, but so be it.

So I just found out about this six weeks ago just from a friend of mine, and as I learn more and more, I'm pretty concerned. And I talk to people in my daily life, and I have yet to meet anybody outside of Orinda Watch, who I have a friend on, who knows anything about this.

And so how could something with such for-reaching implications be put upon us without our say in the matter?

So I guess I'm echoing earlier points, but it just seems right and democratic that we be allowed to vote, and at the very least -- well, the wrong way to go about it seems to have only a 45-day window for public vote, and at the very least -- well, the wrong way to go about it seems to have only a 45-day window for public vote.

As it pertains to Orinda specifically, my wife and I moved there specifically for the semirural character and the schools because we have two young children. And I'm concerned about the impact on both those things, and it seems, you know, obvious that there would be a big detriment to both of those things, and hence property values.

I think we can achieve a lot of other goals, such as bike paths and green environment and clean water, but the idea of having a standard, cookie-cutter approach to all the different cities doesn't respect the individual aspects of those cities. That's why I chose Orinda.

I like other aspects about other cities, and I like to go visit those cities for those reasons, but I don't want this happening to Orinda.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Eric.

Next is Rosa Koire, followed by Tom Morehouse, followed by Steve Herrin, followed by Dr. Cheryl Morgan.

ROSA KOIRE: I'm Rosa Koire. Excuse me. I'm Rosa Koire with the Post Sustainability Institute.

That's postsustainabilityinstitute.org.

We will be suing to stop Plan Bay Area with your help. With your help. We need funds for this comment.
suit. So please go to postsustainabilityinstitute.org and help us collect the funds for this lawsuit. Plan Bay Area violates the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, taking property rights without just compensation.

By the creation of Priority Development Areas, this Plan restricts 80 percent of residential development and 66 percent of commercial development to just a few small areas of your city until the year 2040. If your property is outside of the PDAs -- and 96 percent of the property is outside -- you will likely not be able to expand or build your building, and you will not be paid for this loss.

Plan Bay Area violates the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Equal Protection Clause. Owners of properties in the Priority Development Areas will receive development permits at a rate of approximately 80 times more than owners of property outside of Priority Development Areas.

Plan Bay Area violates voter-approved urban growth boundary ordinances because the Priority Development Areas are within the urban-growth boundaries but are much smaller. They are redistricted areas. They are in violation of ordinances that clearly state that development must be encouraged out to the limits of the community of 17,000 people and about 4,000 houses. I'm an Orinda resident. We live in a very small, sleepy city services. These ordinances are found throughout the Bay Area and cannot be changed without a vote of the people. I say we do not want a vote for regional government. We do not want this Plan. We will sue you. We will stop this Plan. Help us sue this Plan.

Thank you.

MAJOR PIERCE: Next is Tom Morehouse, followed by Steve Herrin, followed by Dr. Cheryl Morgan, followed by Chet Martine.

TOM MOREHOUSE: Hi. My name is Tom Morehouse. I'm an Orinda resident. We live in a very small, sleepy community of 17,000 people and about 4,000 houses. I would say it's very sleepy tonight because about half of Orinda seems to be here, and I think we are here because we're all concerned.

I heard about it -- as a fellow mentioned earlier -- about six weeks ago. We've seen a lot in the papers, and I came here to be educated. And I think it's really unfortunate because I've been educated by all my neighbors. I have not been educated one word by any of you.

have to go and leave to some other area to work their jobs. In other words, they would have to commute. So the objectives, the FAQs of reducing pollution and traffic congestion would in fact increase because there aren't any jobs here. They would actually be -- so how dumb is that?

So it doesn't seem like it would really be solving anything. And in fact, as I said, it would actually increase pollution, congestion, and so on, not to mention the increase in attendance in schools that are not equipped to handle that, the additional drain on city services, and so on.

So I look at it and I think, "Well, who does this really benefit?" Probably nobody here; I don't think. Maybe a few developers and all, but I really don't think that it's something that we need. Thank you very much.

MAJOR PIERCE: Next is Dr. Cheryl Morgan, then Chet Martine, then Kay Tokerud, and then Alex Flagg.

CHET MARTINE: I am not the woman whose name you mentioned.

MAJOR PIERCE: It doesn't look like Cheryl Morgan is here. Her name was called many times.

COMMISSIONER WORTH: She's right behind him.

CHET MARTINE: All right. I am Chet Martine.
CHET MARTINE: My name is Chet Martine. I then Alex Flagg, then Glen Z.

CHET MARTINE: Good evening. Thank you.

DR. CHERYL MORGAN: As you guys know, especially one or two people sitting up here, I am a teacher, and you need to consider yourselves about to be educated.

Socialism is planning to generate uniformity and to eliminate individuality. That is the textbook definition of socialism, and that is what your Plan is, without question.

Socialism is a failed political system. And if you don't believe me, I spent the summer in the Ukrain. They failed. They're starving to death, because they were socialists. Okay. That is the future for the Bay Area if you pass this.

Your Plan is socialism. So are you the local politburo? Are you now the ones in charge of deciding where people will work, where people will live, how much they'll eat, what kind of healthcare plans they'll get? Because if you are, you need to join the Obama regime.

And if you don't believe me that this is socialism, look at the few people in this room who actually support your document. Unions, political, liberal students. That's it. Basically, the fringe.

The majority of the people in this room don't approve your plan. The majority of people in the Bay Area, if they knew of your Plan, would not approve of your Plan. And the fact that you refuse to educate anybody about it, the fact that you're trying to push this through Obama-style, trying to push this Plan through in 90 days when nobody can read the document, including yourselves in 90 days, you're going on the Pelosi plan of: You can't read it until you pass it.

So again, I urge you not to pass this if you consider yourself Americans, because this is a very un-American Plan.

Thank you.

CHET MARTINE: Good evening.

CHET MARTINE: My name is Chet Martine. I reside in Orinda. I've been there 12 years. My wife's been there over 45. I'm a retired patent attorney. I volunteered in the 8th grade middle school in San Francisco for a few years. I was a trustee for two years for a local deceased family, and I'm now a student of ABAG.

My concern is the large unreimbursed cost impact on cities such as Orinda, the impact of the RHNA and housing element process on cities. This impact was increased by a March 30th, 2005 decision of the commission on State mandates. Per that decision, cities will no longer be reimbursed for their costs working on the RHNA and housing element process.

In a service-matters issue -- this is on the website. You can look at it: Service matters. There's tens and tens. In that issue in July/August 2005, ABAG commented on that decision and said, quote, "Without reimbursement from the state, ABAG and other COGs" -- and that means cities such as Orinda -- "are simply not in a financial position to perform the next RHNA process."

A question for you then is: What has ABAG done or will it do up-front before a city infill is built in their city? To assist the cities' abilities to work on the RHNA and housing element tasks, there was no mention of any such financial assistance in service matter issues after 2005.

For example, will ABAG stop requiring cities to pay a membership fee to ABAG to partly offset this decision?

For clarification, I do not mean the so-called incentives that could be paid to a city after completion of low-income housing.

Lastly, I reserve the right to file with ABAG/MTC other comments in writing and without limit on the time I take to write them and without a limit on the number of pages.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

CHET MARTINE: That's my protest against limiting to two minutes. And concerning air pollution, the mitigation standard in best practices --

MAYOR PIERCE: Chet, thank you.

CHET MARTINE: -- was to locate balconies away from the polluting highway.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Chet.

CHET MARTINE: That's crazy.

MAYOR PIERCE: Your time is up.

Next is Kay Tokerud, followed by Alex Flagg, followed by Glen Z, followed by Igor Skaredoff.
The Plan Bay Area is primarily a land use plan, yet there is no mention of property rights anywhere in any of the documents. It's as if those rights never existed. The primary function of Plan Bay Area is to strip private property rights away from most property owners.

In the rural areas, they take away all development rights. Only farming will be allowed. So no houses will be built, no employment centers will be built, unless it's farming. Farming only.

No compensation has been mentioned for any of those property owners. You're essentially taking a conservation easement on all rural land without paying a penny for it. In suburban areas and urbanized areas that are not in the PDAs, you're taking most property rights away from all of those people without a penny's payment in compensation for their lost property values.

Now, in the PDAs, we find out that eminent domain is coming back even though redevelopment was paid, unless it's farming. Farming only.

No compensation has been mentioned for any of those property owners. You're essentially taking a conservation easement on all rural land without paying a penny for it. In suburban areas and urbanized areas that are not in the PDAs, you're taking most property rights away from all of those people without a penny's payment in compensation for their lost property values.

Now, in the PDAs, we find out that eminent domain is coming back even though redevelopment was taken away. A new form of eminent domain powers will be bestowed on every locality participating in the Plan Bay Area.

There is no citizen oversight groups mentioned in that, and that should have been coupled with this Plan, because your Plan has no funding mechanism whatsoever for getting the new development built, although it positively strips away property rights from all property owners in the entire nine-county region.

You must pay for these damages. That's why we're taking you to court. And we will claim these damages and require you to pay us for what you're stripping away from us.

And your plan is 100 percent in accordance with the United Nations Agenda 21 that has as its ultimate goal the stripping away of private property ownership altogether.

This is one giant step towards taking those rights away, and we will stop you with every ounce of our being.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Alex Flagg, followed by Glen Z, followed by Igor Skaredoff, followed by Joel Ramos.

ALEX FLagg: Hello. My name is Alex Flagg. I live in Lafayette.

It's my first time here. I consider myself pretty nonpartisan with regard to all of this, so I'm learning a lot tonight. I don't have any axe to grind, specifically.

I'm confused though, is this the committee?

This is MTA (phonetic) and ABAG? This is -- I just -- I'm sorry, but --

MAYOR PIERCE: We're just two people.

ALEX FLagg: Okay. Wow. Sorry that you guys have to take all the heat, but I guess you can bring it back.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible.)

ALEX FLagg: I know, but they're not all here, I guess is the point. Not everyone is here.

Sorry.

So I rewrote my thoughts here a few different times, because a lot of things have changed, and I came up with four things that stick out in my mind:

Number one was communication, number two was schools, and number three were the options that people seem to have or not have, and number four were the broader community.

And as I said, only recently have I heard about this issue at hand –– these issues at hand, and upon hearing about it, I asked –– like another fellow here did an informal poll of his local friends -- and I was shocked that nobody knew anything about what's going on here.

So while everyone in this room, hats off to you on both sides for being involved. It's just not something a lot of people have been able to pay attention to, and I think that that personally is a failure of communication in a lot of ways.

And if people in Contra Costa, or even around here welcome all their thoughts, you'll need a room a hundred times this size to get the understanding of how people really feel. So I think that that's a problem, that people don't really understand.

I know you guys have been working on it for a long time, but on both sides there's a failure to communicate. And if there is a failure to communicate, I think that something like that should be put out as a vote.

I mean, I'm kind of shocked that this sort of thing needs to be handled in a Marriott in the middle of the night. I think it should be put for a vote. I mean, let people make their minds up. That's how we do things around here; right?

The number two failure that I would like to address was kind of one that's more specific, and it's a lack of research on our already financially struggling schools.
Lastly, I don't know if it's a hundred percent
form of stack-and-pack.

Secondly, why is there zero or near zero
funding for schools, police, fire protection on this
form of stack-and-pack.

Lastly, I don't know if it's a hundred percent
true, but in looking at some of the data that was handed
out here, it's a little shocking that your government
organization, in coming up with these plans, and in at
least my belief, are paying some of the salaries to your
guys' staff that seem outrageous, at least to me. Maybe
others here are making 2- to $300,000, but it's fairly
outrageous, in my opinion. I don't know how many here
are really making those kinds of money.

So in summary, I would ask for reasonableness
in looking at balance, and I'm not under the belief that
your Plan makes sense at this point, at least for my
vote.

I would say, put it to a vote, as has been
said before and let individuals decide based on the
needs of their local communities that they chose to live
in.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Igor Skaredoff, followed by Joel
Ramos, followed by Winton Mather, followed by Mike
Arata.

IGOR SKAREDOFF: Good evening. My name is
Igor Skaredoff. I live in Martinez. I've lived there
since '84.

I love this area, and I just want to point out
that one of the reasons this area is so good is
because we owe that to visionaries who have come before
us, who have seen past their noses and found ways to try
to make this a better place and try to keep it as good
as it was and maybe improve it as much. Without them,
our bay would have been filled in by now, or we would
have no parks. We would look like Los Angeles.

We need regional planning. We need
coorordinated planning. We need to integrate the
different plans for the specific areas into a regional
framework that makes sense, so that the Plans don't
counteract each other, but compliment each other.

Thoughtful, transparent, and inclusive
planning is what we need, and I think this meeting is
probably a pretty good example of that. I have
certainly seen and heard plenty of diversity. I have
seen and heard nobody being intimidated by standing in
front of a government agency and being afraid to have
their say.

And so, I would like to encourage you to hang
in there, take all of this under advisement, work with
it, try to work out all the various things that have
been brought to your attention, and let's get this thing
put together in a way that works for all of us and
satisfies these needs that you're trying to address.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.
Thank you so much for your time, and I hope you will work with us in the future.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you, Joel.

Next is Winton Mather, followed by Mike Arata.

WINTON MATHER: Yes. Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I'm Winton Mather. I have lived in Orinda for over 40 years. I was a cochairman of the Orinda Incorporation Study Committee way back when. So Orinda is now a burgeoning city, as you know.

I'm reading from the Orinda website. It says: Orinda's general plan embodies the community's long-term vision for the future, and they adopted the general plan.

My version, having worked for IBM for my career is: If it's not broken, don't fix it. And the Orinda community is supervised, so to speak, by the Orinda community, by the Orinda City Council, and they have done very well. That's an elected body, which you all know, hence therefore, should stay as it is.

As a nonthreatening speaker, I would just say that your ideas are interesting, worthwhile to listen to, but not to be used, and we should definitely extend the time frame for people to have their capability to find solutions so that we can actually get the time frame for people to have their capability

affordable housing that we need, and housing not just for low-income folks, but regular-working folks like my father. Like my brother who's right now building BART out to Oakley or Pittsburg, but has not been able to afford to hold onto his home. He's underwater now, and is threatening being displaced as well.

I grew up looking at the hills, those beautiful green hills at the foothill of Mount Diablo, and now I see houses being built up there because people can't afford to live closer to where they would like to, which is accessible to transportation.

And my wife right now is a -- is working as an accountant in San Francisco for a real estate firm where people are paying a million dollars in cash for homes there, and it's just becoming a matter of time before people like the young lady, the nice young lady that helped us find this room, who has been working at this hotel for six years and can't afford to live in Walnut Creek. Despite she would like to, but she said that she can't afford it and has to commute from Brentwood every day.

So this leads to more and more freeway sprawl and more and more lanes that will hopefully convert into high-occupancy toll lanes, and then get funding for transit instead of widening those freeways as well.
But meanwhile and in fact, your grossly inflated RHNA allocations, glaringly disproportionate with recent growth patterns and real-world housing needs projections, divide communities while threatening draconian enforcement for jurisdictions which don’t cooperate. It’s a case of play ball, or we’ll be around to break your kneecaps.

In collaborations with outfits like the similarly overpaid Contra Costa Transportation Authority, you continue to pretend that you are addressing traffic congestion. Less than 50 percent of Measure J’s sales tax addresses auto traffic needs even though MTC itself projected 82 percent of future trips by 2025 will still be by auto, with something like 6 to 8 percent by transit. Nonetheless, Contra Costa Transportation Authority is now pushing for a sales tax increase.

If you care genuinely about citizen input, then you will extend your comment period before adoption, allow for longer than two-minute comments by knowledgeable citizens, and arrange for formal debates in each county modeled after the one now scheduled in Marin County on May 30th. Meanwhile, I invite you to Danville for a debate on these issues, if our town council does not itself invite you.

Thank you.

NANCY SCHAEFER: Hi. I’m Nancy Schaefer. I’m a resident of Martinez, and I think I’ve said this before at other of these Plan Bay Area meetings, that a land use planning friend of mine said once: There’s two problems with the American -- or two things the American public doesn’t like, density and sprawl, and I think that’s really what we are facing here.

I’m here to support the Plan. I think it’s a great idea to tie housing, jobs, and transportation much more closely than we have, and I understand that this Plan is not going to automatically go into effect. Each local jurisdiction, each city is going to have to decide how they want to implement it, or if they want to implement it, and this is a carrot approach, and I support that.

I also like the idea of having more housing options. Those who want to continue to live in large homes and large lots can do that, but those of us who are looking to downsize or looking for more housing choices and be able to live closer to stores, restaurants, and possibly be able to walk.

I also like the idea that planning for more compact development helps protect our local farms and ranches from some of the development pressures that they have faced in years past.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Linda Delehunt, followed by Adrienne Harris, followed by Alvin Ziegler.

NANCY SCHAEFER: Hi. I’m Nancy Schaefer. I’m a resident of Martinez, and I think I’ve said this before at other of these Plan Bay Area meetings, that a land use planning friend of mine said once: There’s two problems with the American -- or two things the American public doesn’t like, density and sprawl, and I think that’s really what we are facing here.

I’m here to support the Plan. I think it’s a great idea to tie housing, jobs, and transportation much more closely than we have, and I understand that this Plan is not going to automatically go into effect. Each local jurisdiction, each city is going to have to decide how they want to implement it, or if they want to implement it, and this is a carrot approach, and I support that.

I also like the idea of having more housing options. Those who want to continue to live in large homes and large lots can do that, but those of us who are looking to downsize or looking for more housing choices and be able to live closer to stores, restaurants, and possibly be able to walk.

I also like the idea that planning for more compact development helps protect our local farms and ranches from some of the development pressures that they have faced in years past.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Linda Delehunt, followed by Adrienne Harris, followed by Alvin Ziegler.

LINDA DELEHUNT: Hi. It’s getting late. We’ve all heard so many wonderful comments. I can’t believe the passion in this room, so I’m not going to belabor my particular points too because so much has been said.

But I would just like to point out that it does appear that the concerns voiced here tonight point to a real process gone awry, and I believe you people can perhaps correct it, but I do think we are hearing about a process that’s really gone awry.

We are talking about a 1300-page document, which is about to be implemented before it has been adequately shared by our citizenry. And again, that points to a process that’s really gone awry.

The process itself needs to be revisited. If we don’t do that, our Bay Area will ultimately become faceless, and that is not something that I think any of us want to see. So please, revisit the process.

Thank you for listening.

MAYOR PIERCE: Okay. Adrienne Harris, then Alvin Ziegler, then Robin Mitchell, and the final speaker is Scott Ranzac.

ADRIENNE HARRIS: Hello. I’m Adrienne Harris. Thank you all for stepping forward to perform the underpaid jobs that you do on behalf of the public. I do appreciate that that is a form of volunteerism that can be very painful.

I am a senior citizen. I am the founding Chair of the Richmond Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee, which is an advocacy group which works with the City of Richmond. I am not here to speak on behalf of my organization, however.
I haven't reviewed the Plan. I would agree with those who asked for a little extra time on the Plan so that we can comment in writing on the Plan. My representative on your committee is the magnificent John Gioia, who always makes himself available to hear our opinions and bring them forward for us, and I trust he will do that in this case as well. And he is my only representative amongst all these names, which I find a little bit upsetting.

Less than two years ago, the city of Richmond adopted its new general plan, which was the first General Plan in the state to have a public health component. And our bicycle plan, which was funded by TDA funding, Transportation Development Act funding, was folded into the General Plan, and that's why we wanted to have a bicycle Plan and the Richmond BPAC was instrumental in advising the City on the content of the Plan.

Like the people I've seen here, I think anyone under 35 years old. That's just my judgment. I want to ask you to pay careful attention to connect regional bikeways, don't balkanize them. Don't allow them to be separated. It's not enough to have parking and housing. We really need to have a connected inner-jurisdictional bike lane.

And then to the people in the room, I would say, we as seniors -- and I'm a homeowner, not in Orinda, obviously. We as seniors really need to make some accommodations so that our kids and grandkids can afford to live in the Bay Area.

So thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Alvin Ziegler, then Robert Mitchell, then Scott Ranzac.

ALVIN ZIEGLER: My name is Alvin Ziegler, and I strongly oppose the forced real estate development of multiunit buildings in little Orinda. I'm an Orindan (phonetic) from 1964, and I have lived in Manhattan, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Berkeley, and I've seen the compromised quality of life of crowded, overdevelopment living.

I have returned recently to Orinda as a homeowner to raise my two kids, and I am shocked that this is being spun as smart growth and green living when I've seen what -- Orinda is nothing. It's a paragon of what smart growth and green living is. Okay. And multiunit housing means more impacted schools, more traffic, anything but smart growth and green living. Parking meters.

Wagner Ranch School, where my little boy is going to be going, has four kindergartens already. I attended OIS in Miramonte. These are overcrowded schools already. I don't see the rationale in bringing the problems that exist outside of Orinda to Orinda.

I cherish the way of life of Orinda. This is why I have moved there, and I think that I'm paying real estate taxes to support that way of life and I think that not being able to vote on that is taxation without representation, which is tyranny.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Next is Robin Mitchell and then Scott Ranzac.

ROBIN MITCHELL: Hello. I just wanted to offer a slightly different perspective on living near BART.

I live in El Cerrito, two blocks from the plaza BART station, and I chose to live there. We looked long and hard to find a house that would be near BART so that we can have available to us the great transportation system that it is.

And I have no problems sleeping next to BART, as someone said, "How could anyone possibly sleep next to BART." It's not an issue.

And I know that all the people that are in the BART trains that go behind my house mean that there are that many less cars on the roads, and it will reduce greenhouse gases, and then -- and thus it will help support reducing climate change.

So I support the Bay Area Plan, which I think will result in a good transportation plan.

Thank you.

MAYOR PIERCE: Thank you.

Okay. And our final speaker is Scott R-A-N-Z -- I don't know, A-L, maybe.

Is Scott here?

If not, I would just like to thank you all for coming tonight. We take your comments very seriously. We will -- we have taken note of them and the answers to your questions will be posted on our website.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WORTH: And I would just like to echo that. Thank you very much for spending the evening and sharing your thoughts with us.

If you would like to offer additional comments, we have a website set up where you can provide any comments you would like to have. Our commission and staff will be reading those.

And again, I want to thank you all for coming, and please don't hesitate to send in more thoughts and comments as you learn more about the Plan.

Thank you again, everyone, for being here.
tonight.

(Hearing concluded at 9:21 p.m.)
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SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Good evening. Thank you for joining us. My name is Steve Kinsey. I am a member of the Marin County Board of Supervisors, and I represent Marin County and its 11 cities and towns on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. With me this evening is Mayor Pat Eklund from Novato, who is representing the 11 cities and towns on the Association of Bay Area Governments board -- that’s ABAG -- along with Supervisor Katie Rice, who also serves on the ABAG board and represents Marin County.

We’re here with all of you this evening to hold a public hearing related to the One Bay Area Plan. And it’s important for all of us in the room who care deeply about our county and our future to have an opportunity to speak and to share your thoughts and concerns with us as we go forward with our planning process.

The Plan Bay Area process includes local officials like ourselves in each of the communities of the nine Bay Area counties. The idea that we have in Marin County is that our interests are unique to our county, as is the case I think in each of the counties within the region served by MTC and ABAG. Ideally, we will see home grown priorities that emerge from Marin County reflected in the Plan that is adopted.

Tonight, however, is our opportunity to hear from as many of you who wish to speak to the Draft Plan Bay Area, which is out for public review and comment at this time. The Plan Bay Area offers a long-range plan that has a vision for the future of the Bay Area. It respects diversity. It is intended to capture what is unique and wonderful about our region.

The dialogue that has lead us to this evening, we know, has at times even in this room been somewhat tumultuous and uncomfortable. But it’s an important dialogue for us to have. And we are -- really welcome all of you and appreciate you being here tonight.

Because this is a formal process and a formal hearing, we have two court reporters here who will capture your remarks as they are made to make sure that each of the comments is included within the One Bay Area Plan. So there may be a time when you will be asked to clarify or to confirm some language in order for us to be able to have a good record. The way that this will work is if you wish to speak, you’ll fill out a blue card, which we have here. And you will be given three minutes to speak. If we -- This hearing runs until 9:00 p.m. this evening. So if we get a number of more cards from speakers who arrive somewhat later in the evening, as the evening goes on, by 8:30, we will count the number of cards remaining. And if we feel the need to, we will reduce the amount of time per speaker at that point to allow for the maximum number of folks to make their comments.

You are also going to be able to make written comments as well. And if you have a card, and you filled it out, and you want to just pass it to the sides, we will have staff from MTC and ABAG available to take those cards and bring them forward. So at any point in the course of the evening you are going to be able to pass your cards our way.

Also, I think it’s important to make clear that the purpose of this evening’s public hearing is to receive comments. At the same time, we do know that many of you may have questions about the process, or questions about the Plan itself. And you are also welcome to fill out cards with your question, and those will be responded to, as well as presented in the packet to each of us in our regional agencies, as these plans are brought forward to us. We will not be in a position to answer questions during this hearing this evening. Its purpose is to receive comments on the Plan.

At this time I would like to give Mayor Pat Eklund the opportunity to make a few introductory remarks.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much. And before I do my introductory comments, I would like to introduce Supervisor Rice, who does have some opening comments.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Just very quickly -- So I am Katie Rice. I represent District 2 on the Marin Board of Supervisors, and I am sitting here tonight as the county’s representative on the Association of Bay Area Governments. I took over this seat in January. Susan Adams served on ABAG for the prior nine years, ten years. So I want to say welcome to all of you who came out tonight and who have been following this process and this Plan. I think that -- I know tomorrow at our board meeting the county is being recognized — or Marin County is being recognized for having the highest voter turnout in the state of California November, 2012. And I think that the level of participation we are seeing here tonight reflects that same act of citizenship. So I appreciate everyone taking their time.

And as supervisor Kinsey said, this is a public -- a formal public hearing to take and receive comments,
but it's also an opportunity for us, as representatives on these regional boards, to listen and hear what the folks of Marin have to say. So thank you for coming.

MAYOR EKLUND: My name is Pat Eklund, and I am Mayor of the City of Novato. And first of all, I wanted to welcome you all here tonight. The Plan Bay Area and the Draft EIR are huge documents, and there's a lot of information in there. And it's not easy to digest. But we really want to thank you very much for taking the time to really review that because the Plan Bay Area and the EIR have tremendous impact across the Bay Area.

This is our third public meeting in Marin County, and the primary purpose, as Supervisor Kinsey just commented, is to get your comments on the Plan Bay Area, which is Scenario No. 2 that was identified in the Draft EIR. We're really interested in hearing your comments on the proposed Plan; the entire thing or even pieces of it, the specific policies that you especially like or don't like.

This summer, the Board of Directors for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments will be taking action on the Final Environmental Impact Report, which will include a response to comments. We also will be selecting an alternative that was studied in the Draft EIR, or possibly even modifying the preferred alternative, the Plan Bay Area to include suggestions that you may be raising tonight or throughout the public comment period on May 16th.

It's important to note that this is really a work in progress, and that every four years, we are going to be revisiting the Plan Bay Area. And we are going to be looking at the new priorities and the new resources, the new approaches, and see if there needs to be some modifications.

Also, I did want to comment that MTC and ABAG are both public agencies, and they are subject to the Brown Act. So any policies that would be implemented as part of this Plan Bay Area or Environmental Impact Report will be placed on their agenda, and you are encouraged to follow that and to comment on it as it goes through the process over the next four years. Our goal is really to preserve what we love about the Bay Area and especially Marin, and to continue tackling our challenges to maintain our roads and to address our traffic congestion and to preserve our open space and to plan for housing, jobs, and public transit.

All of the comments that we hear tonight, and those that we've heard from previous meetings and from the online comment forum and the telephone survey will be shared with the Board of Directors for both MTC and ABAG.

And as I mentioned, it is anticipated that the final EIR, along with the response for comments, will be on our agenda for June, and the final Plan will be on our agenda for action in July. Really, encourage you -- Feel free to come to both of those meetings, which will be noticed well in advance. You can view the Draft Plan, if you haven't already, online. You can also view the Environmental Impact Report -- the Draft -- even though it is quite large and may take a while to download, being it's almost 1,500 pages. And you can comment online as well. You just have to go to the Web site called www.OneBayArea.org.

And as has been mentioned all along, the public comment period closes on May 16th, at 4:00 p.m. Your comments have to be delivered to MTC or ABAG by 4:00 p.m. on May 16th.

So with that, then, I would like to instruct our court reporters, Cindy and Amber to our left, that the public hearing is now underway. And I am going to ask our first speaker to begin. And our speakers need to go to the microphone, which is set up just above the first level there. And make sure that you identify your name and also your city where you live. And our first speaker -- And we are taking the cards in the order that we receive them -- is Elizabeth Moody. So, Elizabeth, if you could please come to the microphone. And then Steve will be calling the next person who should be getting in line. And be sure to mention your name and your city.

ELIZABETH MOODY: Elizabeth Moody from Mill Valley. In our Marin County, with 60 percent of our workers living in other counties, having longest auto commutes in the Bay Area, and building up greenhouse gases with their travel, I strongly support the One Bay Area Plan. It is essential to integrate housing growth and transportation planning, along with improving our air and protecting our environment. Sustainability gives equal attention to the three E's: Environment, economy, and equity for workers and their families. Essential in our general local welfare, we must meet overlapping regional challenges that One Bay Area Plan does, while in each of our cities and unincorporated county areas, we do maintain full local control in land-use decisions.

The nine Bay Area counties bring extensive overlap in economic development, deployment services, air quality, recreation and more. Reducing auto and truck travel is essential to our present and future. A 2010 chart shows that low-wage, personal service jobs have skyrocketed over the last two decades, workers who commute to jobs in our county, along with many teachers, healthcare, and other essential workers.

While Marin County population grew less than...
five percent in 1995 to 2005, total vehicle miles traveled in Marin increased 25 percent. Diane Steinhouzer, Transportation Authority of Marin, reports that the traffic on the Richmond Bridge increased fivefold between 1995 and 2005. The average wage in the Marin-based job in 2008 was $7,000 a year, while meeting income of single family households in Marin was $87,750.

We need to be regionally involved and integrate planning in order to eliminate disparities and improve both our environment and family living. By laying out the Bay Area's first ever sustainable strategy, One Bay Area Plan is meeting those regional challenges and still maintaining local control in our land-use decisions. Counties must work together on all issues that effect us and overlap our economic development, climate change, sea level rise, natural disasters, affordable housing, and family jobs, and transportation. There are many critical components that must be integrated in successful planning for all of our nine counties.

I strongly support this effort, along with other members of Mill Valley Affordable Housing Committee that I chair.

Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Ms. Moody. Please, no clapping. Thank you very much. We want to make sure we hear everybody through.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: We are going to ask folks -- in some settings we say you are welcome to show your support with your hands, but not by making noises. We appreciate that.

We are going to invite up Bill Carney, who will be followed by Andrew Allen. Thank you. Bill? Do we have Mr. Carney? If not, we will move to Mr. Allen. Andrew Allen, please. He will be followed by Ronnie Teyssier.

ANDREW ALLEN: Hi. I'm Andrew Allen. I live in unincorporated Mill Valley, actually Tamalpais Valley. I have lived there for 54 years. I have watched traffic get worse and worse. I'm sure the people who want this new Bay Area Plan have warm feelings in their heart that they think they are doing the right thing, but I don't think so. I think growth needs to slow down. We had moratoriums on water hookups 30 years ago. We haven't come up with any more water storage facilities. We are talking about desalination. We certainly don't need that.

I think when an area has reached maximum saturation to where you have traffic jams in the morning, traffic jams in the evening, worse traffic jams on the weekends, and then summer weekends are almost impossible to get in and out of Tam Valley. I think that we don't need to put a whole bunch of people in little boxes and get a warm, fuzzy feeling that we've done the right thing.

I think if we are going to make giant changes in plans that we better think long and hard about it before we do something we can't reverse.

Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

ANDREW ALLEN: I'll yield any leftover time to Ronnie, the next person speaking.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: We don't do that, but thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: This is Ronnie?

RONNIE TEYSSIER: Yes. Hi. I am Ronnie Teyssier. I am a resident of Tamalpais Valley. I will be short and succinct.

There are a lot of people who want to have their voices heard tonight. But I urge you to remove TamAlmonte from the Highway 101 Corridor Priority Development of the Bay Area. Mandating development as planned will cause irrevocable damage to the environment. And it will also subject the most vulnerable of our citizens to extreme environmental impacts, such as sea level rise, water deficit, toxic air contaminants, unacceptable traffic congestion. Again, please. I really urge you to remove TamAlmonte from the Highway 101 Corridor Priority Development of the Bay Area.

Thank you much.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Craig Thomas Yates.

MAYOR EKLUND: And after Craig is Jesse Shepherd.

Craig, be sure to identify your name and your city, please.

CRAIG THOMAS YATES: Yes. Craig Thomas Yates, City of San Rafael. I believe that the TODs that are going to be developed for this development should be a hundred percent accessible. And the fact that it's also the wetlands should be taken into consideration for the conditions that are expressed in the Draft EIR.

And thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Great. Thank you.

And if Jesse Shepherd could you please come forward and state your name and your city. Is Jesse here?

JESSE SHEPHERD: Yes.

MAYOR EKLUND: Jesse, there's a microphone up at the top of the first level.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Jesse will be followed by Ericka Erickson. So if Ericka could get close to the microphone, it'll help us. Thank you.
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ERICKA ERICKSON: So my name is Ericka Erickson, followed by Cathy Cortez.

Ericka, I'm a member of Marin Action Coalition for Equity and The National Low Income Housing Coalition. I am from Tiburon, California, and I support Equity, Environment, and Jobs. Marin County needs affordable housing. There have been opponents of the regional housing needs allocation and the Plan Bay Area, and I want to urge you and all the decision makers to support this scenario and the aspect of it is regarding climate change. We know that this scenario will result in the greatest reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. That's the primary goal of Senate Bill 375. It will create the strongest shift from cars to transit, walking, biking, and other alternative means of transportation.

We will keep a hundred percent of the new development; would keep the current urban footprint; and allocate 12 fewer residents living in homes that we will be at risk of flooding sea level rise by 2050. I know that a lot of people in Marin County -- We are all concerned about sea level rising. So that option of the Plan will be the best to address sea level rising. The 30,000 fewer residents will be subject to sea level flooding by 2050, if we adopt that option.

So I want you to urge all the decision makers to really consider the strongest aspects of this scenario in the Final Plan Bay Area.

Thank you.

CATHY CORTEZ: My name is Cathy Cortez. I'm a resident of Santa Rosa. And I am here affiliated with Marin Grassroots. And I'm here actually tonight because I support the EEJ -- That's the Environment, Equity and Jobs initiative because compared to other services, it pretty much invests an additional 8 billion dollars in increased transit service, which would be tailored to fit our more equitable housing distribution plan.

One of the things that concerns me is that I've been a transit user for -- a public transit user for my entire life. I grew up in Marin; lived in Strawberry for the first 20 years of my life. And the problem is, we don't have adequate public transportation serviced by Marin Transit, serviced by Golden Gate Transit, at night. We have pedestrians that can't get to and from the canal have service jobs at Larkspur Landing, who have to walk under dangerous walkways. And we have people that can't get home.

I know personally I have had to spend probably hundreds -- maybe as much as a thousand dollars in the last two or three years just on cab fare to get home because, well, there were no public transit routes running at 11 o'clock, maybe 10:30 -- 11 o'clock, 12 o'clock at night that were adequate. And it is really important for somebody like me because I'm legally blind in one eye.

So I depend on accurate, solid, firm public transit. And I feel that we need more of that in Marin County. So if that means that Marin Transit has to help, you know, get more funding for that, then we need to work on that. And that's hopefully what I hope that you guys would take into consideration.

Thank you.
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MAYOR EKLUND: Cathy Cortez. Please come forward and state your name and city. After Cathy is Lois Riddick.

LOIS RIDDICK: I'm Lois Riddick, a member of Marin Grassroots, and I live in San Rafael. And I am -- I am affiliated with Marin Grassroots. And I am also a County Planning Commissioner. I would like to ask everybody that's here to support the Equity, Environmental Jobs scenario of the Plan Bay Area to please raise their hands. Basically for the ones that don't know, the environment and jobs -- environmental -- Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario was proposed by a network of health -- public health, affordable housing, and other grassroots groups back in 2011, when this Plan Bay Area was being proposed. And basically this scenario, it was considered the environmentally superior scenario from all the scenarios proposed during this process. And basically the -- by adopting the strongest aspects of this environmental -- Equity, Environment, and Jobs scenario in the Plan -- the Final Plan Bay Area, it would support transit operating budgets by about -- increased by about 5 percent. As we heard from Jesse, it is very needed.

And also have more incentives for affordable housing. I am -- as we know, we have a great need for affordable housing and also diversity of options of housing in Marin and the Bay Area. And that would support -- This option would support that.

So -- But my main -- biggest concern, in terms of the Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario and the Plan Bay Area, and I want to urge you and all the decision makers to support this scenario and the aspect of it is regarding climate change. We know that this scenario will result in the greatest reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. That's the primary goal of Senate Bill 375. It will create the strongest shift from cars to transit, walking, biking, and other alternative means of transportation.

We will keep a hundred percent of the new development; would keep the current urban footprint; and allocate 12 fewer residents living in homes that we will be at risk of flooding sea level rise by 2050. I know that a lot of people in Marin County -- We are all concerned about sea level rising. So that option of the Plan will be the best to address sea level rising. The 30,000 fewer residents will be subject to sea level flooding by 2050, if we adopt that option.

So I want you to urge all the decision makers to really consider the strongest aspects of this scenario in the Final Plan Bay Area.

Thank you.

JESSIE SHEPHERD: Okay. Well, good evening, Board of Supervisors. My name is Jesse Shepherd. I am a resident of Santa Rosa. And I am here affiliated with Transportation Equity with Marin Grassroots. And I'm here actually tonight because I support the EEJ -- That's the Environment, Equity and Jobs initiative because compared to other services, it pretty much invests an additional 8 billion dollars in increased transit service, which would be tailored to fit our more equitable housing distribution plan.

One of the things that concerns me is that I've been a transit user for -- a public transit user for my entire life. I grew up in Marin; lived in Strawberry for the first 20 years of my life. And the problem is, we don't have adequate public transportation serviced by Marin Transit, serviced by Golden Gate Transit, at night. We have pedestrians that can't get to and from the canal have service jobs at Larkspur Landing, who have to walk under dangerous walkways. And we have people that can't get home.

I know personally I have had to spend probably hundreds -- maybe as much as a thousand dollars in the last two or three years just on cab fare to get home because, well, there were not public transit routes running at 11 o'clock, maybe 10:30 -- 11 o'clock, 12 o'clock at night that were adequate. And it is really important for somebody like me because I'm legally blind in one eye.

So I depend on accurate, solid, firm public transit. And I feel that we need more of that in Marin County. So if that means that Marin Transit has to help, you know, get more funding for that, then we need to work on that. And that's hopefully what I hope that you guys would take into consideration.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

ERICKA ERICKSON: So my name is Ericka Erickson, and I live in San Rafael. And I am -- I am affiliated with Marin Grassroots. I am also a County Planning Commissioner. I would like to ask everybody that's here to support the Equity, Environmental Jobs scenario of the Plan Bay Area to please raise their hands. Basically for the ones that don't know, the environment and jobs -- environmental -- Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario was proposed by a network of health -- public health, affordable housing, and other grassroots groups back in 2011, when this Plan Bay Area was being proposed. And basically this scenario, it was considered the environmentally superior scenario from all the scenarios proposed during this process. And basically the -- by adopting the strongest aspects of this environmental -- Equity, Environment, and Jobs scenario in the Plan -- the Final Plan Bay Area, it would support transit operating budgets by about -- increased by about 5 percent. As we heard from Jesse, it is very needed.

And also have more incentives for affordable housing. I am -- as we know, we have a great need for affordable housing and also diversity of options of housing in Marin and the Bay Area. And that would support -- This option would support that.

So -- But my main -- biggest concern, in terms of the Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario and the Plan Bay Area, and I want to urge you and all the decision makers to support this scenario and the aspect of it is regarding climate change. We know that this scenario will result in the greatest reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. That's the primary goal of Senate Bill 375. It will create the strongest shift from cars to transit, walking, biking, and other alternative means of transportation.

We will keep a hundred percent of the new development; would keep the current urban footprint; and allocate 12 fewer residents living in homes that we will be at risk of flooding sea level rise by 2050. I know that a lot of people in Marin County -- We are all concerned about sea level rising. So that option of the Plan will be the best to address sea level rising. The 30,000 fewer residents will be subject to sea level flooding by 2050, if we adopt that option.

So I want you to urge all the decision makers to really consider the strongest aspects of this scenario in the Final Plan Bay Area.

Thank you.
And even then it was only open for a one-week period of time. Marin needs affordable housing with or without population growth. The need is very real as it stands today. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you.

Lois Riddick, and then Linda Rames, please.

LOIS RIDDICK: Good evening. My name is Lois Riddick, and I'm -- I live in Marin City -- A Marin City resident, of course. And I've been advocating for Marin City, as well as throughout the county. And my concern is that -- I do support the Equity, Environment and Jobs scenario. It invests an additional 8 billion in increased transit service. And why transit service is so important to me personally, and to many people that make contact with me by e-mail or in person, I find that there are hillsides that are not accessible through the transit services. And I've been going to meetings. I've been writing letters and been advocating as a part of the housing and transportation committee, also serving as a commissioner on the Division on Aging. And so it is important that we look at the bigger picture. And I depend totally on transportation. I am disabled, and I am a senior. So I am coming from two points.

I want you to consider that there is -- is that you see this commercial on TV; less and more. We need more transportation for seniors. We need this transportation because it allows the seniors across the county that are lonely to get more involved. There are seniors that are still volunteering. There are seniors that are getting older; perhaps would like to stop driving. But if we don't have the services accessible to those seniors, they will not be able to have their lives fulfilled in the way that is needed.

Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

Linda Rames will be followed by Margaret Segart.

LINDA RAMES: Good evening. I am Linda Rames, and I am actually here to comment on the Draft EIR. It is full of inaccuracies and inadequacies. The most striking thing about it, however, is the total disregard for the residents of Marin now and those to come. One document -- Excuse me. This document has no problem building on floodplains, and there are no answers or mitigation for that. It has no problem with the lack of water. The only mitigation for that is conservation; something Marin County is very good at already. In fact, we are famous for it.

The police, fire, and schools that will have to be built -- They will have to be built, but they don't give you any idea how that will happen; who is going to pay for it. Things like that. These are just a couple of examples of a failed document, which also makes false predictions of population growth and employment opportunities in the future.

In addition, there is no distinction between planned and potential development areas. They should clearly be spelled out in the Plan.

Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

Margaret Segart. And then following Margaret is Vinh Luu.

Is Margaret Segart here?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She left.

MAYOR EKLUND: She left? Okay. Great. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Vinh Luu. And following Vinh will be Lawrence Kaplan.

VINH LUU: Hello. Don't worry, Supervisor. I am the only one talking, but they will come up here. I want you to take a good look of your neighbor. My name is Vinh Luu. I've been living in Novato for 25 year.

YU GON PHAM: My name is Yu Gon Pham (phonetic.) I have been living in San Rafael for 42 years.

So many years after that, today we hearing the war ended, we rushed over here. So we have given the opportunity to have a place to live, a place to work, and a place to raise our family.

So many years after that, today we hearing the ABAG come up with Plan that we totally support that because that's the Plan that we would like passed on, those opportunity to our next generation, to our fellow citizen, who is struggling to have affordable housing in Marin County; live and work in Marin County. And after...
I feel that equity, environment, jobs, schools, of life, the quality of air, and the quality of living.

I am concerned about water, the quality

I am a resident of Tam Valley. I am concerned about the

Moreover, if indeed high-density housing is encouraged and allowed in Tam Valley, and if this decision is based, even in part, on faulty population and bootstrap-strapping job projections, then most certainly ABAG and MTC will suffer the indignity and embarrassment of

All, fair housing and affordable housing is a human right issue.

Thank you for your attention.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Lawrence Kaplan.

LAWRENCE KAPLAN: Hello. My name is Lawrence Kaplan. I live in Tamalpais Valley, which at the moment, sits within the Highway 101 Corridor Priority Development Area. As I am sure you are aware, there is a mounting firestorm of community opposition to this situation. And for good and powerful reasons, I ask that you consider and act on the following two requests: First, please consult with all of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and become advocates for the removal of Tam Valley and El Monte from the Highway 101 Corridor PDA. It makes no sense to increase density in a semi-rural neighborhood that suffers regularly from terrible traffic and flooding.

If you cause even more traffic to sit in gridlock at and near Tam Junction, you will ironically increase greenhouse gases, which would be directly contrary to the meaning, spirit, and intent of current laws.

Moreover, if indeed high-density housing is permitted in Tam Valley, it would simply not interest.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. As we mentioned, this Plan, and the fact that we are talking about the extraordinary notion of making plans for the next 25 years, a relatively brief extension of time would allow for broad consensus-building, and the opportunity for many more in the county to be heard. These two accommodations could profoundly improve the quality of decision making and the fairness of the process for which ABAG and MTC hold so much responsibility.

Thank you for your wise consideration.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. As we mentioned, we would ask that you not choose to support folks with clapping, but we will take our next speaker, Luke Teyssier, and he will be followed by Peter Hensel.

LUKE TEYSSIER: My name is Luke Teyssier. I am a resident of Tam Valley. I am concerned about the environment, the community, the place we live. I have small children. I am concerned about water, the quality of life, the quality of air, and the quality of living.

I feel that equity, environment, jobs, schools, housing, and a clean, safe place to live for everyone is extremely important, which is why I urge you, urgently, to remove us -- Marin County -- from Plan Bay Area. I urge you to remove us from the Priority Development Area. I urge you to forbid ABAG and MTC to exert control in our community.

I would like to remind you -- to say it plainly -- I am opposed to Plan Bay Area. However, if you insist, I support the "no-action plan." Let us have local control over our community. We've done a pretty good job in our communities for the last 50 to 100 years of planning what needs to be done, which is why people want to live here. Let us have that local control.

Now, I've heard advocates say, "Let's have ABAG because there will be all this money." Where does the money come from? It comes from us. What happens? The money goes to a big organization over there. They take their cut. They have their offices. They have their bureaucracy. They have their big show-and-tell sessions. Has anybody ever seen a Jimmy Stewart movie, the western, where the big fancy suits from New York come in, and Jimmy Stewart sits there and says, "Now just wait a minute. Wait a minute. I know that's not right"? Every single time I have a meeting that involves ABAG, I have the same sense.

Supervisor Kinsey, during the Citizen Marin Meeting, I noticed that you showed up in time for the news cameras, sided with the folks in favor of Plan Bay Area, and then removed yourself before the discussion happened inside. I submit that this is extremely problematic for two different reasons: The first one is, it appears to the casual observer that you have already made a decision, regardless of community input. Secondly --

(Audience outburst.)

LUKE TEYSSIER: Secondly, sir, I submit that by refusing, after you were invited cordially and multiple times by multiple people to enter and remain in the meeting, I submit, sir, that you have had many opportunities to receive local community input and were simply not interested.

MAYOR EKLUND: Luke, that completes your three minutes. Thank you very much for your comments.

LUKE TEYSSIER: Thank you.

(Audience outbursts.)

MAYOR EKLUND: I know clapping is a lot of fun, but please just wave your hands instead of clapping.

Peter Hensel. And following Peter is Linda Pfeifer.

PETER HENSEL: Peter Hensel, from Corte Madera. I am very interested in water. Where are the water for.
Plan Bay Area represents the single largest plan which I consider flawed -- for community outreach. I like to comment on the Draft EIR and the process of --

LINDA PFEIFER: Hello. My name is Linda And then following Linda is Angela Gott.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you. Linda Pfeifer.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

PETER HENSEL: Okay. But one thing I want to say is that we shouldn't be banking on paper water.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you. Linda Pfeifer. And then following Linda is Angela Gott.

LINDA PFEIFER: Hello. My name is Linda Pfeifer. I'm on the Sausalito City Council, and I would like to comment on the Draft EIR and the process of -- which I consider flawed -- for community outreach.

Plan Bay Area represents the single largest plan for high-density development perhaps in the history of Marin, and yet most residents know nothing about it. The lack of transparency for Plan Bay Area has, in my opinion, been pretty abysmal. Many questions exist regarding high-density development plans in so many gray areas that I am not sure whether to call this Plan Bay Area or Plan Gray Area. Gray areas exist regarding sufficient water supply; the lack of a water assessment plan; endangered, threatened species' habitat, air quality, and traffic congestion.

California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15065(a1) states that a project will have a significant effect on the environment if it substantially reduces the number or restricts the range of endangered, rare, or threatened species.

One Priority Development Areas borders the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and in the middle of the Pacific fly-away where hundreds of migratory bird species, home to 38 rare or special status plant species; nine federally endangered, one federally threatened, 13 federal species of concerns. It is the home of the endangered Mission blue butterfly, and California red-legged frog. Other PDAs are in environmentally sensitive areas prone to rising sea levels, in the middle of fragile marsh and wetlands ecosystems or landfill.

I recently read something that the farmers in the Central Valley this year will be getting 20 percent of their contract water supply on account of a low snow pack in the Sierras. I think in the three months from January to March, we got 52 percent of what we normally get. I mean, this is very serious stuff. And so there's a saying in the water industry -- it's kind of an ironic saying.

They use this term, "paper water." What it means is, water that is planned for that may belong to somebody else in the system, or that may be coming according to future planning, some hoops that people are going to jump through --

MAYOR EKLUND: Peter Hensel, I'm sorry, but your three minutes are up. Thank you very much. If you can submit your comments by May 16th, that would be wonderful.

PETER HENSEL: Okay. But one thing I want to say is that we shouldn't be banking on paper water.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you. Linda Pfeifer. And then following Linda is Angela Gott.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much. Thank you.

JAMES BENNETT: My name is James Bennett. I am a property owner, business owner, and as of the last eight years here, I find myself being a prolific activist. This is not about affordable housing or social equity. This is about good old-fashioned oppression with all of its earmarks. UN globalists that are behind this Plan — and we can connect the dots — come see us afterwards. We are glad to do it.

If you are an oppressor, you don't want the people spread out across the landscape of abundant means with gardens driving around with free transit — freedom of transportation. That's like herding cats. You want them contained where they can be surveilled and controlled. This Plan will, as designed, crash — thoroughly crash the economy of the Bay Area and molest the property rights of all — all of its occupants. All will be caught in this oppressive web of manipulation one way or another.

After eight years here, I'm starting — after studying Agenda 21 for eight years, I'm starting to learn how it works. Aside from employing a soviet model of governance, which includes regionalism and the empowerment of unelected boards and commissions, through a — permeating our government and manipulation of our
MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much, Mr. Stephens. I appreciate that.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR BUNDY: Bob Bundy, Corte Madera. I am on the Corte Madera Flood Board. And we've spent a lot of time locally dealing with our infrastructure and the ability to be more resilient and withstand flooding, heavy rainfall, and high tides.

One of the concerns that I've got is that the Plan doesn't really take into consideration sea level rise. And while I applaud the goals of trying to reduce co2 because that's what's driving climate change and sea level rise, we really need to look at how this is going to impact some of these development areas and some of the infrastructure, as far as the roads and transportation.

The development is going to have to be hardened and protected in a way to prevent sea level rise from impacting it, and also to not create an island where the highways or transportation corridors are not going to allow anybody to get to those islands. FEMA is about to come out with new flood maps, and even FEMA is not really taking into consideration sea level rise in its full extent.

So I think that that -- I know it's being thought about in relationship to the Plan, but I think it really needs to be addressed to a much greater extent to really look at what the total cost of some of these would be, and whether some of the locations for priority development really make sense.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you.

Liz Specht, followed by Joe Faimali.

(Audience outburst.)

MAYOR EKLUND: Excuse me. Liz is about ready to speak.

Go ahead, Liz. Thank you.

(Audience outburst.)

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Be happy to. Be happy to.

Thank you.

LIZ SPECHT: I am Liz Specht. I've lived in Mill Valley for 37 years. 23 years ago, I co-founded a non-profit, El Porvenir.
which works with people in Nicaragua to put in clean water projects. It's the water that I'm concerned about.

Even now, MMWD is asking us to conserve. If there are thousands and thousands more people living in our county, we're really going to have to think: Where does the water come from to give everybody who is thirsty a drink of cold water? We're going to have the problem that Nicaragua has. And if you're thinking that desal is the answer, think again because that would be counterproductive.

Greenhouse gases are what we're trying to diminish by this Plan, but what's going to happen if there is a desal plan? It's going to add even more greenhouse gases to our air, and all of us are going to be enclosed in an even hotter bubble than we are now.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

So Joe Faimali, then John Palmer. We'll add some more names. Susan Kirsch behind that, and Guy Meyer.

Thank you.

JOE FAIMALI: Hi. I'm Joe Faimali. I live in San Rafael. I've been living in Marin County for 30 years, and I really know very little about this Plan and the pros and cons related to it. By my observation, a lot of taxpayer money has been spent on the development of the Plan, on staff, consultants, brochures, all those storyboards out there. And I have a question, if this is the best use of taxpayer money in a very, very hard economic time.

I also need to understand a relationship between jobs and housing that is being assumed, and if there is any real support for these assumptions. It appears that there may be some of these key assumptions that support the building of additional high-density housing in Marin. Other than West Marin, this county is fairly densely populated. I don't see this county needing any additional high-density housing.

Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Great.

John Palmer, Susan Kirsch, Guy Meyer, and then Richard Hall.

JOHN PALMER: Yes. Hi. John Palmer from Mill Valley. A couple of things. First of all, I agree with the speaker who came and said this is happening way too quickly. I'm not going to repeat what he said. I am just going to say, he is absolutely right. This is happening way too quickly. Not enough people are aware of it. Not enough people are aware of the implications of it. We really need to take the time to do it right.

The second thing is that a lot of Plan Bay Area is based on what I would call untested or unchallenged precepts. For example, the concept that high-density housing along an urban corridor will reduce greenhouse gases, that's just taken as a given. There's many, many, many similar precepts in this Plan which are really unchallenged. And I would like to see a really thoughtful challenge come forward. For example, that one, that high-density housing along transportation corridors will reduce greenhouse gas. It is obvious to all of us who live here, that if the transportation corridors become more clogged, it will have the exact opposite effect of not decreasing greenhouse gases, but increasing them. If you really want to decrease greenhouse gases, the simplest possible way to do it is to increase public transit.

I have a lot of sympathy for the people who stood up here and said they can't get around, they can't get through the canal, they can't get to their jobs.

Every time we turn around, they're cutting, you know, public transit.

So if you guys really care about decreasing greenhouse gases, then you should lobby very hard for increased public transit. That benefits everyone.

And the only thing -- other thing I would like to say is that when the Plan Bay Area came out, there was an article in the Wall Street Journal. It was very telling; that what the Wall Street Journal said -- The headline of the article was, "California Declares War on the Suburbs." There's a lot of people here who believe that; that this is a centrally-planned, non-particularly -- not particularly well-thought-out way for people who have an entirely different set of benefits to be gained from it imposed on smaller communities that really don't have the power to resist. And I think that if you really take the time to get this right, you'll find that there is a way to empower the small communities to build more housing in a way that won't increase greenhouse gases.

Thank you.


SUSAN KIRSH: Susan Kirsch; a 34-year resident of Mill Valley. So I would like to underscore too the theme that many speakers are bringing forward to say -- to recommend that you give this process more time, and that it seems to call for at least a six-month extension to be able to give people a chance to be informed and educated and thoughtful about this process.

A part of what seems to be a -- just a terrible inadequacy of what's gone on so far is the fact that there's been such a lack of transparency. And with appreciation for the three of you, who will be voting on the ABAG, MTC executive committee, I would guess that...
achieving equitable access. ABAG/MTC's own conclusion says actually diminishes affordable housing. If you look on Plan -- that this Plan, on the point of equitable access, but I want to point out -- because I've read much of this where we live, and the people who want affordable housing, all of us who wish our children could live in this county mak, and that's in regard to the point of this Plan around equitable access. And with great appreciation for all of us who wish our children could live in this county where we live, and the people who want affordable housing, but I want to point out -- because I've read much of this Plan -- that this Plan, on the point of equitable access, actually diminishes affordable housing. If you look on Page 108 of the Plan, you will read that instead of achieving equitable access, ABAG/MTC's own conclusion says the Plan moves in the wrong direction. So whereas, HUD already determines that if you are spending more than 30 percent of your income on housing, you will be cost-burdened regarding healthcare and food and transportation. This Plan by their own account will require low and lower middle income residents to use 69 percent of their household income on housing and transportation.

So I encourage you to extend the deadline; that we work on this to get it right to really have something of social equity in a plan that we all have to live with for the next 25 years.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Guy Meyer will be followed by Richard Hall, Kay Tokerud -- Tokerud, and Sue Beittel.

GUY MEYER: Hello. I am Guy Meyer. I'm a resident of San Rafael and of Marin County for the last 38 years. Sustainability starts in the present with existing communities, and I believe that sustainability is completely entwined with the essence of what democracy is. If you want to build a sustainable civilization from the ground, the people have to be completely connected to the process of decision making that affects them. Increasing density, increasing population, gradually -- and I'm old enough to see it. Maybe some young people haven't seen it...
and it is actually more likely to increase CO2 emissions. It's also likely to contribute to 101 gridlock, serves a subsidization program for transit and housing that will needlessly tax Marin residents. Plan Bay Area claims it will reduce the region's greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent. But the Plan itself admits that if nothing is done, emissions would actually fall by 12 percent. So even if its assumptions are valid, the Plan only makes a difference of three percent. But the Plan is built on three highly-questionable assumptions; that high-density housing will lead people to drive less and take transit more; that transit emits less CO2 per passenger mile than driving; that reducing greenhouse gas emissions is worthwhile no matter what the cost. The core premise is that high-density housing will increase ridership, but Portland has tried this. For 25 years, Portland has had one of the most aggressive transit-oriented development policies, and it has failed. The Cascade Policy Institute up there has found that people living in four and five-story transit-oriented developments built in that city are no more likely to take transit to work than people living elsewhere. In downtown Portland, during the most intense investment in MAX, their light rail, the share of weekday commuting on transit actually fell from 40 percent of trips to 36 percent during the past decade, according to the city's own auditor. So we are repeating past historic mistakes here. Why are we repeating them? There's no need for this. You should just look at Portland's failure. Plan Bay Area rewards the construction of high-density housing units near transit, such as right here in north San Rafael Civic Center SMART station. This is going to inundate roads and intersections that are already at capacity with added traffic, and yet have no measurable increase in transit ridership. It did not work. They do not take more transit.

The second premise, that transit emits less CO2 per passenger mile than driving, also fails to stand up to scrutiny. Trains in Austin, San Diego, and other cities are like our SMART train. SMART has not reduced its -- released its CO2 figures publicly. So if we base it on those similar trains, the average per passenger mile of a train like the SMART train will be no better than the average car in 2025. Golden Gate Ferry is three times worse than cars, and Marin and Sonoma County buses are as bad or worse than cars. So this is built on bad premises; bad logic.

Plan Bay Area violates voter-approved urban growth boundary ordinances because the Priority Development Areas are within the urban growth boundaries but are much smaller, restricted areas. They are in violation of ordinances that clearly state that development must be encouraged out to the limits of city services. Urban Growth Boundaries. These ordinances are found throughout the Bay Area and cannot be changed without voter approval.

Plan Bay Area will result in lower property tax revenues in areas outside of the Priority Development Areas. This will result in loss of services, roads, police, schools, maintenance of government. This Plan self-describes as being a bold plan, an aggressive plan. And I looked up the definition of "aggressive": Characterized by or tending toward unprovoked offenses, attacks, invasions, or the like; inclined to behave in an actively hostile fashion; pursuing one's aims and interests forcefully, sometimes unduly so.

So you've called it that yourself. And what you're doing is, basically in the rural areas, you're taking conservation easements on all land without paying a penny for it. Land trusts pay millions of dollars to buy conservation easements at this time. This Plan is asking...
1 every county to deny all property development outside of the urban growth areas without paying anything for that. So you are really stealing here, and this -- also, I just, you know, want to reiterate that this Plan does follow exactly the UN Agenda 21 model.

2 Thank you.

3 SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. So, you know, I've mentioned about the clapping. I am going to obviously concede that you are not going to pay attention, but our hearing will be ending at 9 o'clock.

4 Sue Beittel will be followed by council member George Barich. And then we'll begin the two minutes.

5 Martha Vega and Barbara Patton will follow.

6 SUE BEITTEL: Sue Beittel. I'm a resident of San Rafael, and I am representing the League of Women Voters of Marin County tonight. We have written and had approved by our Board a rather long statement, and I am going to highlight some of the items in that statement.

7 Our response to Plan Bay Area: The importance of regional outlook and long-range planning. Since the 1960s, the League of Women Voters has supported the idea of communities around the Bay Area examining together the need for clean air and water, environmental and agricultural protection, transit infrastructure, and a range of housing appropriate for all segments of the community. All of these issues impact everyone in the Bay Area. There are no boundaries. So a plan to approach these issues in a collective way is imperative. Plan Bay Area represents an opportunity to fulfill that need.

8 Plan Bay Area does not introduce concepts that are foreign to planning in Marin County. In 2007, the Marin County General Plan focused on sustainability, including many of the same issues and future visioning as Plan Bay Area. It needs to be remembered that Plan Bay Area provides a general context for local planning.

9 Land-use planning, including housing and commercial uses, continues to be the responsibility of each jurisdiction. The Plan does not take away that mandated local decision making, but places it in the context of the future of our interconnected counties.

10 And then a few more points: Climate change response requires transportation and land-use discussions. All possible tools to address climate change need to be part of planning.

11 Open space and agricultural preservation: The League supports the inclusion of careful preservation of open space and agriculture around the Bay Area. Equity access is a priority for any future visioning. There is a high need for rental housing. When planning for housing in Marin County, the highest priority is for a range of rental housing. Our less than 1 percent vacancy rate promotes very high rents and a hardship for many families and seniors. We have within our midst outstanding examples of attractive, affordable in-fill rental housing complexes built by nonprofits as permanently affordable and accessible to transit. And then we have some areas that we think need improvement.

12 MAYOR EKLUND: Sue, your three minutes are up. SUE BEITTEL: Okay.

13 MAYOR EKLUND: I suggest you send that in writing. And thank you very much for your comments.

14 Councilman George Barich. And then starting the two-minute limit is Martha Vega, Barbara Patton, and then Michelle Belfor.

15 COUNCILMAN GEORGE BARICH: Good evening. By requiring the speakers to use a speaker card, you've violated the Brown Act, and you all know that. You well know that.

16 I oppose this Plan -- this One Bay Area Plan. I went to school in Marin. I studied government in San Francisco. I studied the law. I have property interests in Marin. I am a former city council member in the City of Cotati. This Plan is blatantly unsustainable. 300 billion dollars over 25 years is obscene. The propensity for fraud, waste, and abuse is almost unimaginable.
not going to go pick up my dry cleaning. I am not going
to take my dog to the vet on my bicycle in bad weather.
Okay? I'm not going to take a day off work either.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you.
Martha Vega, Barbara -- followed by Barbara
Patton, Michelle Belfor, and then Alan Scotch.

MARTHA VEGA: (Through an Interpreter.) Hi.
This is Martha Vega, and she represents the families in
San Rafael of low income. And I'll be translating.

First of all, I'd like to say, I believe in
affordable housing. She also believes in the equality of
all people, and that we all deserve to live in an
environment of safety and health.

Where I live, there are families that live in
houses, and it's completely crowded where they have
kitchens where maybe only two people can fit in. And
there is many people living in one room because these
apartments cost about 1,600- to $1,800, and the deposit is
double this. This is paid with the salary of about three
jobs.

Marin County one day will not be what it is --
what it was 20 years ago. If you don't believe it, you
should ask yourself why there are stores that sell
products for about a dollar. Salaries are not large

Barbara Patton: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Barbara Patton, Michelle Belfor, Alan Scotch,
and Elizabeth Manning.

BARBARA PATTON: My name is Barbara Patton, and
I live in Tiburon. I am a native Californian, and I've
lived in Marin County almost 45 years. I have two
comments to make, and each comment will be followed by a
rhetorical question for you.

Plan Bay Area is very similar to a concept used
by Paulo Freire, an Italian communist, please, who was a
planner and architect working in Arizona in the 1960s. I
happened to have worked and volunteered for him for a
summer when I was in college. I went into that program
not knowing what his theory or the concept was that he was
promoting. Now, I do. I learned very quickly what he was
up to. He was a control freak who did not listen to
anyone.

So even though you are having these public
meetings to listen to people, my rhetorical question is:
Are you really listening, or have you already made up your
minds about Plan Bay Area?

My next comment is -- Well, actually, it is
going to start with a question and then end with a

rhetorical question. Why is the United Nations behind
this Plan? I'd like to see an answer to that question
published in your papers and published in the I and the
Chronicle and every local newspaper; a clear, concise,
to-the-point answer to that question.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. Thank you.

BARBARA PATTON: We are a self-governing
republic, and we are -- have not been given the
opportunity to even think or vote on this topic. It is
shocking.

MAYOR EKLUND: Barbara, thank you very much for
your comments. Your three minutes are up.

BARBARA PATTON: You're welcome.

MAYOR EKLUND: Michelle Belfor, Alan Scotch,
Elizabeth Manning, and then Alexandra Deist-Wong.

MICHELLE BELFOR: I have a question for you:

Why is it that Susan Adams worked on this for
nine-and-a-half years, and we just found out about it four
years ago?

Also, a lot of you are aware, I'm sure, that One
Bay Area -- Plan Bay Area, MTC, ICKLY (phonetic) MTC and
SMART are all the same company. Their base is in Oakland.
What bothers me is that you're making decisions for us.
We are supposed to be the voters. We are supposed to have
a say in this. And you have infiltrated every city
MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Michelle, for your comments.

MICHELLE BELFOR: Give us six more months --

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you.

MICHELLE BELFOR: -- because we are going to give you six more months.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Alan Scotch, followed by

Elizabeth Manning, Alexandra Deist-Wong. And then Toni Shroyer.

ALAN SCOTCH: Good evening. I am Alan Scotch from San Rafael, and I'm here to tell you that Plan Bay Area will not work for a realistic long-term future, when everybody will have solar panels and a wind turbine on its roof, as every single family home will be generating more electricity than consumed. Charging the electric car every night. And that's right. Everyone will have an electric car. Home installation will become irrelevant. Solar panels and a wind turbine on the roof of a multi-family apartment building can never be enough to meet the needs of the multi-families below, and will not be energy cost efficient. But single family houses will be net energy producers.

Also in the future will be local waste recycling and water capture and re-use; not necessarily too distant -- in the too distant future. Water will be stored and re-processed for re-use and more. Human waste will even be locally processed and put back into the ground. Remember, with excess renewable energy, all things are possible. This will happen. This is yet another reason why the single family detached home with a garden is the way of the future for carbon sequestration and water recycling and storage, as well as energy efficiency.

Bottom line, the Plan Bay Area will be -- will relatively increase greenhouse gases; not decrease it, totally negating the whole purpose of Plan Bay Area.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. Thank you.

Elizabeth Manning, followed by Alexandra Deist-Wong, Toni Shroyer, and Paul Gusciora.

ELIZABETH MANNING: Elizabeth Manning, Marin resident. After having attended Plan Bay Area meetings in all nine counties, I know the majority of the public comments oppose it. It's not just that our small towns will lose their individual character to the bland uniformity of regionalism, this Plan will eventually deny new homeowners the choice of traditional housing, gradually forcing most residents into high-density living conditions in the interest of social justice, or what you call "social justice." The historical problem with the social welfare is that it slowly cripples the spirit as it extinguishes the joys of accomplishment in an individual's pursuit of happiness.

Before the March 20th Citizen Marin Meeting commenced, it was used by political bureaucrats to add their tired dirty tricks before it -- outside this happened. I am a UC Berkeley-trained social worker who has worked in the Bay Area for 40 years. I mention this to underscore my admonition to Mr. Kinsey and others who attempt to use the cheap tactics of racism and apartheid to distract or intimidate the less informed. It's likely -- It's likely that because of people like Mr. Kinsey that the Bay Area was chosen to lead this invasive attack on our property rights and small town autonomy.

Central planning does not work, whether it is the soviets or Johnson's so-called great society which ushered in the pathetic cycle of generational welfare. Given sufficient study, the end goals are obvious. This Plan -- or whatever it is called nationwide -- over time robs the family of the American dream. Single home privacy will be -- will come to be considered a selfish luxury except for those bureaucrats who have arrived and will be able to live on the ridge tops --

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. Thank you for your comments.

ELIZABETH MANNING: -- with the views of the water.

MAYOR EKLUND: Elizabeth, thank you very much for your comments.

ELIZABETH MANNING: I'm not finished.

MAYOR EKLUND: I'm sorry, but your two minutes are up.

(Audience outburst.)

MAYOR EKLUND: Can Alexandra Deist-Wong --

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Please --

MAYOR EKLUND: -- please come up.

ELIZABETH MANNING: It is politically --

MAYOR EKLUND: Toni Shroyer, Paul Gusciora, and then Frank Egger.

Is Alexandra here? Alexandra, please come forward.

ALEXANDRA DEIST-WONG: Yes. I would just like to say that I'm deeply disturbed about the actual autocratic nature of these proceedings. I'm confused. Where is the statute that gives your authority and legitimacy as a political governing body that makes decisions for our future -- for my future that have irrevocable, long-term repercussions? I'm very confused as to why this entire procedure is so totally undemocratic. I have yet to see ABAG on a ballot. I have
I've been a resident of San Rafael since 1992, for getting the pronunciation right.

Welcome, Paul.

Two, there must be public safety impact fees imposed to developers to compensate for the stress placed upon the current infrastructure by high-density housing.

Adequate public safety should include all units; not just those of 40 units or more. Because of budget cuts, many cities and counties do not have a full complement of law enforcement personnel. This is true of staff of code enforcement officials as well.

So my question is: Are we going to build even more units and stretch our current law enforcement personnel even further? The developers are being allowed to compromise public safety whenever they decide to build.

There are two things we must accomplish: First, we must have best practices for all affordable and multi-family units, regardless whether they're clustered in 40 units or more.

Two, there must be public safety impact fees imposed to developers to compensate for the stress placed upon the current infrastructure by high-density housing.

Let's be people oriented; not developer oriented.

Thank you.


Welcome, Paul.

PAUL GUSCIORA: Hi. I'm Paul Gusciora. Thanks for getting the pronunciation right.

I've been a resident of San Rafael since 1992, and a homeowner. I've been a resident of Marin since 1987. And my wife's been a business owner in San Rafael since 1993. I'm an engineer, and somewhat of an environmentalist. And so some of the things that have been talked about tonight go to economics. And in case you've missed it, there are three rules of economics: If you subsidize something, you get more of it. If you tax something, you get less of it. And the third, which is becoming obvious now in certain -- certain efforts in the United States, if you make something illegal, you raise its price, but you don't get rid of it.

So what I want to say is, in engineering, when you end up at a result that is so clearly wrong, it is time to throw it out and start all over again. And I think that some of the proposals that are being thrown about really are clearly wrong for Marin. I believe that Marin needs to withdraw from ABAG, and that all of us taxpayers need to remove from public office at the next election cycle any elected official that doesn't support that position.

Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Frank Egger, Larry Bragman, Clayton Smith, and then Kerry Stoebner.

Audience outburst.

Frank Egger. Go ahead. Thank you.

Frank Egger, President of Ross Valley Sanitary District.

Speaking for myself only; not the Board. I also serve as Central Marin Sanitation Agency Commissioner. We treat the sewage from two-thirds of San Rafael, all of the Ross Valley, and Corte Madera; roughly a hundred thousand residents. To my knowledge, no one from ABAG or MTC or One Bay Area Plan has ever contacted the Ross Valley Sanitary District regarding our system's current status and future capacity. One Bay Area Plan and its EIR are fairly flawed.

The Bay Area Regional Water Quality Control Board meets Wednesday, May 8th in Oakland to issue the final Cease and Desist Order against our Ross Valley agency. We have major structural capacity issues. The estimated cost to repair in that capacity is 180 million dollars. The One Bay Area Plan calls for 1,446 new residential units in Ross Valley, and 2,246 new jobs. Sewer collection treatment capacity issues must be addressed.

For the record, Fairfax is one of the most affordable communities in Marin. How did that come about? Fairfax has height limits. Fairfax protects existing rental units. I authored the ordinance in the 70s, during a previous term as mayor. We made findings in past...
1 CLAYTON SMITH: Yes. My name is Clayton Smith, and I live in Mill Valley. I would like to say that when I look at this country right now -- I think there is widespread agreement with this -- the great malaise that is gripping this country has one word that really can typify it, and that is "cronyism." This issue of cronyism is very much exemplified by Plan Bay Area, which is basically cronyism on steroids, to put it bluntly. And it reminds me, quite frankly, of that meeting in the Godfather where the one guy complains about Don Corleone. He has all those politicians in his pocket. And I'd have to say that I would say that the great finance interests industry and the development industry and the people up in Sac -- I would say they have a government in their pocket. And that's why this government that is in their pocket is a government that no longer listens to the people who actually do the work of this society, pay its bills, mind their own business, and obey its laws and live in peace and harmony with one another.

And I would say that this Plan Bay Area is an example of a government that is actually attacking civil society as it exists currently. It is like the war in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and the other places that this government has created ferment and civil crisis and strife. You have come here to do the same thing to our community, only in the -- and I would say that if fascism has come to America, it is coming in this guise of social equity and justice, when really we know it's just a vehicle to create power and to line people's pockets. Thank you.


KERRY STOEBNER: Kerry Stoebner, Mill Valley. And I also want to identify myself as one of the members of the Marin Water Coalition that was here. I think, four years ago talking about the proposed desalination plant. And I think before we go further with the One Bay Area Plan, there has to be an identification of where the water is going to come from for this massive new development because we were told by MMWD that we were in crisis, that there was no more water, that we would run out of water unless we built a 400 million dollar desal plant; that contrary to the assertions that you want a -- greenhouse gas emissions cut down, a desalination plant uses nine times more energy than water obtained through conventional sources. And MMWD right now is the largest energy user in Marin.

This is -- Not only that, but for our

---
I want to avoid the sight of Steve Kinsey standing next to the sign -- the guy with the sign, "Apartheid in Marin." I am a native of Marin. It was one of the most embarrassing things I have seen in a long time; Judy Arnold at the Board of Supervisors criticizing people. At the visioning meetings, people actually came from the East Bay -- Can you imagine that? People from the East Bay. And they were a little bit disruptive. They were slightly -- about as unhappy as this crowd is about what you're doing.

But let me remind Judy Arnold that ABAG and MTC are in the East Bay. They're in the same building. Steve Kinsey is on the -- is a commissioner. $11,000, I believe, that he got sitting on that Board. He is going to vote for this thing. The rest of the Board is going to vote for this thing. The Board of Supervisors -- I'm running out of gas here -- they appoint the planning commission. As we speak, they are working on 17 sites where we are going to have 30 units per site. We have to do this. The Board has appointed them. The Board is -- our Board of Supervisors is the Plan. God help us.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much, Mr. Bitter.
Sue Hestor, Deborah from Sonoma County, Helen Lindquist, and then Bill Lindquist.

SUE HESTOR: Hi. I'm Sue Hestor, and I am from San Francisco. I couldn't come to the San Francisco meeting because I was at another hearing.

I support regional housing needs allocation for San Francisco and, if anything, it needs to be increased.

Part of the unknown problem to very many people is that we are losing middle class and low-income housing by the tens of thousands in San Francisco because of upscaling to the -- I was going to say dot com -- the techies that are coming into the City and other upscale people.

The problem we have with the map is that San Francisco all along the Bay side is totally fill, a hundred percent fill. San Francisco grew by filling in the Bay. And we have marshes, and we have dead boats that are sunken, and the land is put on top of them that constitutes the San Francisco waterfront. At the same time, ABAG has this area as the area for growth of housing. I know this area. This area is not -- The only housing that can be built in this area, particularly south of Market, is high-end condos. We need affordable housing, and yet the Plan calls for in-fill development on areas that will never take affordable housing. And sea level rise is an inevitable problem. Right now there is -- sea level comes in -- the sea comes in to the old marshes.

We had deaths in Loma Prieta in the south of
disinformation. That is what we have. So I urge all of you -- I have fliers. You can come and get them.

I want to read a quote. This is from CIA Director William Casey in 1981. "We'll know our disinformation campaign is complete when absolutely everything the American people believe is false." And that is the reality of our current time.

I also want to say, let's stop calling ABAG and their bodies and agencies our government. They and you are not. You are posing as a legitimate government, and you are not. You do not serve us. You are not elected, but rather you serve the private corporations listed on Dunn and Bradstreet.

It is our duty to expose the reality that you are fraudulently receiving public funds and corporate immunity while you are actively promoting the harm of all of us. Even if you -- and most of you employees are as much in the dark as the rest of us, you are responsible and ultimately culpable for the acts that you are doing to all of us.

I also want to say that a grant is a contract between those that offer the contract and those that agree to that contract. Grants are corporate contracts, and we are not obligated to them. And you -- because you've agreed to them -- not us -- as regional panels have signed some of these contracts, you have no authority over us. And you can move into the --

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: We could end it right now, sir.

MAYOR EKLUND: Helen Lindquist.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: We could end it right now, but we are going to continue.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where is the party?

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: I'm going to give the opportunity for Ms. Lindquist and Mr. Lindquist. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just stick with it.

HELEN LINDQUIST: I want to make a couple of comments. In the old days, marshes were filled in, levies were built, and they thought this was the way to go for housing and for farming. Now we know the value of marshes, and how they can protect the environment; how it is great for birds and in-coming tides, high tides. So let's not build any of this multiple housing on marshy areas. The SMART railroad is bad enough. It goes through a lot of it.

The other point is that I'd like a true scientific check for ABAG and MTC to do for basing their whole raise-on-bet on greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gas emissions are not a problem. They've gone down since we're using more natural gas. SB 375, which links this transport to a reduction in greenhouse gases is false.
And lastly, have ABAG eliminated itself.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Michael Gravelle, followed by Bob Chilvers, Bill Carney, and then Denise Beck.

MICHAEL GRAVELLE: Good evening, Board. My name is Mike Gravelle. And I'm a resident of Lucas Valley. I'm also a father, a coach, and an active member of the community. To be perfectly honest, I don't proclaim myself to represent the people of Lucas Valley, but I wanted to express that there are not a lot of people here from Lucas Valley due to the -- all the extra curricular activities with the George Lucas thing.

A lot of people were scared because they've received death threats for speaking out, exercising their votes by using their voices. So I'm just going to stick to the issues that directly impact Lucas Valley; try to keep this brief.

First of all, we've got a two-lane road. We've heard a lot of comments on traffic congestion, co2 emissions, et cetera. Grady Ranch is not the location for any type of development. Lucas Valley is as rural as it gets. Once you pop over Big Rock, you are in West Marin. And it just makes no sense to position this type of project out in that setting for a number of reasons. There's no stores out there. There's no medical offices out there. There's none of the services -- public or otherwise -- that the people that are going to be living in those units are going to need. You are isolating them; forcing them to rely on public transportation, which I don't know if that's part of the Plan or not. I haven't reviewed that, but there's certainly not adequate transportation for the people in that corridor.

The fire and public safety issues, I know you guys don't want to hear about it, but the school district -- I think the projection was that there was 1.3 kids going into the school district from each of the units, 750 units. That gets 750 kids, maybe a little bit more than that into the Dixie School District with not one dollar going. You guys have to consider that. This is the American dream. Don't take it away.

SUPervisor KINSEY: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

BILL LINDQUIST: My name is Bill Lindquist. I live in Tiburon. I've been in Marin for 17 years, and I love the place. I've lived in several countries. I've lived in towns as small as 2,000 people, and cities as large as 8 million. And I can tell you, the larger the city, the larger the bureaucracy that's running it, the more inefficient it is, and the more totalitarian it gets.

To think that ABAG can come up with a plan as complex as it's come up with over an area like the Bay, as diverse as it is, and as widespread as it is too -- and to think it might work is purely delusional. And I'm afraid the only way to fight delusion is in the courts. And I will support the lawsuit that was mentioned by the lady in yellow who talked earlier tonight.

And in parallel with that, I would like to see on the next ballot three referenda: One, to vote you guys out of office who support ABAG. Number one.

Number two, to have Marin County withdraw from ABAG.

Number three, to have Marin County withdraw from ABAG.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much.

Bill Carney, Denise Beck, Elaine Reichert, Sharon Rushton.

BILL CARNEY: Good evening. I'm Bill Carney with Sustainable San Rafael. We're going to submit a letter on this, but a few preliminaries: We think this Plan is a good start. It's a good start towards addressing the most pressing issue of our era, which is climate change.

It also is a start towards addressing the perennial issue of providing more workforce housing in Marin and elsewhere in the Bay Area. It does this by also promoting a revitalization of our traditional Marin downtowns and village and town centers. If you want to see what transit-oriented development looks like, go to downtown San Rafael, go to downtown Mill Valley, go to downtown San Anselmo. We have the examples right here of what a compact and friendly and walkable and bikeable sort of development can be. We should build on those traditions, and we believe this Plan is a start in that...
We would encourage strengthening the Plan in several ways: The climate initiatives that are included in it accomplish -- account for less than 1 percent of the spending under this Plan, and yet they accomplish close to 40 percent of the reductions in carbon emissions. We would encourage those to be beefed up and put more money there, where you are getting the most bang for the buck.

In particular, the nexus with green building. It's an important nexus to make. It is a key development under this Plan. There needs to be assurances that those buildings are zero-emission buildings. Sea level rise clearly needs to be addressed.

And finally, BCDC and the Air Quality District that are theoretically partners in this effort need to be brought on as senior partners so that things like sea level rise are in fact fully addressed.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you, Bill.
BIL CARNEY: Thank you very much.
SUPERVISOR RICE: Denise Beck, followed by Elaine Richert, Sharon Rushton, and Valeri Hood.
DENISE BECK: Okay. This is going to be addressed to primarily Kinsey, since I'm your constituent.

As one of your constituents, I'm most -- I have to let you know that I've been extremely disappointed in your track record. Okay?

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.
DENISE BECK: This is, like, the what? Fifth time I've had to address you. You tend to go through the unpopular -- for unpopular large scale development projects, or related projects without going through proper channels. You have total disregard for public opinion.

Three years ago, after Marin residents gathered 18,000 signatures, over a dozen endorsements from environmental groups, all the political parties, Senator Leno endorsed it, community leaders endorsed it, to put Measure T on the ballot, you were one of the main politicians -- and your buddy Huffman, the father of desalination -- that endorsed to support Measure S, which would've fast-tracked the permitting process for unnecessary, environmentally unfriendly, exceedingly expensive multi-million dollar desalination project.

In February 2012, you tried to push through the San Quentin development Designation Resolution, which would allow ABAG to label San Quentin as the priority development site and circumvent the environmental review.

Up until -- And then you've also recently wanted to push through a massive freeway project in Corte Madera without doing an EIR and botched data. You were using data from the Marina to justify that we needed that big project. This is not San Francisco. This is Marin.

Okay?

Now you are trying to push this One Bay Plan through; another massive development plan. And I think it's outrageous. You are accusing us as being racist.

If you really want equity, fund education, train and increase employment opportunities, increase the Minimum Living Wage, rather than waste public funds on these projects.

MAYOR EKLUND: Denise, I'm sorry. Your two minutes are up. Thank you.
SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Elaine Reichert. Elaine will get one minute, and the other speakers will have one minute behind them as well. We still have about 30 cards left.

ELAINE REICHERT: My name is Elaine Reichert. I live in Santa Benicia, which is a multi-income, very affordable neighborhood. It is racially diverse. We have two large affordable housing unit complexes there. And I want to say, every unit produces two- to three cars or small trucks, which not only park in their front lots, but all over the neighborhood.

The fantasy developments that assume people are going to transit don't take into account the reality of how people live, to get to grocery stores, to get their kids to schools. Unless there's some kind of magic fund to subsidize transit, everybody's going to need a car for various life functions.

At the same time, Novato, for example, is rapidly developing car-dependent retail theme parks. No wonder there's a push for subsidized housing. That supports businesses that don't pay a living wage and don't provide healthcare benefits. But of course, we have community-subsidized clinics for that.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Elaine.
Sharon Rushton, Valeri Hood, Sarah Azerad, and Carol Sheerin.

SHARON RUSHTON: Good evening. I'm Sharon Rushton. I am from the El Monte district in unincorporated Marin. And I'm representing Sustainable Tam El Monte, as well as myself this evening. The Draft Plan Bay Area's Draft Environmental Impact Report demonstrates that implementation of Plan Bay Area would cause 39 significant, unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts resulting in severe environmental harm and serious illness, injury, and loss of life. The severity, magnitude, and number of these impacts are astonishing. They include, but are not limited to: Impacts from insufficient water supply, inundation from sea level rise, exposure to hazardous materials, inadequate waste water
Thank you.

followed by Carol Sheerin, Peter Lacques, and John Hart.

And we are going to have Sarah Azerad, please, desist --

this need to start a Web site tonight; a petition to

VALERI HOOD: I think those of us who oppose

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Sharon.

SHARON RUSHTON: -- and fine particulate matter

emissions.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you. Please submit

your additional comments. Thank you.

SHARON RUSHTON: As well as additional

environmental impacts --

SUPERVISOR RICE: Valeri Hood.

SHARON RUSHTON: -- and sensitive --

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you, Sharon. You can

submit your comments in writing. Thank you.

Valeri Hood, Sarah Azerad, Carol Sheerin, and

PETER LACQUES: Thank you. Peter Lacques,

Gladstone, and D. Dearborn.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Sarah, for your

comments. If you could submit your comments in writing.

SARAH AZERAD: All right. I did. Yes. Thank

you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Great.

Carol Sheerin, Peter Lacques, John Hart, and

then Kevin Gladstone.

give-aways to developers who will make huge profits.

We've been compared to the Oakland Hills in terms of fire
danger, and yet you advocate increasing traffic density.

Caltrans advocated for a four-lane highway from 101 to the

cost. And when we reach total gridlock -- which we will

-- it will destroy another facet of small-town living.

There is a massive push towards geoengineering

at the federal level, to meet our water needs, and I think

this Plan will open the flood gates for local desal, which

our towns can ill afford.

We should not, as a community, accept the

parameters offered here as any kind of solution to

affordable workforce housing. I hope that all

participants will think outside the box offered. And here

we desperately need affordable housing. And I see this

pitting community members against each other. That's a

huge concern for me.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

VALERI HOOD: I think those of us who oppose

this need to start a Web site tonight; a petition to

desist --

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Please. Thank you, Valeri.

And we are going to have Sarah Azerad, please,

followed by Carol Sheerin, Peter Lacques, and John Hart.

Thank you.

SARAH AZERAD: Hello. I live in Lucas

Valley-Marinwood. There's not a lot of us here tonight.

Now I understand why. It's a subsection of District 1.

It is a quiet and beautiful neighborhood. People from all

over the Bay, as you all know and on the panel, come here

for this reason specifically. I'm sure we all agree. 600

of the 852 high-density housing units listed within the

Plan are slated for our district. That's 70 percent of

the new housing units planned for Marin County. Most of

them in our neighborhood -- in Marinwood - Lucas Valley.

It will be a huge influx of people and students in our
district without ongoing funding. A huge influx.

The Dixie School District is funded from

property taxes, and the new high-density housing is mostly

exempt from paying property taxes. So the Plan leaves it

up to our neighborhood to support this increase. We have

only 2,900 households. Okay? That's small. We are a

small community.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you, Sarah, for your

comments. If you could submit your comments in writing.

SARAH AZERAD: All right. I did. Yes. Thank

you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Great.

Carol Sheerin, Peter Lacques, John Hart, and

then Kevin Gladstone.

CAROL SHEERIN: My name is Carol Sheerin. I

live in San Rafael. I've been in my house for 46 years.

Some of you may have read my letter in today's IJ. I also

e-mailed a copy to every town, city, county-elected

official to make sure they read it. I -- the letter

basically asks for all officials of every town, city, and

county to band together and request a six-month extension

on the comment period en masse for us to have time to

handle all of this. It was pointed out by Susan Adams

that it was a 1,356-page document, which is much too much
to read. Democracy is not given a chance to work with

this Plan Bay Area.

One speaker mentioned elections when you ob --

all of you are up for election. I'd like to give you a

reminder that the democratic process for holding our

elective officials accountable is a recall.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Peter Lacques --

PETER LACQUES: Thank you. Peter --

SUPERVISOR: -- followed by John Hart, Kevin

Gladstone, and D. Dearborn.

PETER LACQUES: Thank you. Peter Lacques,

Fairfax, California. One minute; not enough time to

comment. I have concerns in the Environmental Impact

Report about water, supplies for the projective growth.

I also have concerns about the location of many
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of these PDAs in areas that will be subject to rising sea level rise, which also is not adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

Fundamentally, according to ABAG's own handout, Chapter 5, Performance, I have questions whether this is the right way to go because the rationale for this is to increase affordable housing to reduce greenhouse gases. ABAG's own numbers indicate that as a result of the Plan, low-income people earning under $38,000 after this is implemented will be spending 74 percent of their income on housing and transportation, versus 72 percent now. That's actually increasing the cost of housing and transportation; does not seem very effective. Likewise, commute times are going to either remain the same or increase.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

PETER LACQUES: It does not seem to be addressing affordable housing or transportation.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you, Peter.

PETER LACQUES: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: John Hart, Kevin Gladstone, D. Dearborn, and Anna Spake.

JOHN HART: Hi. John Hart of Santa Benicia.

Given the short time, I'm going to whittle all comments down to one. There has been much distress expressed tonight about the fact that unelected regional agencies are in charge of these regional planning chores. But perhaps everyone in this room -- and I smile -- could agree that a good step would be -- give to the Association of Bay Area Governments a directly-elected board. Otherwise, I have to say that I am generally favorably inclined to the thrust of this Plan. I've always wanted to be a contrarian. This is my chance. Thank you.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you very much, Mr. Hart.

Kevin Gladstone, D. Dearborn, Ann Spake, and then Dennis Finney.

KEVIN GLADSTONE: My name is Kevin Gladstone. I'm also a contrarian. And my hat is off to the Association of Bay Area Governments and the One Bay Area Plan being that when I was a census numerator in the year 2000, we had a ten-page form.

In the year 2010, it was a postcard. So there is this dearth of data available for planning, for equity, affordable housing, regional housing needs allocations, housing elements. So it's a very noble effort. My hat is off to you. And I believe it's a good start. If we need more time, we always have 2020 to look forward to for the census to recover.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Thank you very much.

of these PDAs in areas that will be subject to rising sea level rise, which also is not adequately addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

states. The -- one of the fundamental flaws in it is that it addresses -- says it can only address the effects of the projects on the environment, but it cannot address the effects of the environment on the project. And I assume the project is people -- involves people.

SUPERVISOR KINSEY: Thank you, Ann. We'll look forward to your comments.

Dennis Finney, followed by Lou Torn (phonetic) from Santa Rosa, Grace Severtson, and then Margaret Zegart.

DENNIS FINNEY: Good evening. I'm Dennis Finney from Lucas Valley. And like the other woman who was from Lucas Valley earlier, I'm in favor of you guys postponing any decision you make for six months. Lucas Valley -- as she mentioned -- is slated for 70 percent of all of this housing we're talking about -- the density; yet in Lucas Valley and Marinwood, it is literally four or five -- maybe even up to six or seven miles away from any of the transportation that the SMART train is going to provide.

There's no bus transit to Grady Ranch. All this smacks of political patronage (verbatim) -- patronage and expediency on your parts -- whoever the benefactors are. Clearly, it is not a voted position that this Board is, and I applaud the fact that you, know, you guys are just putting out these for public comment. But also -- And the
...
interested in having this conversation continue or continue to participate with your elected representatives. Marin County is the slowest growing county. We will continue to be the slowest growing county. That is an important part of our culture, our outlook, and I think that in this Plan -- although there are many things that have been brought up this evening, I do need to point out that as the Bay Area is growing, that we have been assigned less than 1 percent of the future growth.

The most important thing that I've heard this evening, that we will just have to see where we can go, has to do with providing more opportunity, more time. I'm not certain -- There are significant consequences to providing more time, as it relates to both state laws, as well as our financial opportunities with federal funds. But I do understand folks have had a real concern about the pace at which this has moved. I will say, too, however, that this process began several years ago. Each of the cities and towns have taken up these issues. People were concerned about that. They have taken up these issues. They've made comments through the Transportation Authority, as well as their city councils and town councils. And so I think there is in fact a significant amount of your representatives who have been participating in the process.

Thank you again.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Have the county supervisors --

MAYOR EKLUND: Supervisor Rice would like to make a closing comment, and then I will make the last.

SUPERVISOR RICE: Just very quickly.

Thank you, for all of you who stuck through here and shared your comments. Lots of concerns. Some of them conflicting concerns; a lot of them very valid concerns. We are listening carefully, and I think that you need to continue to provide us with what you're thinking; what your concerns are.

As Supervisor Kinsey said, we are going to have another opportunity on May 9th, a forum hosted by Dominican to discuss this, and then again on May 30th. So we're trying to make ourselves available and provide the opportunities for people to learn and get educated and provide their feedback.

As with any decision that gets made at any level of government, never is every -- are 100 percent of the people happy with the decision. But we try to hear all of the things, and then we have to apply our judgment. That's the role we play. So thank you for coming.

MAYOR EKLUND: Thank you all very, very much for coming and participating in this whole process. You know, I grew up in Marin. I went to John Mateo, Vallecitos, and Terra Linda High. I'm lucky to be able to stay in Marin County. And all of us want to maintain the quality of our communities, and the small-town character and really encourage you to stay involved.

As the representative for the 11 cities in Marin County, I have encouraged all the city councils and town councils to place this Plan Bay Area and Draft EIR on their agendas so that their public -- the people that live in that community -- can comment on that. And I encourage you, if they have not already done so, please encourage them to do that.

Also as the representative, I have set up a meeting with all the ABAG delegates for each of the cities in Marin County after the close of the public comment period so we can start talking about how should I represent Marin cities in the votes that will be coming up in June and July.

Lastly, I wanted to remind you all, please submit your comments by May 16th, 4:00 p.m. Thank you again very much for coming, and good night.

(WHEREUPON, the hearing concluded at 9:33 p.m.)
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SUPERVISOR LUCE: As I mentioned earlier, we would like you, if you plan to speak tonight, to fill out these blue speaker cards, it helps with our reporter get your name correct, as well as it helps me in terms of calling you up to the microphone when it's time for you to speak. I'll give you a little bit of introduction and then we'll get rolling. And I haven't done a Pledge of Allegiance, so let's get to that. Why don't we do that right now.

Join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.
(The Pledge of Allegiance.)

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Kind of gave me a script here but I'm just going to go from memory. My name is Mark Luce, I'm the Association of Bay Area Government's President but I'm also your local county supervisor. I think most of you know that. So it's a pleasure to play both roles tonight in representing us here.

With me is also Bill Dodd. I'll give him a chance to say hello in a second. Also our county supervisor, a member of the MTC Commission, which I'm also a member of MTC Commission. I'm the ABAG representative, he's the Napa County representative, so Napa County, you are very well-represented in MTC.

I want to acknowledge some of the other electives who are here. Supervisor Brad Wagenknecht has joined us. And so I don't think we notice this as a meeting, as long as we don't talk to Brad about anything, we are okay as far as the Brown Act goes.

Alfredo Pedroso, City Counsel Member from the City of Napa, is here tonight. Scott Sedgely was here earlier from the City of Napa so we could get some of the questions answered. Tony Norris who is director of our parks and open space district, and certainly has an interest in our priority conservation areas is here tonight.

And, Bill, did you see anybody I missed?

SUPERVISOR DODD: Nope. Mayor Garcia is I think in the other room.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay. Leon Garcia, who is the cities of Napa County's representative to the executive board is also here tonight. So this is our Plan Bay Area public hearing time. We have had an open workshop where hopefully you have had some of your questions answered from staff, so this is the opportunity now if you haven't submitted specific comments in the basket, or otherwise, it's an opportunity to get your comments on the record. We don't really have a formal presentation tonight for you in this part of the process, that was really kind of
what we were hoping would happen over there. So, so what we will do tonight is
effectively get you to fill out those blue cards so we
know you are going to speak, and we'll have about two
minutes per person to state your comments. And we do
plan to make these comments available audio or perhaps
even visual, looks like, to our ABAG and MTC
Commissioners, so that they can consider your comments
as we deliberate on the final plan later this month. Or
is it next month, I guess, if we can keep our dates
straight.

SUPERVISOR DODD: Yes, for those people that
just walked in, my name is Bill Dodd, Napa County
Supervisor. I represent the County of Napa and cities
on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Mark and
I are here to listen to your comments about the draft
Plan Bay Area. This plan has been nearly three years in
the making. This is our third public meeting that we
have had here allowing Napa County residents to comment
on the Plan Bay Area.

While the plan is slated for adoption
this summer, it's important to note that it is a work in
progress that will be updated every four years to
reflect new priorities, new resources, and new

approaches. Our goal is to preserve what we love about
our region and tackle some of the ongoing problems like
traffic and local road maintenance. It's also about
adding some choices for people, now and in the future,
both in terms of housing and transportation.

All the comments we hear tonight will be
shared with all the decision makers who serve either on
MTC or ABAG. Results from all the public hearings, as
well as the comments from an on-line comment forum from
telephone survey will be summarized and shared with
boards MTC in ABAG in June. And we expect to adopt a
Plan Bay Area sometime in July.

With that, I would like to instruct our
court reporter that the public hearing is underway.
And, Mark, I'll let you run the public hearing.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay. Do we have any public
commenters?

I haven't seen a list yet, so if you guys
want to bring up the cards.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We are just going to
have people line up at the microphone, and when you come
up to the microphone, if you can hand me your blue card
and I will give it to the court reporter.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you come up here

you can state your name and your city of residence, that
would be great. I have one person's card. Randy?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay. Well, that will work.

I think that's a great crowd for that. Larger crowds I
like to have the list in front of me, but so remind you,
you have two minutes tonight. We are doing both several
types of recording, so I may ask you to speak up or more
clearly if I had sounds like the reporter didn't quite
get it right, she will probably give the hand wave,
pound the table or something to catch your attention.

I did want to say, you can both read the
draft plan, as well as make your comments on-line at One
Bay Area dot org. And public comment period closes
Thursday, May 16, at 4:00 p.m. So without further ado,
our first speaker.

MR. GULARTE: Okay. I'm Randy Gularte, I'm a
resident of Napa County. I'm a business owner. My
first -- I have four comments or questions. Why wasn't
this promoted in the Napa Register? I asked the ladies,
the staff back there, they said, well, state law says --

I says, I don't care about state law. I think it should
have been promoted heavily. Both sides should have been
presented in the Napa Register for the pro and con on
this, and then it should have been brought forward so we
can get a better handle on what this is all about. I've
been trying to follow it for quite some time, but of
course, it's quite confusing, and watching all those
charts and maps and all that stuff.

Second of all, did all the staff come by
bus or did they come by individual cars? If they really
believe in this, I think it's kind of hypocritical for
the staff not to be able to come by bus to show that
they really believe in this cause, instead of coming by
individual cars.

Okay. But my main concern is local
control. Are we, are you going to be able to sit up
there, and say, Mark, Bill, and Leon, that you are truly
goint to be able to control our county, warehousing, and
where our transportation is going to go, or are we going
to be dictated by the great State of California, which
is in disaster?

So those are my questions. Thank you.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay. Thank you. I know
you want answers but that's not why we are here tonight.
So I'll catch you off line, if you want my opinion.

Next speaker please.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where do we get answers
then, Mark, where do we get answers for these questions?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: How about we, at some point
I'll take a 15 minute break and I'll be glad to tell you
what I know, and then we will go from there, but this
really is to get the public record, so --
MR. GORY: My name is Jack Gory, resident of
Napa for over 50 years. I'm retired engineer and a
taxpayer. I happen to be the President of Napa County
Taxpayer Association at present. And some of my
questions, and I've turned in questions and I don't
necessarily expect them to be responded to tonight, but
it's to part of the comment that you just heard from the
gentleman before.
One is about local input and control.
Has any opportunity been afforded or will any
opportunity be afforded for an open vote of the
individual area residents on the One Bay Area Plan?
Second question, who is provided the
definition of sustainability in this plan? Because
sustainability, you know, what I see coming from MTC and
ABAG really means single family dwellings in semi-rural
areas, such as Napa, are not sustainable. Their plan
really says sustainable means stack and tack near
transportation centers. And that's not our county.
That's not our plan. That's not something we voted for
or something we may vote for.
Another one that I've asked before, and I
have reference to a 2011 memo from Steve Hemminger, the
president of MTC to the California Air Board, wherein he
says, part of the strategy of this plan is to increase
the cost of driving a private automobile by a factor of
ten. And I ask you to consider for the cost of gasoline
at four dollars a gallon do we want to pay $40 a gallon?
That's not what he's really after. He's really after
not being able to drive your private automobile in the
Bay Area community.
SUPERVISOR LUCE: Thank you.
Next. This is why I like to have
everybody's names ahead of time, I can just call you up.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Take charge.
MR. EGGERS: Hi there.
SUPERVISOR LUCE: Hi.
MR. EGGERS: I live in this community. I've
been here all my life.
SUPERVISOR LUCE: Do we need your name?
MR. EGGERS: Kevin Eggers.
SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay.
MR. EGGERS: I'm on the Freedom Advocates
Board of Directors, and I'm on for the Post
Sustainability Institute Board of Directors. Rosa Corey
and Michael Shaw. Right now they are in the process of
creating a lawsuit, going with a lawsuit against what
ABAG is doing. And hopefully if we make some headway on
this, it interferes with both our Fifth Amendment,
Fourteenth Amendment rights, and it's going to adversely
effect us in numerous ways.
I went, when I went to Ridgeview Junior
High, way back whenever, in the '70s, I learned about
the Soviet system. And how councils are what Soviets
are. Soviet is a council that creates policies for the
community. But the reason that it's utilitarian system
is that you have the local councils that have to answer
to the regional councils, which have to answer to
national counsel which then answers to the international
councils.
We have, under the Soviet system, the
people within the community don't have any
representation. It's their figure heads, the
politicians are, because the regional council controls
what is going on within the local communities. That's
my objection to the plan, is that it's, it's not being,
it's not a representation of what we want in the county,
not a representation of what we want in the
community.
It's representing what ABAG is creating
at the regional level and how it's being basically
pushed by our federal government state with subsidies.
And there's a lot of subsidies involved. And I know how
people are. Thank you.
MS. JESSFIELD: I'm Penny Jessfield from
Calistoga, Napa County. And I had a question. This is
the first time I've attended a meeting, and I've done a
lot of reading trying to get educated on what's going
around. And the thing that I keep coming up with, they
talk about sustainable development, and I want to know
how it relates to the Agenda 21? I'd like people to get
educated about that, and to look and read. This all
falls under exactly what they are talking about, and I'd
like that answered, or that question answered, is where
it relates to that.
SUPERVISOR LUCE: Thank you.
Next? Anyone else? Now you can lift
that up, if you will.
MR. SIMONITCH: I'm Jack Simonitch. I live in
Napa. And I've got a question about, two of them. One
about transportation. And I'm wondering why the Wine
Train wasn't required to provide transportation to
Vallejo. You built two bridges on the river there so
that they could get to the maintenance yard. And it
seems to me that those two bridges ought to be used to
provide a rail link to, at least to Vallejo, or to the
The thing I want to talk about is affordable housing. I'd like to propose that funding for affordable housing be completely transferred to the winery, to the wine industry and to the hotel industry, and to any other industry that is dependent on low income labor. Maybe a head tax of $150 to $200 per year per employee, low income employee would provide the kind of funding that you need to build the, or to buy the affordable housing.

I know that the wine industry employs about 70, about 7,000 workers. And that $200 a head would provide a principally sum for housing. But we are not building low income housing in Napa for workers that are driving to San Francisco, we are building it for the wine industry, the hotels, and McDonald's.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Sorry. Thank you. I have got all kinds of answers for these questions but this isn't the time. So other comments.

MS. SUSAN BARLOW: When will be the time?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Well, we'll get the public comment, maybe again we'll take a break, I think then supervisors and I can answer that from Napa's perspective.

MS. SUSAN BARLOW: That, that was my question, is why were we even invited here to ask questions if you are not going to answer it? And, you know --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Again, if I can just be as clear as I can, this is to take public comment on the draft plan which you can view on the website. And we have a court reporter here to do all that. All the commissioners will have the opportunity to listen or even watch this. So to make the statement, so your input on the plan is what we are looking for tonight.

That's the purpose.

And so, again, we had the workshop out here so that you could ask staff specific questions. We are here to answer your questions, but I don't want to take everybody's time or the commissioner's time trying to answer things from a Napa specific perspective on these issues. So, if we could, further testimony on the draft plan and then when we are done I think supervisor and I would be happy to take some more time with you.

So please step up to the mic., if you could.

MS. OYARTO: My name is Laverne Oyarto. I'm from Calistoga. I've been terribly disappointed with these meetings. Mainly, I went to one in Santa Rosa. I listened to all of the garbage that was handed out to people. People were angry. Then I thought, well, we'll see what is going on over in Napa.

So I came to the meeting here sometime back, and it was as though we couldn't -- when we went to speak, the person who was there -- you are listening, but the people that were up there weren't listening, and so it was like, why am I here asking questions?

And as far as questions are concerned, our local government said nothing. The papers, as the man said, the papers say nothing. We really don't know what this is all about, but what I have learned from it is scary. It's scary for the people of our little towns. And what we have is being taken away from us, according to this plan.

I don't know how much you guys know about this plan, but when I ask people in town, do you know what the Nine Bay Area Plan is, and, no, what is it? I tell them and they think I'm crazy. Is that what we are going to get away with? Are you guys going to be supervisors of Napa and then turn around and just stab our people in the back with craziness? I mean it's got to be clear. It's not clear.

So, thank you, if you can give us some answers tonight, because we have come a long way to come and be at this meeting, and seems kind of stupid not to have answers. Thank you.

MR. MARTINE: Good evening. I'm Chet Martine, and I'm from Orinda. And I'd like to focus specifically on a few of the documents, the draft PDA and forecast of jobs have force gaps in identifying forecast. And one three references, new policies and programs to support housing production in Priority Development Areas, PDA's, but there was no reference provided there as to what those policies are.

So you go to the sustainable communities question and answer issued by ABAG on March 15, 2012, and, question, Will local governments been forced to make land-use decisions that are dictated by regional agencies? Answer, No, local governments retain full land-use authority in their jurisdictions. Okay. A critical thinker would think, wow, retain full land-use authority, sounds too good to be true. And it is.

The critical thinker might help illustrate this point by pointing to San Jose North PDA and look at the report recently from Economic Planning Systems, Inc., apparently a consultant to ABAG, but it's not mentioned on page 30 of the draft PDA as a consultant. They just finished the report, stating that San Jose has implemented a work day -- (inaudible).

The gist is that the perception is by...
Erik And Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
Transcript of Proceedings

Page 18

Audiencemember: Why is that? Supervisor Luce: Because we are trying to create a record for the plan. Audienmemember: A record for the plan but not a record for the public? Supervisor Luce: If you have something to say, you are welcome to come up and say it. Audienmemember: I have said it. Supervisor Luce: Then we are done, okay, for that portion of it. Okay. So I'm going to close that portion temporarily of the hearing, then I'd like to answer questions. (Public Hearing closed.) (Discussion had off the record.) (Public Hearing opened.) Supervisor Luce: Now we are getting to where we want everybody to be on the record. Mr. Gularbe: As you know, I've gone to a lot of these public hearings, and, but the bottom line is, that this is about the first time that I've actually heard conversation between the public and our officials. It's always, we ask the question or make a comment and then you comment back but we can't comment back again. This is the best two-way conversation I've heard in a long time.
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Audienmemember: Three years. Mr. Gularbe: And I think it's very important that you bring this up. You are officials. We are relying on you to represent us. And if your explanation makes great sense, okay, Leon, you, you analyzed, why do we do this down in American Canyon? That's what we want to hear, but we also want to ask the questions. But wait a minute, why aren't you living in Yountville if your job's not there?

Mayor Garcia: Well, I have -- it's my choice. Mr. Gularbe: But those are the things that we like to know about. And why, why do you make these decisions, instead of just saying -- because we believe big brother's up here (gesturing), and that's the State of California, is dictating this whole thing to us. And that's what scares us. We do not have the control. We are relying on you, but at least if you communicate with us and let us know, and we are able to reach back and talk to you, in a form like this, not one on one, so like deals are made, but basically, where it's open and you can actually tell us how you feel about things, I think it would go a long ways.

 Supervisor Dodd: Let me comment, I think that's a great point. I think that this was done this way as a result, Napa was like the number one tourist place to come, so like Randy pointed out, are we going to have people stop outside of town, jump in a big mass transit bus and drive around? Because your only people that you are going to punish are the people that live here. Are you going to punish the people that come and spend money in this town?

Supervisor Luce: Next? Okay. Then what I'm going to suggest is we take a break now. We will be off the record, and Supervisor Dodd and I can take a few minutes to answer some of your questions from Napa's perspective and our participation in this process. Then we'll reopen the hearing. If there's any additional questions for the record, we can take that.

Does that work for you?

Audienmemember: May I ask why it's not on the record? Why is it not on the record? How ridiculous is that?

Hello, cameraman, can you keep recording whatever they say, whatever their answers are, please?

Supervisor Luce: They may. I'm not sure that necessarily we'll make that part of the public record,
I asked Bill Dodd about the Republican comment card and they did what they were supposed to do. We read, we gave the class of the comments that have been coming forward. It's probably not coincidental, here is where I'm going to get in trouble, that there was one in Napa and one in Sonoma County, because the last time this place was dominated by people not from Napa County, and that was a lot of the problem that we had. And so I think that I found over the years the people in Napa County are very respectful, and you know, you may be mad and you may not agree or like it, but you are always, you know, very respectful. And I think that we can have that. And, Randy, I appreciate, you know, that comment. MAYOR GARCIA: I think, as always, an opportunity for, you know, decorum and civility is important to all of us, and certainly an open conversation. I much appreciate a lot of the work we have done with American Canyon, workshop type of format, so it is a dialogue back and forth. There are those groups or individuals that have a particular vision in mind, and they need to vent, and I don't know that it always adds to the dialogue, but it's part of the public process. What I would appreciate is, and chime in on what Supervisor Dodd said, is just the last time around here it was, there was a lot of discord. And I think some of them may have been ill-intentioned and designed by those individuals that were seeking to disrupt the proceeding. At least that was my impression, put it that way. But I think by and large this evening it has been more of a conversation like we should be having all the time, discussion back and forth, clarification, arriving at an understanding. MR. EGGERS: Is it okay if I speak? SUPERVISOR LUCE: Yeah, jump on in. MR. EGGERS: Okay. Thank you. I was at that meeting, and yes, there was some discord, but from what I remember, everyone came up here and asked questions, like they were supposed to. We read, we gave the comment card and they did what they were supposed to do. I asked Bill Dodd about the Republican National Committee resolution against Agenda 21, which you weren't very happy with me about doing. I then -- SUPERVISOR DODD: What did I say? I didn't care about it. MR. EGGERS: Okay. SUPERVISOR DODD: That's, you know, let's talk about what's going on — MR. EGGERS: No, let's not. You just said that you guys care about, and you think, Napa, you know, does a better job. You know that I took Rosa Corey up to you right after the formal meeting was over and I went to shake your hand, you pulled it back and you told me to blow off. SUPERVISOR DODD: That's correct. MR. EGGERS: I was going to introduce her to you so you could talk about why she wrote again this book on Agenda 21. And so when you tell me and when you are telling us that you care, that's not representing us when you tell somebody to blow off. That's not something that a representative should be doing. And so I just wanted to make that point. Thank you. SUPERVISOR LUCE: And, you know, and I, again, the subject here is this plan, and this is what I can speak to, because this is what we have been working on for the last however many years. And how we got here, and all that, you know, I think there's, there's more altruistic than we might be accused of, but all I know is it really works for Napa. And I see in terms of how the plan fits for other communities, and I think we really have a good start on a plan. It is a plan, it's going to get reviewed in another, not two or three years, I think eight years or something like that. So, but, so that's, you know, that's what I can speak to. And what I, I guess I'm saying, it doesn't mean you should stop being concerned about big brother. I mean Big brother is still big brother. There's still a lot of plans at the state level and perhaps the federal level about, you know, how they want us all to live. And you have to pay attention to that. And I think sometimes you guys ask for some things that you don't really want. If we voted on this on a region wide basis, almost 99 percent sure we would not get what we want, because everybody would think Napa should take its fair share, and it would be a different number than what we are getting here. This plan actually allows us to have our values expressed in the plan and considered by other districts in a meaningful dialogue that you are not going to get if you want a region wide vote on this or even depend on the State of California to do this for...
us, because, well, that's what we have had in the past. And so, and you know, I really think
this, somewhat of a confederacy of cities and counties
that ABAG is made up of, and even our relationship with
MTC is more by an agreement, more than anything, is
actually a healthy thing. It causes us all to have a
good dialogue about what's important to each of us and
then in the end those things get considered.
If we had a top down board of eleven
people that were elected Bay Area wide, all bets are
off. And that's been proposed in the state legislature,
so you should be careful what you ask for.
MS. BARLOW: I just want to add a little. Sue
Barlow. And I already gave you a card. It's just that
we see so many things happening in our life, nationally,
where we are losing our say in so many things. We can
come and it doesn't matter. We can, we can have forums
and it doesn't matter. And we just want to know that
what we do, or the way we are used to living is
something that we are preserving, not just for us, but
for our children and their children. And we just feel
like there's more bureaucracy there's more red tape,
there's more rules, there's more regulations, when does
it ever stop, is what we're concerned about.
MS. GERALDINE DREW: Geraldine Drew. Napa
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better how you need to design a transportation system.
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, when we have this,
right now, does anyone know what percentage of our bus
services are utilized? I mean I can't believe that we
don't have a bus in American Canyon at an early time to
get up the Valley. That, I mean, if that's not right
then planning is not right. Somebody needs to have a
better bus schedule here. I mean, I'm all for that, and
I'm all for people getting on buses if they are in
communities that can use it, but we don't know. And we
seem like we're constantly trying to, we're developing
and developing and not having people on these buses.
And what is the button that is going to
say, okay, let's spend some more money in your two
million scenario here?

SUPERVISOR DODD: Probably for Napa that's
going to be your local elected officials, which are the
mayors of every single city, two supervisors and a
council member at large making those decisions without
interference. The only thing that we have to have is
that MTC does is they, they make, you know, rules in
terms of fair box recovery.
So you have to have, let's say, you know,
you have to have like 60 percent fair box recovery,
probably not. Napa it's never going to be that high, 20
percent fair box recovery is a condition that we have to have. You have to have so many people on. So we're continually trying to increase our public transportation. We're promoting it.

They are here tonight, and I think they are doing -- I tell you what, if you look around, and I ride my bike more and more these days, we always have, my kids used to always make fun of me when I was chairman NCFA, hey, dad, there's one of your buses and there's nobody on it. Well, you know what, I'm paying attention, and I, and I'm telling you, I'm amazed at home more people are riding public transportation in Napa. And it's a paradigm. It's, it's not going to be overnight. This isn't going to happen, this is just something that we didn't to keep chipping away.

But I really don't think that this plan here, that we are talking about tonight, really, where the real big bucks are going to go is Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose, where the population centers are, where they have to move people to and from work. And what we're going to have to do here, because we're small, we don't want the housing units, in some cases we might not even want their money, because I don't want to have the housing units.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So they are not connected that -- because he's chosen to put housing in American Canyon, that that's going to be a perk that he wouldn't get the benefit of having more transportation or --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: No, actually they are, if you are a Priority Development Area you are qualified to apply for a certain amount of funding. It's not a lot of money. It's a million bucks or so. Couple million bucks.

MAYOR GARCIA: We have 300,000 coming to help us to come up with a plan.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: So it tends to be planning money. In larger communities with larger resources coming to them it might, for a couple of key projects, make a huge difference, but I think as I mentioned, at the top, there's, that most of the Bay Area's money for transit in the current projections is mostly going for maintenance. It's, you know, keeping BART running, and doing those sorts of, getting our bridges up to standard. And so, so that's the good news and the bad news. And so, uh --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And how about our tourists, as far as traffic flow with them?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: So those, I guess what I'm trying to emphasize is local control is still alive and well, but it's this group of guys and gals that make the decisions.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I wouldn't mind them being in buses.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Certainly there's a lot of private buses that are doing that. So it's the private sector stepping up and doing a lot of that. I know we've talked about Vine Trail and trying to get some people out of their cars and into bikes and some other things. And so, and so your local community continues to wrestle with those questions. And I think that's a good thing. I don't want somebody in San Francisco to decide that for us.

MS. WILKINSON: Hi, okay. I want to know why it isn't being voted on? I understand you guys are our representatives but -- (Reporter requesting name.) Chantel Wilkinson, Calistoga.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: We are in the public hearing phase. Okay.

MS. WILKINSON: I figured we probably were. Okay. And people love their cars, as you know, so are they only, are you going to be able to live in these housing, whatever you are calling them, if you have a job somewhere else, or you have to have a job local, close to it, or on the route?
requirement that you take it, it's just a question of what qualifies as Priority Development in downtown Napa, because we do have the bus system that runs through the center of town, that qualified as a Priority Development Area. So then, so the idea is, well, because there is transit their, it is in the center of a lot of our job activity, that that's a good place to put higher density. And the city agrees with it. I think we already zoned a lot of higher density in that area.

So now because they designated themselves through PDA, they have the opportunity to pull down a few hundred thousand dollars for planning and other things.

MAYOR GARCIA: -- about, they are convenience and cost.

MS. WILKINSON: Correct, but how, how are you going to determine if you qualify to live in the sustainable housing? I mean, because there's a lot of people who are low income, or don't have an income but they need a roof over their heads, and they may not qualify for a job, I mean, they can't get a place anyway, so are they going to be able to live in these sustainable housing?

I mean they are people. And you are talking about people.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Okay. Yeah, and so, when we say sustainable, somebody asked that question, I think, you know, there's the three E's. Economy, environment, and equity, which I like to translate as opportunity.

And so, and I, that's, that's actually a good thing.

There was a time when it was just the environment and the idea of sustainability means no, we have got to roll the economic equation into this as well, and then, yeah, it has got to create opportunity for people not just fix linear problem. And so, so that's what we mean. And so, and that's why we talk about jobs, at the same time as we talk about housing, at the same time we talk about transit, and how people get back and forth, and whether it's fair that you ask somebody to commute two and a half hours a day to go to median to low income job, and should we plan for other ways to do business?

And that's, so it's trying to, when you say sustainability, what I think we're really saying, is we're trying to take the whole picture into account, not just a piece of it, like the environment. And so I think the word sustainability from a person whose concerned about you in Agenda 21 is a good term, actually, because at least from my history it wasn't always that way.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: -- about, they are convenience and cost.

MS. WILKINSON: -- do you have a model what these are going to look like?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: There are -- yes and no. Well, we, we have examples in other communities that we recognize in our Growing Smarter Together Awards, April 18, general assembly, if you would like to attend. And there's some models in Dublin and other areas where people have done these sorts of things.

So, so in this case, and again, the Napa city model, sustainability means we're building housing near the downtown where there are a lot of existing jobs where people can take buses to get to other parts of the city relatively easily. It's presumably higher density, which means it's going to be more affordable by construction, but there's, there's no new set of criteria about who can move in and who can't move in.

MS. WILKINSON: Okay.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: That's going to be the free market that is going to decide that.

MS. WILKINSON: And do you have like a model of these places that you are, that you are going to build? I know you said you had to have people who were willing to build them but --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Private sector will do that, yeah.

MS. WILKINSON: -- do you have a model what these are going to look like?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: There are -- yes and no. Well, we, we have examples in other communities that we recognize in our Growing Smarter Together Awards, April 18, general assembly, if you would like to attend. And there's some models in Dublin and other areas where people have done these sorts of things.

And again, it's, what's really neat about these examples, it's not just black and white, kind like, well, we built high density near transit, no, it's the manner in which they did it, the creativity they used in getting it done, their ability to consider the existing neighborhoods and how it impacted them, and how to work with that neighborhood to make these things work. And, generally, all these examples are win-win.

Everybody is happy with the result.

MS. WILKINSON: And where can I find the picture of these, or how do I find out how to get to these?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Miriam or somebody over there will get in you touch with some of these great examples.

MS. WILKINSON: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR DODD: For everybody that wants to get on the list, if you are not already on the mailing list or email list or MCA Plan for Bay Area, please fill out one of these, put your name and email address on it, and you will be notified of the meetings, when they are happening, local, regional.

MR. STOUT: Hello, my name is Nathan Stout, I'm a Vallejo resident, and I wanted to also advocate for the Wine Train. It would be great if it went all the way to Napa.
the way to Mare Island. We have the ferry terminal, and that the ferry terminal services San Francisco. If that service could be expanded, and there's action in Vallejo that would move the ferry terminal to both sides of the channel so that the ferry -- that's going to happen, probably, but if the ferry did have access to the other side of the channel, it could hook up with the rail there that was used for the old shipyard, and the Wine Train could service San Francisco pretty easily. So I wanted to advocate for that.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Thank you. Just yank it right out of there, if you want.

MS. SMITH: My name is Glen Ellen Smith, I've lived in Napa County since 1951. Unfortunately, I received an email just prior to coming to the meeting tonight that is a historical document about ABAG and how it all came about many years ago. And I only had an opportunity to skim through it briefly, but my question is, did the populous of Napa County ever vote to become members of ABAG or was it only done by our representatives, our council members?

And second, if that wasn't done, or even if it was done, how do we get out of ABAG, and what is the disadvantage to not being in ABAG with these mandates on us on what kind of housing we have to have, how many people, what the density has to be, and what's going to happen to our Valley?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Well, I can answer that I, almost certain nobody has voted as a populous to be part of ABAG. I think that was a city council or supervisors decision, at least it continues to be city council, can continue to join or leave ABAG anywhere in the Bay Area.

We asked that question, we had a great forum a few days ago with the Department of Finance, representative of housing community development, representative of HCD who does these allocations, as well as Steven Levy who does our economic forecast and asks the numbers, ask a lot about the population projections and other things, and asked the question, okay, we have heard people would like to leave ABAG, what would be the advantage or disadvantage?

And the HCD fellow said, well, one, it would probably take state legislation to do that, but that could happen, and once you did, your county would be like many other counties, and HCD then gives you your allocation directly. And HCD -- and his answer was, your allocation, if you are a rural county your allocation is probably going to be a lot higher because in the Bay Area region like this the population numbers, the allocations tend to shift towards Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose.

And if, say for instance, Napa pulled out, then our re-allocation would be more in proportionate to our population, and then we would start getting those 2,000 allocations again, just because that's how the state does it. Sort of cookie-cutter, close your eyes and make it happen.

And so by being a part of a region where we can work together to meet all of our values, protect ag. and open space, not see a lot of growth in this area, but still accommodate the Bay Area's growth and population, as well as jobs, then we work together. And it is One Bay Area in the sense that Napa County is a place where the Bay Area visits to get away, to enjoy the open space.

And we make that point, every time Diane and I are at a ABAG meeting that, you know, this is where you go too. And so a lot of our other electeds in the Bay Area appreciate that, that this is their county, as well. And that that they have an interest in protecting it, both an economic interest because of how valuable our agricultural land is, but as well as a place where they can go and get away from the urban congestion.

So the long and short of it is, is no they didn't vote on it. We could leave if we got the state legislation, which may be uphill battle, but we don't want to. There's a lot of value in participating in ABAG in terms of preserving what we have here in Napa.

SUPERVISOR DODD: Just on that, and it was, I think 2004, I was part of a group that was looking at leaving ABAG. I was concerned about the numbers that we were getting. We didn't have the ability to, to get any, you know, we are certainly not going to convert any agricultural land to land use for housing. And we did go and mark it spot on, that's what they have told him, that's what they told us.

And we found out that that the housing numbers, you know, with the state would not be much different than what they were with ABAG. And then what we did is we went and worked with ABAG. We went down and talked with the executive staff down there and told them about our problem. We brought them up here, did a dog and pony show. Drove them up and down 29 corridor. We took trips on Napa River. We showed them what was going on up Valley, you know, just why Napa was different than Alameda County or Contra Costa County.

And low and behold -- and Supervisor
Dillon, as I mentioned before, was on the, you know, the big committee. And not only did it result in county's numbers going down but it resulted in all the cities going down. And so I, I agree, I think the best bang for the buck for Napa County, at least if evidence is what's happened to us in the form of housing requirements, is with ABAG. There's just, there's just no doubt about it, our numbers have gone down well more than half. It's probably more like 60 or 70 --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: I think we're about a third.

SUPERVISOR DODD: A third, yeah.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: I think now the city's allocation is lower than 2,000. City of Napa, which at one time was closer to 4 or 5,000. So, it's -- and again, that doesn't mean, all that says is that, you know, the pressure for the county and cities of Napa to grow that have been there in the past, are gone. Doesn't mean the city can't continue to zone for more housing if it feels there's an appropriate place for it. The city is still free to do what it wants to do, but the pressure of that re-allocation is, well, again, we now have a plan that is consistent with our general plan.

MAYOR GARCIA: I think --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Go ahead and step up to the mic.

MAYOR GARCIA: -- the best benefit of this whole process, if you participate in the quality making process, you have a voice at the table, you can argue it. I don't know that you would have gotten anybody to come up and take the drive with you had you not been at the table with Supervisor Dillon, as well, seeing how well she did. So, yes, that's the reason, prime benefit of it.

I think secondary to me, it's a great opportunity to network within the community. What's going on in your city? Oh, you mentioned you had that problem. Yeah, we have a similar problem here. What did you do about that? Can we have some of that information? Thank you. I'll be happy to share what we got with you guys. It's a back and forth dialogue.

MS. SMITH: So now ABAG says we have to have 180 homes that we have to build now?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: No. 180 homes that we have to zone for in the unincorporated county. And again, we could use existing zoning. So we have zoning in Angwin, and we have deals with American Canyon, City of Napa. So the county is in a rare situation where we have actually got more housing than we are -- which there's no problem with that, but we, for the first time, have more housing now designated than we have actually got required.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So basically what I'm hearing you say is that even though the state through the MTC or whoever, or ABAG, tells us that we have to zone for that much, those number of houses, we are not physically mandated to build them?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Correct.

SUPERVISOR DODD: Correct.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Correct.

MS. SMITH: All right.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: That's always a misunderstanding perhaps that we're required to do zoning. It's the free market that does building, and even the state realizes that.

MS. SMITH: So taking this to one other agenda that's being discussed, that's Napa Pipe, those homes out there are satisfying some of the requirement that is being put for housing?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Yes.

MS. SMITH: And was that not an area that was going, being looked at as being shared by not only the county but the city would pick up some of those allocations so that the density wouldn't be as much in the Napa Pipe area?

SUPERVISOR DODD: Yes.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So basically what I'm thinking is that even though the state through the MTC or whoever, or ABAG, tells us that we have to zone for that much, those number of houses, we are not physically mandated to build them.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Correct.

SUPERVISOR DODD: Correct.

MS. SMITH: I didn't mean to drag Napa Pipe into this totally.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: No, I don't want to drag it in. The nuance here is the 180 units that we were talking about is actually for the next cycle that begins in another year or two. The current cycle that we're in, the one that we have to be in compliance with, is showing the county for like 680 units, which by the time you add in some other things looks more like 1,000 units.

And Napa Pipe is, there's a 20 acre designation there for, which accounts for about 300 units, that's currently part of our housing element. And we have to follow through with at least that piece of it, or more, depending on what the boards and everybody decides, but there is housing that's in our housing element now to meet our current RHNA requirements. And we need to do something there, either the 20 acres or a larger project.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

MS. GERALDINE DREW: Let me see if I remember my question. Geraldine Drew again. Diane, I think you need to be up here, telling me how, how did she do this,
and what did she do to get our numbers down? And are the rules going to change, is ABAG rules going to change or are they in the future? And --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: They are, you know, what's different about this is that we have a plan that the state has said has to go out to 2040. And so there is an expectation that what we are talking about here is actually going to remain consistent for a significant period of time.

Prior to this point we just went every four or maybe it was six years, five years, I forget what the cycle was, but we didn't know. You know, sort of a black box exercise. And we would cite all the things that the state said we were supposed to have in terms of consideration of agriculture, and all of the things that we thought the state law said why they shouldn't give us a higher allocation, and then we would get the number, and then it was hard to argue with.

So, but with this process we have seen the numbers move. And so, and it's not just a, you know, we will look at it again in eight years, I believe we have three eight year cycles in this plan that we will be considering. So, you know, so assuming that this plan holds together, there's an expectation that this will be our plan for a while. And so that, that's a good thing. I mean it gives us the ability to preserve this county and exercise our own general plans the way our local community is, you know, directing us.

MS. GERALDINE DREW: I still want to --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: So how did Diane do it?

MS. GERALDINE DREW: I still wanted to know how the numbers got so low. Because Diane might decide to move out of the area. And -- want to keep the numbers low.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: No, Diane was on the Housing Allocation Formula Methodology Committee, or some words close to that, where they tweek all these numbers, and along with Hillary, I think was a regular, hillary Gettleman, our planning director. And I think City of Napa had a representative there, as well.

And so they fought it on that level, as a member of the ABAG executive committee where we finalize those decisions. I fought it on that level, again just sort of lecturing my fellow electives on the importance of preserving Napa County, because at that point it kind of becomes a political decision. Diane and I, and others, have visited Sacramento numerous times making our case there. And as much as I would like to say it was all us, I think SB375 had a whole lot to do with why these numbers are different.

The fact that we have to put housing near transit and jobs, and they said that, they said that to the whole State of California, but they said that to the Bay Area, meant that more housing went to San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, than otherwise would have. And that took the pressure off of us. And it's good for the Bay Area and it's good for Napa.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: That is a fact.

MS. GERALDINE DREW: So if we bring too much development to this, we're going to have to have more housing, right?

SUPERVISOR LUCE: The housing allocations will come in. So the last allocation was 183,000. I think at the end of this cycle, this 24 year cycle we're supposed to see 600,000 new units. So the pressure will continue. But, but, you know, the plan is what it is. And so, you know, I think we have got ourselves in a good position for future negotiations.

MS. BARLOW: Mark, when you say units, does that mean single family homes, or two, does it mean --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: It means -- let me qualify units. I'm sorry, the question was from Sue Barlow, you know, it's sort of a state definition of what a housing unit is. Generally a housing unit, it might be multifamily, it might be, you know, highrise, it might be single family detached. All of that is included, yeah.

And another question? Please identify yourself.

MR. RICO: Gerald Rico from MTC public advisory council. It's a voluntary position. And I've lived here in Napa 16 years. Got my news from the Sentinel.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Eeeew.

MR. RICO: The Napa Valley Register. The locals know what that means. But I have to admit that the first time I heard of Agenda 21 was probably a week before our meeting. Having been with the MTC now approximately seven years, that's the first time I've heard of Agenda 21. And I would have to say someone would have to go to the Napa Valley Register and show me the first time it's documented or referenced as Agenda 21 occurring in the Napa Valley.

Can anyone tell me?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You should read --
SUPERVISOR LUCE: For the record, comments for the record? Beyond that, then I think Bill and I can break, get some coffee and visit you with you one on one.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: That's a good question. I believe, one, is we record them, so they will be part of the record. Particularly the questions -- Miriam, or someone, I think will -- I think the intention is that as we make our final record, maybe you just want to --

MS. GRIFFIN: Hi, I'm Ellen Griffin from MTC.

We're taking all your comments tonight, we are going to have a transcript from the court reporter be part of the record. It will be available as a document. And then we're also summarizing the comments and we're presenting them to the decision makers before they go ahead and take an action on the plan.

AUDIOIENCE MEMBER: Who are the decision makers?

SUPERVISOR DODD: Don't you feel better now?

MS. GRIFFIN: -- this summer.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: There are people just like us in other counties, and we get together, so there's about 38 electives that make up the executive body of the Association of Bay Area Governments. And how many MTC commissioners? Another 16 commissioners. Two of them are right here, so that shows you how important Napa is in this whole discussion. And we'll be making that decision to adopt the EIR, and I guess all the variations on the EIR.

And this is, I guess, another point to be made, is tonight was comments on the draft plan. There are other hearings on the draft environmental document. I know I've heard some concerns about taxes and all those sorts of things. Those are where those various
alternatives are discussed and evaluated, so you want to
go to the website, One Bay Area dot org., look at the
draft EIR and the dates for those hearings, and or then
submit your comments in writing or show up at those
hearings to discuss that, because that's another
opportunity.

SUPERVISOR DODD: There has to be a certain
sense of reality on the environmental document. If you
don't study something like VMT, vehicle miles traveled,
where you charge somebody on every mile that they
traveled, somehow you get that documentation, if you
don't study that as part of the analysis of the whole
plan, then the plan, you know, we are going to get sued
and we are going to spend a lot of legal dollars, and
this, this plan is just going to be tied up forever.

Likewise, there are also, that's why
there's a range of alternatives.

SUPERVISOR LUCE: Wide range.

SUPERVISOR DODD: All these different
scenarios, it doesn't mean that you've got your local
officials that are going to support, you know, the most
liberal option or the most conservative option. So
that's all, what that is, I think a lot of people have
seen those things and go, oh my God, this is what they
are going to do, they are going to tax us on every mile

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Because the government --

SUPERVISOR LUCE: But that doesn't mean there
aren't some people that aren't willing to vote for that.
So your comments are still valued. So, you know, it's a
big Bay Area, lots of people, big diversity. So your
comments are more than welcome. They are needed.

Okay. Last call for any comments?

Seeing none, let's go get some coffee if it's still out
there, or head home.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.)
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Thursday, April 11, 2013  7:15 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

SUPERVISOR MAR: Good evening, everyone.

Thank you so much for coming out. I'm really pleased with all the wonderful activity and discussions going on in our open house. My name is Eric Mar. I'm a member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, but I also serve as one of San Francisco's representatives on the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments or ABAG, and I'd like to recognize also Anne Halsted who represents the San Francisco Conservation and Development Commission or BCDC on our Metropolitan Transportation Commission or MTC, as we call it.

I also think that I'm supposed to -- I think this is a good idea that we should join in saying the pledge of allegiance, if you wish. And I'm just trying to see -- is there a flag in this room?

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Behind you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: So if you wish, join us for the pledge.

(The pledge of allegiance took place.)

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. My colleague -- or our colleague Scott Wiener, who is on the MTC, should be joining us later, and my other colleague on the board...
of supervisors, David Campos, I believe could not join us tonight. But a lot of great input and comments that will come from tonight will be shared with the MTC Commission but also the Association of Bay Area Governments Board and Commission as well. So the information will be useful in this hearing but also others as well.

With that, I'd like to welcome everyone to tonight's public hearing. This is your opportunity to comment for the official record on what's called the Draft Plan for -- Draft Plan Bay Area, which is now out for public review. And Plan Bay Area is a long-range transportation and land-use blueprint for the very diverse, unique and wonderful region that we call home.

I hope you had a chance to ask questions and learn about the Draft Plan at the open house, which will continue for another -- I believe, it's 15 or 20 minutes this evening across the hall.

This is MTC and ABAG's third public hearing and meeting in San Francisco to hear from our residents on Plan Bay Area. And while the plan is slated for adoption this July, it's important to note that it's a work in progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities, new resources, new approaches and also new demographic and other information that we gather.

The comments we hear tonight will be shared with all the decision makers who serve on MTC and ABAG. I also wanted to say that the comments tonight are for the public record. It's not a dialogue in this public hearing, but there are key MTC and ABAG staff that are around the room that could answer your questions. But the open house is really for the dialogue; this is for the public comment tonight.

And it's also worth noting that this regional Plan Bay Area is first and foremost about supporting our cities. San Francisco, which I represent with ten others in our mayor and city departments, is taking on much of the housing and employment in our whole Bay Area region, and San Francisco also stands to gain much in terms of infrastructure and investments to support housing and jobs for the region.

Plan Bay Area also provides the needed infrastructure to support redevelopment in key places like Hunters Point and Candlestick Point and Treasure Island through street network improvements and new transit services.

The OneBayArea Grant Program or OBAG, as some call it, supports jurisdictions emphasizing the focused growth around transit. This funding will help the

city -- our city, San Francisco, deliver neighborhood improvements to make San Francisco an even better place to live.

The Draft Plan invests in critical improvements for San Francisco Muni, and we have one of our Muni reps, as well, Joël Ramos, here with us tonight. But it will help make improvements to Muni through bus rapid transit lines on Van Ness and Geary and Geneva-Harney, which will relieve overcrowding and improve travel times on some of our city's most congested corridors.

The plan focuses funding on critical needs of operating and maintenance of the existing transportation system in our city, a particularly important issue for San Francisco's future. And these funds will help replace aging Muni buses and light-rail vehicles, increase BART service in urban core through a new BART-Metro program, as well as fix potholes in some of our famously bumpy and steep San Francisco streets.

Plan Bay Area supports continued job growth, as well, in downtown San Francisco through high capacity transit investments, such as the extension of Caltrain to the new Transbay terminal that we're building in San Francisco now, and the completion of the Central Subway to Chinatown as well.

The Draft Plan also seeks to grow Bay Area's transit affordable housing fund from a $50 million pool today to $90 million by 2014. This revolving loan fund also allows affordable housing developers -- many in San Francisco -- to finance land acquisition in select locations near rail and bus lines.

You can view the draft -- Draft Plan Bay Area, submit commits online, and sign up to receive updates by visiting OneBayArea.org. That's OneBayArea.org. And there's also information on the table to the side. And again, the open house is continuing, if you have questions.

This public comment period that Anne Halsted and I will facilitate -- we're going to limit people to two minutes per person, and Ellen from the MTC has a buzzer. So you should be able to hear a little buzz as the time is up. And we want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak, so listen for the beep.

And the public comment period closes on Thursday, May 16th, at 4:00 p.m. So you can still submit your comments through e-mail and other ways, as well as speaking out today.

So we've gathered a number of cards. And if there are still others that would like to speak, we'll be asking if anyone else -- after we call the cards --
LIZ O’DONOGHUE: Good afternoon. My name is Liz O’Donoghue. I live and work in San Francisco. I live in the Inner Richmond, so I’m a constituent. And I have a family of two small kids and a husband. And we have strong ties to the East Coast, but we affirmatively made a decision to stay in San Francisco, primarily because of the quality of life that it offers. So I want to thank you for Plan Bay Area’s strong focus on additional planning, which is really important and also for the focus on no-sprawl plan, and that is really important. One particular aspect that’s important to me is the quality of life that it offers; living and working in San Francisco, but also having access to and the benefit of the parks and open space and farmland that are a major part of the Bay Area. And so the work that MTC and ABAG have done with the OBAG Grant switch promote the focus of the development on priority development areas, but also to have a very innovative priority conservation grant program is really terrific. But it can do more. And what I urge MTC and ABAG to do is to focus on proactive work and policies and investments to really focus on protecting what we have; the natural habitats, the farmland, the open space, the parks, because that is so important to quality of life and healthy living. And the other piece that concerns me is the impact on displacement. And so I hope that, as you go through this process, you really work on the social equity part of the plan because I think that that is critically important to make this area have a strong quality of life and workforce to support the vibrant economy we have here.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

LIZ O’DONOGHUE: Oh, and I do want to make a plea for the Geary bus rapid transit.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Very good.

ZOE SIEGELL: Hi everyone. My name is Zoe Siegell, and I’m a Bay Area native. I grew up in Berkeley, and always knew growing up that I wanted to move to San Francisco. What I didn’t know was how hard that was going to be. And when I graduated from college and I moved back home and I spent probably six months looking for housing, and I would go to open house after open house, and -- so I was looking at rooms that were the size of closets and well out of my price range, and there were still 50 other people exactly like me applying for these rooms. And it just made me realize there are major housing prices going on in San Francisco. And just the -- due to the lack of sufficient housing, people who -- basically, people who don’t work in the tech industry are just being priced out of San Francisco. And, yes, more affordable housing would be great, but San Francisco really needs more housing in general. And it’s really important to me, as we plan for the future of the Bay Area, that we consider the units of housing. And I think that the Draft Plan Bay Area really goes in the right direction of providing more housing, both rapid rate and affordable, and I shutter to imagine what San Francisco would be like without Plan Bay Area.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

ANNA GORE: Hi. My name is Anna Gore. Thank you for having the open house and the forum. It’s definitely been a great experience so far. I’m a new resident of San Francisco. I’ve been here for just about a year and live in a small apartment that’s just the right size for me and my boyfriend and our two dogs and happily take advantage of some of the amenities and riding my bike to work every day, which is fantastic. The quality of life here is well above where I came from in a part of Georgia.

So I have some family in the East Bay, and most of my family is in the East Coast. I have a dad who’s retired, and he’s considering moving this way. He really does want to be closer to family, and I’d like to have him in the area, but when he starts looking at housing prices in San Francisco, he’s just really afraid...
that he's not going to be able to afford to live here. And I know Plan Bay Area has a lot of efforts going towards providing affordable housing, and I just want to stress that I think that's incredibly important for our community.

I want to see a plan that provides a variety of housing types for people like my dad and for the variety and diverse populations of the Bay Area, to accommodate a lot of different needs.

So, again, I think that Plan Bay Area is going in the right direction, and I just want to encourage and strengthen the amount of efforts going into affordable housing.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

CATHERINE LYONS: I'm Catherine Lyons with the Bay Area Council.

First, I want to thank you for all the hard work that you all as commissioners and the staff has done on this plan. It's been a long process, and we appreciate all that you have done so far.

First, we remain strongly committed to advancing policies that will grow jobs and the overall economy for the region. And a critical component of this is providing enough housing for our workforce. So we urge you to just consider the benefits of adopting a policy changes, and we definitely want to see the needle moved in the right direction on this. And so again, look forward to having further conversations around that with the staff.

larger number of housing units as actually laid out in draft alternative four. And you know, the significant increase in housing -- I'm sorry -- will result in also a huge increase in jobs, from our perspective. And surveys of CEOs and various other reports that we've done, the Bay Area housing -- or one of the biggest barriers to job growth in the region is lack of housing, affordable or otherwise. So we really urge you to take a look at that.

In order to build a number of units that is required to house our new workforce in these priority development areas, we really need to dramatically reduce the barriers to this type of development. So we're really pleased to see that redevelopment replacement, CEQA modernization was a part of the advocacy agenda for the regional agencies, and we'd like to continue working with them on these issues.

And finally, I just want to, again, express our appreciation for the Commission's PDA feasibility assessment. The report found that 62 percent of the units designated in PDAs were feasible without new policy changes, and we definitely want to see the needle moved in the right direction on this.

And so again, look forward to having further conversations around that with the staff.

So thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

CLAIRE JAHNS: Hi. My name is Claire Jahns, and I live and work in San Francisco. And thanks for the opportunity to come and speak with you today about Plan Bay Area.

I came to the city about three years ago for employment opportunities. And pretty sure I'm going to make it my home because of the quality of living here. And a number of my friends have moved around the same time in the last three to five to ten years and all see San Francisco as an opportunity from an employment perspective but also just as a fabulous place to live because of the culture and in large part because of the surrounding areas, so the parks; national, state, county, local parks we have here as well as agricultural land from vineyards to lettuce fields. And some of the gorgeous natural areas. And, in fact, you probably know the Bay Area houses some of the most important ecosystems in the world.

So I thank you for this regional plan. I come from the Midwest, which this kind of regional multi-county plan is rare. So it's very impressive to see. So by focusing growth in urbanized area, we've really taken some of the development pressure off of some of these open spaces, which we so love in the region.

And I just ask you, as you continue to develop this plan and implement this and the OneBayArea Grant Program in the future and in the future generations, to not take those recreational lands, habitat lands and agricultural lands for granted and to, in fact, invest in them proactively to keep them there, keep them strong, and keep them available to us many in the Bay Area and all the visitors in the years to come.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. And before we call the next speakers, let me just say that Anne Halsted is from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, BCDC, and she sits as the BCDC rep on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. I forgot to ask if she wanted make some comments.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Very briefly, and we'll get you right up there.

I have the privilege of representing BCDC, which means I'm representing more or less the environmental issues of the Bay, and -- but at MTC we're dealing with broader issues with that, so I get to try to make sure that we are doing the best for our Bay, but also leveraging our transportation investment so we...
improve our economy, we improve the health of our
citizens. Very aspirational goals, as you’ve seen. I
think we’ve got 15 goals we’ve set, all of which are not
all necessarily going to be accomplished, but I think
it’s really terrific that we’re setting them and then
trying to analyze the results and make sure we get close
to them.

So my biggest message to you is, stay on
course and try to make sure that we get close to those
goals, if not right away, on the next time. But our
ability to analyze it and to set those goals increases
every time we try. So I think it’s a great effort, and
we’re moving closer to an even better Bay Area.

Anyway, next -- have you been called? I’m
sorry. Please.

MONICA HERNANDEZ: I’m Monica Hernandez. I
live in San Francisco. Hi.

I live and work here. I’ve been here since
1998, and I’m here to push for affordable housing and --
for San Francisco. When I first moved here, I came for
job opportunities, and I ended up staying for the
community and -- that is San Francisco, that sense of
feeling like you belong.

I’d like to see that -- what I like about
San Francisco is the neighborhoods having the various
types of people from all walks of life and all different
income. Though, my neighbor next door might make a
million dollars, another person might not make -- under
$50,000. So I’m here to say I’m here for a plan that
supports our communities and supports all walks of life.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you very much.
The next five speakers will be Steve Woo,
Susan Vaughan, Joël Ramos, Trudy Garber and Noah
Friedman.

Could you come up and be ready.

STEVE WOO: Good evening. My name is Steve
Woo. I’m from Chinatown CDC here in San Francisco.

We would like to call out today Section 2.3 of
the draft EIR, which identifies potential adverse
impacts due to the implementation of this plan.
Specifically called out in Section 2.3 it is what the
EIR considers the community’s disruption and
displacement.

The draft EIR actually identifies that the
addition of new housing units and commercial spaces in
priority development areas could stimulate demand and
attract new residents and businesses, resulting in new
development types, higher prices and leading to
displacement of existing residents.

The draft EIR also projects that this plan
will significantly increase density within the Bay
Area’s densest urban centers, which will impact local
land uses, desirability and rents, resulting in what the
EIR considers, quote, "permanent localized displacement
and disruption."

In addition, this plan calls for 160 major
transportation projects around the Bay, impacting over
12,000 households. And the result of this called out in
the draft EIR is specifically the potential to disrupt
and displace communities.

So regardless that the draft EIR goes on to
list mitigations for these impacts, the mitigations are
an important thing to note because under the new CEQA
streamlining laws, provisions of SB 375, if a project
satisfies mitigations, the project can go forward in the
new streamline CEQA process.

So taking a look at the mitigations is very
important; however, the mitigations in the EIR do not go
far enough, and, frankly, are deficient in addressing
the community disruption and displacement concerns. So
what we would like to see and to have commented for the
record is further analysis in the EIR, an analysis of
mitigating long-term impacts of displacement and
disruption of communities, further analysis of housing
affordability needs within PDA today compared to
post-plan implementation and how increased density
within the PDAs will impact affordable housing needs.

Analysis of how to link housing density, which
the plan calls for, to creation of new affordable
housing for low- and moderate-income folks to offset
displacement. And also, principle of one-to-one
displacement -- one-to-one replacement and relocation of
all low-income households directly displaced by the
Plan’s transportation projects.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you.

SUE VAUGHAN: Good afternoon, Commissioner,
Sue Vaughan. I’m affiliated with the Sierra Club. I’m
not speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club.

I am -- have a lot of concerns about this
plan, as we move forward, especially with all the talk
about the changes to CEQA in the air and possible
legislation at the state level and legislation currently
at the local level. I’m very concerned that
San Franciscans are not going to be able to challenge
bad projects or bad components of projects.

As you move forward with this plan, when you
think about combating climate change, we need three
major things:

One, we need affordable housing. And in
San Francisco, our general plan calls for 64 percent affordable housing. We need mass investments in transit, and what I don't see that -- I don't see that here in this plan for the whole region; I see just a little bit of an investment, not nearly the amount we need. And we need protection of natural areas and natural habitat.

I'm very concerned because I look at this plan about widening freeways. This is the 21st century. Why are we widening freeways? Why are we considering -- why are we putting investment into electric cars? If you do -- read the studies, electric cars are not that much better than internal combustion engines. We need to be focusing on transit. You know, electric cars -- again, there -- wealthy people can afford electric cars; average people cannot afford them.

Thank you.

JOEL RAMOS: Good afternoon, Supervisor Mar and Commissioner Halsted. I really appreciate the opportunity and the format that this is -- that you are all facilitating here.

For full disclosure, my name is Joël Ramos. I work for TransForm. I'm Senior Community Planner there. I'm also appointed to the MTA Board of Directors. I'm not speaking on behalf of the MTA tonight. Tonight my opinions are my own and TransForm's.

I am a resident of San Francisco and work over in Oakland. We are deeply supportive of the direction that we're heading. We don't think that we got it all together yet, but we're certainly headed there. We're really happy that the EJ alternative, the scenario that we suggested, emerges the environmental and superior scenario, and we hope that you will -- that the Commission will move towards adopting the strongest elements of that scenario.

What we are concerned about is a couple of things that I think most folks have already mentioned this evening: The lack of really addressing the affordable housing needs that are going to be -- that are going to come to the Bay Area with this plan. We're particularly concerned that we found that in the plan that after build-out, even in the best case scenario, we're expecting people of lower incomes to spend a full 73 percent of their incomes on housing plus transportation, and we don't see that as a sustainable way of controlling the sprawl that we're going to be trying to limit.

What will happen eventually without stronger policies in place to protect that from happening, these folks will end up living further and further away from a place like San Francisco, and we will then encroach on our precious farmlands and open space that we're so fortunate to have in this Bay Area.

The second point that we're mostly concerned about is something that Ms. Vaughan spoke to earlier, which is the idea of widening freeways. We understand that we need to make our freeway system more efficient, and one of the ways we can do that is simply by just refurbishing some of the lanes that are already in existence, turning them into high-occupancy toll lanes and use those revenues to fund the transit that we so sorely need.

That's all I have time for. I thank you so much for your service and look forward to furthering the conversation.

NOAH FRIEDMAN: Hi. Good evening. My name is Noah Friedman. I live in Berkeley and work in San Francisco, so opposite commute. And I also appreciate the opportunity to make a public comment.

Actually, in preparing to come here, I reviewed some past Plan Bay Areas and even came across Projection '79. So it was pretty amazing because it predicted the suburban sprawl and reduced regional density that occurred between '79 and 2000.

And so what became apparent is that Plan Bay Area is more of an indicator of where the status quo is heading, and it's really less of a plan for an alternative future. And this is a little bit of a concern.

Obviously, this Plan Bay Area predicts a more compact and transit-oriented future, and so we're optimistic about that -- or I'm optimistic about that, but it still falls short, and even by the Plan's own admission, it falls short on a number of metrics, including -- you know, I think every speaker here has mentioned affordable housing, and then also reduced BMT, which has to do with increased freeway.

So I guess I'm just here to encourage Plan Bay Area to be more visionary and really less predictive of the status quo. And I'm sure you're going to hear something -- some different opinions on that as you go around the Bay Area, so I just really want to push hard and make sure that the people that are offering this plan understand that there's a growing force of people that want to see the region address these issues, especially with affordable housing.

I mean, to think that by 2040, we're not -- we haven't addressed that issue is sort of shameful.

Thank you.
| Page 26 |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you. | 1. This is an aspiration, not a reality. |
| 2. TRUDY GARBER: Hi. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on the Bay Area Plan and for putting together the open house. | 2. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 3. My name is Trudy Garber, and I work at the Trust for Public Land, which is a national nonprofit that conserves land for people. And I’m here to underscore the importance of green spaces in urban areas or our priority development areas. | 3. Thank you. |
| 4. In addition to transportation, housing and jobs, urban green spaces are an important part of the livable communities we all strive to create. So not only do neighborhood parks and trails add esthetic value to our urban communities, but they also provide opportunities for healthy living. People have access to places to exercise and trees to sit under for physical and mental health, and they make people want to stay inside their cities for recreation, not get in their car and drive to a national park. | 4. SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. |
| 5. So the Trust for Public Land urges the officers of Plan Bay Area to make urban neighborhood, parks and trails eligible for PDA funding, and to make sure that all this new density residents live within a ten-minute walk of an urban park for more livable communities. | 5. MARCY BERRY: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity with this public meeting. My name is Marcy Berry from Libertarian Party of San Francisco. |

| Page 27 |
|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Thank you very much. | 1. Steve Woo was here earlier from Chinatown Community Development Center who pointed out -- and interestingly enough, the EIR calls it "community disruption and displacement." That's some pretty interesting words, but that has been all along for our organization not an antigrowth perspective but concerned about the implications of growth when you particularly overload a system at the community level in a place like San Francisco. |
| 2. COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you. | 2. The report shows that under the proposed Plan Bay Area scenario, that the potential for displacement goes from 21 percent to 36 percent. For all the good planning and thinking and empathy that has gone on over the last three years, the proposed plan increases the potential for displacement from the existing 21 percent where we are already struggling to keep our community stable, to 36 percent. |
| 3. SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. | 3. What are the mitigations and safeguards? There’s no funding in the SCS for affordable housing. And I want to point out the folks who are here supporting affordable housing, that planning for affordable housing is totally different than funding for affordable housing. You don’t get nothing out of the plan, unless there’s dollars for that to be built. So... |
| 4. The next speakers are Peter Cohen from the Council of Community Housing Organizations; Marcy Berry from Libertarian Party; Kate White, SF Foundation; Aubrey Freedman from the Libertarian Party; and Dan Pickett from Pacifica. | 4. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 5. PETER COHEN: Good evening. Thank you, Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations. I’ve heard a lot about affordable housing. Well, we’re in that particular line of business as an advocacy coalition. I just wanted to remind us what’s at stake here from a long-term vision standpoint. We’re talking about going from regional development that’s maybe 50/50 between urban and suburban development, something in the order of 65 to 70 percent of growth in more compact urban areas. And that sounds good, but what does it mean? What are the implications? For San Francisco, that means 92,000 new housing units, which is about 25 percent of all the new growth in the major cities of the Bay Area. 25 percent of all this new urban development is to be in this city. That’s a high state for us. What does that mean at ground level? |
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|------------------|------------------|
| 1. this is an aspiration, not a reality. | 1. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 2. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 3. MARCY BERRY: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity with this public meeting. My name is Marcy Berry from Libertarian Party of San Francisco. | 3. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 4. Someone who has spent her life looking at numbers and making economic analysis, I'm a little bit concerned about the way that Plan Bay Area has framed the argument. The saying that "The one who frames the argument wins the argument" is a good one. So I'm here to say, okay, there's another way to frame it, that -- why is it that we're saying that only Government can do the good things that Plan Bay Area is saying, and I say "good" in quotations because, for example, as Mr. Woo has said before us, that there is going to be... | 4. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
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|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Thank you. | 1. This is an aspiration, not a reality. |
| 2. COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you. | 2. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 3. SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. | 3. MARCY BERRY: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity with this public meeting. My name is Marcy Berry from Libertarian Party of San Francisco. |
| 4. The next speakers are Peter Cohen from the Council of Community Housing Organizations; Marcy Berry from Libertarian Party and Dan Pickett from Pacifica. | 4. Moreover, building affordable housing is not the only answer. We need to stabilize our existing community, so my last point is, we put just as much importance in anti-justification and anti-displacement policies that need to be part of this plan as much as building new housing, and we don’t see those in there either. We encourage the staff to continue working on this, but we’re still very concerned about the destruction potential at ground level. |
| 5. PETER COHEN: Good evening. Thank you, Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations. I’ve heard a lot about affordable housing. Well, we’re in that particular line of business as an advocacy coalition. I just wanted to remind us what’s at stake here from a long-term vision standpoint. We’re talking about going from regional development that’s maybe 50/50 between urban and suburban development, something in the order of 65 to 70 percent of growth in more compact urban areas. And that sounds good, but what does it mean? What are the implications? For San Francisco, that means 92,000 new housing units, which is about 25 percent of all the new growth in the major cities of the Bay Area. 25 percent of all this new urban development is to be in this city. That’s a high state for us. What does that mean at ground level? |
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disruption, and the problem is the financing.  
When you bring Government, obviously you're 
going to crowd out private investment. And this is 
what's happening here because you are so focused on 
providing from the Government standpoint, that you're 
going to crowd out any kind of voluntary investment that 
there is to have.

The other concern -- and these are just 
concerns that I have that I would like to put before 
you -- it would seem to me that if you plan for public 
housing, you are creating a tenable situation. Because 
the more you plan, the more people are going to come. 
So at what point you going to say, "Okay. Now we have 
enough public housing"? There's no such thing because 
the market will find a way. The more -- you will never 
achieve a balance; only the market achieves a balance. 
No matter how much you try to finagle it, it's not going 
to work.

So these are my main concerns: Is the 
financing -- where is it going to come from? The basic 
inflexibility that Government has, that Government 
carries with it; therefore, when you put all your eggs 
in one basket -- okay. Here, the Government is going to 
provide for all this stuff, you're going to find a 
problem.

So thank you very much for the opportunity.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

AUBREY FREEDMAN: Hi. My name is Aubrey 
Freedman. I'm also from the Libertarian Party of 
San Francisco.

I'm not too happy with this plan. I would 
definitely vote no project.

First thing I wanted to say is, why is this 
report, 1,336 pages, came out on April 2nd, 9 days ago.
Do you really expect the public is going to go through 
that amount of reading in nine days is ridiculous.
This -- there should have been a much longer period for 
persons to digest this. This doesn't seem right to have 
such a huge report going out 25 years and having such a 
short time to go through it.

The second thing that really bothers me about 
this whole central planning thing is social equity.

Now, this is supposed to be improve the 
environment, the greenhouse gases, and, you know, all 
about to make a better environment. So what is social 
equity? Why is that part of this Plan Bay Area? That's 
what I'd like to know. This, to me, seems more like 
distribution of income or resources so that all the 
communities will be more equal, which, in my mind, will 
bring them down.

San Francisco is already very crowded. Who 
wants a more crowded city? It's already unbelievable. 
So I do not think this is avid, plus it takes away 
choices too. Not everybody wants to live in these 
high-rise pack-and-stack apartments, so I think more 
choices is better, and Plan Bay Area is to reduce 
choices and to make it harder for people who want to 
live in a single-family dwelling who don't want to take 
transportation is not always feasible.

I actually work in Burlingame. It takes me a 
half hour. I can get home in 20 minutes. So you're 
telling me public transportation is going to get me 
there in half an hour and back? I don't think so.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you.

KATE WHITE: Good evening. Kate White. I've 
lived in San Francisco in the Mission since 1996, and I 
want to thank the decision makers, our leaders here and 
our staff for the many -- I think it's years. I was 
going to say months, but many years of working on this 
plan, and I am thrilled to see that it is -- I believe, 
100 percent of the growth is planned within urban growth 
boundaries, so we're hopefully moving in a better 
direction away from sprawl in this region. So thrilled 
about that. I think the plan could be even better, and
supporting building homes that people of all incomes can afford. And so take a look at EEJ alternative and bring less traffic, healthier residents, fewer traffic deaths, more affordable neighborhoods and would do a better job in allowing our most vulnerable neighbors to stay in their homes.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you very much.

Next I'd like to call Philip Berg.

And then following Mr. Berg, David Pilpel, Henry Chong -- I think it's Chong; might be Cheng, Starchild, Rob Bregoff and Steve Tyson.

PHILIP BERG: My name is Philip Berg. I was a libertarian candidate of congress three times in this district. I've lived here since 1988. I attended Washington University, majored in economics and biology. I attended there because their econimer was the leading environmentalist at the time, proponent of global cooling in the 70s.

But the main reason I want to talk to you is that I believe that liberty, freedom and personal choice from the bottom up is the best thing for human development and for the environment. It's -- essential to liberty is to have a functioning government that works by the rules as accountable. And this process breaks two of those rules.

It breaks the rules of democratic role because a council that's appointed for 20 years is basically then left unaccountable to voters is not democratic. And democracy, to whatever extent the Government has the legitimacy to use arms against innocent people for the goals of an elite -- to whatever extent they have legitimacy, that comes from democracy. So this whole process is illegitimate because this is set up to avoid democratic accountability.

The other basic aspect of this is the idea of separation of powers. In order to have -- in order to allow one group of society to use force to do things like define property rights, development rights, things like that, one of the innocent people -- is that that force has to be accountable. So the two parts of accountability, of course, democracy and the balance of powers.

So the balance of powers require that that whoever is making the decision has to be accountable not only to the voters but to other levels of government, especially to elected levels of government at a state and national level.

So to create a council that's going to take away property rights -- these are not the ones who vote the essential checks on accountability, and I can't guarantee it because humans behave in all different ways, but usually power leads to unintended consequences.

For example, San Francisco is, as underdeveloped as it is, because of -- well-intentioned people for decades prevented any development. So the best solution, of course, is freedom, because as wise as and well-intended as the guys might be, you might end up creating just the opposite result.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, please.

ROB BREGOFF: I guess that's me. My name is Rob Bregoff. And thank you for letting me speak.

Just for the record, I'm an associate transportation planner of Caltrans, but I'm not speaking for Caltrans; I'm just speaking for myself. If I didn't put that in there, I get spanked in my work.

So I just had two things: One of them is -- I was looking at the map of the San Francisco PDA, and I notice that along with Geary BRT, there isn't a Geary PDA. It seems very bizarre that you didn't extend a PDA down Geary Boulevard to take advantage of the BRT system, and it seems like just a blaring mistake to me.
HENRY CHENG: I want to thank you all for allowing us -- to give us the opportunity to express our opinions.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Could you please --

HENRY CHENG: My name is Henry Cheng. I'm an individual representing my City of San Francisco. Been here for almost 35 years.

And one of the things I had notice over time since high school until now is that -- you know, I remember the Golden Gate Bridge, how much it was, and they kept on telling us, "Don't worry. It won't go up."

Now you don't have to worry about paying for it because they're going to send you a bill.

But the funny thing is this: We are a capitalist society. Let the market do the job. I have traveled all over the world, and I have seen the operation between Government and corporation. It's one of the incredible things when the Government get out the way. But the problem is here. The Bay Area is one of the most viable economy in the United States. But do you know how difficult it is for businessmen like me to start a business here versus, say, Sacramento or Texas? We won't be moving our corporation.

And the thing is this: The business will take care of our community if people are working. But when you try to cram more people in a small space like San Francisco, and how all this plan -- and being a person who studied mathematics and statistic, I will say, where you get your number from? You all need to show us the real number. Let us do our own judgment, if you have this wonderful projection.

But San Francisco or the Bay Area is too big for inexperienced people like you or the committee to tell those who know how to deal with it. Less than one project at a time and evaluate the -- let's do Plan Bay Area in all commission, regarding -- take one project properly.

Look at the Bay Bridge. This is one of the most incredible delayed mistakes and on and on and on, and you want to take on the whole Bay Area when we can't even get the Bay Bridge up and running properly on time and under budget.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you, Mr. Cheng.

HENRY CHENG: So in conclusion, I think we need to have a smaller agenda and work one project at a time and let us, the people, evaluate your performance.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

STEVE TYSON: I'm Steve Tyson. I'm a designer and an artist, and I'm a straight guy. To be when -- I have the business, and we made -- revamp for quite a few years and -- for tax reasons.

I've been a gearhead all my life, and my dad was with first landscape architect for highways for the State of California. He's the guy that shows those old handlers down the road.

I hitchhiked hundreds of rides back in the late '60s. I've seen it from ground up. And I work in the three garages -- three motorcycle shops, a truck factory and a factory. And I have been in San Francisco for 43 years. I love it here. It's just big fun. The traffic and transit stuff -- I'd like to see tunnels.

From the Golden Gate Bridge to 280 or approximately because we're not letting freeway in. And we could have another tunnel that goes from the bridge out to the -- say past Candlestick Point out that way and then another one over to the East Bay. From the -- we're going to a hole here. I think that's the only solution because we're not going to let any more on the surface, not in this town. So there's only one choice left.

That's the end of the story. I'm a gearhead, and I love it. I'm a Mr. Fix-it kind of guy. So that's about all I got to say about that. Good luck on what you have to do. It's a tough deal to do.

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Thank you.

DAVID PILPEL: Good evening. David Pilpel.
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On just a couple of substantive points, I think that the extent to which this plan ties together other plans and projects that are being worked on by MTC and some of the other agencies and trying to explain that, is helpful. I noted the Caltrans station that really showed the various plans that they're pulling together into a more coherent Caltrans plan.

I'm wondering, for example, how this Plan Bay Area relates to the transit sustainability project, which is actually looking to rationalize or reduce the amounts of transit service.

And just a final point: Although, I support more concentration of jobs and housing in the core Bay Area, I'm not supportive of another 2 million residents. I think that we should really question whether we need that level of growth in the overall Bay Area; although, I do support the rough percentages that the plan portends.

Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

STARCHILD: Good evening. My name is Starchild. I'm a Bay Area native and San Francisco resident since 1995. I have been coming over here a lot longer than that because my grandmother lived in the city growing up.
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I oppose Plan Bay Area for a number of reasons, including things that other people have mentioned. The overall scope, I think -- the problem is simply that there's a failure to recognize that economic freedom works better. That means letting people make their own individual choices instead of having Government come along and make people's plans for them and confiscate their money to pay for them.

I'm concerned about the lack of transparency in this process. It was mentioned that there was a 1300-page or something report. You know, how much money did it cost to prepare that report? And how much is this overall planning costing? What are the salaries of the people involved in this planning process? And is there taxpayer limited government advocate representation in the actual nuts and bolts plan and not just these public meetings.

There's a lot of things that we could do that I think would not involve the Government that would help the whole agenda, which, you know, is good in many ways. Reduce sprawl. We could make it easier to develop housing in the cities, reduce costs of permitting, reduce building code requirements, these kinds of things.

We could de-criminalize hitchhiking. We could de-criminalize riding skateboards and bicycles on sidewalk in cities. Do things like that to encourage transportation.

Stop criminalizing people for sleeping in their cars. Many people are poor and can't easily afford housing here, and part of the reason they can't afford housing is because property taxes are too high. That doesn't just affect owners; it affects renters because that gets passed along to renters. And costs that are imposed on business get passed along to employers in the form of lower wages and fewer jobs.

The Government redevelopment also has a history of racism in this town. The Western Addition used to be the city's primary African-American neighborhood, was decimated by the city's redevelopment agency during the 1960s. Blacks were forced out in massive numbers and many businesses were forced to close.

I urge you to take these things into consideration and include a less-Government libertarian perspective in the actual plan.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

The next group are David Llewellyn; Hiroshi Fukuda from the Coalition SF Neighborhoods; Barry Pearl; Jamie Ervin; Gwynn MacKellen from the Sierra Club; Madeleine Savit for Folks for Polk.

And those are all the cards that we have. If there's anyone else that would like to speak, you can come forward after these folks have been called.

DAVID LLEWELLYN: I'm David Llewelyn, a resident of San Francisco. I also own a small software consulting business here.

I've been a long-term veteran of the MTC affairs and the support. The basic problem is, of course, the lack of connection between what people say in these meetings and the input that they give and any output of the plan. So far I see a very low correlation here, our square is almost equal to zero.

So -- okay. More specifically, the plan sets itself 15 goals. It fails to achieve some of them. And in fact, some of them it makes negative progress on.

Why was there no unconstrained vision plan that would meet all of the goals that MTC had set for itself and thereby provide a framework for -- a campaign for more resources and the shifting of resources.

The plan is still not of European quality. Europe doesn't spend more on transit really, they just planned it better. The plan contains many suspicious products that will have political juice but that are
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very ineffective. The kind of thing like BARTs in San Francisco airport. Just not worth the resources that we're spending on it.

Too many suburban projects that are inaccessible without a car. The regional gas tax is something that MTC has had the authority from the State, as you said it, to put on the Bay Area ballot for some years and has refused to do so on the basis that the polls show that it would fail. MTC also did not support Prop 1A, the high-speed rail bond issue for the same reason, yet it passed.

One of the primary problems is the Plan does nothing to address what the transit effect of this project identified as the main barrier to improving transit and transportation mode -- transit mode share in the Bay Area. The mispricing and the underpricing of automobile services. And without that, it's a hopeless run. We laughed at Soviet citizens for having to wait on line for underpriced sugar. Yet, what is traffic but waiting in line for underpriced road capacity. This is a very familiar argument. Yet, the Plan, while it makes mention now and again in conjunction to pricing projects, in fact there's no will to actually do it.

I predict total failure of this plan to make a significant change in mobile share, unless, of course, the Plan's assumption of energy prices is far off so that we enter in elastic region of demand, which I think we will. This again is something that should be modeled.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

HIROSHI FUKUDA: Good evening. My name is Hiroshi Fukuda, and I'm with the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods. Some comments:

San Francisco has been producing a lot of housing towards its scenic (phonetic) goals. Unfortunately, it's not the right type of housing. We have met our goals and more for market warehousing. And in some cases, for very low-income housing. However, we're sorely lacking, completely lacking in the area of modern income housing, and the result of this is the flight to the suburbs.

We're losing families, middle income folks, workforce people, and the reason why is we're not building the right type of housing. And all this plan about allocating 90,000 units to San Francisco, I think, is farfetched.

Muni is broken. It's really ridiculous. It's a department that is in need of some type of leadership that brings it and makes it functional. Its long-time performance is outrageous, and deferred maintenance is ridiculous, and the city is not functioning as a well-oiled machine. It's obvious.

Plan is building all these units. They're building all these market-rate housing, which is unaffordable for people who live here. So apparently, they're making these units to attract foreign investment or second homes or corporate housing, and -- so to give San Francisco more money for transportation is just throwing money away because our system is so far behind, we need to stop building and we need to get a -- transit first policy in place and functional. It's not functional now.

And as far as cars are concerned, in some places, you know, you don't need to drive all over creation for every little trip. I use my bike to go all over Richmond, to go to Japantown. But in some cases you do need it. For example, I have a friend who is in Seton Hospital right now, and I go to --

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you, Mr. Fukuda.

Please wrap up.

HIROSHI FUKUDA: All right. Don't waste any more money. Make Muni work and make it functional and fire those people that can't make it work.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. It's wonderful to have a good cross-section of Richmond District residents here. I wanted to introduce my colleague from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and MTC Commissioner Scott Wiener. And he would like to make some remarks as well.

SUPERVISOR WIENER: Thank you very much.

And I want to just thank everyone for coming out tonight and for taking the time to comment on the Plan. We have our work cut out for us in the Bay Area.

We have a growing population that's going to grow whether we plan for it or not. And our choices are either to plan for it or not to plan for it in terms of housing or in terms of our transit system and our transportation system generally in the Bay Area. And I know we can do it. This is a region that knows how to get things done, and I'm confident we can make it happen. So thanks for being out here tonight.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

Next speaker.

BARRY PEARL: Good evening, Supervisors, Commissioner. My name is Barry Pearl. I'm representing myself. If we're talking about relationship to the city, I'm a third generation San Franciscan and lifelong resident and employee in San Francisco.

One of the speakers talked about the maximum
population in the Bay Area under this plan. I'd like to
tackle the carrying capacity of San Francisco itself.
A number of these speakers this evening have talked
about quality of life and providing affordable housing.
I think we all admit that San Francisco is unaffordable.
We're also only 49 square miles.
At some point, this city needs to address what
is the maximum population that this city can handle. I
know the planning department has refused that issue
through the land-use element of the general plan. But
at some point, there has to be an acknowledgment and a
realization that we can't continue to grow this city if
we want to maintain any quality of life. We can't
become another Hong Kong or something like that, or
Tokyo, and approach that kind of housing density. So
this plan ultimately needs to address that.
And then you talk here in the plan about
concentrating new development in the 50 cities listed in
Table 2, but what you're essentially doing is you're
allowing the elitist suburbs to maintain their density
and development, and you're forcing all of the
development into the higher density cities, so the other
communities in the Bay Area need to do their part as
well.
Thank you very much.

GWYNN MACKELLEN: My name is Gwynn MacKellen.
I'm affiliated with the Sierra Club, but I don't speak
for them, though. I'm from San Francisco. I grew up
here.
I'm concerned that a lot of the prior
development areas are in spots that are going to be
affected by sea-level rise. That's not investment;
that's throwing money away. What is also throwing money
away is expansion of highways. I don't understand why
we're doing that at all. We should be taking them down.
From a global warming perspective, that's suicide.
And I also don't understand why some of the
priority development areas are essentially in the middle
of nowhere, like Concord, Pinole and not near any BART
stations. I've lived in Concord, my boyfriend lives out
there. I'm there all the time. There's no sidewalks.
And I don't think we should be having more development
in those areas where they require huge amounts of
parking. We should be having more transit-oriented
development.
That's it. Thank you.
SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.
JAMIE ERVIN: Hi. My name is Jamie Ervin and
I actually live in Oakland, and I sometimes work in
San Francisco and I also work from home, so these days
my commute is pretty easy because half the time I'm
still at home.
One of the things that -- I'm here pretty
frequently, a couple days a week. I feel like I don't
always have the choices that I'd like. Where I live in
Oakland, I live approximately a mile and a quarter from
two BART stations. That sounds to me like it would be a
perfect opportunity for me to be 100 percent transit.
Unfortunately, bus service to where I live is not very
great. There's one bus that runs until midnight, and
another bus that ends pretty early. And I live in a
denser area of Oakland.
Other challenges for someone like me is if I
want to come to San Francisco in the evening, bus
service, BART service, all those things are pretty
limited. I think a lot of the Plan is focused around
commuter transit and not some of the last by-all transit
where people that do live close to transit stations do
want to be transit first, and they don't have that
opportunity without proper transit that runs frequently
and serves their neighborhood effectively.
The other areas that I'm concerned about, of
course, like everyone else is -- a lot of the plans
around -- a lot of the plans addressing the issue of
housing costs. We all know it's really expensive to

live here, and we all hope it gets a little bit cheaper.
I think a lot of the planing doesn't offer a choice for
people -- some people may be interested in single-family
homes. Other people may want something denser.
A lot of people are -- there's not a lot of
options for someone who might want to raise a family in
a denser area, and I'm worried that we're not addressing
that because some like me, that's what I'd prefer at
this stage. I would like to have a family, but those
opportunities aren't available.
Thank you.
SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you. Next speaker.
MADELEINE SAVIT: Hi. My name is Madeleine
Savit. I've been living in San Francisco for just over
a year.
A lot of these issues are very new to me. And
I now represent an organization called Folks for Polk,
which began because it's quite distressed by the very
debased level of discourse around a public initiative,
primarily. So the organization is not only about
infrastructure -- built infrastructure, it's also about
the infrastructure of public interest into the future.
And it's not working very well.
Having said that, I also wanted to bring in a
little bit of a global perspective. Across the globe,
our populations are increasingly urban. Across the globe, issues of public transit versus car, et cetera, are being hashed out. This is not unique to San Francisco. And anything but the most authoritarian governments has issues about who has control over these things. So, you know, people in San Francisco will wait for buses, as people in Berlin wait for buses. It's universal.

I will say that the most forward-looking countries and the fastest growing countries are the countries that are building infrastructure for public transit as rapidly as they can. I was in Australia, and Australia basically was the source for the raw materials for the high-speed rail for across the -- entire China. They know which way their bread is buttered, and that's the way it is; increasing urbanization. We are no longer a rural country and we have to just deal with it.

So the change is already here. As somebody already pointed out -- I believe it was you, Mr. Wiener, who said, "We can manage it, but you can't deny," and it's part of what's happening.

I wanted to say that the reason I chose to come back to San Francisco, even though my children are on the East Coast, is because of the access to the outdoors, because of the public transport, because I could make a decision.

Now, I'm very fortunate, unlike other people, to decide whether or not I wanted to own a car, and I have been very pleased that I have not had to buy a car. I don't want to. And I'm perfectly fine with that. Unfortunately or fortunately, that is the way of the future, and we have to manage that.

Scapegoating doesn't work. So I have heard everything about scapegoating against Muni, about bicyclists, about this person, that person. It's much larger frustration that everybody is dealing with. They're universal, and they have to be dealt with for what they are.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you so much.

So we've called all the cards that were given to us. If there's anybody else that would like to speak -- I see a lot of people that have not spoken, and I'd like to encourage anyone that wants to comment to come forward.

DAN PICKELL: Hello. My name is Dan Pickell and I'm actually a -- I was born in San Francisco but I'm a resident of Pacifica and have grown up here and I'm a private property owner. And I'm pretty lucky -- I'd say fortunate enough to be property owner in the Bay Area, since I grew up here.

But what I'm hearing is a lot of this Plan here -- first of all, choices that are made that are going to be for the citizenry and the public in general here seems to be coming from an appointed commission, such as you guys here. And earlier somebody spoke about the public's input on this. And obviously, you're having these meetings here to get some public input, and I see that there was an online survey to get some input also, but who chooses -- I mean, ultimately, who chooses where I can live and where I can't live? And how much property or if I can even be a property owner or not.

And that highly concerns me, and especially if it comes from a commission that gets appointed.

Earlier I heard people talking about the need obviously in this country for democracy, and I think that's obviously a great choice for people who want any kind of freedom in their life and also choice. And I see where there's displacement of people whenever there is a government body that's appointed, and it's not, you know, chosen by the public through the voting process.

But also, I also see the displacement -- in this plan particularly, it looks like the displacement of communities. Especially, Mr. Woo pointed out earlier that Chinatown and businesses that would have to happen in order to do what I see as stack-and-pack housing, which is already happening in San Francisco from what I can see, and also -- I also agree there has to be some point where you go, you know, where do you stop the population in the city or not. And --

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you so much, Mr. --

DAN PICKELL: And how long as a -- something like that and say, "I don't want to live for something like that." So --

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you for your comments.

HENRY PAN: Good evening. My name is Henry Pan. I was born and raised in San Francisco. I currently go to San Francisco State. I've been living here 20 years.

It's -- OneBayArea is new to me because I haven't really been studying much of it. But when you found out there was some plans that go against livability values -- especially since we're in the 21st century and there's a lot of clout about climate change and sustainability. I was concerned to hear that the Plan would consider highway widening, which is very troubling to me, especially since this is the 21st century.

Global warming is a real concern, which is mainly caused by the amount of cars and congestion we have on the road, and that oil prices are skyrocketing.
And even though we have electric cars, they're so expensive and unaffordable to many of the households, so highway widening should not be the way to go.

Instead, HOT lanes should be implemented so they can be used by transit. So -- and if cars want to go on the HOT lanes, they pay the toll and they would fund transit, which is desperately needed, not only in San Francisco, which we have transit for a city, which we haven't been living up to. But it's also desperately needed for the Bay Area as well.

Hopefully with better transit service, you'd be able to get people off of their cars and onto the buses, and maybe they'll even start riding their bikes and walk to go their jobs. Another possible way to reduce driving would be to design -- and I understand some people don't want to live in high-rise condominiums. And one way to potentially mitigate that would be to design developments that follow new urbanist principles, which is like a suburb but it favors transit service, biking and walking over driving, as well as -- so transit-oriented development.

And it's very important that funding for transit, bus, rapid transit, LRT and affordable housing is very important to this plan, especially to accommodate the growth in the future and especially since -- especially affordable housing since --

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you, Mr. Pan.

HENRY PAN: Yes.

-- many people can't live here anymore.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

Next speaker.

I know that there's probably people that haven't spoken that are dying to say something. Last chance. Is there anyone else that would like to speak?

Please come forward.

AARON BIALICK: Hello. My name is Aaron Bialick, just speaking as a resident of San Francisco.

There's been a lot of talk about, quote/unquote, stack-and-pack housing and increasing density and lots of references to Hong Kong, but I'd just like to point out that on the scale of outside of the United States, while we are second densest in the country, we're pretty far off from plenty of other major cities in the world. We don't have to go to Hong Kong's density, but we could go to Paris. That would go a long way towards accommodating the real demand for housing that we've suppressed for decades, and as a result have these unaffordable -- extremely -- we have extremely short housing supply, especially of the kind of apartments that people want.

Maybe everyone doesn't want to live in a high-rise apartment in a dense neighborhood, but there are plenty of people who do. And as long as you don't provide housing in a place like San Francisco where those people want to be, they're going to compete for new housing, even if you live along the peninsula. It's all in the same market, so you do have to -- I would just say it's kind of disappointing to see that by 2040 we might not even come close to meeting that vision and accommodating that demand that exists today.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

CATHIE LAM: Hi. My name is Cathie Lam, and I work for the Chinatown Community Development Center.

I actually didn't intend to speak up, but I think with the invitation, I was encouraged to come up and talk to the public.

I actually meant to write a comment. I -- because of our role in the community, we do conduct workshops with the groups and our community members to give input to this big, very ambitious plan. And I feel that the process is quite a big lack of really reaching out to community and giving them opportunity.

I mean, we had our last workshop in March, and

...
Particularly, here in San Francisco, we have a couple major concerns; one of which is the question of displacement of low-income communities of color.

As you might know, San Francisco is hemorrhaging black families faster than any other major U.S. city besides post-Katrina in New Orleans, and it's important to us that the city and that the MTC take steps that are proactive in helping to prevent that type of displacement. When we see that there is a prediction that there will be a dramatic increase in the cost of housing, we become particularly concerned about vulnerable and marginalized communities here in the city.

We're also concerned that there is more resources going toward the construction of highways than there is toward mass and public transit, and we think that that's an important consideration. Given that San Francisco is quite an expensive city to live in, we do think that one way to prevent the increase of greenhouse gases and to get people out of their cars is to provide more options for public transit that particularly serve the needs of low-income needs of color here in the city.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

Then we're going to close the public part of this hearing. Thank you so much for coming out.

I'd like to give opportunities for my colleagues to make closing remarks, if they would like.

Commissioner Halsted?

COMMISSIONER HALSTED: Well, I would like to thank everyone for coming and caring about our community, expressing their views. Hopefully, we'll find a way to balance people's views with what we can accomplish.

One thing that I'm very much aware of is we're setting goals for subject matters over which we have very little control. We only control a few factors. So they are kind of aspirational goals, and we'll try to reflect the interest that we hear expressed as well as we can.

Again, thank you very much. I also wanted to thank staff from ABAG and MTC who have come here and spent their evening with us as well and for the good work they've done in putting it together.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR MAR: And Supervisor and MTC Commissioner Wiener.

SUPERVISOR WIENER: Thank you.

Thank you again to everyone who came out. You know, I said when I arrived a little while ago that the growth was coming, and we can either plan for it or not plan for it. And that's our choice, but we can't stop the growth from coming.

And I think it's important to -- as a -- to follow up from that at conclusion is that what happens if we don't prepare for it and we don't create housing opportunities and new housing, is we just will continue to see this unsustainable upwards spiral in housing prices. And we see it today in San Francisco, which I know best in my district -- I see one of my constituents here.

Where if you are -- if you need housing in San Francisco -- if you lose your apartment, if you have a break up and have to go find your own place or if you're moving here -- good luck, if you're not wealthy. You're going to pay 2,500 to $3,000 for a one-bedroom apartment. And why is that? It's because a lot of people want to be here, and our population is growing.

And it's because, for example, last year we produced -- I think, what, about 200-some-odd new housing units in San Francisco, and that is absolutely unsustainable, and we will become a city where if you're fortunate enough to have purchased a home years and years ago or to have a rent-controlled apartment for some period of time, you'll have your housing. But if you need to find housing or if you're just coming here, you're going to be out of luck.

And in terms of stack-and-pack housing, we have that already. And it's called people packing and stacking into roommate situations, and that is going to happen whether it's legal or not legal, and it is also not sustainable because you end up having really bad living conditions for people. So the goal is, you know, to plan for it. And plan for it in a smart way and -- in a smart way.

And I also just want to put in a plug for something I talk about a lot, and that is that we are starving our public transportation systems in San Francisco, in the Bay Area, and a lot of parts in this country we are absolutely starving them. And we need to invest heavily in expanding the system, but in just state of the repair for what we have today.

Muni is struggling; BART is struggling. We see systems struggling all across the Bay Area. And if we want to have any hope of actually reducing auto congestion so that people who need to drive can drive, but people who don't need to drive, giving them that option of using public transportation because there are
people who will take that option. And right now we’re not doing that successfully, and we need to prioritize transit funding.

SUPERVISOR MAR: Thank you.

I just wanted to say again that the information that you’ve shared -- the 35 or so speakers -- we’re going to be making sure that the information gets to all the MTC commissioners and all the ABAG members as well.

And the public comment period -- in case you want to write out more detailed comments, it’s open until Thursday, May 16th at 4:00 p.m. So people can still comment, and there’s a number of other hearings in other areas of the Bay Area. And for more information on the Draft Plan Bay Area and the other hearings and how you can give input, go to OneBayArea.org.

So I also wanted to thank the staff of ABAG and the MTC for their efforts to put together these public hearings. And, of course, we can do a better job all the time with outreach, but I really appreciate all the valuable input that people have given.

So with that, we’ll call this public hearing to a close, and we really thank you so much for coming out and speaking out.

Thank you so much.

(Hearing concluded at 8:38 p.m.)
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SUPERVISOR TISSLER: Good evening, everyone.
Welcome. I'd like to ask, before we start the meeting,
if you all rise and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance took
place.)

SUPERVISOR TISSLER: I am Adrienne Tissier. I
serve on the County Board of Supervisors here in San
Mateo and represent the county on the Metropolitan
Transportation Commission.

With me tonight is the in colleague Supervisor
Dave Pine, who also serves on the Executive Board of the
Association of Bay Area Governments.

Alicia Alguirre represents the cities here in
San Mateo County. She's also a member of MTC.
And I think -- I didn't see other electives,
unless I missed them. Yes, I did. If you're an elected
official in our county, please stand up. Just to let
them know that the electives do care about what's going
on here. Thank you. Thank you.

So I want to welcome you tonight to tonight's
public hearing. I know your time is valuable and your
attendance is an indication of how much you care about
the future of San Mateo County and our region.
And as a local elected official, I'm frequently in the position of having to make tough decisions about how our county should or shouldn't grow. So any time I can hear directly from all of you that are residents here in our county and throughout the Bay Area, I absolutely welcome it. What's been helpful so far about the Plan Bay Area process is that the local elected officials throughout our county at this table are not officials from Sacramento. We are local officials who are listening to our local residents to understand what it is you would like to see in the Plan Bay Area.

Now, we are -- obviously, San Mateo is part of the Bay Area, but we always have considered ourselves to be a little bit distinct. The plan respects this distinction. It emphasizes the different investments and development for different parts of each region. That means San Mateo County's homegrown priorities for growth will guide development in our county, not anything imposed from the outside.

Our hearing tonight is your opportunity to comment for the official record about the Draft Plan Bay Area, which is now out for public review. This plan offers a long-range transportation and land-use vision for the very diverse, unique and wonderful region that we can call home.

The dialogue on this plan has been heated at times, but I feel it's been an important conversation to have. By looking ahead over the long term, we can provide a foundation for a future that we are proud to pass along to the next generation.

A court reporter is here this evening to transcribe your remarks, so please speak clearly into the microphone. He or she may ask you to repeat something, so -- to make sure we have a good record of your comments.

And if you have not already done so, please fill out a request-to-speak card. I believe there's -- they're in the back room or there's people walking around with them. And please turn it in to one of our MTC staff members. I will call up the speakers in the order in which they put their cards in. The public comment will be limited to two minutes per speaker, and everyone who wants to speak will have an opportunity to speak.

We have written comment sheets at the welcome table over there where you -- but I also see some being passed around as well. So now I'd like to turn over to my colleague, Supervisor Dave Pine, so he can offer a few words as well.

SUPERVISOR PINE: Thanks, Adrienne.

And it's great to see so many people here tonight. Fantastic turnout. Adrienne has done a good job of, I think, keying up what we'll be doing this evening and the importance of getting your input. I just wanted to share a couple of thoughts.

I have served on the Board of Supervisors in San Mateo now for two years, and one of the fun things about the job is it's giving me the opportunity to serve on regional committees. And one thing we all share is just how special the Bay Area is and how important it is that we continue to make it a special place. We're the 19th largest economy in the world, just the Bay Area. And we have an awful lot going for us; right? We have a center of innovation, great educational institutions, incredible open space, incredible mix of people, tolerance for all different kinds of ideas. But we have to compete around the world. And when I think of the Bay Area Plan, I think of that as a tool to help us do that.

Another thought too, just -- a personal reflection is, a lot of the things talked about in this plan, I think we've been doing -- committed to San Mateo County for a long time. When you think of San Mateo County, most of our land is protected open space. It's really just the bay side where we can have development. And we don't have opportunities for sprawl. We don't have empty land to build on.

So over the last decade or so, there has been a real focus and concentration on trying to build along transportation corridors. And we've had some, I think, some very impressive successes when you think of the Crossties at El Camino and San Bruno or Bay Meadows that will allow people to use Caltrain. So in many respects, I think we're way ahead of the curve on some of the concepts introduced here.

And then finally, it's also important to remember that ultimately local land use decisions are always local. City councils and local planning commissions decide what gets built in our communities. It's really kind of an incredible thing. The president, the congress, ABAG, board of supervisors, it's the local communities that decide; these other groups do not. So keep that in mind as we go forward.

So just a couple final remarks: This plan we're now working on and anticipate voting on in the summer will be updated in four years, so it won't be perfect, but we'll have a chance to look at it again in four years. But we do want to hear your comments so...
that we can share them with the MTC and ABAG boards.
You can also provide comments online if you don't want
to testify (verbatim) tonight. Just go to
onebayarea.org, and comments will be received through
May 16th at 4:00 p.m. So we are eager to get your
input.
And, again, thanks for coming tonight.
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you, Dave.
Also joining me is my other colleague,
Supervisor Warren Slocum, who is also on ABAG.
Okay. I'm going to go ahead and start. So
card along the way.
Victor Torreano, followed by Anne Kenney,
followed by Irvin Dawid.
VICTOR TORREANO: Hello. I'm Victor Torreano,
business representative of Smart Local 104, which
represents over 9,000 sheet metal workers in Northern
California.
Our members perhaps have a greater stake than
most in the final version of the OneBayArea Plan. Both
the quality of the communities they live in and their
capacity to earn a decent living is at stake.
At our annual campaign for jobs conference,

over 250 of our members adopted a set of principles
which we called "Livable Communities Initiative." We
are the first building trades union in the nation to do
so. Much of the OneBayArea Plan supports this
initiative.
For example, protecting our open space, as it
does, pushes -- protecting our open space, as it does,
pushes construction toward infill development provides
us work and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Having
housing placed along the transit corridors and having
lots of choices for transit will help our members and
families get to where we need to go and make transit
less costly.
We're concerned that not enough is being done
to provide housing that is affordable to our members. A
union sheet metal worker building thousands of housing
units envisioned by this plan makes less than $40,000 a
year. Not enough to pay the 2,800 for a two-bedroom
apartment that's going to be the rate in many cities.

We are very concerned that the Bay Area plan
is completely silent on the thousands of construction
jobs that will result in building out the plan. Here's
why we are concerned:
The current business model for developers
building infill development is based on creating the
group of people. And so a lot of the ideas here about
having transportation projects that are spending
billions of dollars, when the truth is, we already spent
billions of dollars, and we haven't removed that many
people from their cars. And though we have problems
here in San Mateo, we asked to have Proposition 8 years
ago that would increase density, and it was rejected by
the voters.
And the question that I'm asking is, we have
all these projects that come in front of our local city
councils and the county, and then they're rejected
because there's so many restrictions on them that the
developers sometimes will even just go away because
they're sick and tired of waiting.
So my question to you guys is, is this a smart
move for not only San Mateo County, but for the Bay Area
in general? It takes away a lot of -- Am I there?
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: We lost all the mikes.
(Pause in proceedings.)
ANNE KENNEY: Thank you for giving me a
second. So I'm going to speak into the mike because
it's recording on the -- yes. Thank you.
So here's the thing that -- the challenge I
give you is, there's a whole bunch of -- the ideas I have
moving toward central planning, and the problem I have
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The Bay Area has some of the worst faceless organization to make decisions about how we run our lives, and how we want to live. And, frankly, I don't want to use the bus or public transportation if I don't have to. I want to be able to use my car because after all that's what we're about. We're about freedom, being able to go where we want.

And it seems like you guys are trying to take that away with this very large unmanageable plan and planning for growth that may or may not come and for things that may not come to fruition.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Irvin Dawid, followed by Douglas Henton, followed by Evelyn Stivers.

IRVIN DAWID: I'm a fairly new resident of Burlingame. I'm supportive of the plan, but perhaps I'm actually coming from the opposite end of the last speaker.

As has been emphasized throughout the works -- the open house and even just now, essentially, local government is in charge of the local land-use decisions, and this plan doesn't change that. I think people, you know, should recognize that. And that perhaps for me is what I'm concerned about, because I think we need some more oversight of what local city councils do.

I think local city councils need to be held accountable for their decisions. And if they -- for instance, if city councils choose -- Supervisor Pine, you mentioned a lot of development that's occurring alongside the bay. I tend to see more commercial development than I do residential development. And when cities choose to build that commercial development and they get the sales tax revenue, where do the workers come from? So many of the workers on the peninsula come from across the bay, and to me that doesn't seem right.

I think there's an equity issue there. We supply the jobs; you supply the people. We won't supply the homes because our city councils -- simply, they're responding to residents who basically are more concerned about what they perceive is their own quality of life; less people, less traffic, less parking problems. Whereas, from my perspective, this goes to the heart of what sustainability is about.

Sustainability is that future generations will actually enjoy or have a better environment and better life than we do. We have to stop thinking of our own quality of life and perceive threats like increased density and more about what the future generations will have.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you.

Douglas Henton, followed by Evelyn Stivers.

DOUGLAS HENTON: Hi. I've lived in San Mateo for 25 years. I'm deeply committed to this community. I've actually also been involved in a number of activities here around the future of this region.

I just want to compliment the work. I know how hard this is to do something that involves so many people. So I think this is a reasonable collaboration.

I've been involved, actually, here in the county, and Supervisor Pine mentioned this: We did something called the San Mateo County Vision. And this process was going on and meeting with people in town halls, listening to people, trying to understand what their needs were. And many of the things that came back in the county were similar in what's in this plan; quality jobs, transit-oriented development, affordable housing. That's what people want. So I think the work here is pretty good.

I think what's going on is, you need a region that collaborates to compete globally. We're out there. We have to come together. We have to solve our problem. I think if there's anything here that I'm seeing with...
SUPERVISOR TISSIER:  Thank you.

GEORGE ROBINS:  I'm George Robins. I moved here from New York 11 years ago; live in Belmont. And what I'd like to say is, this is a free country. It's driven by a free market economy. That's what your adult right is. We should not have people telling the citizens -- the individual citizens how they're going to live their lives. We should not have people saying that because you can afford to live here, you're going to pay for stack-and-pack housing so others that can't afford to live here are going to live. If they can't afford it, they'll live where they can live.

If we don't have enough housing, have enough land for that housing, let's free up from some of that open space. I came from New York where my lot was small, a half acre. A neighbor across the street, a couple acres up the street, and it was great. We didn't need open space; we had our yards. Now I'm packed. I can reach out and touch my neighbor.

Let's just let the free market economy drive it and not have bureaucracies drive it. There was a comment made about we have to oversee a -- local cities, local councils. No, we don't. The voters oversee the local councils. If they don't do their job, they're voted out of office. And that happens at all levels. I think that's about it.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER:  Thank you.

JEFF HOBSON:  Hi. I'm Jeff Hobson. I also --

I work with TransForm, and we'll be submitting some more detailed comments in writing as well focused and more -- a bigger picture of this evening.

I don't live here in San Mateo County. I live in Alameda County, but I can't go to Alameda County's meeting on Wednesday night because I'll be coaching a Little League game. And I see a little bit of similarities between the reasons that I coach in Little League and the reasons that I'm here tonight to talk about this regional planning.

I also happen to participate in my kids' schools' PTA. I'm on -- I'm the treasurer of the homeowners' association in the condo I live in. And I do all of those kinds of things because I believe in collective action to try and make our lives better. I think we can do well by doing this planning. So I appreciate the work that all of you are doing to try and help make all of our lives better through that mutual planning.

I also want to talk about freedom a little bit and talk to you about my wife's aunt who lives in San Mateo, not too far away. She just turned 70, recently retired from teaching at San Francisco State for many years. She still drives some, but she doesn't think that she is a safe enough driver to be out on the freeways. And she's probably not alone. And so she gets around almost entirely on public transit. Certainly, when she goes any distance -- she does come up and visits me and my family. And so she depends on having the freedom of having public transit available to her in order to be able to live her life. I hope that through this plan that we are able to do more investment in public transits. We would like to see more investment than is actually in the Draft Plan as it stands.

So we notice that in the Draft Plan, the Draft Environmental Impact Report that came with it, looked at several different scenarios and found that one of them, the equity of the job scenario --

SUPERVISOR TISSIER:  Your time is up.

JEFF HOBSON:  Well, it's the best one. So we'd like to see that.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER:  Anybody, if you want -- I know people probably have lots and lots of comments; feel free to also submit them.

George Robins, followed by Glenn Geleineau.

GEORGE ROBINS:  I'm George Robins. I moved...
BOB COHEN: Good evening. Thank you for letting me speak.

My name is Bob Cohen, and my wife and I are long-term residents of unincorporated San Mateo County. I consider myself a pragmatic environmentalist, but I'm also an oceanographer and a certified consulting meteorologist.

As a scientist, I'm very interested in the climate change debate, and I think that's portrayed as a small part of the One Bay Plan, but it's also shown as the Number 1 goal of the plan in the room next door.

And I would like to bring to your attention some observations which have been ignored in the preparation of your plan, but they have a huge impact on the decisions you're making today.

I have a plot here, which I'll deliver after I make it to this meetings.

If the people out there really knew what you're up to and what you're doing, this whole room would be packed. This hotel wouldn't be sufficient to hold the people that would want to comment on this.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: It's either Bob Cohen or Bob Cohev, followed by Melissa Hippard, followed by Tom Weissmiller.

BOB COHEN: Good evening. Thank you for letting me speak.

My name is Bob Cohen, and my wife and I are long-term residents of unincorporated San Mateo County. I consider myself a pragmatic environmentalist, but I'm also an oceanographer and a certified consulting meteorologist.

As a scientist, I'm very interested in the climate change debate, and I think that's portrayed as a small part of the One Bay Plan, but it's also shown as the Number 1 goal of the plan in the room next door.

And I would like to bring to your attention some observations which have been ignored in the preparation of your plan, but they have a huge impact on the decisions you're making today.

I have a plot here, which I'll deliver after I make it to this meetings.

If the people out there really knew what you're up to and what you're doing, this whole room would be packed. This hotel wouldn't be sufficient to hold the people that would want to comment on this.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Sir, your time is up. You can submit that to us. Thank you.

MELISSA HIPPARD: Hi. I'm Melissa Hippard.

GLENN GELINEAU: Gelineau.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Okay. Thank you.

GLENN GELINEAU: I would like to echo the sentiments of the previous speaker. I oppose the One Bay Area Plan. I also oppose the regional governments.

You're not elected directly by the people. I think if we're going to have a body such as ABAG and MTC, they should be directly elected by the electorate, not appointed by their council.

I think the public resoundingly voted down Prop 31 during the last election, which spoke to regional governments. And I think it clearly spoke -- and it seems like this is being pushed on us in spite of the will of the electorate.

I personally think that this plan has been foisted upon the public, and they're largely unaware of it. You've done a very poor job of advertising this whole process. I think that this process should be put to a vote of the people. The people have the right to make it to this meetings.

But this graph shows that temperatures have been stable, not increasing, since 1997. And you can see with the plot of temperature that the models are not predicting the observations. And so that the observations are now --
than I can currently pay or say my father, who's on Social Security. So I'm very concerned about that. And I'm also very concerned that we need to invest equally in our grand infrastructure of the roads, et cetera, as well as the ranches and farmlands and open space. It's a sustainability plan, and the plan doesn't say enough about how we're going to actually make sure that the natural resources we say we care about and love are actually going to be taken care of. Just not building on them isn't enough.

So these are my tax dollars too. This is money coming from the federal government, and I'm saying that I want to see my tax dollars spent on bike and pedestrians safety and infrastructure and more public transits, and I want our air quality to get better.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Tom Weissmiller, followed by Mike Bulea, followed by Nina Pellegrini.

TOM WEISSMILLER: Good evening. My name is Tom Weissmiller. I've been a resident of San Mateo since 1980. I work in San Francisco, and every day I take Caltrain from the Millbrae station.

By the Millbrae station, there's a number of the high-density housing units, and a number of the housing units and the retail spaces seem vacant. My concern is that the One Bay Area Plan is investing in housing and transportation plans that are not sustainable.

Another example is, today I heard on the news that the ferry from South San Francisco to Oakland, the train ticket was $7, but it requires $87 subsidy for each ticket. We just can't live with this. We've got -- I know there's a lot of moving parts. Whatever we do, we've got to make it right.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you. Mike Bulea, followed by Nina Pellegrini, followed by Gail Raabe.

MIKE BULEA: Hello. Thank you for giving us a rare opportunity to speak. I wish you had this type of meeting in every city, that you advertise them in the main newspapers, like the big page. Make sure people in every town in every city know that this thing is going on, and that you give every city and every town and every county ample opportunities to learn about your plan and to give them an opportunity to go to their neighborhood and in their town and speak up, whatever they think, whether they think it's good or bad.

So I think it's inadequate that you have only a couple of them or -- and they're not advertised. The only way you find out is just by coincidence. That's the first observation.

The second one, I would like to basically reiterate what previous speakers have said. This change is radical. It changes the structure and the role of the United States government. And it just flies in the face of the Constitution. You cannot have both. We need -- for something so great in terms of changing and in terms of the expenditure -- I understand it's going to be maybe around $300 billion for the next 30 years. This is the largest most expensive real estate and transportation undertaking in the State of California.

And for something like this, I don't understand why you will not definitely want to have a referendum because that's the way you would make sure that people understand. Because ultimately, we, the taxpayers, are liable to pay for this, and we're going be using it. So definitely please move this thing and make into a referendum. That's second.

Third, I would like to mention, every time I drive on the road, I see the public transit is basically virtually empty. So you see two or three people in the back. Nobody likes it.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you. Nina Pellegrini, followed by Gail Raabe, followed by Chris Pareja.

NINA PELLEGRINI: Hi. I'm Nina Pellegrini.

I have been to a lot of your meetings last year, workshops, and I agree with what the speaker previous said, that you guys are not advertising these enough. A lot of people do not know what the Bay Area plan is. I think it should be put to a vote. That's what America is all about. Voting by the citizens of the country into what they want or not want. That's why I came to this country.

I'm from Cuba, and I can see the same thing happening here to your plan. That's why I'm completely against it. This is central -- call it engineering, because you're trying to put people into houses, one on top of the other, limited by where the urban boundaries are, and that is so you can look at them, you can be able to know at all times where they are. You want to take cars away because cars give people freedom. Freedom of action, and that way you cannot control them.

In Cuba, you cannot go from Point A to Point B without a card that you have to show and get permission from the Government to go from here to Menlo Park. If that's what you want to do to this country, you're going to ruin it. And you guys are sitting behind that desk, and I hope that you can read Agenda 21 because this plan...
is all over the country and the world. It's not only here.

And you're doing the buildings of this stack-and-pack housing, that it takes the beauty of this country of the individuality of the towns, you're making them all look the same, and that is destroying. And you will destroy the individual -- individuality of this country and in San Mateo especially.

So I urge you to read before you vote on this thing. Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Gail Raabe, followed by Chris Pareja, followed by Michele Beasley.

GAIL RAABE: Good evening. I'm Gail Raabe, a resident of Redwood City.

When I read the Draft Plan and related documents, I was pleased to find these three statements: "The Plan will create livable communities, reserve open space and direct development within the 2010 urban footprint, promoting development and priority development areas, takes development pressure off the region's open space and ag lands. Open space preservation requires regional solutions."

What I didn't find in these documents is any assurance that this plan will actually protect the region's important open space lands. The plan's draft assurance that this plan will actually protect the Bay Area's open space lands. This objective is a critical part of the Bay Area plan that has not been adequately addressed.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you.

Chris Pareja, followed by Michele Beasley, followed by Matt Jones.

CHRIS PAREJA: Chris Pareja from Hayward.

There are lots of initials in the draft of the One Bay Area Plan. There's ABAG, MTC. There are PDAs and more of the plan I read, the more I added my own initials, most commonly "WTF." For those of you who don't know what that means, it means "what the heck."

On page 19 you set a goal to increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation by 70 percent. So what you're asking for is more money for transportation so you can tell us not to use your transportation and that we need to walk more. WTF?

On page 31 you say you're expecting 2.2 million more people in the Bay Area by 2040 when the trend is a mass exodus from the Bay Area in California and even people of questionable documentation because they can't find work. WTF?

On page 30 you projected job growth that's a percent of national job growth, but you didn't seem to take into account the trend of businesses leaving the Bay Area and state because it's too expensive to do business and it's over regulated, over taxed area of the country. WTF?

On page 31 you're assuming an unemployment rate of less than 5 percent, even though the four-quarter average on a Q1 shows the U6 unemployment for California is 18.8 percent. WTF?

The whole plan is supposed to satisfy SB 375 CO2 reduction requirements, but you can't show measurements from 1990 or today to let me know if we've made any progress. Again, WTF?

On page 62 you say you expect 27 percent of the funding for this to come from federal and state governments, which are both broke. And you say you're expecting $400 billion in unexpected revenues. WTF?

So in summary, you want to build real homes and transportation for imaginary people to protect them from environmental poisons you haven't measured, as they work in imaginary jobs, and we're going to pay for all of this with money you can't prove exists. If you want to know if I approve of the plan, I would say "NFW."

That means "no way."

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Michele Beasley, followed by Matt Jones, followed by Patricia Boyle.
MICHELE BEASLEY: Hello. My name is Michele Beasley. I live in Belmont, and I was born and raised in San Mateo County. This is my home, and I love it here.

I believe the Draft Plan is pointing us in the right direction and will allow the region in the county that I love to thrive even more by being more strategic on how we spend our transportation dollars, getting more bang for their transportation buck, so to speak.

I want to be able to get around the peninsula and the region more easily without a car. I ride my bike sometimes down Ralston to catch Caltrain at Belmont, which can get a little sketchy at times, and if I miss the train, I'm out of luck for an hour.

So it would be great to invest more in bicycle infrastructure and to make our transit system more robust because I think it would encourage people to leave their cars at home, which is great for everyone, including the people who want to and have to drive because then there are less people on the road with them.

I would say my main concern is how this region addresses affordable housing. Living near transit is going to be very desirable. Rents are completely ridiculous right now, something like $1,500 for a one-bedroom apartment. When you consider people earning minimum wage, I would say that's a crisis. People who work in San Mateo County should have the option to live in San Mateo County. I like inclusive communities.

Actually, three of my friends, all people who grew up here, are moving out of the area -- this is just in the past year -- moving to Portland, San Diego and China because of the high cost of living here.

So I would suggest that the plan incorporate some of the best parts of the equity environment and job scenario so we can make sure that there are homes that everyone can afford, and that we can reward cities that prevent putting out low income families, and so therefore, I think the plan would be even better.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSLIER: Thank you. Matt Jones, followed by Patricia Boyle, followed by Christine Kradjian.

MATT JONES: Hi. My name is Matt Jones. I'm a lifelong resident in San Mateo County. I'm an avid hiker, runner, bicyclist and a proud dog owner.

What makes this region so appealing to me are the multitude of trails, parks and open spaces that are accessible to me, our efficient transportation system and excellent quality of life.

However, Plan Bay Area needs to do more to discuss how to incorporate close proximities to green space in all new development. And if this is not possible, to provide affordable available transportation options.

As noted in the plan, we will see a greater demand for affordable housing options, and it's imperative that we achieve the state-mandated goal of housing a 100 percent of our projected population growth by income level. As a young adult who's currently searching for housing in the Bay Area, I need more affordable options.

Second, protection of open space must be at the forefront of all major planning decisions.

Protecting open space provides a variety of health and benefits. And as this region prepares for the effects of climate change, we need to provide a dedicated source of funding to protect our quality of life and biologically sensitive areas. Utilizing online planning's resources, such as the conservation lands network in the Bay Area's protected database will give policymakers the ability to meet this challenge.

Lastly, we need to provide funding for local agriculture. They not only serve as effective carbon sinks but will additionally provide us with a lower carbon footprint when making food purchases. Our farmers on the San Mateo coast need the same protection for their land that is given to the many other open spaces in the region.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSLIER: Patricia Boyle, followed by Christine Kradjian, followed by Paul Magginetti.

PATRICIA BOYLE: I'm representing the League of Women Voters for the Bay Area, and we strongly support the planning process which has successfully coordinated land use and transportation planning for the Draft Plan Bay Area.

The League places a high priority on reducing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 38</th>
<th>Page 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>down El Camino. Who's going to live in these? Why do people have to live in these? What happened to the free country where we have a lawn, a place for children to play?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think this should be brought to the vote of the people in this country, in this state, in this county. And I hope there's some elected officials that are standing up for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PAUL MAGGINETTI: My name is Paul Magginetti. I live in San Carlos. I've lived on the peninsula all my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I take a map here of all the PDA areas (indicating), and I have to wonder if my local city council would approve of these. I don't think they did.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>And what this plan does, it takes away the property rights of anybody who happens to be within a PDA. I'm not yet, but I probably soon will be, and my single-family home will be in jeopardy. This takes away local control by putting them under duress on rules that they have to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have a story: Caltrain has been delaying keeping their equipments in good repair because they need to money to balance the budget. San Mateo is going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>to go off the cliff in 2014. So they have a plan to lease their land for 99 years to developers to build stack-and-pack housing on it. This money is coming from CalPERS and AIG to build these, and they're going to put a housing project in my city, shoehorned in between El Camino and the train tracks. The city is under duress because Caltrans is threatening to sue them if they don't go through with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>So you can see how this plan, if you use the old boy backdoor networks, is not going to come out good. You're going to have stupid projects like this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The reason I know this is I got tired of getting run around, and I made a document request under the Records Act, and I found all the e-mails, and they're all talking to them. The whole time they've just been leading this by the nose and saying, &quot;Yeah, yeah. We heard you say. We're going to listen.&quot; They're not listening, and you're giving them the license not to listen to them and shove anything they want down our throats. Please don't do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Susan Hart, followed by Bea Phillips, followed by Cherie Zorlawsy (illegible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I'm not sure if I have that correct. Do we have Susan Hart?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PUBLIC SPEAKER: I think she left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11 (Pages 38 to 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Emerick And Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transcript of Proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: She left? Okay.
Bea Phillips, and then followed by Cheri --
I'm not sure if this is correct -- Zorlawsy, and then
followed by John Q. Public.
BEA PHILLIPS: Good evening. My name is Bea
Phillips, and I live in South San Francisco. My husband
has lived there for 50 years.
And I feel railroaded, and I feel like this
plan is being whitewashed. For one thing, I don't
believe there's any science in global warming, and I
don't believe that the climate change has just happened
recently just because of man. I think climate change
has been happening ever since the world began.
I'm concerned about all these transportation
projects, the billions and billions of dollars that I
don't know where the money will come from, in order to
keep us out of our cars and off the streets.
I'm concerned about the small businesses that
are up and down the El Camino Real. I don't know how
they're going to survive if people can't get out and
park and go into the business and shop or use the
business. I think that they will suffer greatly with
all of these transportation changes, unless there's some
modification made in the transportation.
I also feel concerned about my grandchildren.

Page 42

Page 44

Page 43

Page 45

I don't think stack and pack is a healthy way to live.
I agree with the lady who said that we need yards for
our children to play in. And we need -- it's -- we need
our own mental health by having our gardens and our
places to work and grow in our backyards. I also think
that -- I've lost my train of thought.
I agree with the gentleman who said that these
meetings are wonderful, and that they're not advertised.
And I agree that this is a very small meeting compared to
the number of people who will be affected by these
decisions.
I was very disappointed to learn that South
San Francisco City Council joined ABAG and MTC. I
didn't know anything about it. These meetings were not
held or not advertised, and we were not even privy to
talk about or understand all of it before it's
already in place.
Thank you.
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Cheri -- you're going to
have to pronounce your last name for me.
CHERIE ZORLAWSY: Yes. "Zorlawsy" (phonetic).
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Say that one more time.
CHERIE ZORLAWSY: I'm so used to
mispronunciation --
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: I am too, so I'm

reflective particulates into the atmosphere to reflect
sunlight away from the earth would quickly and
economically cool the planet. The technology already
exists. We are so fortunate to discover this
breakthrough before the draconian changes envisioned in
Plan Bay Area inflict irreversible harm on our diverse
communities.
Just think, all that social engineering
forcing people out of their cars and into few laden
buses, all the stack-and-pack housing, the loss of
individuality and tranquility of our suburbs would have
been for nothing. Fortunately, Plan Bay Area has been
rendered obsolete.
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Are you John Q. Public?
JOHN Q. PUBLIC: Yes, I am. You can call me
John. You can call me Mr. Public, and don't ask me what
the "Q" stands for because I haven't figured that out
yet.
SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Before you start, Rich
Hedges is after you, and then Jennifer Walsh.
JOHN Q. PUBLIC: Very good
So I was near the open space that you want to
provide. One time I was at that political meeting of
some rich guy in Los Altos Hills, and he asks me, "Gee,
are you here from the Hills?"
I said, "No, I'm down there." And you can see the downtown of a place called Mountain View, where from Mountain View, we can see the hills, but from the hills, they can also see us.

And he said, "You know, you folks down in Mountain View, I can see the downtown. You've got some restaurants down there that I like."

And I was thinking, "Okay. Well, maybe I could serve you if you come down."

But these are the folks that are most interested in preserving the open space, the folks that occupy it. And they have a plan for the Bay Area. It involves being competitive internationally, bringing in more foreign labor, and being able to generate a profit right here in the Bay Area. The heck with the quality of life for people that are here.

Now, the truth is that local communities have no control. You talk about state legislation giving you that, but the minute you oppose the state legislature, they'll take it away. And what communities need to do as a hedge against that, other than getting involved in the election of people to the state legislature, is to form charter cities so that you have some constitutional basis for challenging the state mandates on additional housing.

RICH HEDGES: My name is Rich Hedges, and I'm very supportive of this plan.

Why can't we say no to an extra 2 million people that the corporate profiteers want to bring into -- how about we say no to that? How about we say no to dedicated bus lanes on El Camino Real so that we can drive there? Can you say no? Politically, you're not going to be able to say no, unless you take over the state legislature.

Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Rich Hedges, followed by Jennifer Walsh, followed by Joshua Hugg.

RICH HEDGES: My name is Rich Hedges, and I'm very supportive of this plan.

There are some things that I would like to talk about it. But first, let me say that I already live the plan. I walked here tonight. I live in a transit-oriented area. You're in it now. There's transit at all parts of the Bay Area that leave from here, and I walk for all my services but groceries, and I'm 70 years old. And one of the reasons I still walk is because I've always walked, and it's very healthy. I can attest to it.

A couple of concerns I have is, I'm very fortunate. I imagine most of the older folks that are here now did what I did and bought a house 40 years ago and their house is paid for. If they have children,
Good evening. My name is William Nack. I've been a resident of San Mateo for 47 years. I'm here this evening to speak on behalf of San Mateo County Building Trades Council, representing 26 local San Mateo County construction unions.

While there will be some negative impacts from construction as a result of this plan, the Draft EIR and the plan itself missed a critical positive impact as a result of the proposed alternative; that being jobs, millions of construction industry jobs.

In addition, the EIR in its mitigation measures should make policy recommendations encouraging or requiring project sponsors to pay the workers area standard wages and require local apprentices who are enrolled in the State of California approved apprenticeship programs to be part of the construction team.

Without labor standards in the plan and the EIR, the transit-oriented housing that will be developed as a part of this plan will not necessarily benefit local workers or pay decent wages. Creating middle class jobs is a key to improving the health of our local communities.

Decent wages will ensure the construction workers can afford housing in the Bay Area. This will allow them to travel fewer miles per day to get to work, thereby improving their health and decreasing air pollution from vehicles.

Highly skilled and continuously trained local workers will be permitted and accountable to implementing the best environmental mitigation measures envisioned by the EIR for construction projects.

The outcomes of the proposed mitigation measures in the EIR will depend on the quality and commitment of the workforce that will implement that.

I look forward to working with you to implement these proposed amendments to the plan and the Draft EIR, and I thank you for allowing me to speak to you this evening.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you.

Janet Borgens, followed by Mitu Schrude (phonetic). I'm sorry. I can't read the writing.

JANET BORGENS: Hi. My name is Janet Borgens.

And my concerns have to do with some of the things that are missing out of the plan. And I'd like to see for those that -- I'm a planning commissioner in Redwood City, and some of the things we deal with are based on CEQA documents. And so although the plan says that the plan does not override local or land-use

in, and a lot of those people -- you know, they grew up in our community. And when there was ever a chance to buy a house, they looked at the prices and just left.

I'm very happy that we -- that we're moving forward with the sustainable community strategy plan because I think it helps address some of these gaps, maybe not aggressively enough.

I would encourage you to look closer to the equity environment and job scenario for some of the proposals that it has. But we have to stop bleeding our communities. North central has some of the worst overcrowding. If you're not commuting into the county, then you're moving into overcrowded conditions. If you're graduating from college, more likely than not, you're moving right back in with mom and dad, and that only lasts for so long.

So with the priority development areas that are being proposed, I would hope that we can maximize those high opportunity areas, access to transit, access to amenities. My mother-in-law takes advantage of that in Redwood City. More people need to be able to take advantage of those high opportunity areas.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you. William Nack, followed by Janet Borgens, followed by Sofia Lozano.

WILLIAM NACK: You ready?
control, one of the things we deal with in CEQA is if
to -- can you have a little bit more detail about
the plan meets regional or any other plans that are
currently going on. So it would be, are they in
compliance with regional goals and policies?

So I want to make sure that is included
in the verbiage, that it says that -- that is -- that
CEQA will not be challenged because I think it's
important that we don't have that cross-jurisdiction
where someone can come up to us and say, "Yeah, but it
doesn't meet the regional goals that you've already
established, so -- even if you say it doesn't take away
land-use."

Other things, I'd like to see a glossary of
terms. I know in here you have "What does open space
mean?" But I think it would be good for the general
public to hear, what do you consider to be protected
open space? And what the implications it might have on
protected open space; the definition for "critical
habitat."

Mapping is based on what? I looked at some of
the maps here, and they're not consistent. Some of them
say -- in Redwood City, for instance, some of our space
is urbanized area. And then other ones, it says it's
protected open space. Albeit, when I look at the map, I
know it's all developed already, so I'm just curious as

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Mitu Schrude (phonetic),
first name M-I-T-U? Okay.

LINDA KOELLING: Good evening. Linda
Koelling. I'm a resident of Foster City. I've been a
resident for 40 years. Formerly, I grew up in San
Francisco where we had transportation, and I had to take
two buses to get to high school.

I think the missing element around here is
that you have not held enough open sessions for the
public. I've known about this because I was an elected
official in the City of Foster City, so I've known about
this for quite a while. This is being shoved down our
throats, unfortunately.

There are a lot of moving parts to this whole
plan. Some of the parts can be very good for the
community. It's not about a generation gap either. I'm
talking about local control. I don't care what you say
up here and what has been written, local control is
being systematically chipped away to a point where local
officials are not going to have control. And the
ability for the voters to have any kind of say in
anything is going to get -- the gap is going to widen,
and we know that.

Communities have been resigned over the last
several years to share its services. That was the first
step; to regionalizing everything. We are not going to
have control over this. MTC is going to have control
over it. The Nine Bay Area Commission that's going to
be set up is going to have control, not the people.
We're going to be looking like robots in 50 years.
Thankfully, I'm not going to be here, but my grandkids
will be.

This isn't about sustainable communities. If
you want a sustainable community to live in, live in
Foster City. It's a wonderfully planned community.
We are using too many buzz words. And like I said, the whole thing about sustainable communities is a blanket, and one blanket -- one size does not fit all. If the -- if -- we all moved out of San Francisco to suburbia for a reason. Well, if suburbia is now evolving to a more urban climate, then we need a better infrastructure, and transportation is Number 1.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Matt Walsh, followed by Mike Roest, followed by Dante Pellegrini.

MATT WALSH: By the way, I just want to say that I fully support maintaining the legality of walking so that I can continue to walk. I think that should be supported.

I also want to say that I hear a lot that local authority will be maintained, and there's this -- discretion will be protected. But the reason I have a problem really buying into that is that the incentivization, the money they'll have to turn and walk away from just seems like an awfully hard thing for them to say no to. And I don't like this idea that they basically have a choice between funding or what their constituents may want.

The second half of it is in terms of housing pricing. I do fully support reduced housing prices. But, you know, the Japanese -- if anybody here -- drove here in a Lexus, the way they do things is they have a five-wise process where they say, "Why can't we make a fast, comfortable car like the Lexus LS 400?" And they deep decompose.

So the question is, why are housing prices high? Certainly, supply is a problem. But also, really, the pricing of housing reflect income levels.

And income levels reflect the amount of money that somebody needs to make to get by. Those also include taxes. And they also include the property taxes. And if you do the math, if anybody in here owns a home and you see what it costs to actually rent a house and come out ahead, you see where these numbers come from.

And the problem I have is by making life and doing business here more expensive, you're going to make those pressures greater, and that will push housing prices higher, except for places where the Government is controlling those, and that doesn't end well, as we know from countries to the east.

So in conclusion, I really support all the things in the plan. I like the idea of having public transportation. I want more people to have the opportunity to live here. I want more businesses to succeed. But I don't think that's going to get there by making things that are already expensive more expensive.
Meeting that we're having on this.
I urge you. You guys have the ability to do this: Advocate to put this to the vote of the residents of these nine counties. This is -- this is not something that we have to rush into. This is not -- And I understand there's a debate about global warming, whether or not it's factual, true, effective, what it is. This is not something that's going to happen in the next year. I think everybody here would agree that we're not -- the ocean is not going to rise and flood San Francisco in the next six months.
That being said, take your time, advocate your other elected officials to put this on a ballot. Let us vote for it. That way everybody can know about it. I mean, this is the third meeting. There aren't even 100 people here. Talking $3 billion over the next 30 years.
Please don't make this mistake. Hopefully we elected you for a reason. Do the right thing; put it to a vote. You guys have the right to do that. You represent us.
Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Rosemary Boardman, followed by Jay Michlin.

ROSEMARY BOARDMAN: Hi. My name is Rosemary Boardman, and I am a Bay Area native. I grew up in Belmont, and I live in San Mateo, and I'm a teacher.
I'm in my tenth year of teaching, and I rent a studio apartment.
When we don't allow our teachers and our police officers and our firefighters to be able to afford to live in our communities, our communities suffer for that. I previously lived in Portland, Oregon, and within a year and a half of teaching, I was able to save enough money to purchase my condo.
Portland has an urban growth boundary, and they have been planning for the fact that their population is going to increase. We know that the Bay Area is a desirable place to live. We know that more people will come and live here, and it is important that we plan for that increase in population.
We've been talking a lot tonight about quality of life issues. And one big quality of life issue is being able to get to where you're going in a timely fashion in a way that's affordable, and I believe that having public transportation that people can choose to use that is affordable and easy is a great way to go. I know that -- I live on El Camino. I work off of El Camino, but I don't take the bus because it's not convenient for me. If it was, I would take it. And so -- I would live in a high-density environment because I like to walk to my grocery shopping and my local library and my coffee shop. I don't want to have to get into my car to go somewhere.
Thank you.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Jay Michlin.

JAY MICHLIN: Hi. Jay Michlin. I'm a resident of the City of San Mateo. Much I can say, not the least of which, is how much I personally am listening to other people here, and I know you have too.
But I want to say something a little bit different, and it's a plea to you for some humility about our ability to plan 30 years in our future. Think about it. What a monumental undertaking that is.
So I've been around a while, and I've asked myself if in 1960, when I was growing up I tried to plan 30 years into the future, what would I have today? Orchards here? Not 7 million people.
In 1980, I tried to plan 30 years; semiconductor chip plants, complete with all the pollution and the particular electric needs they have. I wouldn't have even thought about something called Google.
So among other things, I'm involved in the city government. And the main thing I've learned there is extraordinary humility. Humility about paying attention to citizens, caring what citizens say, hearing every side, and learning from what they say.
And being a bit humble about my own ability to project the future, I'd ask you to do the same.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you.

So that was the last of my speaker cards. I had two people, and I'll repeat their names again in case they are here. But Susan Hart and Mitu -- I can't pronounce the last name. Okay.

MIKE SCHRADER: I filled out a card.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Pardon me?

MIKE SCHRADER: I filled out a card. My name is Mike Schrader (phonetic). I wasn't called.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Let me check. I have all the cards here that I got.

Sir, come up anyway. And we'll make sure we fill out another one, if we didn't get it.

MIKE SCHRADER: At the start of the discussion, you folks made comments about the great meeting, and I was over next door and saw all the plans and all the staff people. And today I find out through the web page and looked at the plan, hundreds of pages totally baffled me. So I took the same approach I do when I see initiatives on the ballot. I went and looked to see what the people on the other side have to say.
I have been watching ABAG quite a while. I find it very interesting. I've got friends who've been with ABAG. You have a lot to do. I think one of the supervisors made a comment, it was great to have all these people show up in the room. I asked up front when I got here how many public meetings there were. One. This county's got over 600,000 people. Probably don't have any idea what's going on. You're elected officials, but you're insulated because there's a map.

Let me tell you a story what happened, why my parents came to this country 60 years ago. I'll be 60 next year. They bought a house in the Terra Nova area of Pacifica. Six years later they lost it to property taxes because money was being spent on other things that they want to shift to. I understand low-cost housing, all that. But it has to be paid for somehow. They lost that house. They moved to the city and lived in a flat. Moved back to Fairmont and bought a house in '88. Lost that one to property taxes three years later. Moved to Marin County. Lost one two years later for that. And when I was employed by the County of Marin, working into college, and Prop 38 came up, I voted for it, and I lost my job. But people stopped losing houses. And now there's all this discussion taking Prop 13 over. Everything you're talking about here is being done with information and facts. You probably got more staff in that room than we have in this room here. But you're not responding to the people that are here. You're not having meetings. Okay?

The reason why I don't go to the Oakland meetings of ABAG, the same reason the electrician in that county moved from Oakland to Dublin. It's not a safe place.

You don't advertise the meetings. It doesn't fall on the brine (phonetic), as far as I can see. What you're doing is unfair. You're not paying attention to focus. You've got these wonderful dreamy ideas. The thing is, somebody is going to have to win and lose. The people that live down here that want to walk, want the transit, they can all have that. The folks that got houses on the hill that will get 2 percent of the improvement that are all preferred.

On your own web page, there's a story in the left-hand column about San Rafael requesting ABAG to let them get a change. They got it; seven cities didn't. There's definitely oversight by you guys and force being used. I don't want the force there. I want you to back out of this.

SUPERVISOR TISSIER: Thank you, sir. Thank you, sir.

That's the last speaker I have. So we will be taking all this information. We have it being recorded here, so your voices are being heard.

There are meetings in each and every one of the counties, the nine Bay Area counties. And we'll take all these under advisement, and we will be making -- well, we have more and more meetings over at MTC and ABAG in the future. So we welcome any comments online. You can send letters. We see them all, and we welcome any of your comments.

Thank you very much for being here this evening.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:26 p.m.)
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COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Well, good evening. Thanks for coming. Good evening. It’s wonderful to see so many familiar faces and some not-so-familiar faces. And I imagine some of you came a long way to be here. I’m just curious. If you drove more than 30 minutes from wherever you came from — at work or home — to get here, could you raise your hand. I’m just curious. Thank for your sacrifice in coming all this way. I know many of you are residents of Santa Clara County or in San Jose. Some of you are not. Thank you for joining us.

We’re, of course, embarking on an effort to see how cities and towns throughout the Bay Area can start to collaborate together. Because for many of you who sat in traffic for more than 30 minutes, you probably know something about how it is we got to be a Bay Area where lots of people sit in traffic for a whole lot more than 30 minutes. And it has something to do with the fact that land use and transportation weren’t always planned together in a way in which cities and towns are talking to one another. And so now we’re actually doing that. We’re communicating with one another.

I’m pleased to be here with my colleague, Ronit Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters

Transcript of Proceedings

Wednesday, May 1, 2013 7:12 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Well, good evening. Thanks for coming. Good evening. It’s wonderful to see so many familiar faces and some not-so-familiar faces. And I imagine some of you came a long way to be here. I’m just curious. If you drove more than 30 minutes from wherever you came from — at work or home — to get here, could you raise your hand. I’m just curious. Thank for your sacrifice in coming all this way. I know many of you are residents of Santa Clara County or in San Jose. Some of you are not. Thank you for joining us.

We’re, of course, embarking on an effort to see how cities and towns throughout the Bay Area can start to collaborate together. Because for many of you who sat in traffic for more than 30 minutes, you probably know something about how it is we got to be a Bay Area where lots of people sit in traffic for a whole lot more than 30 minutes. And it has something to do with the fact that land use and transportation weren’t always planned together in a way in which cities and towns are talking to one another. And so now we’re actually doing that. We’re communicating with one another.

I’m pleased to be here with my colleague, Ronit Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters Transcript of Proceedings

Page 7

Page 8

Page 9
Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
Transcript of Proceedings

Page 10

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

And what I'll do is I'll ask several people to
approach. And if the first person whose name is called
could start speaking, and the other two can get near the
microphone. We know that it's a large room, and it will
probably be -- eliminate a lot of pausing and waiting if
everybody is able to come up together.

Mr. Chen, followed by -- and
forgive me -- I'm going to mispronounce your name,
because I'm not sure I can read this spelling. It looks
like Padraig Omathuna. So forgive me if I mispronounced
that. I might have certainly have. Followed by Willie
Solis.

Good evening, Alex.

MR. CHEN: It's a lot of pressure.

I just want to start off by saying that I
think, for people like me and people -- other people of
my age, affordability is very important. And one of,
like, the huge expenses in my life is my car, which is
old and raggedy, guzzles up gas, any gas that I put in
it. Really expensive to maintain despite the poor
quality. And so, for that reason, I would love to see a
more robust transportation -- public transit
infrastructure in the Bay Area, not just in Santa Clara
County. That would be a huge load off my wallet.

And, you know, I think the biggest deterrent
for, like, people who don't like taking public transit
is that it's inconvenient. And I think, you know, the
answer to that would be, you know, to really make an
honest effort to invest in public transit
infrastructure.

And, yeah, it's not -- it's not simply just
telling people, oh, you know, drive less, you know.

What am I going to do instead? It's -- you have to take
kind of like a holistic approach.

And so -- the other kind of aspect of
affordability is rent. You know, as someone who's just
kind of starting out in their career and, you know, as a
lazy person too, I would like to be able to find an
affordable place to live, where I can hop on the bus
really easily and get to work. The saddest day every
month is, you know, when I have to hand over a rent
check to my landlord. So I would like that day to be a
little less sad. It's always going to be sad but . . .

I think Plan Bay Area is a step in the right
direction. I look forward to seeing, you know, a
better -- a more interconnected Bay Area -- Santa Clara
County, San Jose, what have you. You know, I would like
to sell my piece-of-crap car to some poor high school
student and maybe get like an extra ten minutes of
shuteye on the bus on my way to work.

Thanks.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you. The ringing
may hear is the two-minute bell. So just in time.

Welcome, Padraig.

MR. OMATHUNA: Hi there. Yeah, my name is
Padraig Omathuna. So I'm a resident of Los Gatos.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Forgive me for
mispronouncing.

MR. OMATHUNA: No worries. No worries.

So I -- actually, I'm against the plan. I'm
actually for, I guess, the goals of SB 375, which is the
reduction of greenhouse gases.

Okay. So I'm against the plan. Okay? I'm for
the goals of SB 375, which is the reduction of
greenhouse gases.

And I'm against this plan for a number of
reasons. One, I don't understand how, I guess,
affordable housing, et cetera, ties in with greenhouse
gases. Okay? I would say that if you want to reduce
greenhouse gases, hike the price of gas. It's a much
simpler way of doing it, rather than the social
ingineering experiment that we're -- that we're doing at
the moment.
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Another thing, too, is this plan for the Bay Area is not based on realistic projections for population growth within the Bay Area. For instance, the RHNA 2007 growth protections that you guys signed off on in ABAG had growth projections of 10 percent. The census came out with 5 percent. All right? So that was a significant overallocation of resources.

Now once more we are allocating 10 percent for the growth of the Bay Area in the next RHNA allocation, which is 2014. And we see that 10 percent growth going on and on and on.

However, if you look at the BayAreaCensus.gov figures, you will see that the growth in the population of the Bay Area is actually decreasing, percentage-wise, year on year. And, in fact, 1950 saw one of the largest increases in the population in the Bay Area, 1 million. Last year it was -- let's see -- 4 million, 400,000 people. All right? So it's half of what it was in 1950.

And with these projections, you are projecting that 700,000 people are going to be coming into the Bay Area, you know, year after year. And that's actually going to be increasing with 10 percent growth. We'll actually hit something like almost a million in 2040. And that, again, is just like unrealistic.
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We are very concerned that the Plan Bay Area is completely silent on the thousands of construction jobs that will result from building out of this plan. Here's why we're concerned. The current business model for developers building infill development is based on creating a low-wage work force imported from the Central Valley.

BRE, B-R-E, is a perfect example. This developer has two new projects in Sunnyvale, totaling over 600 units. At the resulting sites, 17 out of 34 contractors were based outside the region. Sheet metal workers were paid $12.00 an hour and shipped in from Sacramento.

Why is there nothing in the plan encouraging the use of the local work force and paying these workers their standard wages? Why is there nothing in the plan of the benefits of having several billions in construction wages recirculated within the local economy, resulting in millions in local sales tax revenues? Why isn't there anything in the plan about the thousands of new middle-class careers that could be the results of the building?

Thank you.
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I wish there were more requirements. That's families.

I want to talk you to about that I would like to see clarified.

I really thank you for doing this. A great man told me, when he hired me 40 years ago, a plan usually helps you succeed, so plan to succeed. And I think you've done that.

I would like to say that my union is a block from here. If you pass it, you will see it's 13 stories. We were the first building in redevelopment, and we have 12 stories of below-market-rate housing for retirees. Not just our members but everybody.

And I see many of the people in here are very much like me. They've probably got a home that's paid for. I've had a home for 40 years. I fixed my costs.

The first man that spoke was young. We need to keep people like that in the region. They're bright.

And they are having a really hard time staying housed. We need better transit. We need better housing.

I want to talk to you about some of the things in the -- in the plan that we need to fix. There has to be more below-market-rate housing. I'm not saying low-income housing. Below-market-rate housing. Big difference.

And I'm also -- and I'm also very concerned about no comments about prevailing wage. We do not need people coming in here and taking all the value that we're adding to this -- this area out of construction and taking it somewhere else. We need to make sure our local work force, both union and nonunion, are able to be employed in these projects.

So I would close with just saying that -- keep it up.

I hope that we will make sure that our young people can stay here. Our members are young, for the most part. Most of them are working now, so they can't be here. But they would tell you they are sick of driving for an hour for $25,000 a year. Even though they have good healthcare and a pension, it still doesn't pay the bills or pay for the housing. And it's about all they can take. They have very little time with their families.

So let's get this plan off and rolling. I wish there were more requirements. That's another thing that I see that's probably a deficiency.
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We need to make more requirements in the plan for cities.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, sir.

Susan Stuart.

MS. STUART: Hi, I'm Susan Stuart. I'm with the County Public Health Department. And -- which is a member of the Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Could I ask you to speak up just a bit.

MS. STUART: Sure. We'd like to commend the regional planning bodies and the participating stakeholders for this innovative effort. The draft plan is an enormous step towards sustainability, as it prioritizes existing transportation and focuses on the location of housing near transit, the reduction of premature deaths from particulate matter, the preservation of ag land and open space and the investment in local projects that support focus growth through the One Bay Area grants.

However, a major concern with the draft plan is the displacement of vulnerable communities that would result from the dramatic increase in the cost of housing and transportation predicted in the draft plan. The plan expects lower-income families to spend nearly three-quarters of their income on housing and transportation, leaving very little for food, clothing and education. This is both a financial burden for individual families, as people are saying, and a threat to the viability of the local economy.

It also means that a large percentage of the population will continue to spend long hours in commutes to work, making it difficult for them to spend time with their families in their communities and difficult for them to get physical activity, which is so important in the prevention of chronic disease.

Another concern is the expected rate of injury and fatality collisions in the communities that will experience the biggest growth and the need to invest more heavily in projects that calm traffic and make roads safe for all users.

Going forward, we ask that you continue to partner with Public Health and refine methods for measuring impacts on health. One example is the Integrated Transport and Health Impact Modeling Tool that was developed with MTC staff. This research determined that for every 1 percent increase in active transit commuting, the region could expect a roughly 1 decrease -- 1 percent decrease in mortality.

We urge the regional agencies to continue to
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explore alternatives, including the Equity, Environment and Jobs Alternative, which was called the environmentally superior alternative in the draft EIR. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you. Mr. Lepe, followed by Michael Ludwig and Michael Shaw.

MR. LEPE: Hello. My name is Chris Lepe. I’m the community planner for TransForm, a Bay Area transportation advocacy organization.

And, you know, overall, we support the plan. Plan Bay Area is going to bring people closer to their jobs, and it’s going to provide better transportation options. For the first time, transportation projects are being ranked in terms of cost-effectiveness and benefits for the environment and for communities. So this is a greatly superior plan from where we have come from before, from previous plans.

And -- however, we do have few different concerns. In particular, the HOT lane network. So we are not opposed to HOT lanes, but we are opposed to adding excess capacity. And so we would like to see, instead of the revenues from the HOT lanes go towards additional highway expansion -- what we’d like to see that instead go to is transportation options -- better public transportation options. For example, shuttles, you know, buses along -- express buses along the freeways and also a low-income pass to allow for low-income individuals as well as youth, a youth pass -- to allow them to be able to access different destinations. So I think the HOT lane network is one of the main concerns that we have, but we think that can be fixed.

Also, we would like to see more funding for transit operations. So with the EEJ, the Environment, Equity and Jobs Alternative, there’s actually a significant amount of additional transit operations projected as part of that plan that will help reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and get people from Point A to Point B.

Finally, as we invest in communities such as low-income communities, we should try to avoid the displacement of people living in those neighborhoods. Because those are the folks that are dependent on our public transportation services. So we would like to see anti-displacement measures as part of the plan.

And just -- I’d like to finish by saying that the EEJ alternative provides so many more benefits in regards to health, the environment and just improving the quality of life for Bay Area residents.
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Is that my time?

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: It is. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Lepe.

Michael Ludwig, followed by Michael Shaw and Mike Bulea. I hope I didn’t mispronounce that.

MR. LUDWIG: Thank you.

I’m Michael Ludwig from San Jose. And I do like, in general, what you are doing with this Plan Bay Area, especially trying to coordinate the growth in housing and jobs with transportation.

I am concerned about a few things. Most of Chris Lepe’s comments -- I want to echo them. I agree with him. And also the concerns about affordability. I am a low-income person, so -- so I am very concerned that there be low-income housing and low-income transit, things like that, available.

I see in the plan it’s expected to accommodate 79 percent of new housing within PBA. That’s good. That’s a high percentage. I like that. But only 63 percent of new jobs. And the 63 percent sounds low, but I notice it only includes PBA’s. If you also include the -- the new jobs that are within a half-mile of a rail transit station or a BRT station, how much would that 63 percent increase? I hope by a lot.

And I can’t think of anything else, so I’ll just.

Emerick And Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters Transcript of Proceedings

just . . .

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Michael.

And that’s actually a helpful example. If anyone doesn’t feel the need to take up the full two minutes, you’re not obligated to do so.

Okay. Mike Bulea, followed by Don Connors and Megan Fluke.

MR. SHAW: Did you said Michael Shaw?

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Mike, yes.

MR. SHAW: Michael Shaw.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Oh, I’m sorry. Michael Shaw. Forgive me, Mr. Shaw.

MR. SHAW: I’m going to start by saying two minutes is not enough time for somebody who has spent many years studying these issues to be able to express the problems with the One Bay Area plan.

My name is Michael Shaw. I’m from FreedomAdvocates.org. It’s a tax-exempt organization dedicated to expanding public understanding of the nature of natural law and understanding the nature of Agenda 21, the globalist plan for the remake of America. Your connection with One Bay Area and to Agenda 21 is phenomenal. Your thrust to create stack-and-pack living arrangements is an assault on our auto mobility, on single-family neighborhood living and
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So my first request is to advertise. Make sure you advertise this thing. Don’t make any decisions about, no one has approved and which doesn’t exist under the constitutional framework of the American republic.

So I ask you: How do you justify the powers taken on by COGs like ABAG? COGs engage in regional and municipal planning, economic and community development, cartography and GIS, hazard mitigation and emergency planning, aging services, water use, pollution control, transit administration and transportation planning.

What happened to local government? You have replaced it without awareness to the public.

How do you reconcile actions that pursue these Agenda 21 objectives — first, the abolition of private property; second, absolving political boundaries, like county lines; and, third, the creation of dense human settlements — with the fact that there is virtually no public support for these actions in California, other than those who stand to gain on a short-term basis?

I would ask for more time, because your association with the ICLE organization needs to be understood by the public. If you shut me off —

MR. BULEA: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Shaw.

Mike Bulea, Mike Bulea, followed by Don Connors.

MR. BULEA: Thank you.

So, first of all, two minutes is unacceptable. I mean, why don’t — 30 seconds? You really don’t get to hear from us. So two minutes is not acceptable.

Second thing, this is the largest real estate and transportation development in California. It costs — it is estimated to cost $300 billion for a period of 30 years, and yet the vast majority of Californians and people in the Bay Area have no idea this even exists. You are not advertising in newspapers. You are not advertising on TV. So this things — you’re actually flying this thing under the radar, yet it is much larger than the speed train that was supposed to cost $40 billion. Forty billion/300 billion, and no one has heard about it.

So my first request is to advertise. Make sure you advertise this thing. Don’t make any decisions.
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where they can no longer keep their doors open, they have to outsource, they have to do all these things that result in a loss of jobs. Please remember that.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, sir.

MR. BULEA: And make sure you put it up for a vote.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Megan got in front of Don. But go ahead. No, that’s okay, Megan.

Hi, Don.

MR. CONNORS: Hi, Sam. It’s been a while. I see — he used to represent me, but I had to move.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: I’m sorry about that.

MR. CONNORS: I’ve seen and participated in a lot of changes over my 72 years. A lot of this was for the good and improved the quality of life and some of it not so much and made matters worse. Based on my knowledge, education and 50 years of statistical analysis in a variety of fields, I say this plan falls into the latter category.

One of the things that they talk about is changes in technology and transit behavior will be necessary to achieve the objectives. Some of us in the room remember back in the 70s, when the first fuel economy standards were put in. It was due to the fuel — due to the Arab oil embargo. Global warming was
not an issue. In fact, it was global cooling at the
time. Same groups and same scientists are now telling
us about global warming. But that’s an issue for
another day.

So, 25 or 30 years later, we take a look and we
find out that the fuel economy of the average car on the
road has doubled. So you think, Whoa! We’ve
achieved our goal, we’re using less oil. People are
saving money on gas. Wrong. Miles driven per car
doubled, exactly offsetting the increase in fuel
economy. So these projections of social engineering do
not stand up very well. And, by the way, I did that
research, and it was published locally in the Metro and
nationally in the Wall Street Journal. So I’m not
talking through my hat.

Also, citizens say they would like to have --
well, some of them say they would like to
have near transit and be able to get closer to work.
Well, that sounds good, but let’s look at people’s
record on this. People have a very low opinion of
Congress, and yet they keep sending the same people back
to Congress. So they don’t vote for their convictions.
And -- well, I see I’m out of time, but I’ve
got a lot more. And I’ll try to submit that via e-mail
comments.
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COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Feel free to submit it
in writing or by e-mail.

MR. CONNORS: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Feel free to submit by
e-mail or in writing.

MR. CONNORS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you. Thank you,
Mr. Connors.

Megan Fluke Medeiros, followed by Jeff
Loughridge and Susan M., as in Mary, from Gilroy.

MS. MEDEIROS: Hi. My name is Megan Fluke
Medeiros, and I’ll just say I could not find a safe
place to park my bike, so it’s really nice to have
police guards in the back. So thank you for the police
tonight.

So I’m a San Jose resident, a bicyclist, an
active transit user, pedestrian. And I wish that my
husband and I could go from being a one-car household to
a zero-car household. But it’s just absolutely
impossible in our region.

I’m also a Sierra Club Loma Prieta chapter
staff.

And I just -- I feel that -- I just like
everybody deserves the choice to drive around, I and
other people like me deserve the choice to get around
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that they need at all income levels? Five, how can we
address the climate crisis and reduce greenhouse gas
emissions as we change and grow? Six, how can we plan
our cities so that we increase the convenience and
cost-effectiveness of public transit? Seven, how can we
ensure our housing needs meet the needs of the people we
need and value in our communities?

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

MS. MEDEIROS: And, finally, how can we meet
the obligation that we have to others in future
generations?

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

MS. MEDEIROS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Susan.

Welcome.

MR. LOUGHRIDGE: Yeah. Hi. My name is Jeff
Loughridge.

I want to say I don’t support this plan -- not
even in the slightest -- because I think that it’s a
program that we didn’t ask for. It’s a government
program that’s been pushed down our throats, along with
several other programs.

But this one in particular is most egregious
because it involves the whole Bay Area. Not just one
town. And that’s why -- one of the reasons you’re
getting around all of the separate towns and all of
their ordinances, by overlaying the zoning that's in
each of those areas with your own plan, which changes
everything. The zoning on -- the zoning on the land
that you are touching -- well, anyway. . .

So my example of how this -- this -- it's a
very complicated program. It relies on a lot of complex
information from many sources. And the worst thing that
would be if this information that you are basing it on
is incorrect.

Well, the population numbers, which is one of
the basis for your projections, is based on a two
thousand -- ABAG's numbers. And ABAG is supposed to
represent the Council of Bay Area Governments. They
don't represent the Bay Area, though. Because they came
up with a population growth projected at 10 percent.
The census came out two years later and proved that it
was 5 percent. They are also supposed to take their
numbers from the Department of Finance, which rounded
down their numbers to 5 percent. ABAG didn't do that.
And that was in 2010. Since then they've added the same
to the 2014 RHNA numbers, so affordable
housing and everything else. All your numbers are based on
the wrong projections of population growth, so it
can't be right. And when you're off by 5 percent in
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Year 1, 40 years or 30 years later, you are going to be
off by at least 15 percent.

So I think this is a social engineering that we
did not ask for and we don't want.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, sir.

Susan will be followed by another Susan, Susan
Russell, and Phyllis Cossel. I hope I haven't
mispronounced that.

Hi, Susan.

SUSAN M.: Hi, my name is Susan, and I'm from
Gilroy.

And I do want to say -- just add to what Jeff
said about the population. Because people are leaving
California. California is the highest-taxed state in
the country, with New York, and it's going to get worse.
So people are leaving, they are not coming in. So I've
got to say that the -- that has to be looked at
again, because it's not going to reach that.

But, anyway, I want to say, regarding -- I
perused the EIR, the 1335 pages of the EIR, and what I
see is total control over my life. It's in housing.
It's in transportation. It's in land use, taking away
from agriculture, ranching. We used to be the
breadbasket of America, that's gone. Okay? You are
opening up space that you say can be used by the public,
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Susan Russell. Susan will be followed by
Phyllis Cossel and Libby Lucas.

MS. RUSSELL: Okay. I'm speaking from the
League of Women Voters of the Bay Area. We strongly
support regional planning that coordinates Bay Area
transportation and housing land use decisions to reduce
greenhouse -- greenhouse gas emissions and to meet the
region's full housing needs for people of all incomes,
in accordance with SB 375. Done well, regional planning
will protect our environment, improve our economy,
increase social equity, conserve agricultural lands and
make our lives safer and more secure.

These are region -- issues of regionwide
importance that require thoughtful regional policies.
The recently released draft EIR and the equity analysis
provide a wealth of information that should be used to
improve the draft Plan Bay Area approved for study.
In particular, we note that the draft EIR
identifies the Environment, Equity and Jobs or the EEJ
scenario, Alternative 5, as the environmentally superior
alternative among scenarios analyzed. The EEJ
alternative also outperforms the other alternatives and
most of the performance targets and equity metrics your
agencies have adopted. Compared to all the other
alternatives, the EEJ alternative would bring us less
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traffic, healthier residents, fewer traffic deaths, more
affordable neighborhoods, and would do a better job of
allowing our most vulnerable neighbors to stay in their
homes.

We urge MTC and ABAG to incorporate the best
elements from the EEJ alternative and add key
mitigations into the final Plan Bay Area to improve
outcomes on a host of issues vital to the future of the
region. In particular, with regard to affordable
housing, plan for sufficient housing affordable to
low-wage workers in all infill locations with access to
jobs and transit.

With regard to displacements, strengthen the
One Bay Area grant program to better incentivize local
anti-displacement and affordable housing policies. Fund
mitigations such as land-bagging and housing rehab.
And with regard to health and active
transportation, fund more active transportation and
complete streets programs to maximize health co-benefits
of physical activity and transit use and better mitigate
air pollution.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you. Ms. Cossel.
MS. COSSEL: I'm Phyllis Cossel, and --
COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Forgive me for
mispronouncing.
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MS. COSSEL: I support the regional -- a
regional plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. We need
our open spaces to support more than clean air. We need
these lands to provide watershed and agriculture and
other uses. We need the water to be able to regenerate
someplace. We don't need private developers to fill
every little piece of land we have. We need to stay out of
the bay lands in our work. And that needs to be done
consistently, for a number of reasons that you have
listed already. And most people know the water level's
rising, the lands are fragile, and we shouldn't be
building on them.

We need an adequate supply of housing. Supply
controls cost. A shortage increases the price for
housing for everyone, and an adequate supply reduces the
price for everyone. We need housing for all kinds of
people in the community, and we need it close enough
together that we are able to keep other spaces open for
other uses.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Libby -- Libby Lucas,
followed by Selena Santa Cruz and Ron -- I think it's
Sacman (sic).

MS. LUCAS: Hi. My name is Libby Lucas. My
background is environment and recreation.
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MR. SACLEAN: Hello. Thank you.
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First of all, I want to thank you for planning this outreach meeting. I think it's a good start to bring affected residents and homeowners into this dialogue. So, first of all, thank you for -- for making this outreach effort.

And, Council Member Bryant, it's nice to have you here tonight. I'm a resident of Mountain View.

And so I'd like to speak a little more about a specific high-density project with which Council Member Bryant is very familiar. I live by -- I live in Mountain View, near the intersection of Castro and Miramonte. So there is a project under consideration to build the high-density housing complex at the intersection of Castro and El Camino. And I have a couple of concerns about it that I'd like to share.

First off, that this particular project would not be within practical walking distance of Caltrain or any other public transportation, as far as -- as far as I can see. So if you had 200 -- 200 residents living there, the likely traffic pattern would be to introduce 200-plus cars onto an already crowded street intersection. So, to me, I just don't see how that's in keeping with the vision of ABAG, with where -- with where this is trying to go.

Also, this would put out of business a popular local market called the Rose Market, which I think both of us probably shop there. And I think that's a -- that would be really a tragedy.

You know, if you look at small businesses that are affected by some of these high-density housing projects, someone that spends a lot of their own time and a lot of their money to develop -- to build up a small business, grow it up and they are doing well -- kind of part of the American dream, if you want to think of it that way -- and then -- then these projects would come out -- come down and steamroll several small businesses, through no fault of their own. They would stay in business if this project wouldn't come along.

So I submit that this particular project is probably -- to me, at least, as a local resident who would be very impacted by this project, I don't see how it's in keeping with the philosophy of where I think your group is going. And I submit, therefore, that it should be reconsidered and probably not pursued.

One additional consideration is it's directly across the street from Graham Middle School and would have a significant impact on traffic.

So I would just suggest that as -- there should be dialogue involving local homeowners when -- on specific projects like this.
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And I thank you again for having this initial discussion. It's very helpful, and it's very good to be able to air this out in public. But a project such as this one, it's an example of many -- need to be brought under scrutiny.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO:  Thank you, sir.

Georgine is followed by Beth and Matt Freeman.

MS. SCOTT:  Hi.  Georgine Scott.

I wanted to have Mr. Shaw speak on my behalf, but I was told that I couldn't. So I can only assume that you don't want somebody highly educated on this subject educating the rest of the public here.

So I -- I would like to say, I am opposed to this plan. I agree with what Mr. Shaw had said. If you read -- One Bay Area plan is a vision. It's straight out of the sustainable development Agenda 21 document. If you don't know about it, I would suggest you go to the website and read it and understand what it's about.

It's a United Nations plan.

This particular plan, I believe, is a vision that's unrealistic, nonattainable, and is based on false and unsubstantiated data. And, in fact, I actually wrote the County and asked them for their data to support climate control or global warming or whatever.
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you want to call it, and I actually got a bunch of gobbledygook. I was expecting to get actual legal references or cases or something that supported it, but I didn't get it.

This plan targets and caters to minorities and the low income and is designed to redistribute the wealth, with new made-up feel-good terms such as "environmental justice" and "social equity," to make the people feel good as you slowly take away our rights. It gains -- all this plan seems to do is gain more control over our lives.

And the transportation to reduce air pollution -- that, to me, seems like a joke. Just as the greenhouse gas emissions, reducing air pollution is laughable when you devise plans where I can sell my cars to you because you are not using them. I don't understand how that's actually reducing any air pollution.

Then on Page 3 in the plan, it says you can't -- if you can't meet the targets, oh, well. That's okay. We'll just go to Plan B because, quote, that doesn't have to be as feasible or achievable as the SCS. I can't believe how much time you spent coming up with answers like that.

Thank you.
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I believe it is our individual freedom to choose where we live, how large a house we want and can afford, what type of car do we want to drive. And so I totally reject the social engineering of the Bay Area Plan. Stated in their own literature, it says, "The Bay Area Plan will reduce the separation of land use, jobs, stores, schools and homes and encourage more complete mixed-use communities so people can drive less and walk, bike or use more transit."

"Number 2. Cluster more homes, jobs and other activities around transit so people can more easily use transit rather than drive."

"Plan land use and transportation together to reduce traffic congestion, improve vehicle speeds, reduce emissions from idling and other inefficiencies."

And you also state that the priority development areas are proposed to absorb 80 percent of the new housing and 66 percent of new jobs on only 3 percent of the Bay Area land. You are trying to push Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters Transcript of Proceedings

more to achieve its goals through proactive and focused conservation of greenbelts, open spaces and agricultural lands.

More specifically, the Authority would like to see more focus and investment in the protection and establishment of the priority conservation areas.

SB 375 includes a requirement that financial incentives to cities and counties be considered for the protection of open space, farmland and natural resources. The One Bay Area grant program, however, only includes $10 million towards the establishment of the priority conservation areas out of an estimated nearly 290 billion in transportation revenue over the next 28 years.

In Santa Clara County many of the priority conservation areas fall within really important areas that have been identified as critical land conservation priorities by the Bay Area Open Space Council's Conservation Lands Network and the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan. So increased investment in these areas is really essential to ensure the economic viability of our remaining farmlands and also to protect the natural systems that provide so many benefits to ensure livable communities, clean air, clean water, food, access to recreation, tourism, new sheds. So, by protecting these important natural resource areas and farmlands, conservation and the priority conservation areas will help the cities meet their greenhouse gas
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Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

Dat Phan, followed by Ishi City and a person with the first initial J., Wert.

MR. PHAN: Great. Thank you, everyone.

I just wanted to also extend my gratitude towards Plan Bay Area folks for really making an effort to not only get to the community but really engage folks in the discourse.

A couple points I wanted to emphasize is especially when it comes to putting this plan together and putting it into action, it's going to affect all nine counties. And especially for Santa Clara County and the city of San Jose, with a population of almost a million people, I really wanted to emphasize, when it comes to investments in transportation for the future -- buses, trains, light rail -- really to emphasize translation services for the Bay Area's diverse immigrant and aged community we have here in the city. Especially when it comes to affordable housing, thinking about the aging and the growing senior population, the number of students that are here in the city. And particularly for working families, making sure seniors have access to the community centers, families have access to jobs and students have access to schools.
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And finally, on the point of quality jobs, really making the emphasis to continue to work with community partners, going forward. They have the access, they have the information, they have the staff, they have the people, they have the insider knowledge to really be able to make this plan inclusive, going forward, and really engage the communities.

And, in closing, I really want to emphasis [sic]: The point in building this plan together, collaboratively, is to engage the community. I definitely encourage you to continue to do so as we go forward with this plan.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

Mr. City, Ishi City, followed by J. West or J. Wert. I may -- I'm having a hard time reading. Followed by Ralph Kearns. If you are any of those three people, feel free to come forward.

MS. CITY: I am Ishi City. I am against this plan. I want cities to have local control. I want the money I pay for gas taxes to pay for road repairs. If you choose Plan Bay Area, you lose the character of your town and the whole Bay Area.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

MR. WEST: I am James West.
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those of us that serve this county, and we contribute to our communities. But when we find when we go to the local planning departments, the local city councils, because we're such a small percentage of people -- Palo Alto does not have a large minority community -- that we're cut off. So when local communities are planning for these kinds of things and they are looking to get input on how to serve us, there is no input. We are totally cut off from the planning boards and planning decisions. We find that things are planned for us.

Examples of this is they have now an almost -- a housing development where there's lots of traffic, and they're putting kids in there. If that was a residential area, they wouldn't put kids in there.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. West.

Ralph Kearns.

And -- forgive me. Just one moment, sir.

Ladies and gentlemen, I certainly appreciate people want to express their points of view, and we want you all to express your points of view. I would ask you: Please refrain from booing or any negative comments if you are not in front of the microphone. Everyone is going to have an opportunity to speak, but we'd like to have a civil dialogue.

Mr. Kearns.
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MR. KEARNS: Thank you.

First thing is, population is going to grow over the years. So I think double-decking most of the freeways might be something to look at. The land's already there. It's already used. Put solar paneling above it for additional creation of electricity.

I think the homeowners should have a better access to solar-paneling the houses such that you don't have solar-paneling of the deserts, of which the desert wildlife may not be accustomed to the extra shade that's being created.

Bay Area Rapid Transit is a good example of local control overpowering regional. I think BART should have gone all the way around the Bay Area. But the two should work together.

Thank you. I think I've covered everything I wanted to say.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Kearns.

Gudith -- I would say Fawcect. Gudith Fawcect, Sue Adams and Michael Dittmer.

MS. FAWCECT: I am a Mountain View resident, Sue Adams and Michael Dittmer.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Kearns.

Thank you. I think I've covered everything I need to know what it's about. So I say, Well, start going to city councils to find out what's, you know, going on and checking it out.

I don't think it should be up to a small group of people to decide the future for all. More people need to be made aware of this.

I do not support this social engineering plan.

I don't want my family/friends being slowly nudged to something -- to someone else's idea of how we should live.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

MR. DITTMER: Hi. My name is Michael Dittmer.

We only have so much money, and you are taxing people out of California. I have two clients -- I'm an insurance broker. I have two clients that can't wait to get out. Now that the market is back, they are selling their house and they are out. I've had entire families move. I would go except I have three children and six grandchildren. Unless I can get the group to go, I'm not going. But I was born and raised in San Francisco. I understand transportation, and this is not working out.
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Three of the original owners tried that. They didn't last long. Somehow it was a little too close, working and living in one building. And they all gave it up within a year. So, you know, that's all I can say about actual experience.

And the other issue I have is the bus rapid transit on the El Camino. Since 1981 I've been sitting in that building, watching the empty buses go by. And maybe someday they are going to be filled, but they aren't filled now. And they want to spend $875,000 per bus. They've said one bus will go by every ten minutes. 875,000, 875,000, 875,000. Empty. Empty. I mean, every ten minutes is insanity. If you had a peak rush hour and you needed a bus every ten minutes, that would be fine by me. But that's not the way it's been explained. It's a waste of money.

We only have so much money, and you are taxing people out of California. I have two clients -- I'm an insurance broker. I have two clients that can't wait to get out. Now that the market is back, they are selling their house and they are out. I've had entire families move. I would go except I have three children and six grandchildren. Unless I can get the group to go, I'm not going. But I was born and raised in San Francisco.

I understand transportation, and this is not working out.
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and I'm from DeAnza College.

I'd like to also voice my support for Plan Bay Area. But, like Chris Lepe, I'd like to support my -- voice my support for the EEJ option. I believe that the money from the HOT lane should be used to support public transit options instead of simply more lanes in the road.

And I also believe that the displacement that poor and low-income people are facing in our housing should also be addressed as well.

Now, there's a lot of people here who seem to think that we're going to, you know, tell people where they have to live, tell them what car they have to drive, and that simply isn't true. We need to think about the ways that our car-centric planning has ruined people's lives. Think about what New York City did during the 1960s under the design -- under the traffic planner -- who I believe his name was Robert Moses. And what they did is that they destroyed neighborhoods in order to build more highway. If that's not government intrusion in your life, I don't know what is. That is very clear and an example where we need to empower people with our transit options and our housing options instead of limiting what they can do because they have to purchase a car and they have to drive on the highway.
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The simple fact remains that if we were to put this to a vote, severe problems could happen. So, for example, when BART was implemented, there were certain counties like Santa Clara County that did not approve of the plan. And, as a result, BART was -- BART was fragmented across the Bay Area. The simple fact remains that is we need to coordinate our effort in order -- so that in -- for an example, like Plan Bay Area, so that we can get an effective solution. If Santa Clara County was to vote against the plan and Alameda County was to vote for it and then another county voted against it, we'd get fragmented implementation. And that would be worse for everyone, including those taxpayers who want their money well spent.

The fact remains is that there are plenty of externalities to our car use. People are dying. There are about 40,000 people who die from car pollution each year because we drive cars. That needs to change. That costs lives. That costs money. And, ultimately, we need public transit solutions that actually solve that problem. Ultimately, we don't need our public transit solutions to distribute money from the poor to the wealthy through the use of HOT lanes that would prioritize wealthy people over poor people, even when poor people pay for those lanes.

Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
Transcript of Proceedings

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, sir.

Cecilia Ng will be followed by Mounia O'Neal -- forgive me for mispronouncing your name -- and Rich Richer.

MS. NG: All right. Yeah, so Michael is a very hard act to follow, but I'll do my best.

All right. My name is Cecilia, and I'm also from DeAnza College.

And, first, I'd like to really thank Plan Bay Area for recognizing and honoring all points of view by having these faces, faces like these. I'd like to push for more -- like others said, to have more community voices speak in these things, and reach out to them so they can provide their input.

And, specifically, I have come here today to show support for the Environment -- Environment, Equity and Jobs Alternative. And I'm -- I'm personally coming to speak as a person of color, a student who plans to study in the Bay Area and ultimately live in the Bay Area, work here. And, really, I'd like to show my utmost support for the EJ, because it is the best. Because it's going to bring us less traffic, healthier residents and fewer traffic deaths and more affordable neighborhoods and it would do a better job of allowing Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
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my whole life. And I've seen how a lot of the policies that have been implemented have impacted my own life, as a daughter of a single mother and someone whose father was in the Army, just because of how difficult it could be to get around and to access a lot of the resources. And so I really do want that freedom of choice of not being able to -- of not having to drive continuously.

I -- I used to nanny, and I worked -- two full-time jobs now. And so driving around and taking my siblings everywhere is just a huge burden on myself and on my family. To implement something like bus rapid transit, that would basically make access to our schools and to our communities -- you would basically be saying that you don't need a car to be an active member of our community, which I don't think should be true.

And just in terms of the environmental justice. When I was a nanny, I could see so many of the kids that I worked with would -- are developing asthma and having, basically, a lot of -- sorry. I'm getting really nervous.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: You are doing fine.

MS. O'NEAL: A lot -- sometimes when we think of these things like environmental justice we kind of see it as a huge theory rather than something that's actively in the lives of a lot of Bay Area residents.
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So I just want to voice my support for the EEJ plan and for including students, people of color, minorities, disabled folks, in this plan. So thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

MS. O'NEAL: Mr. Richer will be followed by Jim Kurtl or Kurtl. And followed by Benjamin Cogan and then Rob Means.

MR. RICHER: Okay. Thank you very much.

The stage name is Rich G. Richer because the rich get richer, because that's a prerequisite of really to any plan. There has to be a way here for the rich to get richer.

You know, we all come from somewhere. And here in Silicon Valley, unlike the rest of the country -- we have, in Santa Clara County, 1.8 million folks, 700,000 of whom are foreign-born. Now, that isn't by chance. It's by importation. That is, corporate executives see the opportunity to bring in cheap labor, relatively, talented folks from around the world. And that's really, I think, what this plan is about, bringing in folks from elsewhere. Not necessarily a bad thing but could have impacts for people that are here.

The folks that came here tonight to speak on principle, I congratulate you. If you came here to get Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters Transcript of Proceedings
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front of the city plans instead of following what the city plans are. You need to have goals for emission reductions. You need to have goals for public transportation use increase. Go from 1 percent to 25 percent. You need solar power goals. Increase it to 25 percent of the solar power generated in the area. I don't see any innovation in your plan. I just see smorgasbords of projects.

Another example that you could do to get out in front is affordable housing. We have heard here in the audience it's a huge issue. Instead of having this anemic 15 percent that most of the cities have for mixed-use, residential, commercial housing, hey, state it at 25 percent. We need help in that area.

I personally have a Social Security check that I live on, and I'm retired. It's $1500 a month. I don't have a public pension.

The other thing that I can recommend that would show some innovation is for these bus rapid transit routes, install synchronized traffic lights so all the vehicles can move at a higher speed. This would have an immediate permanent reduction in emissions.

I don't see that kind of innovation. Come on.

You guys are being paid big bucks. Think ahead. Look out. Show some innovation.
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a job as a $100,000 bus driver, I'm not so favorable to you. There are a lot of people that have trickle-down interests in this. You want to spread it around and sell it to folks, and that's interesting.

But I think the truth tonight is that folks who are here are speaking not to you two but to that blank wall in back of you. Because you folks aren't going to do anything for them.

And an example of that is down in Mountain View, where the city council expresses opposition to a dedicated bus lane, as the council did in Sunnyvale, and that's going forward with a regional board, the VTA.

And they are silent about what they are going to do in Palo Alto, because you're taking piece by piece. That's anemic 15 percent that most of the cities have for mixed-use, residential, commercial housing, hey, state it at 25 percent. We need help in that area.

So, this is a very touchy subject. And the guys from DeAnza College, thank you very much. It feels good to speak.

And I think affordable housing sounds really good. And I agree. I want that. But there's a bigger picture. There's a bigger scheme. There's actually something bigger behind all this, behind the white wall. I don't know -- you know, behind -- how far you want to go behind the white wall for the better situation. And it's not affordable housing. It's affordable living.

It's responsibility. Okay?

And so what's really going on? And so we got world factors. World factors. We got United Nations.
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Ms. Nathan will be followed by Luis Flores and Mark Henry Young.

MS. NATHAN: Hi. My name is Shirley Nathan. And I have been shocked to witness the rapid transformation of the Bay Area, mainly due to the ill of the building ordered by ABAG specifically, as well as traffic congestion, with roads being narrowed and lanes eliminated.

Saving the environment is being used in order to implement this agenda, when, in reality, controlling the citizens to conform to an unrealistic utopian agenda is behind this hysteria. It benefits no one in the long run. How can stacking people in small boxes be healthy and sustainable? Bike-riding is great but totally unrealistic when used as a goal to replacing the automobile, which affords the most freedom and flexibility.

Transit corridors may work for commuters who live near the trains. But, then again, there's so much mobility in our society that all alternatives should be planned, such as improving the roads and adding parking spaces instead of eliminating them. I've never read of so many cases of road rage leading to violence, with people fighting over parking spaces instead of eliminating them. I've never read of those plans into El Camino.
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Secondly, we'd ask that you prioritize transit operations with future unrestricted funds. And please ensure that the HOT lane network is designed in a way that mitigates the impacts on low-income commuters. And
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And it was very interesting to see here -- what does "environment justice" mean? The Presidential executive order talks about fairly distributed benefits and burdens for disadvantaged communities to include minority and low-income communities. What's fair? Who determines that?

So this is really nothing more than social justice, taking from those who have and forcibly giving it to those who don't have. Our policies -- economic policies are forcing the middle class to flee the state and to go elsewhere, leaving only the wealthy, those that live in the silk stocking districts around San Jose, and the poor that work in their factory floors.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Mungai.

MR. BERNAL: My name is Martin Bernal, and this is an extension of Michael Shaw's speech that he was giving.

ICLE, ABAG has worked closely and has generally conformed to policies -- policy directives delivered by ICLE. Evidence all over the web. ICLE -- full name is International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives -- is an international organization that is accredited by the United Nations for purposes of implementing the action plan of Agenda 21, the blueprint for world government. Local -- quote, Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide, close quote, was drafted by ICLE -- by the ICLE organization. ICLE has contracts with over 600 U.S. cities and 1200 cities around the world. The highest concentration of ICLE cities contracts -- ICLE city contracts in the world is the San Francisco Bay Area.

Article 1, Section 10, California Penal Code Section 37 and 38, dating from the 1850s, sets forth the procedure for notifying officials of treasonous activity. This is called a misprision of treason. Ask Scott Haggerty, H-a-g-g-e-r-t-y -- I might have mispronounced that -- supervisor in Alameda and ABAG leader, as to how you might experience receipt. Those interested may obtain information on misprision of treason by visiting FreedomAdvocates.org and reading the Misprision of Treason Primer.

Ladies and gentlemen, the development of policies you are pursuing are a patent implementation of Agenda 21 sustainable development. Michael Shaw, over there, challenges any elected official who is part of ABAG to publicly debate the philosophical, economic and political implications of ABAG's existence and the actions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>and -- to help sustain an accessible community and also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>that have public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anyhow, I want to say that I support the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>general idea of this plan, but -- and from -- I'm a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>person from a younger generation that do want to live in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the city. And I love the idea of being able to walk out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>of my house or my apartment, or whatever the heck I'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>going to be living in in a few years, and walk five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>minutes and hit a bus stop, hop on the bus, go to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>or go to school. And so I do support the idea of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>plan and everything else that DeAnza students have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>supported so far and also Chris Lepe from TransForm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>And on the topic of electric automobile, if I'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>going to drive in the city, I would love an electric car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>that will help reduce pollution and also global climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>change. And most of all I love the idea, and it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>really support public transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>And continue on,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: So I have five cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>left in my hand. If you would like to speak, get the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>cards in because time is running short.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Okay, Simon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MR. TAN: Hi. So this is actually my first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>time speaking at a public hearing, so excuse me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Originally I didn't -- I wasn't going to speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>at first, because after looking through the plan, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>realized just the sheer amount of complexity and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>amount of detail that you guys went into. And, clearly,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a lot of effort went into the plan, and I just -- I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>can't think -- fathom how I could have provided some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>useful input into it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>But, you know, while sitting here and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>to a lot of the opposition to the plan, I'm really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>shocked, actually, to the opposition just because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>like -- I mean, maybe it's a generational gap, maybe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>you know. It seems that way. That people who are the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>most vocal about the plan, against the plan, are the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ones who seem to have, you know, the most time or the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>most ability, the most dedication, to come out here and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>voice their opposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>But, you know, let me ask a rhetorical question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>to the room. And it's really, like, if you are against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>the plan, are you really against, you know, specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>parts of the plan or are you against central planning in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>general? Because central planning -- so it seems that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>way. Okay. It seems that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>But -- well, here's the thing. Here's the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>thing, though. If you don't have centralized planning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>you don't have a sustainable growth plan for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>This state can't sustain itself without central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>planning. Like the best cities and regions -- hold on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The best cities -- the best cities and regions in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>world are planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I mean, you look at a place like Singapore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>They are known for like 50-year plans. And the fruits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>of their planning from 50 years ago pay off now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Because that place is tiny. Like, you know, they have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>to plan in order to sustain the amount of sheer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>population growth that happens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>California has population growth. California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>has incoming residents. You have to realize that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>this -- this is -- this is a -- this is a problem that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>we have to deal with, starting now. And, you know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>having different regions and different cities kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>arguing about -- well, you know, this plan doesn't work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>for me; this plan does and disagreeing doesn't really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>create a cohesive story for the Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No plan is going to make everybody happy. Every plan is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>going to piss off somebody. But which one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>is the responsible plan? Which one is the one that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>actually accounts for future growth and which is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>scalable one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>So I thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Tan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>C. -- C. Novak, followed by Gloria Strong,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>followed by Susan Marsland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR. NOVAK: Hi, panel. Thank you very much for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>having this public forum. I appreciate that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm going to focus on more of the politics and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>the local representation of this matter. All politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>is local. But when you look at this plan, it just puts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>it further and further out from the reach of people that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>are going to be affected by it. So if there are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>millions -- are millions of people in the Bay Area and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>this is something that's driven by some world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>organization and unelected officials, that just is a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>recipe for disaster and not having transparency, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The -- we are a democratically elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>republic, so far. I believe in solutions of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>individual and innovation. We are Silicon Valley. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>people have the power. They've got the wisdom. We can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>find a solution. We don't need a one-size-fits-all,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>huge plan that is forced upon us and our children and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>grandchildren, if this plan is going to last 30 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I just look at many different government-run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>organizations, the inefficiencies of it -- the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>inefficiencies of them. When the Transcontinental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Railroad was first built, two companies did it. One was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>a government-sponsored; one was an individual, privately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Thank you. And thank you to the students that address the gap in equitable access for all people.

Recommendations from the EEJ, which will help also

And those kinds of households involved all kinds of

on Page 108 can be raised to help struggling households.

I do have one concern about Target Number 7 on equitable access, and hope that the 10 percent decrease on Page 108 can be raised to help struggling households. And those kinds of households involved all kinds of people, from teachers, police, fire. And we need to do a little bit more to support those people.

If you can please incorporate some of the recommendations from the EEJ, which will help also address the gap in equitable access for all people.

Thank you. And thank you to the students that came tonight. I have a lot of respect and admiration for you being here. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Ms. Ryan, followed by Emerick and Finch, Certified Shorthand Reporters
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Mr. Tebo.

MS. RYAN: Hi. I'm Jean from Morgan Hill.

And I understand where those DeAnza students are coming from, because at one time I was a student and wasn't making -- very little money. But the American dream is to have your own home, and most of these homes are in suburbia. And part of this plan is taking money out of suburbia to finance this regional plan.

I downloaded the 1300 pages of this EIB report, and I was able to get through the first 100. And the thing that hasn't been mentioned here is about the vehicle miles driven in your plan. I think eventually you want to impose a tax on people who drive cars and record how many miles they drive and tax them accordingly. To this I find a terrible thing in California, because we're being taxed already. But to tax the miles you are driving? Who is that going to hurt? It's going to hurt low-income people, anybody trying to get to work. I think it's vastly unfair. But this is something that was not mentioned, but it is in your report.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you.

And finally -- finally, Mr. Tebo.

MR. TEO: Hi. My name is Noel Tebo. I live in San Jose.

My simple desire is for my children and grandchildren not to have to move away so that they can live in a good community with affordable housing and great transportation. Including walking and bike and transit as well as cars.

We've all seen what 50 years of unplanned growth and urban sprawl has done to California. It's been a disaster. The so-called free market merely makes rich developers richer. Our children deserve better ideas.

Frankly, I never expected to hear so much ideological nonsense tonight about doing smart planning. It's time to leave horse-and-buggy ideas behind. I support the Bay Area plan. It is a sensible, smart idea that's supported by our elected officials.

Good job. Our kids deserve it.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BRYANT: As we conclude tonight, I just want to thank you all for coming. Obviously, there's been a wide diversity of opinions here, which is what makes the Bay Area so wonderful. We are very diverse. We disagree. We all live together. I think that's why so many people want to come here.

The final two takeaways: One is that this is a thoughtful plan that we have in front of us tonight that emphasizes housing elements and transportation.

The final two takeaways: One is that this is a thoughtful plan that we have in front of us tonight that emphasizes housing elements and transportation.

Mr. Liccardo, you told us earlier to be civil. Minority, the individual.

Would you tell somebody who is being assaulted to be civil as well? We will not be silenced.

Would you tell somebody who is being assaulted to be civil as well? We will not be silenced.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you, Mr. Novak.

Susan Marsland, followed by Jean Ryan.

MS. STRONG: My name is Gloria Strong. I just followed by Jean Ryan.

Gloria Strong, followed by Susan Marsland,

followed by Noel Tebo.

Mr. Liccardo, you told us earlier to be civil.
work in progress. And the other is that land use
decisions are made at the local level by your elected
officials. I know how it works in Mountain View. We
have areas that we want to change, areas that we don't
want to change. People get choices. People --
different people want to live in different places, and
one set of people finds it very difficult to understand
the other set of people. Why would you want to live in
suburbia and drive? Or why would you want to live in an
apartment near the train tracks? People find it very
difficult to understand each other, but we all find a
way to live together in the Bay Area.

So thank you for coming.

COMMISSIONER LICCARDO: Thank you. I would
just like to echo my colleague's comments. I appreciate
all of you taking time out of your very busy days to be
here.

(Hearing concluded at 8:59 p.m.)

---o0o---
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Mr. Crutchfield: Good evening. I'm neither F.D. Crutchfield and then Shirlee Pierce, and following Shirlee will be Doris Robinson.

Mr. CRUTCHFIELD: Good evening. I'm neither Shirlee nor Doris.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you. I am still wondering, who are you? There are two elected people in this vast Army of unelected people that have generated this plan. Faceless, nameless bureaucrats following some kind of plan that we're not privy to. The whole attitude seems to be, the public be damned.

I have attended previous meetings and there is an overwhelming avalanche of propositions to item after item. The figures you are using are very suspect. I challenge to support the employment numbers, the housing numbers. They seem to be tailored to fit the plan rather than the plan fitting the real numbers.

If it's so good, why can't we vote on it?

That's the main question I have. Why can't we vote on it?

Thank you.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

Shirlee Pierce, and then after Shirlee, Doris Robinson and then Nathan Daniel Stout.

MS. PIERCE: Good evening.

My comments are mostly directed to those of you on these boards that are not elected officials. You are making the crucial decisions for our community rather than our own elected representatives.

You are deciding how tax money that has been taken from us will be spent, a job that our own elected representatives should be doing. If you don't do a good job, you can't be fired. Your positions and incomes are safe no matter what kind of hell you let loose on us.

I would like to be able to fire those, or at least vote out of office, those who are shaping our future if they don't do a good job, and if they don't know what the heck they're doing. Some of these numbers, like my husband said, they're suspect numbers, and I know they have been -- other people that have spoken have disagreed with your numbers.

And what happens if this thing doesn't work? Do you have any plans to retract any of this or is there anything that you know of or that you have in the

Page 2

Page 4

Page 3

Page 5
plan, in any of your plans, that would backtrack this whole thing?

And you said this is the priority of the Solano residents, Solano County residents. Not mine. I really don't want more bike lanes. I don't want more walking trails, and I don't want to have -- live in a house where I can only have space for one car, which is what you're planning. Those stack-and-pack houses have space for one car. That is not what I want. I want my house. I want my yard.

I am a senior citizen. I don't want to have lanes taken off of the highways for bikes. And I think we have plenty of bike trails. There's plenty of -- I don't know if there's -- how many advanced there are. I don't see people here saying, more bike lanes, more bike lanes. There might be one here, but I don't think that there is that many here.

So, that's it for me.

These are not my priorities, and you said priorities of Solano County.

MR. SPERING: Doris Robinson and then Nathan Stout, and then Bob Berman.

MS. ROBINSON: Good evening.

It looks like we are all coming from the same place here, but this plan is -- I don't know how it got put together because it has drastic effects on property rights of Solano County landowners.

In order to accomplish what you're going to do, you will need the land to do it. And, guess what? It's all owned by private people. The government doesn't own this land.

So in order to implement your plan, you have to somehow confiscate that property. And the liability for the inevitable litigations that are going to accompany the undertaking of this magnitude are going to be astronomical, because people are not going to sit still why you take their land.

The restrictions on the individual landowners will not allow for development or redevelopment, assuming that the liabilities that could easily reach into the hundreds of millions of dollars, even before considering the cost of litigating these cases.

The impact on our county and our city budgets have got to be assessed, preferably by an independent entity that is not a proponent of the UN or Agenda 21, which is the grandfather of this diabolical scheme.

Such an analysis has to be made available to us, the public and it should be transparent and it should be exposed to all concerned parties at the same time.

MR. SPERING: Okay.

MS. ROBINSON: I am going to leave you to wrestle that weight of my words and conscience in the hope that you're going to see the mistakes you could be making for your neighbors, your friends and families with the
In terms of agriculture, again, I think the plan does a good job in recognizing the value of agriculture; however, beyond the One Bay Area Grant Program, there are really no measures to ensure the permanent protection of agricultural lands, nor policies that facilitate the growth and improve deficiencies of that agricultural so agricultural is set. So, again, I think we could be doing better policies and programs.

In terms of goal three, which is to provide all Bay Area residents to access of parks and recreational open space, I believe that the plan could explicitly call out better our plans to increase parks in urban and suburban areas and to improve access to and the utility of open for recreation.

In addition the plan could identify a purchase of increase of residents' and visitors' abilities to access parks and trails by public transportation.

And in terms of Solano County, I would note that we have two state parks here in Solano County, both of them in the Vallejo/Benicia area. And one of them certainly, the Benicia state recreation area, but both parks are on the state's original closure of the state parks.

And although records are done in the Benicia State Capital Park, the Benicia State Recreation area is certainly is in danger of closing for changed circumstances in the future.

And, finally -- so I would just simply say that overall, I think the plan lacks a specific actions of policy needed to ensure long-term protection and investment of the Bay Area's park open space.

Thank you.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

Lynne Hansen, and Mike -- Michael Hayes, and it looks like Joy Potter?

MS. HANSEN: Yes, I am Lynne Hansen and I -- if you have never read the Book Agenda 21, this seems to read exactly what the book says. And the homes in Europe are all stacked up on top of each other, those countries are pretty well socialized now and there are bicycles, et cetera, et cetera, seems like a goal I see here and it's terrifying.

Just like people had said before, we are capable of taking care of ourselves. We are replenishing our cars with more energy-efficient cars and putting in solar we can do all of these things ourselves.

But this is clearly stacking houses, penalizing people that live in the suburbs, make them move in town so that they can get on bicycles and not drive their own cars anymore. That is socialism, I'm sorry. No.

Thank you.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

Michael Hayes and Joy Porter and then George
Mr. Hayes: Yes. Thank you.
I think -- I don't know the plans specifically verbatim, but I think it needs to be language that looks at and reflects the need for stabilizing the population of California.

The plan, I don't think mentions it, but I think you can draw an illogical conclusion that at some point, we can only accommodate so many people in the state and the plan seems to be just that it seems to want to keep track of the people in the state.

Again, their needs to be language within the plan that looks at and reflects the need for stabilizing the population, even though the state might require the plan to essentially accommodate growth.

So we really need to look at the state population and the responsible thing to do is specifically for this sort of -- this plan is to start looking at stabilizing the population, even though the state might require the plan to essentially accommodate growth.

Again, their needs to be language within the plan about the need to -- whether in the initial statement or whatnot, to stabilize the population.

So thank you.

Mr. Spering: Thank you for your comments.
Joy Porter, George Guyan and the Kathy -- it looks like Kerridge.
Mr. Porter: Thank you all so much for your time tonight.
Forty-three years ago, my parents did one of the most important things they ever did for me and my wife, and that was they chose to rent an apartment.

Mr. Spering: Are you Mr. Porter?
Mr. Porter: Yes, I am.
Mr. Spering: Mr. Porter, I'm sorry.
Mr. Porter: Joey.
Mr. Spering: Okay.

Just for the record, Joey. I apologize. I said --
Mr. Porter: Just like the --
Mr. Spering: Thank you.
Start over. Start over.
Mr. Porter: As I tell people, just like linebacker but I'm bigger than him.

So, anyway, we're both outspoken.
So anyway, 43 years ago my parents chose to make one of the most important decisions in my life, which was they chose to rent a small apartment about 15 miles from where we lived so that I could attend a better public school because the teacher that was going to teach my class in my local elementary school was the subject of a parent walkout at the previous school I attended. Forty-three years ago.

I came to Vallejo in 1995. 1998, I bought a piece of heaven. 1100 square foot. I had 20 fruit trees, 50 rose bushes, solar panels. I'm living the American dream. I'm looking for the American dream for my children. I don't -- this plan, I understand, puts the preponderance upon stacking-back housing, sitting on top of one-floor retail developments.

It has an emphasis on something called social justice, which means, the people living across the hall from you, may be Section 8 housing and you are paying the same amount of money.

Move to a better neighborhood, yeah, but at least the plan does allow single-family housing. But if that is limited by zoning, isn't that going to be something that only one percent can afford.

The American dream. That's what I want to preserve. I want to preserve for everybody here.

I thank you all for your time. And that's why I generally don't like this plan.

Thank you.
saying, well, let's go ahead with this. Most of the people are saying nay.

And if that's the case, it's certainly not the consensus of the public. It seems to me. You should be happy to have a vote of the people if you think you've got the votes.

I really shutter at the thought that this country has got support to go to socialism. This is the kind of stuff that happens to a lot of the countries in Europe and it's not good. We don't need that here.

That's what the founding fathers told Britain, they didn't want a tax war, so that they could do things independently. They didn't want to be taxed without representation and they is definitely taxation without representation.

So we really hope that you guys stop this. And I think the best thing you could do is get rid of the MTC, ABAG STA, all of these government agencies that we don't need and that waists a lot of money and create unnecessary means for the public to continue to try to stop you from doing things that you shouldn't be doing.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

MR. GUAY: Thank you very much.

MR. SPERING: Kathy Kerridge, Doug Darling and Coleen Morrison.

MS. KERRIDGE: Good evening.

Hi. I'm Kathy Kerridge.

I, in general, completely support this plan. I think it's vital in a region that is essentially connected to the Bay Area that we do long-term regional planning. And I think it's very well and it's nice to wish that population does not increase. I hope the population does not increase. But if it does increase, I think we need to be prepared for it.

So I am in favor overall of the plan. I think it's vitally important for our future. And I think it not only helps people who drive cars to make it less congested highways, but it helps people who would like to use more regional transit.

Real specifically, I have some things I would like to add to it.

In looking at the bike trails, I am one -- a person who does like bike trails and does utilize them. I would like to see a bike trail going from Benicia to Vallejo and to the ferry terminal. Ideally, it would be separate from the road. I think bike trails not on the road are much more utilized. Many bicyclists feel more comfortable riding when they don't have to worry about vehicle traffic.

There's a beautiful road that you can take all a long Vallejo. I work in -- I live in Benicia. I work in American Canyon. And, believe me, I've tried to scope out how I can get there easily on a bike. And once you hit 37, it's really hard. So I would love to see some type of bike trail that can take me from Vallejo, to 37 up through American Canyon and up through Napa. I think in the future that would be a wonderful asset for this whole region.

I'd also like to see a higher percentage of the funding go for specific climate change mitigation. I know overall the plan has that in mind, but it's only a very tiny percent who had -- who goes for that.

I would like to ensure that affordable housing is included and is not set aside. Sometimes when we are in the process of redeveloping areas affordable housing was lost. And I do think it's very important that that not happen.

And, finally, I do like the idea of in-fill housing. And I think when we have in-fill housing and you have a little bit higher density housing, that, basically, means we can preserve more open spaces that are around us.

So that's my two-cents worth.

MR. SPERING: Thank you, Kathy.

Doug -- Doug Darling, Coleen Morrison and Shirley -- Shirley, I apologize. I can't read your handwriting, but you're from Dixon. So Shirley from Dixon will follow-up.

Thank you, Doug.

MR. DARLING: Doug Darling, President of (unintelligible).

Supervisor Mike Luce, ABAG President, Napa County Supervisor, quote, "Bottom-up plan recognizes the diversity of Bay Area Communities, city and counties identify the best places for growth to preserve the character of existing neighborhoods and protect agricultural land."

MS. SEIFERT: Doug, the court reporter is having a hard time keeping up, so if you can just slow down.

THE COURT REPORTER: And can you speak up just a little bit, please.

MR. DARLING: Certainly.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. DARLING: Do you want me to start over?

MR. SPERING: Yeah. Go ahead, because she didn't get it.

MR. DARLING: Mark Luce, President of ABAG, Napa County --

MR. SPERING: You're time's up.
by the county on the daily forum center. You are currently
muscling us on the fairgrounds project. And now you are
seated before me tonight muscling me on behalf of ABAG.
This is social engineering at its finest. And the fact that you have gotten away with it this long,
should be considered alarming. It reminds me of a movie
called Soylent Green.
Thank you.
MR. SPERING: Colleen Morrison, Shirley from
Dixon and Ginger Emerson.
MS. SEIFERT: I think you can adjust the --
MR. SPERING: There you go.
MS. MORRISON: Can you hear me?
MS. SPERING: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Barely.
MS. MORRISON: Colleen Cole Morrison,
Vallejo.
My understanding is that this plan really
has been three years in the making and it's going to happen
and then this is just what you have to do in order to
justify what you're doing.
And you know what, I can live with that. I
am not a planner. I can live with help. But when I look
at the maps of the PDA's and when I look at the maps of the
jobs that are supposed to be created, I am reminded of a
really famous map that in the 50's Dean Rusk sat down and
looked at in the White House, and it was the map of Korea.
Dean Rusk took 15 minutes to divide up a
country without talking to anyone from Korea about what it
meant to divide the line a long the latitude instead of the
longitude.
If he had divided it differently, we would
not be having the threats that we have from North Korea
today. It would have just taken a little time to talk to
the people who are being affected by the maps.
So my question, and I have been trying to
get this answered for a couple of weeks through e-mail is,
who from Vallejo and Benicia is the author of the PDA's.
Is it city or is it county? Number one question.
And, number two. Who controls the PDA
development?
I understand here that it's 80 percent of
the PDA's are expected to the region numbers, but it's not
an eat it. My understanding was that, really, the city's
zoning determines where the reading numbers will go. And
that it is not an absolute formula that really goes into
PDA's. And I feel like you know what the bottom line is
here tonight and I would be hoping for that answer.
And then to add Doug Darling's ideas, you
know, he was saying things are happening from the county
level to Vallejo that we're noticing, and it doesn't breed
trust.
The things that I know is that in January
2012, the county upturned, overturned a voter-mandated
ten-city level for the unincorporated areas in Vallejo.
The voter mandated 2008 level for density in the
unincorporated areas of Vallejo, were zero to four. But in
January 2012, the county changed that to zero to ten.
So what I would like to know is, how can we
be part of the process so that we don't end up with
problems such as Mr. Rusk created.
Thank you.
MR. SPERING: Okay. Thank you.
Shirley -- if you could give us your last
name, please, for the record.
MS. HUMPHREY: My name is Shirley Humphrey
and I am from Dixon, California.
And before I start my prepared comments, I
would like to make a copy -- a comment on population.
If you are reading in the Sacramento Bee,
the University of Southern California is projecting that
the growth in California is going to go to a low of 7/10th
of one percent. Last week there was a study by Lutheran
University which says California is losing population.
So you need to look at those statistics from
Okay. I wanted to talk to you about our problems in our local area. You guys are promoting transit centers. Well, we’ve got a transit center, and it’s got a locally mobile center and there is a train station there, and 1.8 million dollars of the tax payers’ money has been spent. And guess what? There is no transit there. There probably will never be any transit there.

We rent it for a dollar a month and so far the citizens of Dixon have collected $66. And for that you get a 2,000 square foot building and 114 parking places.

People in Dixon have protested, they don’t like the train station. You need to make sure that you have local input and local buy-in.

Now I want to talk to you about public transportation. You seem to be emphasizing public transportation. Let me tell you about our public transportation in Dixon.

We have a Ready Ride that you can call and they will come. But what it basically does now, is it supports taking kids to school in the morning. And that seems to be a real contradiction because you’d think you want kids on their bicycles and walking with Michelle Obama’s Health initiative so that we’re -- but we’re taking, we’re driving to high school.

The Ready Ride starts at 7:00 in the morning and ends at 5:00. If you get back from a bus in Davis, which won’t get back by 5:00, there is no public transportation. There is no taxi. There is nothing. It does not move on Sunday.

For all of this, we subsidize each one of those Ready Ride things $29 per ride. So $800,000 is being spent in Dixon on an on-call bus and it’s not very efficient.

I would like to talk to you about the PDA. In our case, the PDA had no public input. And we actually have it on record that community development director said that the city council did not believe that they needed any input from local citizens. It took us seven months to even get the planning commission to take a look at it. 115 runs through this PDA.

So being really good citizens that we are, we go down and we ask the city council, what is the plan? What will be done within five years? When will we have the walkable communities? What is your plan for the open space? We never get a response. They’re not planning to do anything. They’re simply planning to take the money that they can get through ABAG with a PDA.

We also have, and this is really a dumb decision. I have to let you know, I’m a graduate of UC Davis Community Development. I believe in affordable Housing. I have worked in it. But what we do in Dixon is really dumb. We want to put the stack-and-pack housing, affordable housing, right next to the train station.

There’s plenty of areas that -- other areas.

I don’t think poor kids ought to have to live next to a train station and I know those kids will be playing on those train tracks. So I don’t know why you encourage that.

Let me give you a little example of why transportation is so bad in Dixon. Over in Yolo County, where I spent a lot of my time, I can get a bus to get anywhere in the city. I can go into the (MU?). I can get a bus to go to the Sacramento Airport, a dollar each way. I can come back until 11:30 at night.

Their transportation money is being spent well. Ours is not. So I would make sure that you -- encourage you to make sure that you have local support, and I don’t think you should be having your community development director and the city council saying you don’t want any input from local citizens.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.
MR. SPERING: That's true.

MS. EMERSON: -- and we come back and we have some degree of knowledge, more than most of the people in our neighborhood. When we do attempt to go before our city officials, we are abused. We are called sociopaths.

I have some emails that I won't share with you at a public microphone, that I have received from our elected officials. So I will be putting my comments in writing. It seems the safer thing to do.

MR. SPERING: Thank you very much.

Judy Irvin, Robert --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Brekke.

MR. SPERING: -- Brekke, and Mary Savage.

MS. IRVIN: Hello.

MR. SPERING: Judy, how are you?

MS. IRVIN: Good. How are you?

MR. SPERING: I'm fine.

MS. IRVIN: Hi, I'm Judy Irvin. I just want to -- this kind of gives me a giggle because I am a planner and an architect, and for awhile I was the director of Sustainable Development for the Bay Area, a long time ago, for Urban Ecology.

So I did a lot of research on this sustainable stuff. I've read Agenda 21. The Brundtland report and all of that. And what the Brundtland report says, this kind of limits to growth at the great paradigm of Adam Smith that we are going to grow forever and everything would be great because we just grow our way out of it, was over and the limits of growth were met.

And what the Brundtland Report says, we are there. We met it. We're done. We can't grow anymore.

So I see this plan coming out saying we are a sustainable plan. We are going to grow 30 percent. It's an oxymoron. It's not sustainable. You can't do it.

So this whole plan is this amazing game of marketing. We are going to grow our way out of it. Somehow we are going to get there.

So what happens is, your money, the stuff that you bring forth, these MTC's dollars, we'll give you money. You play the game. You do what we want, we will give you money.

I live in Vallejo. I know how addicted they are to this money that you have. But they want it real bad. They will do anything. Anything. It's a drug.

So when they -- when you offer them money to build a parking garage, they said, yes, we want it. We'll build a parking garage out there and we'll dig the parking levels below the water table and it will fill up with water. So all of the money you gave them can be thrown in the trash.

MR. SPERING: All right.

Robert and then Mary will follow up.

MR. BREKKE: Robert Brekke, resident of Vallejo.

I find it preposterous that we keep making plans and we don't take a true analysis of the situation, at least in this the city of Vallejo. And we cannot -- this city cannot afford to continue to build housing that is owned by someone else in the likes of Danville, Marin and Napa and Hillsborough, and all over, but not in Vallejo; and getting in public dollars to house more people and it's not enough.

We have to start thinking about Vallejo as if it has opportunities to employment for a reverse ferry ride from San Francisco there to Mare Island and coming from other places.

But as long as you continue to put poor people in Vallejo and not take care of the poor people that are already there and give them adequate resources of good education for their children and for themselves to further their education and for parks and recreation and for lowering -- or raising the number of people that have a stake in Vallejo, that live there and ownership; and otherwise it's a self perpetuating situation that we will just become or remain the dumping ground of poor people.

And I am not speaking disparaging of poor people. We are not taking care of the poor people that are there, and we are subsidizing the very wealthy people that own property there. And you have to analyze the situation in terms of not just public dollars that go to affordable housing.

We are poor people, all of us, in Vallejo.

So there is plenty of affordable housing without anything extra.

And I urge you -- can I also ask, who's -- are they raffling a -- are the raffling off the Mercedes out front on the sidewalk or is that someone's car here.

MR. SPERING: No. But if you want to pay cash, I'll take it.

MR. BREKKE: Okay.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

MR. BREKKE: Thank you.

MR. SPERING: Mary Savage. Mary, and then
Natalia Clarke.

Hi, Mary.

MS. SAVAGE: You know. The word “sustainability” doesn’t really mean what it says. What do you want to sustain? What we already have? No. You want to sustain something you have in your mind.

But the consensus for following through with your plan has nothing to do with the citizens that live in rural Solano, especially when our representatives, who don’t even listen or allow public participation in the political process, are the ones who seem to decide these political representatives who decide what is best for us. They are not our parents. We need our input.

You are sitting here, and I do not believe will never fit.

You want to make it into a big grander -- big city hype and it will never fit.

It’s not fair what they’re doing to our small town. A town of 18 plus – 18,000 plus people. They want to make it into a big grander -- big city hype and it will never fit.

You are sitting here, and I do not believe again that the voices will be heard. And the reason I say this, is because I have been to other meetings and they say, it doesn’t matter what you’re saying. It’s up to your city council. You have got to change their minds. We are going to do what they tell us. We are going to follow through were their decisions whether they are yours or not.

So we need business in our town, business that will keep the population in a small town, not have to travel out of town; and preserve the agriculture that we have surrounding our small town; yet this program that you sell, has no guarantees.

MR. SPERING: Okay. Thank you.

Natalia Clarke.

MS. CLARKE: My name is Natalia Clarke and I reside in Vallejo.

I come from --

MR. SPERING: You need to face us when you speaking so the reporter can hear everything you are saying. So, please, face us.

MS. CLARKE: I come from country where we have socialism. Ukraine. So all this plan remind me of my country where we go to build for 70 years. Seventy years we build socialism.

So then I come here because I don’t want socialism anymore, so I decide to come to United States of America. So what I see here, the same way. You know the way I stood around, like I go opposite direction what you do before. From last very wonderful country, United States of America, you become somewhere bad.

So I present -- I sell everything in Ukraine. I was a rich woman, and I bring ever cent to America to invest in my business.

Now (unintelligible) next to my building. So all this (unintelligible) and homeless people hang out around my property where I put my crystal shop (unintelligible).

People afraid to even think about moving to Vallejo, and you continue to put more affordable houses -- MR. SPERING: Slow down so the recorder can get it.

THE COURT REPORTER: You have a very thick accent. Sorry.

MR. SPERING: Yeah. A little slower.

MS. CLARKE: We have 60 percent of affordable, homeless, (unintelligible), Section 8 in Downtown Vallejo. No more. The city is full.

Some one like (unintelligible) I hear some lady ask in Benicia, she really like this. You just put every cent in Benicia. You guys can afford. You have lots of unity. You can teach them to be a good citizens. So you have time and money and we don’t. We have no money, no reason just to teach them, everybody very poor, more than poor. So no more in Vallejo.

Don't make Vallejo dump city. It's already dump. So no more affordable, no more homeless. No more.

Look all this community come from Vallejo we will stay very strong for our city.
I've said enough. I will leave good. Keep it on a

MR. REECE: I have one more thought that I

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

I'm very suspicious right now.

I hate to think that would be happening in

-- maybe there is some validity to it.

And if it isn't -- if you don't do that, I'm suspicious
that maybe some of these negative thoughts and things are
maybe there is some validity to it.

I hate to think that would be happening in

my good state of California and good city of Vallejo. But
I'm very suspicious right now.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

MR. REECE: I have one more thought that I
would just like to -- well, I think I'll skip it. I think
I've said enough. I will leave good. Keep it on a

Positive note. But I weigh in heavily with the lady from
Ukraine. Let's not repeat that.

MR. SPERING: Is there anybody else that has
any other cards?

Laura, you're going to be our clean-up --
third clean-up speaker.

Laura Peters.

MS. PETERS: Hi. Thank you for hearing us
this evening.

I'm sorry to see not all of the supervisors
aren't here, and I'm hoping that does not show us their
unwillingness to hear us. They aren't even willing to show
up. One.

Two. I have been to many of these meetings
and, again, it is -- the public is heard. They are seen
but they aren't listened to. We are the one's paying your
salaries, and if you choose to vote the opposite of what
the public is asking you to do, then I ask you, why are you
there? You are here to listen to us and follow our
direction.

And if you vote yes on this Agenda 21, ABAG,
it's all the same bag, you aren't listening to the public,
who is begging you and asking you and give you great reason
why you vote on this.

Another -- my sister-in-law also came from

when I go back to visit family in the suburbs of Detroit,
my family that still stayed there, I go around Detroit,
except when I can't find Mexican restaurant open and it's
only open in Mexican town on Labor Day, so I will make an
exception for something like that.

But the point is, if you've seen pictures of
Detroit where they took over with liberal policy, union
control, all of these very things that I always get
charged, I'm anti this, anti that. No. I'm pro freedom.
I'm pro people's voice being heard. So I'm weighing in
heavily with those that are generally on the side of --
let's keep it local. Let the local people --

And if this plan is so good, let's set up a
thing where each city votes on this thing and -- with a
majority vote and if that is so good, we will be behind it.
And if it isn't -- if you don't do that, I'm suspicious
that maybe some of these negative thoughts and things are
maybe there is some validity to it.

I hate to think that would be happening in
my good state of California and good city of Vallejo. But
I'm very suspicious right now.

MR. SPERING: Thank you.

MR. REECE: I have one more thought that I
would just like to -- well, I think I'll skip it. I think
I've said enough. I will leave good. Keep it on a

Russia. And she left because she had enough of Russia.
Russia was not doing well by her. And she was young when
she left. And she is a brilliant woman and doing very
well, but she left because Russia was socialized and not
taking care of their people.

And I, also, would like to point out that
all of those same countries that you are happy to follow
with this ABAG and Agenda 21, all of them are going
bankrupt. Do you want us to go bankrupt? Then vote yes.

If you want us to fall on our face, our country to fall,
our cities to fall, I think it's all very sad that the
supervisors of all the counties are not listening to the
public, because the public is loud and clear.

MR. SPERING: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PETERS: Thank you.

MR. SPERING: We have one more clean-up for.
Is it Annzel Loufas?

MS. LOUFAS: Yes.

MR. SPERING: Okay.

Annzel?

MS. LOUFAS: Annzel Loufas, Vallejo.

I have one question.

I would like to know where I would look to
find the process for a city to pull out of ABAG?

Thank you.
MR. SPERING: Okay.

On that note.

First, I want to thank all of you for your testimony, and I certainly take all of the comments seriously, both myself and Supervisor Seifert. We will certainly keep those considerations as we move forward.

At this time, we are now going to end the public hearing. So at this point, I'm going to close the public hearing.

So with that, we are done with the recorder.

(Whereupon, the public meeting The meeting adjourned was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.)

--oOo--

Page 42

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
) ss.
COUNTY OF SOLANO )

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the time and place therein stated, that the foregoing is a full, true and complete record of said matter, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties in the foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2013.

_____________________________
SUSAN L. STRAUB, CSR NO. 7608

Page 43
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING
ON THE DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA )
SONOMA COUNTY )

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2013
FRIEDMAN EVENT CENTER

Reported by:  CINDY L. BOCCALEONI
Hearing Reporter
ATTENDEES
JAKE MACKENZIE - Rohnert Park City Councilman
DAVID RABBITT - Sonoma County Supervisor, 2nd District

---oOo---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice of the Hearing, and on April 8, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Friedman Center, 4676 Mayette Avenue, Santa Rosa, California 95405, before me, CINDY L. BOCCALEONI, CSR No. 12987, State of California, there commenced a Public Hearing.

---oOo---

PUBLIC SPEAKERS
STEPHANIE REYES 9
KAY TOKERUD 11
ORLEAN KOEHLE 13
PHAEDRA GLIDDEN 16
MARGE SORBI 18
JAMES BENNETT, POST SUSTAINABILITY INSTITUTE, THE NORTH BAY INDEPENDENT 19
DAVID GRABILL, SONOMA COUNTY HOUSING ADVOCACY GROUP AND LATINOS UNIDOS DE NAPA 21
DENNIS ROSATTI, CONSERVATION ACTION 23
LLOYD GUCCIONE, PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY 25
ROSA KOIRE - POST SUSTAINABILITY INSTITUTE NA 27
JACK SWEARENGEN, FRIENDS OF SMART 30
STEVE BIRDLEBOUGH, TRANSPORTATION LAND USE COALITION 31
ANN HANCOCK, CLIMATE PROTECTION CAMPAIGN 32
DEBORAH, STOP THE CRIME.NET 33
GEORGE BARICH 35
NEIL HANCOCK 38
GINNY DOYLE 39
JENNY BARD 40
VESTA COPESTAKES, SONOMA COUNTY GAZETTE 41

---oOo---

PROCEEDINGS

MR. MACKENZIE: Good evening, everybody. I’d like to welcome you to this Plan Bay Area public hearing and I’d just like to introduce myself and my colleague.

My name is Jake Mackenzie. I’m on the Rohnert Park City Council and I represent Sonoma county and the nine cities as a Metropolitan Planning Commissioner. And on my left is:

MR. RABBITT: My name is David Rabbitt. I’m the chair, current chair of the Board of Supervisors representing the South County, 2nd district. I also represent the County on the ABAG Executive Board.

MR. MACKENZIE: And if you would all please stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Hand over your heart:
(Pledge recited by group)

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

I just introduced myself, as did my colleague, Supervisor David Rabbitt. I believe, and I know as an elected official, that fellow elected officials always like to be recognized; I do when I’m in the audience, but Carol Russell from the city of Cloverdale was the only
fellow elective that I have seen here and -- oh Julie  
Combs, sorry, from the city of Santa Rosa and anybody  
else who's elected to public office?  
Anyway, who else? Am I missing somebody?  
Oh, sorry, Bob; also from Cloverdale.  
Anyway, I never do this right. But I would like  
to welcome you to tonight's public hearing. I would  
emphasize that this is a public hearing. The purpose of  
the public hearing is to receive oral comments from the  
public. All comments will be transcribed by a court  
reporter or reporters, I believe, who are on my far left;  
and these will become part of the official record, and  
they will be shared by my fellow commissioners and  
Supervisor Rabbitt's fellow board members. So I just  
wanted you to be clear about that.  
The carefully prepared remarks; I'm not going to  
follow carefully, but I am going to say that we are going  
to be facing a decision on ABAG board and on the MTC  
commission later on this summer as to how we would adopt  
this Plan Bay Area. And so this is an opportunity for us  
to hear directly from you and also, of course, we will  
have a record of your written comments that you may have  
left in the room behind us there, and these will also  
become part of the record.  
This is a long-term and a long-range  
transportation and land-use blueprint for this region  
that we live in. And I would just say at the moment  
that, given this number of cards that we have, our time  
limit will be three minutes per speaker. Everyone who  
wishes to fill out a comment card -- a speaker card will  
be recognized. There's also a website where you are can  
engage in comments at OneBayArea.org, and the public  
comment period closes on Thursday May 16th, at 4 p.m.  
And you've already met David Rabbitt, but  
Supervisor Rabbitt has some remarks as well before we get  
underway.  
MR. RABBITT: Thank you, Jake.  
And again, my name is David Rabbitt. I am the  
current chair of the Board of County Supervisors, and as  
said, one of my regional assignments is to represent  
Sonoma County on the Executive Board of the Association  
of Bay Area Governments, otherwise known as ABAG. I am  
an architect by profession, always interested in planning  
topics, including this plan for growth in the Bay Area in  
the future. I could tell you that this Plan had been  
nearly, what, three years in the making? This is our  
third public meeting in Santa Rosa to hear from Sonoma  
County residents on the Bay Area -- on the Plan Bay Area.  
While the Plan is slated for adoption this  
summer, it's important to note that it's a work in  
progress that will -- it will be updated every four years  
to reflect new priorities, new resources and new  
approaches. And the goal is to preserve what we love  
about Sonoma County and the region and to tackle some of  
the ongoing problems like traffic and local road  
maintenance. It's also about adding some choices for  
people now and in the future, both in terms of housing  
and transportation.  
The Plan in many ways reflects what's already  
happening in Sonoma County, certainly in my home town of  
Petaluma, featured in actually this morning's Press  
Democrat, if you saw that. Development is occurring --  
or being planned around the Smart Station downtown, what  
it might look like. And if you're familiar with  
Petaluma, the Theater Square Project, which actually  
revitalized the entire downtown and the warehouse  
district; projects that are all privately funded and  
privately financed, all were successful because the  
market was there for that type of housing, which actually  
didn't exist in Petaluma prior.  
So in short, nothing in this Plan precludes or  
prohibits single-family detached residences from being  
built or the county and the cities from developing in  
accordance with their own general plans.  
And again, as Jake said, I want to make sure  
that everyone knows that all the comments we hear tonight  
will be shared with all the decision-makers who serve on  
either MTC or ABAG. Results from the public hearings, as  
well as comments from the online comment form and from a  
television survey, will be summarized and shared with the  
boards of MTC and ABAG in June. We expect to deal with  
this issue in the month of July.  
With that, I would also like to -- we have two  
court reporters here tonight making sure that they hear  
and record everything you're saying. I can say that  
we're not here to answer questions. This is truly a  
forum to accept public comment. If you do have a  
question, as you speak, it will be transcribed and will  
be on the website within two business days. Thursday.  
And again, the website is:  
MR. MACKENZIE: OneBayArea.org.  
MR. RABBITT: OneBayArea.org. So look for that.  
And Jake, I think that's it, and we'll start  
taking public comment.  
MR. MACKENZIE: Right. We'll call the first  
card; these are in order of receipt, and they are being  
enumerated, I believe. Well, here we go.  
Any event, Stephanie Reyes. And if you could  
just, for the record, state your name and your hometown.  
It's three-minute time limit, and we have the timekeeper
in the front.

STEPHANIE REYES: Hello, Council Member Mackenzie and Supervisor Rabbitt, my name is Stephanie Reyes. I am a resident of the Bay Area.

Two years ago, my mom had hip replacement surgery. And for those who are not familiar with it, this is a very invasive surgery with a multi-week recovery time. My parents still live in the two-story home, where they raised my sisters and me, and all the bedrooms in that house are on the second floor. My mom had a really tough time moving around after her surgery.

My parents have always known that they'd eventually move to a smaller place now that all three of their kids are out of the house, but the experience of my mom's surgery made them think, "Huh, maybe we need to move to a place that's only one story so we don't have to deal with stairs as we get older."

My husband's parents are going through something slightly different but related. My mother-in-law can't drive any more. She still wants to do things like go to her aqua aerobics class or meet friends for coffee, but they live in a place where you have to drive to get everywhere. And fortunately, my father-in-law can still drive and he's very nice about taking her around, but she's a little shy about asking all the time. And also, he's in his '80s, so that's not going to last forever either.

So it's important to me that as we plan for the future of the region, that there be plenty choices for my parents, my in-laws and others in similar situations to downsize to a home in a neighborhood where they can get around without a car. And from what I've seen tonight, I think the Plan Bay Area goes in the right direction in planning for a high quality of life for Mom and Dad as they get older. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. The next person I'm calling on is Kay Tokerud.

KAY Tokerud: Good evening, my name is Kay Tokerud. I live this Santa Rosa, and I have some very serious concerns about the legality of Plan Bay Area on a number of both constitutional and other existing laws that are not consistent with this Plan.

I've studied the documents and talked with some attorneys, and I feel that Plan Bay Area violates the 5th Amendment of the US Constitution by taking property rights without just compensation. By the creation of Priority Development Areas, this Plan restricts 80 percent of residential development and 66 percent of commercial development to just a few small areas of your city -- of the cities of the Bay Area -- until the year 2040.

If your property is outside of the PDAs, you will likely not be able to build or expand your building, and you won't be paid for this loss of your development rights.

Next, it -- Plan Bay Area violates 14th Amendment of the US Constitution, the Equal Protection Clause. Owners of properties in the Priority Development Areas will receive development permits at a rate of approximately 80 times more than owners of property outside of the Priority Development Areas. And if you think that is not going to effect property values, you're absolutely wrong. It's setting up an unequal system where some people have rights to develop and other people don't.

And beyond this, it violates the voter-approved Urban Growth Boundary ordinances that are pretty much in every city in the Bay Area because in the Urban Growth Boundaries, you're supposed to be able to allow -- you're supposed to be allowed to build up to what your zoning allows everywhere where there are city services. All the way out to that line, the government has to encourage development in all the area. And this clearly does not do that. It encourages areas in these small PDAs and will, of course, then have to discourage development in other areas.

Those areas will go into decline because there won't be investments in those areas. And in the rural areas, there will be no new housing built at all according to Plan Bay Area. One hundred percent of all housing must go within the urbanized areas with this Plan. So what you're effectively doing is you'll be taking a conservation easement on all privately-owned land in the County without paying.

And by the way, there's a market for buying development rights. Right now people buy conservation easements. You're taking them without paying anything. That's a crime. And we will not stand for it. And the Post Sustainability Institute will be filing a lawsuit on these several different grounds.

And it's PostSustainabilityInstitute.org where you can find out more about what we're doing, and I'm wrapping it up, so thanks a lot.

MR. RABBITT: Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

The next speaker I have is from Orlean Koehle, if I'm pronouncing it --

JAMES BENNETT: Koehle.

MR. MACKENZIE: Koehle. There you go.

ORLEAN KOEHLE: Thank you. My husband is from
<table>
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<td>Germany, that's how you get the pronunciation. I would just like to second what Kay just said. I think what is going on here in spite of all your hard work, and I know you are very dedicated in all that you're doing. This is my third meeting that I've been at Santa Rosa as well, and I know that you've been planning this for a long, long time. I've met many dedicated people, I just met some more tonight, and you are as passionate at what you're doing as we are about protecting our property rights. I grew up in a large farm in Idaho. My father was one of the pioneers that developed this land that was once sagebrush, lava rock and jackrabbits. And through the years, even though it was first dry farming, he was eventually able to dig a well and discovered this wonderful underground lake. So his fifteen hundred acres of land eventually became – blossomed like a rose, became this wonderful, beautiful land. His little road that he developed was able to be a superhighway, and he did this because he had the freedom to do so. There was a free market system back then and a free enterprise system. Now that would have been impossible. At the end of his life, his land that he got for 17 and-a-half cents an acre from the government because they thought it was desert wasteland; it began to blossom like a rose and turned into this beautiful place. At the end of his life, it was worth 3.7 million dollars. That was the American dream. We used to have the right to do that with our own land. This OneBayArea will be destroying that American dream, destroying everything that farmers and ranchers, people in the rural area used to hope and dream for. The freedoms that our nation stands for will be gone. So I urge you to take another look at this to realize that regional government was never what our Founding Fathers wanted. They wanted local control. We elected our local representatives like Mr. Rabbitt to represent us in our own county, to not have to go off and represent us in some big region that we never planned on. Our nation -- our state has been divided up into 18 big regional plans and regional enterprises, and when you see all your amazing graphs out there, you want these to all be intertwined. You're not just planning on regional government. You're planning on all these regions to be intertwined so we will not have local control any more. We will not have local representation. So I please urge you and all those here in the audience to take a second look at this. This is not what we want, and I urge you to support this lawsuit. Send your checks to Post Sustainability Institute, P.O. Box 15192, Santa Rosa, 95404. Thank you. MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you. I'll now call on Phaedra Glidden, please. PHAEDRA GLIDDEN: Good evening. I'm Phaedra Glidden and I live here in Santa Rosa. I'd like to echo what the two speakers before me said. I'd like to state for the record that I have reviewed most of the information that was posted online regarding the OneBayArea Plan. In addition, I was present at the OneBayArea visioning workshops held last year in both Santa Rosa and San Rafael. I've seen videos of most of the other visioning workshops that were held throughout the Bay Area. Since then, I've spent countless hours over the past year and three months researching the origin of sustainable development and looking at the other plans being instilled across this nation. I find it interesting that these plans are identical to the one being rolled out here in the Bay Area. I have many concerns about this Plan. My first concern is that the process is deeply flawed. It was obvious to me that the public had no real input during these visioning workshops and that there was already a plan in mind for us. We were merely as dress -- window dressing to make it appear that there was so-called consensus for this Plan. All of the choices put before us lead to the sustainable community's conclusion. I am here to attest that there was not a consensus for this Plan. I noticed that soon after these workshops, they conducted some telephone surveys in order to skew consensus numbers for this Plan in their favor. My next concern is regarding the growth numbers. It has been acknowledged by officials that these numbers were overinflated and they need to be re-evaluated. I noticed that there were cities like Corte Madera that questioned these numbers as well and are attempting to get out of ABAG. God, I wish we could do that here in Santa Rosa. This makes sense to me because I've spent a lot of time in that town and I know that they're pretty much built up there. My third concern is related to the money. I still have not figured out how our local county, state or federal governments are going to pay for all this infrastructure. I had a CPA take a look at this and she agreed with me that this part just does not add up. How are we going to pay for this? I'm very concerned that this will bankrupt cities, counties, our state and even our nation; and most of all, our citizens.</td>
<td>We were merely as dress -- window dressing to make it appear that there was so-called consensus for this Plan. All of the choices put before us lead to the sustainable community's conclusion. I am here to attest that there was not a consensus for this Plan. I noticed that soon after these workshops, they conducted some telephone surveys in order to skew consensus numbers for this Plan in their favor. My next concern is regarding the growth numbers. It has been acknowledged by officials that these numbers were overinflated and they need to be re-evaluated. I noticed that there were cities like Corte Madera that questioned these numbers as well and are attempting to get out of ABAG. God, I wish we could do that here in Santa Rosa. This makes sense to me because I've spent a lot of time in that town and I know that they're pretty much built up there. My third concern is related to the money. I still have not figured out how our local county, state or federal governments are going to pay for all this infrastructure. I had a CPA take a look at this and she agreed with me that this part just does not add up. How are we going to pay for this? I'm very concerned that this will bankrupt cities, counties, our state and even our nation; and most of all, our citizens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We only need to look to Stockton to see what can happen if we overextend our cities with infrastructures that they cannot afford. I know that we just don’t have the revenue available to pay for all this.

I’ve done a lot of research on this Plan as well as the Bay Area Conservation Plan, the Bullet Train, the Smart Train, and I really think we need to take a serious look at whether or not we can afford all this. Do we think we are the too-big-to-fail great state of California? I would rather -- is that for me? Okay.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

The next name I have is Marge Sorbi; is that correct?

MARGE SORBI: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

MARGE SORBI: Thank you for being correct.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak, and I think I’m going to take a little different tack than my -- the people speaking before me. I agree with everything they said. I am totally bowled over by this Plan in general. I’ve been to most of the meetings, I’ve read a lot about it, and I’ve talked about it a lot with other people. And just on a whole different tact, just to try and express something that perhaps people who are sort of for it because they haven’t really looked into it closely or because there’s one minor detail, or something that appeals to them greatly, for heaven only knows why; think about San Francisco.

I used to live in San Francisco. I moved up here in 1985, and I moved here because I wanted open spaces and I wanted room, and I didn’t want to be crowded into transit -- what do you call it? Public -- public transit. Thank you. Yes.

I just wanted some room to breathe. And the first thing I did when I came up here was to ride a bike, but not for transportation to get me places, but for recreation. And I just can’t imagine myself at this age riding a bike too many places for long distances. Although I ask still ride a bike.

The point is; there is supposed to be farmlands, and all that is what our country was founded on. And that’s what we -- we prided ourselves on. We thrive on being self-sufficient and having space to do that without a thousand laws squeezing it -- squeezing us off of it and into little cubicles in sustainable development.

Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I’d like to call on James Bennett, please.

JAMES BENNETT: My name is James Bennett. I’m next year going to retire and build your dream home; under the OneBayArea Plan, you would not be able to do so, unless, of course, it included having a farm. And anyone that’s in agricultural can tell you you’d rather have a skin disorder than be in agriculture right now.

The burden of notification should be on our local government not on the people. Somebody like me shouldn’t have to teach themselves how to print a newspaper to see to it that their fellow citizens knew about this enormous Plan that would forfeit their freedom of choice in terms of where and how the eight or nine million people in and especially around the Bay Area live.

And I’ve said it before and I’ll say it again, this chapter is about recognizing what’s right and what isn’t right and having a spine and not going along to get along. They do not print enough money for me to be complicit in the Plan that you people are spearheading.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I’d like to call to David Grabill.

DAVID GRABILL: Good evening. My name is David Grabill. I’m with the Sonoma County Housing Advocacy Group and Latinos Unidos De Napa Advocacy Group. We are in favor of regional planning and see it as an important tool to make housing choices affordable to all the people
with who work in our communities.

Unfortunately, this Plan doesn't do that. This Plan concentrates housing development, particularly lower income housing development in communities such as Oakland, San Jose, and San Francisco that already have high concentrations of low-income households. It does not provide adequate housing in counties such as Napa and Marin, to a lesser extent, Sonoma County; to meet the housing needs of the people who work in those counties. Those counties, they are full speed ahead with economic development, with tourism, with things that create jobs but, particularly Napa and Marin, have been very resistant over the years to housing for people who work there. Sonoma County has made a reasonable effort in that regard, although they're fallen short.

This Plan, by concentrating housing development in Oakland and San Francisco and San Jose increases the concentration of low-income people in those communities, walls off Napa and Marin to the people to -- for residences for housing for people who work there. That's another nice way of saying they're segregated. Because most of those low-income folks are not White, they're people of color. So we have de facto segregation in a guise of a regional housing plan creeping back into California where it has no business being and where it's illegal.

With regard to ABAG's RHNA allocations that you're about to adopt in the next month or two, those new RHNA allocations cut the housing that's allocated to Marin and Napa by 50 percent. Even out of those jurisdictions, 60 percent of the people who live in -- who work in Marin County can't live there. Don't live there. They commute from other counties. It's a little less for Napa Count, but --

MR. MACKENZIE: Could you bring your remarks to a close, please, Mr. Grabill.

DAVID GRABILL: Okay. We hope you'll rethink this so that everybody who works in all our counties, all our cities can have a reasonable opportunity to live close to where they work. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

I'd like to call on Dennis Rosatti, please.

DENNIS ROSATTI: Councilman Mackenzie, Supervisor Rabbitt, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Dennis Rosatti with Conservation Action, 540 Pacific Avenue in Santa Rosa. We'll also be submitting some written comments on the Plan.

But tonight I just wanted to say that I think it's great that we're planning regionally using SB 375 to get us there. Planning for the future for greenhouse-gas reductions and transportation infrastructure I think is really where we need to go if we're going to confront the daunting challenge of climate change.

Conservation Action has worked for years for a smart growth vision for Sonoma County in the North Bay. Through Urban Growth Boundaries, we've worked to stop sprawl from happening. We've worked for the Smart Train and Pathway. And then recently we've -- since we got the Smart Pass, we've been working on the station area plans up and down the Smart Line. And we've been through these processes engaging the public in person-to-person organizing strategies, and I think we do have a public that's open and willing to have this conversation and do things a little differently in the future.

I hope that through the Plan we can find a way to finish our Smart Line and get that connection to Larkspur from San Rafael. I think the feds are going to rain money on us if we can promote a vision and sell them a vision of a connection from northern Sonoma County right past our airport where we're going to add 16,000 people in the Santa Rosa -- or 16,000 housing units into Santa Rosa, so we're going to need a more robust transportation, you know, infrastructure for that. And I think the feds will really smile upon us when they see that not only are we a self-help county through our Measure M investments and our Smart investments, but we're actually connecting to a larger infrastructure.

Regarding housing in Santa Rosa with 16,000 new units by 2040, that's about 500 units per year that we're projecting; I'm hoping that we can find a way to prioritize those units into the station area planned zones as much as we possibly can and then to the adjacent areas around those zones.

I do have some concerns regarding prioritizing and placement of housing unincorporated areas in the county; Forestville, the Springs area and Sonoma Valley. These are small towns that don't really have the infrastructure. We've got a lot of county roads on the books already that we've got to find a way to fund and keep up. And I think the County does a good job of this in general, but I think as much as we can, we need to focus that growth around the existing city infrastructures and whether transportation is able to handle it. Thank you very much.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call on Lloyd Guccione. If I've got that right, then I'm blessed. I guess.

LLOYD GUCCIONE: You are blessed, my son.

I'm very glad to have heard the speakers who came before me. I'm very glad to have seen Mr. Grabill
One other thing I noticed, this Plan is the same plan all across the United States with a major exception. But the Plan is identical to Plan New York, PlanET, PlanTulsa. It's identical to the Hanoi Center Regional Plan 2030. This is the same Plan all across the world.

You need to take a look at that. And I know you have looked at it because you're elected officials, but the people here, who think they're talking about just the regionalization of the San Francisco Bay Area, are completely uninformed. This Plan is a worldwide plan.

This is not some fantasy or a tinfoil hat thing. This is reality. And you need to take a look at it and ask yourself what this is all about.

Now, I'd also like to tell you that we will be suing you. Planned Bay Area violates the 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution. You are not paying just compensation for the rights that you'll be taking, that you are taking through this Plan. Priority Development Areas restrict 80 percent of residential development and 66 percent of commercial development to just a few small areas of the Bay Area, about four necessary allocation from ABAG that Sonoma County have so many, and Guerneville must accept a certain number of units. Now, Guerneville is a long way out of the corridor and the Priority Developments Areas, and yet it will be impacted, as will other outlying areas. It is very, very hard to not have that happen. I would like the Plan to certainly give very good consideration to what will be the impact.

Reducing commute times; an important factor. However, it has unintended consequences. I know that your staff, the staff here, everyone, is very, very competent, and the people who spoke before me are knowledgeable. But I don't know if it will suffice because I believe the underlying premise, the paradigm under which it operates, is not doable. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call Rosa Koire.

JAMES Bennett: Koire.

MR. MACKENZIE: Koire. Thank you.

ROSA KOIRE: I'm Rosa Koire. I'm the executive director of the Post Sustainable Institute.

One thing that I did notice when I read through the Plan and the EIR was that it looks like you want to bring back redevelopment even though it's been ended in California. You want to bring bank tax increment financing, TIF. And this is really a problem because what it does is it sucks the funds out of the areas that you want to improve for 20, 35 and 40 years.

One other thing I noticed, this Plan is the same plan all across the United States with a major exception. But the Plan is identical to Plan New York, PlanET, PlanTulsa. It's identical to the Hanoi Center Regional Plan 2030. This is the same Plan all across the world.

You need to take a look at that. And I know you have looked at it because you're elected officials, but the people here, who think they're talking about just the regionalization of the San Francisco Bay Area, are completely uninformed. This Plan is a worldwide plan.

This is not some fantasy or a tinfoil hat thing. This is reality. And you need to take a look at it and ask yourself what this is all about.

Now, I'd also like to tell you that we will be suing you. Planned Bay Area violates the 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution. You are not paying just compensation for the rights that you'll be taking, that you are taking through this Plan. Priority Development Areas restrict 80 percent of residential development and 66 percent of commercial development to just a few small areas of the Bay Area, about four necessary allocation from ABAG that Sonoma County have so many, and Guerneville must accept a certain number of units. Now, Guerneville is a long way out of the corridor and the Priority Developments Areas, and yet it will be impacted, as will other outlying areas. It is very, very hard to not have that happen. I would like the Plan to certainly give very good consideration to what will be the impact.

Reducing commute times; an important factor. However, it has unintended consequences. I know that your staff, the staff here, everyone, is very, very competent, and the people who spoke before me are knowledgeable. But I don't know if it will suffice because I believe the underlying premise, the paradigm under which it operates, is not doable. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call Rosa Koire.

JAMES Bennett: Koire.

MR. MACKENZIE: Koire. Thank you.

ROSA KOIRE: I'm Rosa Koire. I'm the executive director of the Post Sustainable Institute.

One thing that I did notice when I read through the Plan and the EIR was that it looks like you want to bring back redevelopment even though it's been ended in California. You want to bring bank tax increment financing, TIF. And this is really a problem because what it does is it sucks the funds out of the areas that you want to improve for 20, 35 and 40 years.
We recognize that the problem of global warming is real. It's upon us. We don't have long deal with it. We're very concerned that the pace that this Plan and the one that follows are taking are going to take too long to get there. Nevertheless, it is what we have to deal with and we're going to do our best to deal with it.

My main concern is providing for adequate transit, and to do that we want to see that we not only have more buses but that we have the operating funds to operate them. And as I look into the Plan, it looks like there's no real provision for operating money, unless we can pass some more local tax funds in order to raise that sort of money.

That's going to be a local problem. And I think we need to realize that that's one of the shortcomings of the Plan. I think the plan needs to -- to frankly point out that there's got to be more money in order to accomplish subjectives and to set up the avenues to realize that. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. I'd like to call on Ann Hancock, please.

ANN HANCOCK: Ann Hancock, Climate Protection Campaign, and I think that the Plan has a serious flaw. I'm echoing what Steve Birdleough just said. We are now at 395 part per million concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. This is a big jump from the year before when it was taken, and we need, as scientists say, to be at 350 parts per million in the atmosphere.

So what does Plan Bay Area do? What happens to greenhouse-gas emissions under this Plan? They continue to rise. It says in the Plan that we'll be meeting a reduction in per capita greenhouse-gas emissions. But scientists and Mother Nature doesn't care about per capita emissions. What matters is absolute greenhouse-gas emission reduction. And the Plan itself, if you look at some of the pie charts and where money is going to spent, you see that of the total 289 billion, five percent is allocated for road and bridge expansion, leading to more greenhouse-gas emissions. And of the 57 billion discretionary revenue, less than one percent is allocated for Protect our Climate.

So please ask yourself, do you think this Plan is adequate for preserving life on this planet, and if it's not, what do you plan do about it? Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. I have a card from Deborah. This is Deborah with StopTheCrime.net.

DEBORAH: Good afternoon. Thank you for saying "StopTheCrime.net" because that's really what this is about.

I think, unfortunately, if everyone here had
read the Iron Mountain Report and the Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars, you would be here all on the very same page. Because in the Iron Mountain Report in which Kennedy revealed a week and a half before he was assassinated, he talked about the convergence of ruthless conspiracies that were conspiring against the United States in stealthful (as said) ways. And his quote is on StopTheCrime.net. And he says that "there is a highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations."

We've all be duped. We never read the Iron Mountain Report. We didn't read the Silent Weapons Quiet Wars policy that was a 1954 Bilderberg policy that says exactly the agenda that you're following now. We've all be duped. We all have been duped, sadly.

And I can tell you that a NASA document that is on the NASA website speaks to how we curb our problems, and it's very simple. They say that we reduce human beings to machines. We blend machines and robots and that's how we reduce their greenhouse-gas that they're worried about.

You can find this document on StopTheCrime.net. This was on the NASA website. They talk about how we deal with these very problems that we're all gathered here about today.

Also, we know that we have the Wildlands map. This is a map that's the United Nations, UN Agenda Biodiversity Treaty, that talks for transformation and relocation of the human population all over the world. And what is the United States look like? Take a look at this map.

I have these brochures. These are all absolute policies. This is nothing anyone made up. You can get these from me after the meeting. I can tell you we've all be duped.

We're collapsing our local economy as we're watching other cities now across the Nation. We're watching global collapses monetarily. This is the design -- is to require infrastructure that is absolutely a hoax. It is a hoax.

Read the Iron Mountain Report. It's up on YouTube video as well as you can download the document itself. And read the Silent Weapons document. They tell you exactly what the agenda is.

MR. MACKENZIE: If you could now bring your remarks to a close --

THE WITNESS: Thank you very much. I have these for anyone who'd like one.

MR. MACKENZIE: We'll call on George Barich, please.

GEORGE BARICH: Good evening, Gentlemen. And good evening, Members of the Public and Members of the Staff. My name is George Barich. I'm a former city councilman in the beautiful city of Cotati, and I've been studying this informally for a few years as this has come through our city. And I would like to say that I feel that most of this is unsustainable by design. I can't see how any of it in the long term is sustainable. Much of it is based on junk science, poor projections, lazy projections, unrealistic projections in a scenario where consultants keep moving the goalpost one way or another depending on the economy, our carbon footprint and so forth, that it seems like the consultants and the experts are going to be making most of the money off this Plan and nothing really realistic is going to be done in a productive manner.

But I believe that the housing projections are flawed. We have seen since the first of the year 100,000 people have left the states of California, more than have come into California, according to statistics.

But more importantly, I don't feel I was properly noticed for this meeting tonight, and I'd like this to be reflected on the record tonight. I was not noticed in any way, fashion or form. I've read the information out in the other lobby about the outreach for this meeting and the outreach was concentrated on low-income groups and people of color. And I'd like to ask you, what color am I? Where was the outreach?

I believe my civil rights have been violated. If I was categorized by an income group or by the color of my skin to have any resources allocated to outreach that did not make it to me. And I'd like to preserve those rights in the future for future litigation.

I do also believe that for the most part much of this is very well-intended; very well-intended. However, the consultants are making most of the money here and I think that the results will be squandered.

The lady by the name of Ann tonight, who represents the Sustainability Institute, said in no fewer words that she wants to see no money allocated towards roads and bridges. Seeing that that -- those outlying areas would actually be counterproductive to the OneBayArea Plan.

I think that that pretty much sums it up in a nutshell where some of the folks are going with this; that outlying roads, bridges, streets in the rural areas will be neglected to the detriment of our community and our society, and I feel that that's very, very disappointing and destructive. Thank you.
MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call on Neil Hancock.

NEIL HANCOCK: Yes. Good evening. My name is the Neil Hancock of Cotati. I signed up at the last meeting and got a nice notice in Cotati of this meeting coming up.

I appreciate that there is a Plan for the region and I support Sonoma County's actions, comments for it, being in some depth. I'm a working person and don't often have time to get into the depth of these large plans.

I do appreciate having a healthy environment.

In the 90s, I lived in Phoenix, and I was cycling to work one day and I had burning lungs. And I had figured out it was pollution, pollution in the Valley of the Sun.

And I decided at that point, I couldn't live in that area for much long because if you can't breathe the air, then it's going to be very, very difficult to live in the area.

I moved into Cotati because of previous years of planning. There was water and sewer and roads and I very much appreciate the fact that there had been planning in those areas. So I appreciate that we're trying to plan for the future for future generations that are coming along. It's been very, very powerful in the past and I think it can be powerful in the future.

I appreciate the core sustainability ethic in the state of California. It's doing a lot for California. It's doing a lot in making us smarter. We have to think about the way we're using things. We have to make more industries to do that.

I work in software and electronics, and it's hard work to actually make things smarter in that area. But it's has done well for California; better utilize energy in the computers, make them less power hungry.

And overall, I support having a sustainability index, or one of the limitations in the Plan that I see is that there isn't a sustainability index to be able to judge elements of the Plan by.

So I hope we can make the plan go further, but thank you very much for the work that's been done on it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

I'd like to call upon Ginny Doyle, please.

GINNY DOYLE: I'm Ginny Doyle. I live in Santa Rosa. And I want to get back to the first speaker's comments, which I think have been most relevant, about taking care of where our parents and our children live; how we get around without them driving, how we put money into having options for mobility and that there be money in the Plan to do it. I think the idea of the regional sustainability ethic in the state of California. It's doing a lot for California. It's doing a lot in making us smarter. We have to think about the way we're using things. We have to make more industries to do that.

I work in software and electronics, and it's hard work to actually make things smarter in that area. But it's has done well for California; better utilize energy in the computers, make them less power hungry.

And overall, I support having a sustainability index, or one of the limitations in the Plan that I see is that there isn't a sustainability index to be able to judge elements of the Plan by.

So I hope we can make the plan go further, but thank you very much for the work that's been done on it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

I'd like to call upon Jenny Bard, please.

JENNY BARD: Thank you so much for allowing us to comment on the OneBayArea Plan.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of the OneBayArea Plan. I support regional planning. I, too, want to echo the comments made by many of the previous speakers; David Grabill, Denny Rosatti, Ann Hancock, Steve Birdiebough, Ginny Doyle and others. Greenhouse gasses are continuing to arise.

Regional planning is critical to reducing the public health burden and costs of a car-dependent society; sprawl. This comes from transportive-related air pollution and lack of safe and abiding alternatives to driving. Communities designed around cars and driving are responsible for the traffic pollution and congestion, which contributes to global warming. And this also limits opportunities for healthy, active lifestyles such as walking and cycling; and providing opportunities for our seniors to age in place and not be relying on driving.

So the OneBayArea Plan begins to address this. I want to urge you to do more. I think the Plan could do more. There are elements from the Equity, Environment and Jobs Alternative that actually increases investments in active transportation and alternative transportation.

There are -- this scenario actually performs the best of all the scenarios, and having a little more information about those plans at these public hearings I think would be very important.

Let's see. I'd also like to see a little bit more specificity in the breakdown of expenditures on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure because it was not really evident on the pie charts and as well as the -- what percentage of all the investments are going to increase bicycle and pedestrians usage and what policies will lead to what percentage of trips by bicycles and pedestrians, too. That would be helpful to know.

Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I have a card from Vesta, and I apologize if I misspeak here, Copestakes?

VESTA COPESTAKES: That's okay. Copestakes is
My interest here is much more parochial I think. I am a bus rider not because I don't have the means to drive a car, but it's an ethical and personal decision. I have my Santa Rosa Transit pass, I have my Sonoma County Transit pass. Behind my Sonoma County Transit pass I have my Clipper card, and I have a ride-sharing app with that guy back there. Where did he go? There he is -- on my phone.

And not to say that I'm not sympathetic with rural land owners, I've owned rural land in two different states. However, one of the things I've noticed in the Plan is if you're going to be concentrating on transit in any way whatsoever, coordination is something that isn't, I think, rising to the top. There are almost three dozen transit agencies in the Bay Area. And I have to -- I have three modes right now in my wallet that allow me to get on them, and there are two within walking distance of my house that I can access but not ride on because there's no coordination. There's -- it is inconvenient in a pretty extreme way to ride transit.

That being said, I also want to point out that on a global sense that it might be -- it might be sentimentally sweet to harken back to the days when the Founding Fathers landed on this land, and there were 200,000 of them, looking at 4 million square miles of land. That is not the case any more. No matter what we say, no matter what you do, until you can reverse the trend of more people being born than are dying, it's going in a different direction. And we can either be ready for it, we can prepare for it or we can let it hit us in the face. Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I have a card from Wayne Gordon.

WAYNE GORDON: Okay. I'm Wayne Gordon. I live in the unincorporated area in the Sonoma known as El Verano, and I'm wondering what planet some of these people are living on. We had somebody come up here and say the government is going to rain money down on us. Our federal government is so broke, we owe so much money that our grandchildren are going on to be paying it off long after we're gone. In addition to that, when they give us, quote, unquote, give us money, there's always strings and we'll have to live by those strings.

Now, that was said in regards mostly to finishing Smart, the Smart Train. Smart was promised to go from, what, Windsor to what Larkspur Landing. Right now it goes from Santa Rosa to San Rafael. It's about half of what it was supposed to be. A lot of the bike paths have been removed, and it's just another waste of
I see no one coming forward with a speaker card. Otherwise we will bring the public hearing to a close.

We’ve -- additionally, somebody else talked about the highways. We’ve lost a lot of money. In Sonoma Valley, we lost all of the money that was -- put aside -- already set aside to repair Highway 12 through the Springs area, and that was basically taken from us.

So now we’re having to spend money on lawsuits to sue the -- the county is suing the state -- there’s a great idea, so that we can try and get the money that we have already set aside to fix those roads.

One of the things that we did a few years back was back was pass Measure M to repair the roads. In a town home meeting, Susan Goren, a few weeks ago, stated that some of the money was going to Smart. When I asked her about that, she says "No, no, I misspoke." I’m wondering about that.

Smart is never going to be finished. Smart is going to be a pain in our side in which we will have to pay for out of our property taxes from our already -- as a property owner, I'm already burdened with enough property taxes. And after that, we will have to pay somewhere between 72 and -- excuse me 62 and 70 percent of the cost of operating that every time somebody gets on the train.

Okay. So this is something that you might be planning on as part of OneBayArea Plan, but I don't think you can count on it, and I don't think your Plan is very good.

The last thing I want to talk about is the so-called global warming or global climate change. Every day more and more people are talking about climate change. Scientists are coming out and saying it's a hoax. CO2 -- CO2 makes the plants grow green. Every time I exhale, that's CO2. And it's crazy.

MR. MACKENZIE: Please bring your remarks to a close, I'd appreciate it.

WAYNE GORDON: And at least those of you out there think I'm not an environmentalist, I would like you to know that I do like to breathe clean air and I do like to drink clean water.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. I would ask if anybody else would like to address us, if they would fill out a speaker card, otherwise we will bring the public hearing to a close.

I see no one coming forward with a speaker card.

---

So I just -- I only want to make two more specific comments. On your final list of Bay Area transportation projects and programs, the enhanced bus serviced frequencies in Sonoma County, which is estimated at 104 million dollars; there are no committed funds. That's disturbing.

The next one is extending Farmers Lane from Bellevue Avenue to Bennett Valley Road as a three-lane or four-lane arterial. This is the so-called Farmers Lane extension, which is a locally improved project -- approved project, but not funded yet. I seriously hope that no MTC funds are going to go toward this. This was a development backed project that at this current time does not seem to be necessary any more.

Thank you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

I'd like to call on Bill Kortum.

BILL KORTUM: Good evening. I want to congratulate MTC after all these years to finally address and connect land-use and transportation, which we have been begging for a decade, and it's very enlightening to come up here and see land-use getting as much attention as just the transportation itself.

I've read parts of Plan. I understand there will be about 300 new miles of freeway built. And I was
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<td>their cars to get back and forth to work. I can also vouch for the fact that most people that I sell property to do not have any use whatsoever for a train. I also can vouch for the fact that I drove down Sonoma Avenue to get here and almost wiped out the axle on my car; all the bumps and maintenance that that road needs. The alternative, Montgomery Drive, isn't much better. As I pulled into the parking lot here, I didn't see one bicycle. I'm sure most of you used your cars to get here as well. Nor do you plan on using a bicycle for your day-to-day travels. A lot of the people that live in Sonoma County are retirement age. I know for one thing, my mother cannot -- who is 83 years old cannot drive a bicycle. I'm in great shape, and I can tell you that I would not get much use out of bicycle for my mode of transportation either. Okay? The day of the train is over. It's too costly. It won't be used. And again, we need to really rethink things. In order to advocate your Plan, you have to cut off a lot of the people who live on the outskirts of town from even getting into town to begin with by taking their roads away from them. I pay gas tax and I expect my gas tax to be used for the roads. Okay? I have no use for the train. Most of the people that I sell property to are not planning on moving next to the train tracks and, by all means, they should not be forced to by the governments. It's not the government's position to tell people where to live. People have a free choice of where to live. And I intend to fight in every way I can for the property rights of my clients, who I've sworn to as part of my real estate broker's license; I'm sworn to uphold property rights, and I see this as a taking away of property rights which you people are proposing. Okay? And if you don't like it, you know, that's not a call for you to make for the rest of us. Okay? We have paid our property taxes. And I've lived in this city all on my life; I'm 53 years old. My father before me lived here and paid property taxes. And we do not like our property taxes being put to something that would be adverse to the majority of the people who pay property taxes. If you ask people who pay taxes in this county, what they want to do, they're going to come up with a whole other answer than what I'm hearing from the people who don't. Okay? So again let's not be foolish, let's stay with what we're doing. Let's not be hypocrites and expect people to ride bikes when you're not ever going to ride your own; and there's not one bike in this parking lot. Okay? And again, we're having a hard enough time maintaining the current roads that we have right now. I cannot see possibly repaving all of the roads; the bike lanes to nowhere. The one that ends at the freeway onramp and then in the other direction ends on Montgomery Drive. The bike lanes to nowhere. Okay? It looks like the lines were drawn by -- MR. MACKENZIE: If you could draw your remarks to close, please. JEANETTE MCFALL: Absolutely. Thank you very much for allowing me to speak here today, and I hope that if the Press Democrat does print this, they do a better job of representing the conservative side than I've seen in the past. Thank you very much. MR. MACKENZIE: I have a card from Michel -- it begins with an S. I'm sorry. MICHEL STAMOULIS: No worries. MR. MACKENZIE: I'm sure you can pronounce it properly. MICHEL STAMOULIS: My name is Michel Stamoulis and I used to live in San Francisco, so I'm very familiar with mass transportation; taking BART, walking to work along so. So I actually do support Smart Train. I think</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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we need Smart Train not to go just go to Larkspur, but we really need it to go all the way to San Francisco to be realistic.  

I mean, let's look at reality, people, here.  

This county is beautiful, but there's not enough jobs in this county. Look at the unemployment rates in Sonoma County. Compare the unemployment rates of Sonoma County to the unemployment rates of Marin. Look at the parking lot on 101. Think about not just yourself because Sonoma County is becoming a county about people who are retired. They're not finding a job. Think about your kids and your grandchildren; where are they going to work? They're going to work towards San Francisco. They're not going to work towards Santa Rosa. So we need mass transportation. 

I will use the train if there's jobs in Marin because there's not enough jobs in Sonoma or Napa County. This is reality. This is a beautiful area we live in, but it was probably the biggest mistake I've made moving here from San Francisco at the age of 30. This is reality, people. I look around -- and we need people in this room speaking up to you, people who are in their 20s and their 30s and 40s. If you're doing a projection plan of 20 years out, you need to be talking to people who are going to still be working 20 years from now, not people who are going to be in retirement homes 20 years from now. 

Let's look at reality, people. We do need mass transportation. We need something that will take people from Healdsburg all the way to San Francisco, whether the BART station or their Smart Train will connect people from Richmond or somehow go through San Francisco into the Embarcadero where their jobs are. 

I mean, it's unbelievable to live here in such a beautiful area and in such a contrast; there's so much wealth and there's so much poverty. It's just mind boggling to me. Thank you. 

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much. That brings the public hearing to a close. I would like to thank my colleague, Supervisor Rabbitt. 

MR. RABBITT: Thank you, Jake. 

MR. MACKENZIE: You know, I'm always happy to be at public hearings myself. 

MR. RABBITT: You got to butcher the names, so thank you for taking that one on. 

MR. MACKENZIE: But the thing that I really wanted to say is I would like to thank our staff, both from MTC and ABAG, for all the prefatory work they've done in setting up the workshop areas.
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JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your presentation, Carolyn. And now, we will start the public comment. So I will be reading off names in groups of three, and I'd like you to line up behind the microphone. Ursula will be keeping time, so if you approach the two minute mark, I'll just give you a brief hand signal to wrap up your remarks. If you do have additional comments beyond your two minutes that you need, please remember, you can provide comments in writing today, or by email, mail, or fax, as Carolyn showed on the slide. So with that we are going to get started. And I please ask that you speak slowly so that our court reporters can get your information down accurately.

So let's start with Peter Hensel, followed by Richard Hall, and Clayton Smith. So if you could start, your name and where you are from.

PETER HENSEL: I'm Peter Hensel, and I live in Corte Madera. And just as a little perspective, I'm definitely not against affordable housing. I think we need more of it, but it needs to be dispersed through
the community. I consider myself an environmentalist, so this, I tackled this gigantic document, a thousand pages, as best I could with limited time, concentrating mainly on biological and water resources, because that's all the time I had.

But what struck me, you know, on page 39 of the biological resources report, there's a footnote that defines a certain section of Federal Endangered Species Act. It says, a taking is defined at section nine of that act, as broadly defined to include intentional or accidental harassment or harm to wildlife. Now, in the extreme, that could be something even as disastrous as killing wildlife.

So, if you are a modern day land-use planner or developer, what you want to do is mitigate. They have a word for that, LSM, or an acronym, I should say, means less than significant impacts. So, this puts planners and developers in a kind of quandary, because, let's say -- and again, this is from the document, page 60, of biological resources.

In the event that construction with the needs to operate in any water course with flowing or standing water, a qualified biologist resource monitor shall be present at all times to alert construction crews to the possible presence of California red legged frogs, nesting birds, salmon heads, or other aquatic species at risk during construction operations.

Well, I got kind of a laugh out of that, actually, because one hopes that the state planners would provide a chair for this guy sitting there all day long watching the action. Am I?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Yes, that's time.

PETER HENSEL: Afraid so.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could please wrap up your remarks.

PETER HENSEL: Well, let me just wrap it up. So, in other words, we need to do some more work on the people impacts of this report, and especially around the water, because -- and this will be my last sentence. I plugged into the California water agencies, they have a website, and they say that Central Valley farmers are going to get five, excuse me, 20 percent of the water, their contract water this year. And I said, my goodness, why are we planning for all these people under that scenario?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Following our next commenter is Clayton Lement.

PETER HENSEL: Well, let me just wrap it up. So, in other words, we need to do some more work on the people impacts of this report, and especially around the water, because -- and this will be my last sentence. I plugged into the California water agencies, they have a website, and they say that Central Valley farmers are going to get five, excuse me, 20 percent of the water, their contract water this year. And I said, my goodness, why are we planning for all these people under that scenario?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

Following our next commenter is Clayton Lement.

Sir.
what they can to oppose such an opus document. Thank
the freedoms that are the gift of this country, will do
person who loves this country and who basically loves
And I think it's up to the duty of every
our life, the life we have enjoyed in this country, will
all basically in the state, as described by these
Area, is fascistic. It is a statement that we are now
state. And I would argue that this document, One Bay
everything in the state and nothing out of the
state. Again, everything in the state and nothing outside of the
state. And I would argue that this document, One Bay
Area, is fascistic. It is a statement that we are now
basically in the state, as described by these
bureaucrats and unelected officials, and that none of
our life, the life we have enjoyed in this country, will
be able to be permitted outside of the state.
And I think it's up to the duty of every
person who loves this country and who basically loves
the freedoms that are the gift of this country, will do
what they can to oppose such an opus document. Thank
materials you use and how you dispose of the waste in
building it, it's not green. Twenty units per acre is
appropriate in our county. We are not urban. And you
can't go five miles out into deep country below
landslides and put more people at risk.
The places that have been chosen in Marin
County are dangerous. They are either toxic sites, they
are next to cell phone tower farms, they are next to
freeways where you double the chances of your children
having autism and asthma, according to 93 studies that I
downloaded. This is not examining the community’s
impacts. The EIR is insufficient in this way and the
process has been scripted from the beginning.
So the process has been incomplete, exclusive, and too fast for us. The assumptions behind
it are wrong. We have two freeway projects now in
Marin, no one is living in them. They failed. And
lastly, we have the water. The international standards
for transit oriented development is spoke and wheel.
It's not cramming people next to a freeway where they do
not want to live.
So far all this and more reasons, no
project, give us an alternative, let us develop an
alternative. It's going to taking more time in Marin
than we have been given. Thank you.
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| JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.
And let's see. We have Nona, then we have Susan Kirsch and Linda Rames.
NONA DENNIS: I'm Nona Dennis, I'm representing Marin Conservation League, and these are our very preliminary comments on the EIR itself. I have five comments. The first is that --
JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could use the microphone. We can't hear you.
NONA DENNIS: Okay. Sorry. Thank you. Okay. The first comment, is that as far as it goes, the EIR, I must say, stands in sharp contrast. It's subjective. It's comprehensive. It misses some major points, which we are going to be making, but in comparison with the plan itself, it is refreshing because it does identify the areas of controversy, it identifies the significant unavoidable impacts. It presents information objectively, whereas the plan itself is sugar coated and written through rose colored glasses.
So anyway, that's as far as it goes. So I've heard -- so main comment on the EIR, is that it's based on projections that now are in question. We are aware that there are discrepancies between the numbers projected by ABAG and those by the Department of Finance. We don't know, some people are familiar with those, the differences, the explanation of the differences, so forth, but it's our understanding that the entire EIR plan itself are premised on projections. And you have a deadline, you have no time to correct those.
When will we see a correction of those projections, such that all these assumptions underlying the EIR can be made consistent with projections that are accepted? Are we going to have to wait four years for review of the plan? The plan, the EIR itself does deal fairly well with directives of the transportation project, such as the displacement of open space and so forth. It fails to, however, address the long term indirect effects of the actual rate of growth, economic growth as projected.
This will have to be, those indirect impacts are not addressed. The impact of sea level rise should be carried beyond the mid century. And we will have some more comments to make on deficiencies in the EIR. Thank you.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Next we have Susan Kirsch, Linda Rames, and then Al Dugan.
SUSAN KIRSCH: Good morning, Susan Kirsch, of local communities working in collaboration but holding power with local communities, which many of us are in favor of.
The other thing that I want to comment on, is many groups have been holding great promise for this plan thinking that it's going to provide affordable housing. And I'd like to point out from page 108, in terms of hidden targets for equitable access, that in fact, instead of hitting equitable access, the wording from page 108 is that this plan moves in the wrong direction.
The share of household income needed to cover transportation and housing costs is projected to increase to 69 percent for low income and lower middle income residents during the Plan Bay Area period. And further, transportation cost from page 109 will change by one percent. This project is based on faulty assumptions, faulty numbers, and a faulty process. It should be slowed down and reconsidered.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment. Next we have Linda and Al Dugan, followed by Harry Brophy.
LINDA RAMES: Good morning, I'm Linda Rames, I'm a resident of Mill Valley. I simply have one comment to make. Don't you think it's a little putting...
HARRY BROPHY: My name is Harry Brophy. I'm from Novato. I have nothing against housing. That isn't why I'm here. In a way, it, it might effect it, but what I want to talk about is the water situation in Novato. I've looked at some of reports. I have a book full here that I haven't quite finished yet, but Novato is going to have problems with water. They have 6,100 acres of feet they are using now, and ABAG projects 12,000 feet by 2020. That's almost double.

In Novato, people at ABAG has projected is up around 64,000, that's way high. And what I'm saying is it's up around 64,000, that's way high. And what I'm saying is that, that pipe is out of the game. So they have one way of getting water to Novato. And more than anybody in this room, I know what happens when a pipe full of water breaks. And don't tell me it can't, because I was in charge of the City of San Francisco the day that Loma Prieta had all the pipes break in the marina. We used the bay. You don't have that option right at this time.

We could set up a system where you could use above ground water, I could do that for you, but as it is now, the amount of water coming in is not sufficient. All these statements in this book are taken from North Marin Water District, in conjunction with talking with Krista Gabriel, he's the head engineer, all these things are true, and it comes down to where they tell you, by the year of 2020 when there's going to be a 20 percent reduction by the State of California that's mandatory, the water you have now won't be enough. You are going to have less water up there. You are going to have more people. You are going to have a major problem when you do the EIR. And another thing about the EIR, I would like it to be impartial. So I don't know why Novato could be the lead on the EIR when they are in cahoots with ABAG trying to put these buildings up in Novato. It's got to be impartial, because they are siding together. They are not going to look at all these facts. They are just going to do like one did, do we have enough water? Yes. End the game. Let's look at it from the start of Maravalle all the way through where it comes down. There's nine water contractors between Russian River and lower Marin. They all have this water problem. And it's going to get worse.

Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Following our next speaker, Ray Day, we have Margaret Kettunenzesar, followed by Pam Drew. RAY DAY: Hi, I'm Ray Day from Marinwood. And I'm just representing myself, so don't take this to mean that I represent the entire Marinwood area. I just wanted to say that I agree with the prior speakers indicating that the EIR focuses on transportation, jobs, air pollution, and ignores many things that are really important to the communities here in Marin.

And especially one thing, as a result of SB50, which really messed us up, because the impact on...
schools, which are not permitted to be placed in the local school districts. Giving example, in the, in Marin County here, 70 percent of the county’s affordable units will be, are planned to be located in the Dixy School District and concentrated there. Now, okay. Now, you say so what’s the impact of the affordable housing? Okay. For example, I did a calculation, over the 40 year life of the project it would mean about 14.8 million in tax revenues if it was done on a regular affordable basis. That meaning that the county’s original plan of 20 percent affordable housing and then the rest to be market rate housing. Right now what the plan is on the existing PDA is to go ahead and have it 100 percent affordable housing with the owner being bridge housing that is entitled then to not pay any property taxes that would be going to the schools.

Okay. Now you say, what is the impact? Okay. For the school districts, that would amount to over the life, that would be 1.6 million that they would receive from the project out of the funds that would be sent to the schools, versus 3.8 million that they would be entitled to.

So this is a problem, and I think that if it’s nothing else, it’s put in as a informational item to the public so they know what the impact is to there local school districts, because otherwise it won’t be mentioned, they have no say in what is going on. And this is a very important issue that has not been discussed and should be contained in any of these plans.

Thank you very much.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

And next we have Margaret.

MARGARET KETTUNENZESAR: Horrible would be the use of the funds for urban areas. Unfortunately, in the unincorporated areas of Marin, all population has been added and creates an urban prophecy, which does not exist. The very sad thing is the PDA’s and the information of location of affordable housing in Southern Marin, where I live, is on flood plain. A flood plain.

Climate change does is not addressed in terms of the areas where the population is planned. The population is assuming transit orientation, because there is a Highway 101, which is inadequate and will be inadequate for many years. Shoreline Highway is impassible on weekends and sunny days. Shoreline Highway is accessed by flooded – accessed from the bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge. There is no transit facility throughout rural, semi-rural Marin.
I think that when you look around the Bay Area and you see whether it’s because of highway construction or infilling of housing, or whatever it is, and I know these are all very deep complex problems, you look at arenas that are not very attractive. At least not along the freeways. And going farther and farther out now, because what we see seem to be forgetting is we live in such an incredibly beautifully blessed natural area. And, unfortunately, we have lost that along 80, 880, 580, south of San Francisco on 101.

What I see here is an opportunity to try to find balance in the basic concepts by which thinking is done over future plans. And we still have some of the suburban rural nature in Marin, and Sonoma County, and farther north. And I would like us to treasure that and to find a way to balance out all these needs and wants.

And last thing I have a real problem with, again not to not respect all the hard work that people do, but in general I’m a little bit opposed to top down government, because I don’t think one size fits all. And I think that when you, when, every time we take control out of the local hands we have more and more and more of the risk, than in general, every day peoples needs are not being served, as much as people are trying to serve them.
existing transportation networks and only include projects that have either already received funding and have environmental clearance as of May 1st, 2011. This would be a much better alternative, and it's too bad that so much money, when people are losing their homes all around us, so much money has been spent planning a process and not going to real jobs.

We really need to have real jobs. And this planning process and the millions of dollars that ABAG and MTC has spent is really a very sad situation. So thank you very much for coming here, and I hope you enjoy your day in Marin.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Robert Chilvers, followed by Elizabeth Moody, and then Margaret Nan.

ROBERT CHILVERS: Rob Chilvers, President of Annabel. Marin County is truly a very special place. It's the only county in the entire United States that has three national parks within its borders. One of those, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, which is largely within Marin, is the second most visited park in the entire national park system.

We also have almost 500 species of birds. And there's very good reason for that. It's because we have the open space, we have the trees, we have the habitat. Well, how did Marin County, even now, after all of the growth that's been around us in the entire State of California, still maintain its beauty and its open space and its habitat? By fighting. We have had this fight many many times.

Marincello was proposed for the headlands and it was squashed. The Vincent Silvera properties were slot to be developed and that has been stopped. It's taken citizen action for decades and decades to preserve it. Now my backyard is the entire Bay Area, and Marin County is a jewel for the Bay Area. In fact, it's a jewel for the entire world.

Try to think of one other city as large as suburban San Francisco that has anything like Marin County, literally within walking distance of the city. It doesn't exist anywhere, except here. We must preserve it. How did we get to the point where we have this beauty? The foresight of Burton and other politicians who put these national parks and national monuments together, the citizen activities of myself and the people in this room, and other citizens, we have to fight to keep it as beautiful as it is.

The proposal to build it, literally, within walking distance of this hotel, 600 units in this area, which is an architectural treasure, and which is almost entirely single-family detached homes, it would change the character of this very neighborhood profoundly. And anybody that thinks that this SMART train is going to have a station nearby is going to alleviate traffic on 101, if you build 600 new units, you are going to have at least a thousand new cars on 101 every day, and for multiple trips. So, totally aggravate the traffic problem.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you can conclude your remarks, please.

ROBERT CHILVERS: I think that elected representatives who support this growth do so at their peril.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Okay. Elizabeth Moody, I believe is next.

ELIZABETH MOODY: I strongly support the nine Bay Area Planning. I've read the full plan but not the EIR. Sixty percent of our workers come from out of the county, making greenhouse gas raise, as well as the unfairness for those families who lose time, and the cost of travel, and the importance of this plan in providing for the three areas of sustainability. The environment, the economy with jobs connected with transportation, and equity, it's just absolutely essential.

My three kids with their eight children, my three kids could not afford to live here, even though they worked here. And it has been very distressing for me to see that this county is so wealthy and 82 percent white, so I participate in ACE, Action for Coalition -- let's see. Action for Coalition Equity, which stresses the discrimination in this county. And it is absolutely essential that we do planning between, and integrate the planning between the nine counties that make up the region.

And it is, as far as all of the elements of sustainability, with the protecting the environment which the plan does, and it also continues to allow for the local land use, fully local decision making. So there's just no reason why we shouldn't cooperate, coordinate, and integrate, so that we have a better region and a better future.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Next we have Margaret Nan, and then Ann Spake, and Julie Leitzel. Those are all of the comment cards I have, so -- I have one more. So if anyone else is seeking to speak, please let us know.

Margaret, you are up next.

MARGARET NAN: Hi, I'm a homeowner and also a representative who support this growth do so at their peril.
long-term resident. I was raised in Marin County and
Sonoma County, I went to school here, and then I
returned after living in Los Angeles, New York, D.C.,
and lots of urban areas, and I do not want Marin County
to turn in to having some of these issues like urban
areas. Like a lot of people have moved, specifically to
Marin to enjoy the beautiful scenery and the nature.
I know I moved back to Marin, I think, I
thank my family for raising me here and being able to
have the privilege of living here. That being said, I
do believe it’s inevitable and there needs to be
affordable housing of some sort placed in Marin County,
however, after living in Hamilton, was our first home,
we stretched to get in there, we stretched to get into
Marinwood, we are in our third home now in Lucas Valley,
after stretching, working really hard, my husband works
here and so do I, I feel like we have sacrificed so much
to live in this community, and I’m happy to do so, but I
don’t think we should be giving away the farm,
necessarily.
We have -- our kids go to public schools.
I believe in public school. We contribute to Kendale.
To put this additional pressure on the school, and I
talked to our local principal, and he actually was not
really concerned about the homes that were going to be
built, 700 units in Marinwood, Lucas Valley have been
proposed, he said that he was more concerned about Marin
Commons being taken off the board as source of tax
revenue.
So Marin Commons was sold to the county,
apparently, and they no longer have two million dollars
in school revenue annually. So here we are getting
squeezed from tax revenue from the schools and you are
going to put more kids in our schools and have less
resources. So that’s certainly an issue. The other
thing is I’ve seen, even in my community in Lucas
Valley, for affordable housing. I’ve actually gone and
talked to Sharon McAdams at Upridge Housing, I think
it’s very well run. I’m not against that.
What I’m against is putting in a lot of
affordable housing, having people from outside the area
coming here and taking advantage of that and having
less, less revenue. When I lived at Hamilton at the
Meadows I was told by police officers that police
officers wouldn’t buy there, because they would rather
live in Vallejo, realize their 30 percent increase in
their home price, trade up, than being set with one or
two, three percent increase.
So what ended up happening, is you got a
lot of people from outside the Bay Area with limited
options that were put in there by the developers. So
you are identifying a set of people that you want to
move to this area, but those people will not buy there.
So I don’t know what your solution is with that. I’m
certainly for it, but it needs to be done properly. And
I just don’t like this being where it’s going. And
needs to be more controlled.
JOAN CHAPLICK: And can you state your name
for the --
MARGARET NAN: Margaret Nan, I live in Lucas
Valley.
JOAN CHAPLICK: Our next speaker is Ann Spake,
and then we have Julie Leitzell, and Carol Sheerin.
ANN SPAKE: My name is Ann Spake, I’m from
Tam Valley. I was carefully reading the EIR, and I
note that three parcel viable for potential development.
You were basically analyzing, calculating the
profitability of new development or redevelopment on
each parcel. I would submit that this profitability is
fundamental to the proposed plan, proposed alternative,
and it is profit over people.
We need to plan for housing that’s
healthy for sensitive members of our community,
including young children, pregnant women, seniors, and
those who have compromised immune symptoms. You admit

in your EIR that this plan is totally in contradiction
to that. The current plan has the most and over twice
the transportation projects exposed to mid century sea
level rise inundation in the no project alternative.
You say it exposes more residents and
more new residential development inundation by placing
people closer to the bay than the other alternatives.
The proposed plan does not provide the least
environmental impact in relation to air quality. The
EIR does not examine the effects on local or regional
air quality from specific land use and transportation
improvements in the proposed plan.
The proposed plan could cause a net
increase in emissions of criteria pollutants and PM10,
and diesel, MP TACs from on roll mobile sources compared
to existing conditions, and yet you considered it to
have no adverse impacts. The proposed plan when you
admit will cause a localized net increase of sensitive
receptors being located in TPP corridors where TACs and
fine particulate matters concentrations result in
elevating cancer risk.
The proposed plan will also increase TACs
and PM in disproportionately impacted communities
creating even greater health disparities and
environmental justice. Environmental justice person
I think it's ridiculous. I think that there have been teachers who do not want to live in developments like this. I agree that the firefighters, the school developments that, generally, they are hard to fill. You know, a six lane road to get there. These are for lease signs in the retail. There's only a Starbucks over there you will see that the whole bottom floor has a transit oriented villages, and if you all want to go I have been over to the Pleasant Hill BART station where It's going to be too late at that point. Because of the levels of bureaucracy that we have to get Next we have Julie Leitzell. She will be followed by Carol Sheerin and Sue Beittel. JULIE LEITZELL: Hi, I'm Julie Leitzell, I live in Larkspur. I apologize, I came in late. Are there any board of supervisors people here? JULIE LEITZELL: Well, I wish, I wish they were hear. My problem is with the big picture and the top down central planning. We will not have any control over, I guess there are 14 sites in the county that are going to be open for overdevelopment, rezoning. That doesn't include all the various sites in all the cities. And when people start seeing these developments going up, they are going to have nobody to complain to, because of the levels of bureaucracy that we have to get through to get something stopped. It's going to be too late at that point. I have been over to the Pleasant Hill BART station where a transit oriented villages, and if you all want to go over there you will see that the whole bottom floor has for lease signs in the retail. There's only a Starbucks there that serves the office workers that comes across, you know, a six lane road to get there. These are developments that, generally, they are hard to fill. I agree that the firefighters, the school teachers do not want to live in developments like this. I think it's ridiculous. I think that, that there have been central planning fiascos in the past. Marincello has been mentioned. Thirty thousand people were supposed to be living in the Marin Headlands. And with that project, 1959, the Army Corps of Engineers projected that the Bay Area would have 14 million people by the year 2020. They were obviously very off. If you watched the PBS special on saving the bay, what was the plan for all those people? We were going to fill in a third of the bay. And we started with Foster City. If you look at what they were going to do, there was a large wide river that was going to be flowing instead of the bay. So I, I urge every elected official and everybody running for office, if you are not opposed to this, this is going to be your legacy. Thank you. JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker, we have Carol Sheerin. CAROL SHEERIN: I'm Carol Sheerin, I live in San Rafael. A few few weeks ago I read in the local newspaper about the opening of the Devil's Slides Tunnels, and I didn't think that I was going to be affected by reading that article. The people in Devil's Slide, the Caltrans wanted to build a four to six lane highway going to the coast to avoid all those slides on that highway. The people didn't want that. And it took them many years, they wanted a tunnel, and it was dedicated two weeks ago. And Anna Eshoo, who was a San Mateo County Supervisor at the time, and is now a congresswoman, spoke at the dedication to those tunnels, and she said, what I, what I saw was democracy at work and the people being heard. And what we need, is we need to have the people being heard. Because we are not being heard. I would like to thank everybody who came to this meeting today and those who spoke, because we are trying to get our voices heard. And we, if we get enough of us, we will not be ignored. I was in Santa Barbara and Ojai over the weekend, and we have friends who have property in Ojai, and I was shocked to hear they are going through this very same thing. Ojai is an agricultural community with citrus groves, and they are fighting for -- they want 400 units of affordable housing there. This is going on all over the state with nobody having any voice in the cities and towns that we live in, and the counties. And you are right, there should be supervisors here listening to this. And that's what we need to do, we need to get people to listen. You look like you are listening, and I
could also rent their rooms. Second units are another
21
provision, rather than new buildings for low income
22
people, to provide rent subsidies for low income people.
23
I think it's much more sensible to
24
the right way to provide affordable housing.
25
the gold standard for growth around here.
26
support affordable housing in this county. We have for
27
high density plan, we
28
they never had
29
had enough grain grown. Plan never worked. That was the
30
regional level to start assessing that legislation and
31
see how it is dysfunctional in many ways.
32
It's much better to support low emission
33
vehicles than to try to build high rises in order to get
34
less driving, because it just doesn't happen that way.
35
Thank you.
36
JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.
37
Next we have Vincent Welch followed by
38
Brendan Burke.
39
VINCENT WELCH: My name is Vincent Welch, I've
40
lived in San Rafael since 1960. (Speaking Russian.)
41
During the Korean War I was a naval officer, Russian
42
language, working at the National Security Agency.
43
(Speaking Russian.) This meeting reminds me of a
government plan of the Soviet Union in operation. Top
down, no bottom up. This is not Brigadoon, it's a brig.

JOY DAHLGREN: My name is Joy Dahlgren, and I
46
pronounce your last name correctly.
47
Next we have Brendan Burke. And this is
48
our last speaker.
49
BRENDAN BURKE: Hello, my name is Brendan
50
Burke, and I'd like to follow up on that. Russia had a
five year plan, my old childhood, and they never had
enough grain grown. Plan never worked. That was the
top down approach. ABAG's approach in Marin County is
completely wrong. Their numbers are related to job
growth in this county, don't dovetail in any way, shape
or form with the Department of Finance, which is
supposed to be the gold standard for growth around here.
They don't show what ABAG projects. Your
projections are wrong. Your high density plan, we
support affordable housing in this county. We have for
years. But put a few units in with the current stuff.
Don't make them standalone. The ripple effect of high
density is horrible. The cost of infrastructure, the
schools, the tax base, the real estate values, the
environment all suffer under this high density plan.
The final thing are related to the
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AB-32. It’s what’s behind SB-375. It’s what’s behind the federal EPA, it’s in the California EPA. It’s a government to draft all this, you know what. ABAG is wrong. Our supervisors are wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High density is wrong for the county. It is out of character. I’m from Tam Valley. Where is the mitigation on our 42 mitigating circumstances? There will be no mitigation. The homeowners will have to pay for it. And we will pay for it with destroyed quality of life, lower environmental situation, high traffic. And we are going to have to pay -- the sewage and the schools alone are, comprise more than the eleven million dollars the supervisors are going to get in the highway aid, but for doing, implementing ABAG’s plan. And ABAG sails along like its own ship, doesn’t hear any of this. You people need to go back to the think tank and realize you have got the wrong plan, and the wrong approach. We support affordable housing, just come up with something where the people are involved, where everybody can work something out we can all live with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Do we have any other speakers? We do need you to fill out a speaker card just so that we get the correct spelling of your name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JIM BITTER: It’s B-i-t-t-e-r. It’s real easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Please introduce yourself and where you are from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JIM BITTER: Jim Bitter from Mill Valley. I grew up across the street from the guy who owned the dump. This Italian. He played golf. He went to Marin Joe’s with Adolf Delasatia. And he drove a dry-cleaning truck. Somehow he got the dump. Now it’s Target, Home Depot. And I think he’s in a rest home now. He drove a dry-cleaning truck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>So the meter is running. But it’s -- you guys are getting it right, because the visiting sessions, you can’t make a reservation, you couldn’t get in, because you got filled up real quick, but some people came anyway. Judy Arnold and Susan Adams were kind of annoyed that people were disruptive, and some people actually came from the East Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>So I don’t know where you came from, but I live here. I was born here. This is a wonderful place. I grew up across the street from the guy who owned the dump. He played golf. He went to Marin Joe’s with Adolf Delasatia. And he drove a dry-cleaning truck. Somehow he got the dump. Now it’s Target, Home Depot. And I think he’s in a rest home now. He drove a dry-cleaning truck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>And somebody, this, I almost hit print on this thing, but I went through it. And I planted trees in land, because I work landscaping and construction. They are out there now. In here it’s telling us what trees to plant, how far from somewhere, and has something to do with the environment or something. It’s it’s insulting to all of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>This is a great place and we know how to do it. Martin drove his dry-cleaning truck. In here it says prohibiting trucks from idling for more than two minutes. I, I, we know how to do that. We don’t need this bureaucracy. We don’t need the federal government telling us how to live our life. This is a great place because of us, not -- you need to drive out 580, across 680 and look at the stuff they are building out there. And we should put our supervisors on the bus with all their belongings and make them, make them go live out there, because we don’t want that in Marin. And you don’t represent us, do you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JOAN CHAPLICK: I’m the moderator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JIM BITTER: You are the moderator. Great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JOAN CHAPLICK: And if you could wrap up your comments --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JIM BITTER: Let me say this, so whoever represents us is conveniently not here today. Thank you, supervisor. And they are going to vote for this thing. It’s a done deal. They appointed members of the planning commission, they are going to vote for it. The staff has swallowed all this indoctrination and school that we need. Nobody, we can’t explain, global warming, climate change, greenhouse gases, you can’t do it. Or come up to the mic. and do it for me, because it’s in all the legislature. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. And I have a comment card from Barbara"
Salzman. And then, are there any other any other
speakers?

If you could give your card to Ursula,
she will pass it over here.

BARBARA SALZMAN: My name is Barbara Salzman
and I'm representing Marin Audubon Society.

JOAN CHAPLICK: A little closer to the
microphone so you project.

BARBARA SALZMAN: And I have, I'm sorry, I
missed your presentation. I have a few comments on the
EIR and will be submitting a letter. One of the
comments and concerns is that you seem to, well you
don't seem to, it's pretty clear that you consider that
there's little in the way of environmental resources
along the 101 corridor.

There's a repeated reference to the fact
that the more rural areas have more resource impacts. I
think that's a major flaw in the document, because our
101 corridor, our major corridor goes right by the tidal
wetlands and all the endangered species habitats. And
you also don't even mention endangered species, which
was sort of shocking, because our major endangered
species in the Bay Area, well we do have a few others,
but are connected to tidal marshes. And we have a
number of those, actually, right out here, (inaudible)

Macris. 

JOAN CHAPLICK: And then followed by Marjorie
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2

MACRIS: Sorry. My writing isn't too
good. It's Macris.

JOAN CHAPLICK: If you could just tilt the
microphone down so we can hear you.

MARJORIE MACRIS: It's Macris, M-a-c-r-i-s.
And I'm speaking on my own, I'm not representing any
organizations. I think that the one critical comment

that I have, even though I think that the idea of having
a regional plan makes a lot of sense, and your idea of
concentrating development in locations that have transit
and other services is a very valid one, and it's
something that has been an established principle in
Marin County's plan, and for 40 years, but the one major
criticism I have of this document is that it does not
take into account the effects of sea level rise.

There is a very dismissive comment in the
plan itself saying, well, we know that the sea level is
going to rise but we are sure we will work it all out,
but it doesn't say how. And in the EIR there is a
description of how sea level rise is likely to effect
transportation lines but not Priority Development Areas.
And it's, I don't understand why the plan does not take
into account the projection of sea level rise to the end
of the century.

BCDC has done that, and you just choose
the year 2040, which is the time horizon of the plan.
But if we know this is going to happen beyond that, it
seems to me that a good plan needs to take into account
what we know is going to have major impacts on any
development potential in Marin and around the rest of
the Bay Area. And then coupled with the repeated
emphasis on, we have to streamline CEQA, that is

Barbara Salzman.  And then, are there any other
any other speakers?

If you could give your card to Ursula, she
will pass it over here.

BARBARA SALZMAN: My name is Barbara Salzman
and I'm representing Marin Audubon Society.

JOAN CHAPLICK: A little closer to the
microphone so you project.

BARBARA SALZMAN: And I have, I'm sorry, I
missed your presentation. I have a few comments on the
EIR and will be submitting a letter. One of the
comments and concerns is that you seem to, well you
don't seem to, it's pretty clear that you consider that
there's little in the way of environmental resources
along the 101 corridor.

There's a repeated reference to the fact
that the more rural areas have more resource impacts. I
think that's a major flaw in the document, because our
101 corridor, our major corridor goes right by the tidal
wetlands and all the endangered species habitats. And
you also don't even mention endangered species, which
was sort of shocking, because our major endangered
species in the Bay Area, well we do have a few others,
but are connected to tidal marshes. And we have a
number of those, actually, right out here, (inaudible)
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fighting City Hall, we are fighting Sacramento, we are limited by this person that it's absolutely useless. We are living with, and very knowledgeable people, but I was told by the supervisors in, in San Rafael. And we were many. Here I went to the one with the court reporters are going to be here until noon to fill out a speaker card. The MTC and ABAG staff and the court reporters are going to be here until noon to receive any additional comments that come through the process.

Okay. We have some keys left at the front table. So with that, we will have Brad from ABAG.

BRAD PAUL: A number of speakers asked why there weren't members of the county board of supervisors here, and several of them called me, because they are meeting right now, their regularly scheduled meeting is, unfortunately, at this time. So they wanted to be here. I'm just, I'm telling you where they are.

JOAN CHAPLICK: We do have some additional hearings coming up. Carolyn is going to review them for us.

(Discussion had off the record.)

JOAN CHAPLICK: I have a speaker card here. So I have L. Crocker.

LILIE CROCKER: That's correct.

JOAN CHAPLICK: And so if the court reporters could take the comments. So after, after this last comment we'll be closing the public hearing. If you have additional questions or comments we will take them in writing. Okay. So we have a final, a final comment here that I have a speaker card for.

LILIE CROCKER: Yes, my name is Lilie Crocker, I live at just at Marin Lagoon, bought the house in 2007. I'm a widow, have lived in San Rafael since 1966.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay.

LILIE CROCKER: I was told by my neighbor that, when I had gone to City Hall, that there's no use to come to these meetings. I went to the one with supervisors in, in San Rafael. And we were many. Here we have, and very knowledgeable people, but I was told by this person that it's absolutely useless. We are fighting City Hall, we are fighting Sacramento, we are fighting Washington, D.C. And we are, limited government is no longer the goal. It is growing government.

And life has to be fair. And by as my husband told me once, he said, I, I said, that's not fair. He said, Lilie, life is not fair. You have to, it doesn't, if you want to make it fair, I don't know if robbing Peter to pay Paul is exactly fair, but we are growing government. And when you look at the map and here at Embassy Suites, when you build the housing and the station at the end of McInnis Parkway, unless I can swim or walk in wetlands, I have no way to get out of my neighborhood, which is family housing.

And very nice, and I bought it for my old age to be safe, because that's a, you, you have to go -- you can get in but you got to go out the same way. And also, we, it's already a lot of traffic. And, well, since business, big business is leaving into homes maybe, not so many workers coming into -- and anyway, I just say, I will be shut off with the commuters that support, and my property taxes go up, or my -- well, it goes for everybody, I guess.

But I'm reminded that if you get something for free, you don't really take care of it as much as you have strained to work for yourself up, and your money, you take better care of things. And I, I think, I was reminded by the, by the gentleman that, whatever happened to cruise ships, highrises? And cruise ship was -- sure, a nice man, a Russian person, but if you go to Moscow and you see this urban landscape, whatever, these highrises are slum money, and not, not many of them occupied. And is that what you want to happen in Marin? Besides --

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. That's it.

LILIE CROCKER: I know. I'm so frustrated because I think that you are going to do, government is going to do, and I have no recourse.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you, thank you for your comments.

I have a speaker card --

Sir, if you could --

(Interuption in proceedings.)

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: This has to do about a process question that you --

JOAN CHAPLICK: Sir, if you could --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's just real simply, you said --

URSULA VOGLER: We have a process, sir.

JOAN CHAPLICK: I have my speaker card --
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I just want to know when the court reporter's comments will be made available, to us, the public?

You are not going to make the recording available, how about the comments? That's all.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. So that is, that is a question we will take into the process. I can't answer it right now. I don't know, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: You can't answer a simple question like that?

JOAN CHAPLICK: Yes. Yes. So my next comment is from Susan Wernick. I need Susan Wernick in the front of the room. I'm taking comments from those who have not commented, so if you have already spoken for two minutes, you can make additional comments in writing, but it is two minutes per person.

So for those of you who have already spoken --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is the juggernaut.

URSULA VOGLER: Just to answer your question, sir, through the public record document request you can make a public records request, we can send you those transcripts. Okay. So through info@onebayarea.org you can request --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sixty days, ninety days after the period is done.

URSULA VOGLER: When we get the transcripts we can send them to you.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: We, you know we pay them.

URSULA VOGLER. Asked and answered. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you, sir. So our next speaker is Susan Wernick.

SUSAN WERNICK: I just have one quick comment. I've lived in Marin my entire life. I work retail in Novato. I speak to people daily about this project, and there is very little awareness among the general public about what is going on. I understand you have a website. I'm someone who is linked into that. I get The One Bay Area updates, but most people do not.

So, I, my question to you, or my suggestion, perhaps, is that these meetings should be printed not in an article buried in the newspaper but an add that your organization paid for and put out. They are carefully printed, they are in all newspapers of the Bay Area. We have so many people that are not clued in. We have thousands of people in Marin County that still do not know what the SMART train is, and yet the tracks are already being laid.

So communication is really key. It is extremely frustrating that a project like this, as vast as this is moving forward, and the bulk of the population is unaware of it. So I think you could do a little better job by not telling people to go look for the information. Put it out there. Put it in print. We have got SMART train posters finally coming up along the freeway. So people are becoming a little bit more aware of it. What's that?

But that hasn't happened with this whole project. And then clearly you put a lot of money into it. I pay a lot of taxes, you could do it. So if we could just get this into The Chronicle, the IJ, the Press Democrat, all the newspapers, so people are aware of these meetings, and so it might spark some interest. Thank you.

JOAN CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments. Do I have anyone who hasn't spoken yet? Any additional speaker cards?

Okay with that we are going to close the public comment period.

(The Public Hearing concluded at 12:00 p.m.)
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MS. JORDAN: Let's get started.

Good evening, everyone, and thank you all so
much for coming out tonight. My name is Jamillah
Jordan, and my planning firm MIG is working with ABAG
and MTC on these public hearings tonight.

We may get some more sound in a moment.
I'll be your moderator tonight, and I want to
thank all of you for coming out, taking the time, giving
your attention to this really important issue.

Our purpose today is to receive your comments
on the draft EIR. Tonight we have several members of
the project team responsible for the Plan and the EIR
documents here tonight listening. We also have two
court reporters who will be transcribing the comments
that we receive today.

So I want to go ahead and acknowledge the
elected officials who are in the room tonight. And
first up we have Mr. Mark Luce, who's an MTC
Commissioner and ABAG board chair and Napa County
Supervisor, Mr. Luce, over there.
We also have Mr. Robert Rayburn, a BART board
member, in the audience tonight. Wonderful.
We also have Mr. Pedro Gonzalez, who is the
mayor of the City of South San Francisco.

Thank you all for coming out tonight. We
appreciate that.

So our agenda for the meeting is as follows:
There will be a short presentation by Carolyn
Clevenger, MTC planner, on the draft EIR. And her
presentation will provide an overview of the EIR and the
general process.

Following the presentation, we'll go ahead and
start the public comment period. If you'd like to
speak, we ask that you please fill out a blue card with
your name and where you are from. We see an example of
that. I have one up here as well that I want to show
all of you.

Each speaker will have two minutes to provide
their comments. We will have a timekeeper to help
ensure that everyone sticks to that two-minute time
frame and everyone gets the same amount of time. Once
you hear the buzzer go off, it means that your time is
up and we ask that you wrap up your comments.

A court reporter will provide MTC with a full
transcription of the comments, and the court reporters
are located right over there (indicating), as you see
them. So please go ahead turn in your comment card form
if you haven't already done that.
I will read the names of each commenter in groups of three. We ask that you please line up and be ready to comment. Please state your name for the record and the city where you live. We ask that you please speak slowly so that the court reporters can get all of your information down.

Once you reach the two-minute mark, you’ll need to close your comments, and I will call up the next speaker. If two minutes is not sufficient, you can provide additional comments in writing, and these forms are available at the welcome table. I think all of you got one on your way in.

Okay. For those of you who do not wish to speak, you’re encouraged to fill out a comment card and turn it in at the end of the meeting. You can also submit comments in writing via fax, mail or e-mail. The deadline for comments is May 16 at 4:00 p.m.

I want each of you to know that all of your comments, whether they’re received verbally at today’s hearing, through a comment card or sent in writing by fax, e-mail or mail that I mentioned, they’ll be handled the same way and responded to in the final EIR.

And finally on a housekeeping note, I just want to mention that the restrooms are located towards the entrance. The women’s is on my left and your right.

And the men's is located on my right.

So with that, I want to go ahead and now open up the hearing and introduce Carolyn Clevenger from MTC who will provide a brief presentation on the EIR.

Carolyn?

MS. CLEVENGER: Good evening. Hopefully these microphones should work.

My name is Carolyn Clevenger. I work in the MTC planning section. I’m the project manager of the draft EIR. I hope to talk about this evening.

Sitting next to me is Mark Shorett with Association of Bay Area Governments, which is our co-lead agency on this document.

The purpose of this public hearing is to present an overview of the plan and the EIR, as well as to receive public comments on the Draft EIR. Responses to all comments and questions will be provided in writing in the final Environmental Impact Report.

I’d like to note that the focus of this meeting is on the EIR; it’s not on the Plan document itself. So we ask that you focus your comments on the EIR. And for comments related to the Plan, you can send your comments to info@onebayarea.org, or you can also attend one of the Plan open houses and public comment hearings that are being held throughout the region, and there’s a brochure at the table where you came in identifying the opportunities to comment on the Plan at those public hearings.

The purpose of the EIR is to analyze and disclose the potential environmental impacts of the implementation of the proposed Plan. It is meant to inform decision-makers, responsible agencies and the public of the range of environmental impacts of the proposed Plan. It also recommends measure to mitigate any significant impacts that are identified, and it also evaluates a range of alternatives to the Plan, which I’ll go into in greater detail.

Just as some background to help provide some context, the Plan is a regional task. It’s the first time we’ve done and integrated land use and transportation plan. It’s required by Senate Bill 375, and it requires an integrated land use and transportation plan, which hits two specific objectives of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent by 2035 and also houses the region’s population at all income levels.

The Plan embodies local visions, in that it works with local jurisdictions to identify areas for growth; priority development areas. And it seeks to increase economic competitiveness while also preserving the natural environment of the nine-county region.

The Plan looks from 2010 to 2040 and identifies projected jobs and population growth in that time period, and this table summarizes the projected approximately 1 million additional jobs that the region will need to accommodate in that period and approximately 2 million additional people. The EIR evaluates the environmental impact associated with accommodating this growth; it doesn’t evaluate the projection itself.

This map shows most of the focused growth in the Plan — is allocated to PDAs, priority development areas. They account for less than 5 percent of the region’s land, but in the proposed Plan they can accommodate approximately 80 percent of new homes and over 60 percent of new jobs. Approximately 40 percent of the new jobs and housing are projected to be in the region’s three largest cities; San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. And approximately 75 percent of the growth is located in the four central counties; Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco.

Get to the transportation side. On the transportation side, the Plan — the total revenues forecasted over the 28-year plan period of $289 billion, just over half, 53 percent, is local fund sources. It’s...
The "Transit Priority Focus," which was called Alternative 4 in the EIR, is based on input from business stakeholders. They opted to use a higher peak period Bay Bridge toll, which is used to fund additional BART and AC Transit investments.

The "Enhanced Network of Communities," which is called Alternative 5, was developed based on input from the equity and environmental stakeholders. On the land use side, it emphasizes increasing opportunities for low-income housing in job-rich communities.

And the last alternative, "Environment, Equity and Jobs," which is called Alternative 5, was developed based on input from the equity and environmental stakeholders. On the land use side, it emphasizes increasing opportunities for low-income housing in job-rich communities. It also is -- it eliminated uncommitted roadway expansion projects in that alternative, including the express lane network was eliminated in that alternative. And it charged a VMT tax that was used to fund additional transit investments in the region.

In terms of how the alternatives performed in the Environmental Impact Report, all of the alternatives, including proposed Plan, have similar impacts. Alternative 5 is identified in the EIR as the "environmentally superior alternative." It had the greatest reductions of GHG emissions, greenhouse gas emissions. It also had fewer emissions for toxic air contaminants and particulate matter emissions as compared to the other alternatives.

However, the proposed Plan did have the benefits over Alternative 5, it had the lowest vehicle miles traveled or VMT per capita. It also had lower congested VMT than Alternative 5, so fewer miles were traveled in congested conditions. It included less agriculture and open space conversion.

Alternative 3, the transit priority focus had the least environmental impact on the transportation side, as a future shorter commute, travel times, lesser amount of congested VMT, and a lesser potential for transited crowding.

As Jamillah outlined, there's multiple ways to comment on the Draft EIR. You can comment orally at today's meeting. You can submit your comments in writing, either at today's meeting or mail, fax or e-mail to my attention by 4:00 p.m. on May 16th.
And I just want to note again that comments on the Plan should be made separately to info@onebayarea.org or at any of the public hearings being held on the Plan throughout the nine counties. In terms of schedule, the comments period closes on May 16th. We will be presenting the comments in responses to comments to the MTC commission and the ABAG board. Those are the two bodies that will vote on adopting the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Plan, and we anticipate a final adoption of the EIR in July of this year.

So with that, I'll turn it go back to Jamillah.

MS. JORDAN: Great. Thanks so much.

Okay. Is that better, everyone?

THE PUBLIC: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: Sorry about that mishap there.

So now we will open the comment -- open up the hearing here for the public comment. And I want to mention that along with your comments, any questions that you may have will be included and responded to in the final EIR. Okay? So let's go ahead and get the process started. I'm going to call up the first three speakers, and we ask that you form a line there in the middle and speak when I call your name.

The first one is Charlie Cameron, followed by Myesha Williams, followed by Devilla Ervin.

Mr. Cameron?

CHARLIE CAMERON: Yes. Good evening. The name is Charlie Cameron. I'm a Hayward resident, but I consider myself now a resident of Union City. First of all, only three things that I want you to note. Being that the current Union City west side is now completed, I do think it is not going to be able to perform up to expectations. The design is pretty much bad. It's piss poor bad, the way the buses come in and the location for other things to include the taxis and pickup area and the kiss and ride. I'll be sending in corrections for the San Jose Diridon Station. The signs. I was in crisis one time, and I realized the signage was screwed up and could be better.

I'm going to be sending in correction -- correctly corrections with the correct spelling of the word "Capitol Corridor." It's misspelled in the document.

And I want to thank you, Moderator, for bringing to our attention now the deadline for comments is May the 16th. We didn't know that, and I didn't know that. Thank you for bringing that attention.

Bye.

transit-dependent people's health is suffering as a result of disinvestment in transportation. The HIA found that reduction in bus service negatively affected the physical, mental health, safety and well-being of the most vulnerable rider.

In order to reduce VMT, we must restore local transit to a reasonable baseline of service by committing an additional 70 million per year to restore bus service cuts made over the past five years.

The EEJ alternative funds significant investment for frequency improvement for high-demand systems like AC transit, which many people in the community that we work with depend on for daily access, opportunities and necessities. According to the Bus Access Health Impact Assessment conducted by the Alameda County Public Health Department, more investment and transit service, especially bus service, can improve health and vitality for riders, their communities and the transit system overall.

Currently, youth, seniors and school students to help them gain skills and experiences for a free youth bus pass program. This proposal was especially significant for those of us who work with youth who experience negative health impacts and critical barriers to opportunity, due to rising transit costs, service cuts and route changes.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

DEVILLA ERVIN: Thank you.

Hello. My name is Devilla Ervin, and I've
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 18</th>
<th>Page 19</th>
<th>Page 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| been working with the New Voices Are Rising Project for a more sustainable and resilient Oakland since I was 14. I'm now 23. As a young man looking to live on my own, I am deeply troubled by the threat of displacement in my community and other areas slated as priority development areas. But underestimating the impact of displacement, I feel we are doing a disservice to the entire purpose of Plan Bay Area. This placement needs to be at the forefront of this conversation, not swept under the table. You cannot cut VMT and/or greenhouse gases, gas emissions without dealing with this threat. Living in Oakland, I know many people who find themselves being forced to leave their homes and community that hold extensive history to find housing that is less expensive. One example of this is my foster mother. In my junior year of high school, she found a place that was affordable, but it was in Sacramento. She was still working in Hayward commuting five hours a day to and from work. This is what I fear for thousands of other low income families with the adoption of this proposed plan in the absence of additional mitigation. Without careful, conscious, deliberate planning, more low income residents will be pushed out to less attractive and more polluted parts of the region, while new transit-oriented developments attract new residents who have not historically found neighborhoods like West Oakland attractive. Plan Bay Area should not add to the list of issues residents of West Oakland or similar neighborhoods have to deal with. By increasing investment in public transportation, affordable housing and strategies to retain and build businesses that serve the existing community, Alternative 5 will go a long way towards addressing these concerns and mitigating the impacts of displacement pressure. Plan Bay Area should be providing solutions and incorporating the strategies in Alternative 5 that make it the environmentally superior alternative, leading to a more truly sustainable and resilient Bay Area. Thanks for your time. MS. JORDAN: Thank you for your comments, sir. I'm going to call up the next three speakers. First will be Brenda Barrón. Next will be Pamela Tapia, followed by Woody Little. Please come to the center of the aisle. BRENDÁ BARRÓN: My name the Brenda Barrón, and I'm currently a freshman at San Francisco State University. I was born and raised in Oakland, California, and I lived my whole life here. I have seen many problems in the community, and I have been to different meetings and spoken about what we can change. One of the problems that concerns me most is public transportation because I take it almost every day to school. Speaking today -- tonight was Plan Bay Area and the EIR do not do a good enough job of addressing the impact of adding more rides to the transit system. Without the level increasing transit investment that includes in the environment equity and job alternatives, adding more rides to the public transit system without enough adding investment will have serious impact for youth and other low income riders. I have been taking public transportation since I was five years old when I started riding the bus to my mom's work, and I never thought transportation was a big deal until I grew up, but it has changed a lot since I was five. Bus stops have been moved far from my house. There are fewer buses, and I have to wait longer most of the time. Night services have been reduced. The bus I take that -- takes off 10:00 p.m. When I was five, I was too small to understand what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and heard what people say about transportation in their community. In the last few years, bus lines have been changed and cut so that people get confused about which line goes to which places. The people do not want to see bus services cut; they want to see more bus routes and more frequent buses. Many people take the bus because they cost less than the BART -- than BART. The BART takes you back and goes farther. MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments. BRENDÁ BARRÓN: There are other problems with ground service levels. BART does not have enough transit so that people can sit down. Thank you. MS. JORDAN: Thank you. PAMELA TAPIA: Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. The EIR Draft consideration of displacement is inadequate. The EIR fails to factor in the impact of gentrification on housing costs in neighborhoods that historically have been home to low income residents. The assumption that low income residents will avoid moving farther away from their jobs and their homes and neighborhoods despite these areas becoming more attractive is false. It is a reasonable assumption that if residents are required to move farther away from their jobs and their homes, they will do so. The EIR Draft does not do a good enough job of addressing the impact of displacement. Without the level increasing transit investment that includes in the environment equity and job alternatives, adding more rides to the public transit system without enough adding investment will have serious impact for youth and other low income riders. I have been taking public transportation since I was five years old when I started riding the bus to my mom's work, and I never thought transportation was a big deal until I grew up, but it has changed a lot since I was five. Bus stops have been moved far from my house. There are fewer buses, and I have to wait longer most of the time. Night services have been reduced. The bus I take that -- takes off 10:00 p.m. When I was five, I was too small to understand what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and heard what people say about transportation in their community. In the last few years, bus lines have been changed and cut so that people get confused about which line goes to which places. The people do not want to see bus services cut; they want to see more bus routes and more frequent buses. Many people take the bus because they cost less than the BART -- than BART. The BART takes you back and goes farther. MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments. BRENDÁ BARRÓN: There are other problems with ground service levels. BART does not have enough transit so that people can sit down. Thank you. MS. JORDAN: Thank you. PAMELA TAPIA: Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. The EIR Draft consideration of displacement is inadequate. The EIR fails to factor in the impact of gentrification on housing costs in neighborhoods that historically have been home to low income residents. The assumption that low income residents will avoid moving farther away from their jobs and their homes and neighborhoods despite these areas becoming more attractive is false. It is a reasonable assumption that if residents are required to move farther away from their jobs and their homes, they will do so. The EIR Draft does not do a good enough job of addressing the impact of displacement. Without the level increasing transit investment that includes in the environment equity and job alternatives, adding more rides to the public transit system without enough adding investment will have serious impact for youth and other low income riders. I have been taking public transportation since I was five years old when I started riding the bus to my mom's work, and I never thought transportation was a big deal until I grew up, but it has changed a lot since I was five. Bus stops have been moved far from my house. There are fewer buses, and I have to wait longer most of the time. Night services have been reduced. The bus I take that -- takes off 10:00 p.m. When I was five, I was too small to understand what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and heard what people say about transportation in their community. In the last few years, bus lines have been changed and cut so that people get confused about which line goes to which places. The people do not want to see bus services cut; they want to see more bus routes and more frequent buses. Many people take the bus because they cost less than the BART -- than BART. The BART takes you back and goes farther. MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments. BRENDÁ BARRÓN: There are other problems with ground service levels. BART does not have enough transit so that people can sit down. Thank you. MS. JORDAN: Thank you. PAMELA TAPIA: Good evening. My name is Pamela Tapia. I'm a student at Peralta Colleges. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. The EIR Draft consideration of displacement is inadequate. The EIR fails to factor in the impact of gentrification on housing costs in neighborhoods that historically have been home to low income residents. The assumption that low income residents will avoid moving farther away from their jobs and their homes and neighborhoods despite these areas becoming more attractive is false. It is a reasonable assumption that if residents are required to move farther away from their jobs and their homes, they will do so. The EIR Draft does not do a good enough job of addressing the impact of displacement. Without the level increasing transit investment that includes in the environment equity and job alternatives, adding more rides to the public transit system without enough adding investment will have serious impact for youth and other low income riders. I have been taking public transportation since I was five years old when I started riding the bus to my mom's work, and I never thought transportation was a big deal until I grew up, but it has changed a lot since I was five. Bus stops have been moved far from my house. There are fewer buses, and I have to wait longer most of the time. Night services have been reduced. The bus I take that -- takes off 10:00 p.m. When I was five, I was too small to understand what was going on. But as I grew up, I've seen and heard what people say about transportation in their community. In the last few years, bus lines have been changed and cut so that people get confused about which line goes to which places. The people do not want to see bus services cut; they want to see more bus routes and more frequent buses. Many people take the bus because they cost less than the BART -- than BART. The BART takes you back and goes farther. MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments. BRENDÁ BARRÓN: There are other problems with ground service levels. BART does not have enough transit so that people can sit down. Thank you. MS. JORDAN: Thank you.
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more attractive to other residents. Without significant
addition investment in affordable housing and other
anti-displacement policies, displacement will occur.

In September 2011, my mother lost her minimum
wage job. Her factory decided to pack up and move to
South Carolina. She was out of a job. As a single
parent raising two kids, my mom depended on the $280 she
received every week to pay the $700 rent. She spent
most of her check on housing and transportation. She
decided to move to central valley to a city called
Manette. An apartment was half the price as our former
home, but there are no jobs in the central valley. She
had no option; she had to go back to what she was doing
before.

After months of desperate job hunting, my
mother found a job in a factory in Union City's
Industrial Park. My mom now lives in Manette but has to
commute to Union City for work. What used to be a
30-minute drive now become a four-hour commute. She
doesn't have a car. She has to take the bus from
Manette to Stockton, from Stockton take a train to
Richmond, from Richmond take BART to Union City, and
from Union City take another bus.

She now has to pay over $60 a week (verbatim)
just to travel to work. She works eight hours at an
8-hour dollar rate turns out to 64. So she spends $60 a
day and she gets $64 a day also, she's only getting $4.
She knows she cannot work. She literally cannot afford
to work.

So when spending so much money traveling, she
determined she had to stop traveling. She often slept
on BART, traveling the trains from one end to the other
end, hoping to just catch another day.

MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments.
PAMELA TAPIA: I feel awkward writing this and
even reading it to you, but I do not look for pity.
This was not my goal. My goal was to inform you that
this happens. The EIR assumes that displacement will
not result in increased rates in commuting from outside
Bay Area and cross commuting from -- between counties.
This assumption is not supported by historical transit,
and it's not supported by my experience.

Thank you.

WOODY LITTLE: Hello and good evening. My
name is Woody Little, and I'm a first-year student at
UC Berkeley but an Oakland native. I want to talk	onight a little bit about displacement, as some of the
other commenters have echoed.

The Plan Bay Area document states that the
Plan will place 36 percent of communities of concern to
residents instead of us who had been living there a long
time, I wonder what our family would have been able to
afford in terms of other services for me to do outside
of school, extracurricular activities that enriched my
life and made it possible for me to attend UC Berkeley.
Additionally, I wonder what would have
happened if I had been displaced and had to restart my
life all over again in the middle of high school or in
the middle of elementary school, an even more
informative time in my life. I think that would have
been a significant obstacle to get into UC Berkeley and to
-- you know, the struggles that I now have in trying
to further my own education. I think that would have
been much more difficult under this Plan. So I hope
that you take those facts into consideration.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.
I'm going to call up the next three speakers.
First we have the Teadora Taddeo, Signe Mattson, and
Kasey Saetern.

TEADORA TADDEO: Hello. Good evening. I'm
Teadora Taddeo, and I'm also a UC Berkeley student.
I take great pride in being a part of a
cutting-edge and progressive region. I want to look
back in 20 years and find that my community was on the
right side of history.

Our regional plan, as a step towards sustainability, should promote safety and longevity for all people. A plan that neglects low income and under-resourced individuals is absolutely unacceptable in my eyes. I believe the environment equity and job alternative can serve our community more fairly. Affordable, updated housing, quality transportation and increased security for residents susceptible to extreme weather. These are the provisions that simply must be made in any plan to be adopted in the Bay Area in 2013. We need a plan that will carry us into the future, taking into account serious environmental concerns, as well as equity and justice for all Bay Area residents.

I support Alternative 5, and I strongly encourage you to consider it as well. Thank you so much for your time.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you. Next speaker.

SIGNE MATTSON: Good evening. Signe Mattson, resident of Albany. A few concerns: At this point, first of all, the amount of public notice, it claims in the report and in the EIR, that you outreached so many times in so many places, but I only heard about this by accident about maybe two weeks ago now. So that’s the first thing. If you seriously want some public input, you’ve got to let people know.

Secondly, this is touted as a strategy for a sustainable region, but yet I have to find no mention of the question of food security, equitable production and distribution of food. This is -- I don't know how you can talk about sustainability, and you don't even mention the question of food.

Another concern I have is about the CEQA streamlining, and overriding of CEQA. Many of us are of the opinion that the CEQA requirements are already very weak, and yet you propose to weaken them further, and yet you're talking about improving the environment.

So I don't know how lower environmental standards and then -- to improve the environment. If you're going to concentrate a bunch of people living in apartments along high transit travel areas that produce all these greenhouse gas emissions, one of your mitigations is going to be air filtering. So does this mean that you'll have windows that don't open and air condition on 24/7, except for when the power goes out and the air conditioning can't work?

MS. JORDAN: Please wrap up your comments, ma'am.

SIGNE MATTSON: Okay. Sea level rise and tidal surges, and yet you want to concentrate the population at the shoreline? Doesn't make a lot of sense to me, and I dito the comments about the preferred alternative. Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you. KASEY SAETURN: Hi. My name is Kasey Saeturn. I'm a senior at Oakland High School. So I just wanted to say that I would like to see more eco-friendly buses, because so far I've only seen, like, a couple hydrogen fuel cell buses, and that's only on one bus route. So this bus route runs along my school, actually. It's the 18 bus, and I've only seen it a couple times, and I just think it'd be nice to see more eco-friendly buses.

Also on another note, I'm a student. So after school or, like, before school, I take the bus to school and to work and stuff like that. But the fact is, in the morning, it's really difficult to actually get on the first bus and be on time for school sometimes because it's just so packed. Because it's so packed, I'm either late to school and work, and it just doesn't exactly work out for me.
and how that can have a greater reduction in GHG emissions than is acknowledged in the Plan.

Right now, the biggest limiting factor to affordable housing production in the region is money. Increasing bus and -- especially bus service, but local transit service, can make more properties competitive for tax credits. It can increase the amount of money that the state and the -- this region gets in an investment and make more properties viable for affordable housing.

So I think that's an important consideration, especially given the current climate and the huge disparity we have between the regional transportation plan, which is a funding allocation plan and the housing plan, which is very well-intentioned but not funded.

Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

PETER SINGLETON: Peter Singleton.

I'm going to submit my comments on the Draft EIR in writing once I've had a chance to look over the document. As you probably gathered, it's a very large document.

But what I wanted to do was I wanted to thank the young people for coming, and I don't personally support Alternative 5, but I think the students that are here are raising a couple of really important points that I hope that you folks considered.

One is displacement. And I think all of the alternatives have displacement risk that is significant and should be looked at. And that's a big concern. And these kids are right, what they're talking about.

The other is the importance of bus service.

And the Plan is very heavy on rail and light rail and other kinds of what you call transit investments, but bus service is often the -- adding buses to heavily utilized routes and also dropping fares can be the very best way to serve lower income communities that our buses are so important to.

And I would just urge you to listen to these young people, and, again, I -- thank you guys for coming, I really appreciate it.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.

We have one card remaining. I'm going to call up that individual, unless -- if you have a blue comment card, please hand it to our ushers here on the left and right. Now is the time to do that.

So I'm going to call up the next two speakers.

That's Peter Singleton -- oh, I'm sorry. Peter already spoke.

And this individual. Pardon if I butcher your name. Decline Lastot (verbatim)?

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Decline to state.

MS. JORDAN: And then the gentleman as well, if you wouldn't mind --

PUBLIC SPEAKER: I note that the EIR includes $14 billion -- I note that the EIR includes $14 billion in nebulous, quote, "anticipated unspecified," unquote federal dollars. The Plan relies on the use of these dollars. The EIR is entirely flawed because this reliance accounts for fully 5 percent of the money figured into projects that affect the environment.

I also note that the population figures that are forecasted are entirely created by the staff. California statutory law has deemed the California Department of Finance as the proper authority to create population figures used by the Government in California.

Also, I was moved by the students' talk this evening about displacement, and it reminded me of the urban redevelopment that took place in the Bay Area in the 1960s to very, very bad effects. And the historical analysis was not included in the EIR.

MS. JORDAN: Thank you.

Sir?

JIM BITTER: I'll just be a second. So my name is Jim Bitter, and we came up from Mill Valley, and...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 34</th>
<th>Page 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. we generated a lot of greenhouse gas here. So 1. regional level you can’t actually enforce mitigation on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. thanks for holding this, and I want to thank the kids 2. a local level, you can put criteria in place for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. for coming tonight, except that -- or I just heard 3. incentivizing good projects that get funded that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $14 billion and the cost of MTC and the cost of the 4. actually mitigate those anticipated impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. consultants and the cost of the consultants to put 5. That’s it. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. together the EIR report and other consultants that are 6. MS. JORDAN: Thank you, sir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. involved in the EPA, federal, state, CARB -- what did I 7. So I’d like to take this opportunity to let</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. leave out? California Energy Commission. It’s all the 8. you all know again that our ushers to the left and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. same language. It’s all the same industry that’s 9. right have the blue comment card forms. Give you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. pushing this thing. And that the kids in the gallery 10. another opportunity to fill that out and state your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. here are going to end up paying for this because the 11. comment publicly, orally rather.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. State of California is in the hole about $80 billion, 12. Are there any additional blue comment card</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. and the federal government is approaching 17 trillion. 13. holders who’d like to speak?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There’s no way we can pay it back. 14. So our next speaker will be Rachel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I came from a little town up in Marin, and 15. Hallowgrass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. there’s probably lots of stories like this where we had 16. RACHEL HALLOWGRASS: Forgive me. I came in a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. a city council, we had a planning commission, we had a 17. little bit late, so I don’t know what everybody else has</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. little white church, we had steam locomotives, we had 18. said, but I did want to say that while costs about a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. dairy farms. It was all our stuff. The federal 19. plan like this are certainly large, and the funding by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. government didn’t tell us what our town was going to 20. its nature in certain, especially given that we don’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. look like. That was the old United States of America. 21. know a lot about the future economy, I just wonder about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. So I’m telling the kids, get ready because 22. the alternatives that I think not implementing a plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. you’re going to find out that people other than yourself 23. remotely like this will be much more expensive, more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. are going to be telling you about transportation, 24. expensive to our children in terms of health, their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. housing, the kind of housing you have. And a lot of 25. economy and their ability to participate in a healthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROCEEDINGS

MS. CHAPLICK: Good afternoon. Thank you so much for coming today. My name is Joan Chaplick. I work with MIG. We're a consulting firm that is helping MTC to put on today's public hearing.

Our purpose today is to get comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Plan Bay Area. So when you all came in, you were given the opportunity to receive a blue card. That's your speaker card.

If you would like to make comments during the meeting, you'll need to fill out one of those. They all will be brought up to me, and I will call out the names in sequence and every person will get two minutes -- every person wanting to speak will have two minutes and be able to share their comments.

We are also receiving your comments in writing today, and you can also comment by e-mail, fax, and mail. And that information will be provided to you shortly. So that's our purpose.

Our basic agenda is we will be having a short presentation by MTC planner Carolyn Clevenger. She's going to provide an overview on the Draft EIR, and after she concludes her presentation, then we will start the public hearing.

We have with us two court reporters who will be transcribing all of the comments that they receive today verbally, and everything we receive verbally and in writing will all be treated the same way and responded to in the final Environmental Impact Report.

So with that, I believe we are ready to get started. So Carolyn Clevenger from MTC.

MS. CLEVENGER: Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us today. As Joan mentioned, my name is Carolyn Clevenger with MTC planning. I'm the project manager for the EIR. Seated next to me is Mark Shorett with the Association of Bay Area Governments.

So the purpose of this public hearing is to present an overview of the Plan, as well as the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which are both out for public comment right now.

We'll be receiving your public comments here on the Draft EIR, and as Joan mentioned, all responses to comments and questions will be made in writing as part of the final Environmental Impact Report.

I would just like to note that the focus of the meeting today is on the Environmental Impact Report. There are a number of hearings going on throughout the region on the actual Plan itself.

The hearing for Santa Clara County will be on
15 percent per capita by 2035, and also that the region houses the region's population at all income levels. The Plan was developed working off of the Priority Development Area strategy that ABAG and MTC had been working on for a number of years, and it focuses on increasing economic competitiveness while also preserving the natural environment of the region. Looking from 2010 to 2040, which is the out year of the Plan, the region projects -- and these are projections developed by ABAG -- 1 million additional jobs and roughly 2 million additional people in the region by 2040. And the EIR evaluates the environmental impact of accommodating that growth; it doesn't actually evaluate the forecasts themselves. So the focused growth strategy that the Plan is built around focuses on Priority Development Areas that are shown in this map -- it's the pink and purple hues -- and it accounts for less than 5 percent of the region's land, but it accommodates nearly 80 percent of new homes and 60 percent of new jobs in the proposed Plan. Much of this growth is concentrated in the core cities of San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland, as well as in -- 75 percent of the growth is accommodated in Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco Counties. Turning to the transportation side, the revenues forecast for the region over the 28-year plan period are $289 billion. This pie chart shows the different sources of those funds. So just over half, 53 percent of those funds are local funds, and that's primarily local sales tax revenue. Eight of the nine counties in the Bay Area have a local sales tax dedicated to transportation, and that's the bulk of those funds. The additional funds are: Regional, 15 percent is primarily from bridge tolls, and then State and Federal funds. The 5 percent anticipated is based on fund sources that come along during the 28-year projection of the Plan that we don't necessarily know about right now. But based on historical trends, that's -- we've had about a 5 percent of new funds and new programs that have come up over the life of the Plan. So we do account for those in the revenue projections. In terms of how the funds are spent, 88 percent of the funds are dedicated to operating and maintaining the existing system, that includes both roadways, local streets and roads, highways, and transit operations, as well as transit capital replacement. The remaining 12 percent is split roughly equally between roadway and transit expansion. The Environmental Impact Report looks at impacts on 14 different environmental areas that are listed here: Transportation, air quality, land use, energy, climate change and greenhouse gases -- which include sea-level rise analyses -- noise, geology and seismicity, water, biological, visual, and cultural resource, as well as public utilities, hazards, and public services. This presentation is available on our website, so if you're trying to write this down, we can let you know where it will be available. Potential mitigations are identified for each of the areas where there is deemed to be a potential impact. Mitigations would be implemented as appropriate at the local levels by local jurisdictions as they move forward with projects if they're using our EIR. Since MTC and ABAG cannot ensure implementation of mitigation measures in all cases, those issue areas shown in bold are found to still have potential significant impacts. Now, I had mentioned that the EIR evaluates a range of alternatives. This provides some detail on those alternatives that were evaluated.
Table 1: Environmental and Economic Benefits of Alternative 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser amount of congested VMT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer miles traveled in the region at</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space converted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels of congested VMT,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So fewer miles that were traveled in the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region at congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of Environmental and Economic Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser amount of congested VMT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer miles traveled in the region at</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space converted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels of congested VMT,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So fewer miles that were traveled in the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region at congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Summary of Environmental and Economic Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser amount of congested VMT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer miles traveled in the region at</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space converted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels of congested VMT,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So fewer miles that were traveled in the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region at congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Summary of Environmental and Economic Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser amount of congested VMT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer miles traveled in the region at</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space converted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels of congested VMT,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So fewer miles that were traveled in the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region at congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Summary of Environmental and Economic Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Alternative 5</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest vehicle miles traveled per capita</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser amount of congested VMT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer miles traveled in the region at</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space converted</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels of congested VMT,</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So fewer miles that were traveled in the</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>region at congested conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agricultural and open space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted for the year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is Ivana Yeung. I'm with the County Roads and Airports Department.

We had a comment regarding the transportation section, which is 2.1. We had read that there were going to be significant unavoidable regional impacts.

While we realize that is probably going to be the case, we are wondering if there were going to be plans to have a map or some analysis for the Santa Clara County in particular, just because we understand that we have a lot of employment areas here, but I feel that a lot of the congested VMT miles are going to be in the Santa Clara County. Are there any plans to include that in the EIR.

MS. CHAPLICK: Questions will just be recorded and responded to in the final EIR.

IVANA YEUNG: Okay.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you.

Our next commenter, I have a card from Ed Mason. And please introduce yourself and where you are from for the record.

ED MASON: Good afternoon. Ed Mason of San Jose.

And on Page 1-2-7, it says that there's going to be an increase in the number of seniors that will be in the downtown areas. I really find that hard to believe in the Bay Area. It might be happening across the nation, but there are two articles that basically say, nobody is going anywhere for the baby boomers that are retiring.

It's been my experience in roundtable and personal surveys that basically seniors are going to age in place and not go into the downtown areas, and I believe that only the wealthy move to Rincon Hill in San Francisco.

Also, there is no mention on Page 1-2-24. There's jobs and prosperity. There is no mention made of the corporate commuter buses. If they were a transit agency, they would be about six or seven as the largest transit agency.

The real estate ads in San Francisco tell that the residences for sale in nearby neighborhood stops. And the housing quota that is going to be allocated in San Francisco or any other location, who is the residence really going to be designated for?

You know, if you've got all these commuter buses going around, it implies -- even in San Francisco, you've got 24 percent of the population that goes out of the city, and it's a consequence. If you are going to assign a housing allocation to San Francisco as an example, why -- we've got commuter buses going on.
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they don't live where they work. You know, the company town is extinct.

But that's one way that I think there really needs to be a reevaluation by businesses to not get into this mode of saying, Well, you can live in hip San Francisco and congest all the neighborhood streets with the commuter buses but, you know, you can live here.

Highway investment. We always wind up mitigating everything and we widen. We've widened 880 in '96 and 2000. Now we're going to widen Old Oakland Road. Well, what happens if we did nothing and really made commuting a painful experience? Because your projections indicate that over the near term in long term, it's only going to be a few more minutes increased in commuting time.

Well, if you want to reduce the greenhouse gases, let's make -- you know, don't do anything and just let everybody kind of suffer, and then maybe they'll get the message, because eventually, they may be commuting with the fish as the sea level rises. So I think that needs to be a message that's not being made.

MS. CHAPLICK: If you could wrap up your comments, sir.

ED MASON: Yeah. And also, 75 percent of the jobs are half a mile off of a freeway exit, and only
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25 percent are within the 88 rail stations. So there seems to be a mismatch that maybe we should be encouraging more commuter buses.

Are my two minutes up?

MS. CHAPLICK: Yes, your two minutes are up, sir.

ED MASON: Sorry.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments.

If you do have additional remarks that you would like to share, feel free to add them to a comment form and turn them in, or also comment -- send additional comments by e-mail, fax, or mail.

I have no other blue speaker cards, so if there's anyone who would like to speak, I'll give you a minute to fill that out. Our main purpose is to receive comments. So we don't have a question-and-answer portion. And any questions that you have will be responded to in the final EIR.

So if you would like to make a comment for the record, we'll need your speaker card.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: This is not a comment, it's a question on the presentation.

MS. CHAPLICK: You know, we're -- I'm sorry.

We are not taking questions on the presentation. So they're all -- it's all part of the CEQA process, where
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we receive the comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll make a comment.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. So I'm going to give --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll give you a few minutes. If you have --

MS. CHAPLICK: Sir, I'm needing speaker cards, if you would like to speak. So we are going to give people a moment to fill out a speaker card, and then it's two minutes per person.

So we have someone coming up here. We'll just need your name for the record. I have a card from Michael Ludwig. Okay, Michael. And you have two minutes to comment.

MICHAEL LUDWIG: Okay. Yes. Sorry I got here late, but I just was wondering why -- I mean, I don't know what exactly the lists of projects are in the Plan Bay Area, so I'm thinking you might be doing this kind of backwards to be holding the environmental hearing before the hearing for the list of projects.

And so I'm just wondering about that, and I just want to make sure that you encourage jobs and housing as close to transit as much as possible.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comment.

Our next speaker is Don Conners.

DON CONNERS: I know an awful lot of very intelligent and highly educated people worked very hard on doing this Bay Area Plan and the Environmental Impact Report, so I don't mean to impugn your competence or motives; however, let's look at the history of past projections.

In the middle '70s, we put the first fuel economy standards in. It was supposed to save an awful lot of oil because we were going to use less oil in our cars. So over the subsequent years, the fuel economy standard of people on the road roughly doubled. Savings in oil, none, because miles per car also doubled exactly, offsetting that.

We also have the record of light rail in San Jose, where the cost estimates kept going up and up and up, the ridership estimates kept going down and down, and the operating costs were tremendous. And that's just in San Jose. The same thing happened with BART earlier. It's doing well now, but it took a lot of time to get there.

What makes you think that your planning is any better than the past record?

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. Thank you for your comment.

Our next speaker is Hilda, and I will let you pronounce your last name.

HILDA LAFEBRE: Hilda Lafebre with San Mateo Transit representing Caltrain in San Fran.

I saw in the presentation four alternatives; however, you mentioned a fifth alternative. Does that mean that in the document we will see five alternatives or four alternatives?

MS. CLEVENGER: The proposed Plan is the other alternative. So it's the No Project, the Proposed Plan, and then the three additional alternatives that I described in more detail.

HILDA LAFEBRE: Okay.

MS. CLEVENGER: So yes, since the previous slides went into detail on the Proposed Plan, I didn't include that in that alternatives chart.

HILDA LAFEBRE: All right. Thank you.

MS. CHAPLICK: I apologize for my break from process.

Do we have -- I have no other blue speaker cards.

JIM BITTER: I have --

MS. CHAPLICK: Please fill out a speaker card, and we'll have your name, and your comments can be entered into the record. I'll give you just a minute or so to fill that out.

If we don't have any more people wanting to speak, we will close the public hearing portion of the meeting.

JIM BITTER: I'd like to speak.

MS. CHAPLICK: Yes. Just get me a card.

JIM BITTER: I have a card right here.

MS. CHAPLICK: Okay. And if you can state your name for the record. And the card, I just -- the court reporters use it to get your --

JIM BITTER: My name is Jim Bitter, B-I-T-T-E-R, and I'm from Mill Valley, California. I'm up north of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Why am I down here getting lost in San Jose?

I'm down here because I care about my country. I care about college kids that are the next generation that are having trouble finding jobs when you get out of here. You are going to have a big debt to pay when you get out of here.

And on top of that, you are going to be paying for all of this, and it's wonderful stuff. It's housing, transportation, green stuff, green stuff, green stuff everywhere, but there is no money at the federal level. $17 trillion, going to 22 trillion. $50 billion in debt in California.

The consultants that are here, MTB -- or not MTB, but the -- I need to take a breath here. The
Metropolitan Transit Commission, an $11.5 million bureaucracy, the consultants, ICF International, the company that did the Environmental Impact Report, that's Dyett & Bhatia.

This is San Jose. It's a big place, and you have how many people here? So you have invested -- they won't tell us what this costs. And it's on my computer, and I didn't hit print, because I -- but we're all paying for this thing.

You know, 99.99 percent of the public is not going to read it, they'll never see it, and I pity the next generation that has bought all of this and that is having to pay for it.

So what else can I say? I got lost coming down here.

So anyway, these meetings were conveniently arranged during the day when people couldn't get here. They have two at a time. The one up in Marin was arranged so that the Board of the Supervisors couldn't come. They're the ones who are responsible for this. Darrell Steinberg, who drafted the legislation, the legislature, the California Air Resources Board, they're all responsible for this.

The next generation, the college kids at San Jose and other places, are going to pay for all of this, so good luck, because the old people are set. But you, you are going to -- they're going to be in your wallet, big time.

MS. CHAPLICK: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Do I have any more -- anyone wanting to fill out a speaker card and speak?

Okay. With that, we will close the public hearing and will -- you know, the MTC folks, we will be collecting comment cards, if you want to provide us written comments. But that's all we have for now, so with that, we are adjourned. And feel free, again, to stay and provide some additional written comments, if you prefer.

Thank you.

(Hearing concluded at 1:32 p.m.)

---00---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Waste of taxpayer money. Top down central planning. Leave control with cities. No Plan.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>Charlie Cameron, Alameda County</td>
<td>1. There were no seats for attendees to sit in the lobby, waiting for the 7 pm public hearing. What are the seniors and disabled to do? 2. There were no secure bike area for people to secure their bikes. 3. There was no trash receptacle in the lobby area after 5:30 pm. I put my trash in a smokers receptacle outside the building. 4. I got there via public transit was there any questions at the start of the 7 pm public hearing like how many people got here via public transit for your own info and tally -- and at other plan meetings? 5... I did leave just before 6 pm and I did fill out a speakers card and did turn in approx. 10 pages of my comments for the Draft Plan and Draft EIR and Draft TIP. To have the moderator and court reporter note my attendance and turning in my comments because there was no lobby seats to sit down till before 7 p.m.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>Christine Ippolito, Alameda County</td>
<td>I am very in favor of the concept of sustainable communities - near transportation - infill. Strongly support housing for low and moderate income families with children including 3 and 4 bedroom units.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>Christine Ippolito, Alameda County</td>
<td>Please include some gardens, small parks/playgrounds in or near multi-unit dwellings. Don't build more houses than can be provided water into the future. Protect and enlarge our open spaces. Don't infill the entire eastern shoreline of SF.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>Kim Evans</td>
<td>Affordable housing. Good transportation with affordable fares.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda written</td>
<td>P. Ghosh</td>
<td>Affordable housing needed. Good transportation and affordable fares.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Amanda Elliott, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>We need more West County representation. Please consider holding a meeting in Richmond or El Cerrito.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Ana Irma Angulo (#2)</td>
<td>Also more housing for retirees and seniors is needed because the waiting lists are great and today, there are a lot of retirees suffering due to the lack of housing.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Ana Irma Angulo, Contra Costa County (#1)</td>
<td>I would like the transportation service for persons of limited resources, mainly single women with children and women who need to go to the hospital or important appointments to be renewed. Many years ago, I was a single mother and I made use of this service and it was very valuable to me. I now work at the front desk of the Michael Chavez Center and many people ask for this service. Thank you.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Colleen O'Connell, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>The EIR and OneBayArea plan are based on flawed set of data. California has a shrinking population, not a growing population. The supposed need for every community to absorb ultra affordable housing in packed-in 4 story buildings is therefore greatly overstated. The imposition of these projects on the remaining productive taxpayers in California will only hasten the exodus under way.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Daniel G. DeBusschere, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>I word searched the digital edition of the draft Plan for the words &quot;BART parking&quot; and I found none. Why is the issue of additional BART parking missing? Significant VMT can be reduced with additional parking?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Dr. Cheryl Morgan</td>
<td>To put it bluntly, this is a grandiose, well rehearsed lie. Repeatedly your representatives claim that Agenda 21 does not influence this plan - clearly it does when the text is taken from Agenda 21 documents. Socialism is planning for the benefit of the majority at a cost to minorities -- &amp; your plan meets this definition of socialism. Socialism is un-American. Are you?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Emilio Melendez, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>Plan Bay Area is necessary for many reasons. One reason is that many families would benefit in different areas. It would also benefit small businesses such as restaurants, super markets.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Eric Strattmann, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>I just found out about this plan 1 month ago and most people I talk to in my community of Orinda have never heard of it. Actually, I have yet to meet a single person who knows about this. Changes are being pushed upon our local communities without any opportunity for people to have an appropriate say. This should be put to a vote city by city. This will irreversibly damage the unique character of my city, my property value, schools. At the very least 6 months should be allowed (not 45 days) for the public to weigh in.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Igor Skaredoff, Contra Costa County (#1)</td>
<td>Former Concord Naval Weapons Station should be a priority conservation area.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Igor Skaredoff, Contra Costa County (#2)</td>
<td>Ferry from Martinez to San Francisco - connecting with existing Amtrak at Martinez Station</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Janet Maiorana (#2)</td>
<td>2. There is no analysis on impact of the high density subsidized housing on cities.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Janet Maiorana (#3)</td>
<td>3. CEQA waivers for eligible projects is ridiculous. 4. Leadership should be by example. All MTC/ABAG members and staff should not be given free parking or allowed to use cars.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Janet Maiorana, Contra Costa County (#1)</td>
<td>1. Citizens need more time to analyze the Plan and draft EIR. Ninety days would be appropriate.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Jesus Nunez</td>
<td>Promote healthy communities. Provide housing to all residents. Maintain transportation services. Reduce premature deaths.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Jewlia Eisenberg, Alameda County</td>
<td>Thank you for thinking regionally! We can't solve our housing or transportation issues without working together for a more sustainable future.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Joanne Ford, Richmond</td>
<td>More representation from Richmond and low-income families.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Lenore Krause, Contra Costa County</td>
<td>In this state we think of the levels of government to be: City (in my case, Pleasant Hill); County (Contra Costa); State (California); Federal (The United States of America). ABAG and MTC are like another level of government that we do not need and we do not want. When ABAG and MTC tell me how to live and where to live, they are yielding way too much power. When they blackmail cities into doing their command by withholding transportation funds from the city if the city does not do as ABAG and MTC demand, this is a level of power I cannot comprehend. If we would have to have this level of government, we should at least be able to elect the officials of this government directly. We elect our representatives to other governmental bodies in this state directly. You might say to me that city councils and other government bodies select their duly elected officials to serve on sub-committees, etc. This is true, but none of these sub-committees has the power that has been given to ABAG and MTC. The elected officials of our various cities should be the ones to make zoning decisions, etc. Our city officials should not allow this power grab by ABAG and MTC. It is time for us to withdraw from ABAG and MTC.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Marita Platon (#1)</td>
<td>All your assumptions are based on erroneous data. There are more economical ways to help the environment without vested interest benefiting from these ways.</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Marita Platon, Contra Costa County (#2)</td>
<td>Why is this plan being imposed on cities and not let free market work? We are a free enterprise economy with supply &amp; demand working itself out. Subsidy on these low cost houses are a huge expense and there is a lot of abuse and waste of resources. This has to stop and let the free market work.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Mike Garrabrants</td>
<td>The One Bay Area plan is deeply flawed. 1. It is based on a flawed presumption that to be &quot;one&quot;, we need to have all regions be homogenous and occupied with high-density transit villages. This flawed assumption arises from the failed government philosophy that the government knows more about what people want than the people, or perhaps worse, the government seeks to impose its will through &quot;strong arm&quot; tactics. Practically, these plans are flawed because they are based on flawed assumptions. California is shrinking and will continue to do so.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Nati Flores, Contra Costa County (#1)</td>
<td>On Section C Target 4: to reduce fatalities: there are non-profits who do a lot of work and education on bicycle and pedestrian safety and advocate for more biking. It would be very important that if we wanted to make a difference in this area to also fund these organizations.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Nati Flores, Contra Costa County (#2)</td>
<td>Section C Target 7: build complete streets. I really like this, I moved into a community with complete streets and I can see the difference it makes in our driving habits. I enjoy spending time on trails, walking to shop and walking my children to school.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Nati Flores, Contra Costa County (#3)</td>
<td>Section C Target 2: We used to live in Concord, we moved east for 10 years. We now live in Antioch. Even though my commute is not long in miles, it is long in time travel. I look forward to the day I can take BART or my bike to work. I work in Concord and have worked there for 12 years but I can’t afford to live there. I do think that it’s important to build affordable housing so we don’t have to move out of our communities. Incentives like &quot;Free BART ride day&quot; or reduced fares for sports events or other events that clog up the freeways are also important. All the freeways are congested even on the weekdays.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Pablo Fragoso (#1)</td>
<td>Plan Bay Area is necessary because it promotes the economy in our area. It is also essential to promote housing to all residents of the Bay Area because there are large communities that require more access to housing and reasonable prices. Public transportation transfers given at time of boarding need to be a bit more extensive, should one have a medical appointment, once the appointment is over and you leave the doctor’s office, the transfer is not valid and you have to pay again.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Pablo Fragoso (#2)</td>
<td>On the streets, more access should be provided to use bicycles so we can ride safely. Should more bicycle lanes be made, autos would be less utilized and it would lower our pollution levels. Build hospitals with economic access for low-income communities; when you don’t have enough money, you do not seek medical attention as often because it is very expensive to pay for appointments. Create communities with shops, employment opportunities, parks, schools, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Ralph Hoffman</td>
<td>We need to place on the ballot and pass an additional 1/2% sales tax in Contra Costa County to fund improved public transit. Today we have record high temperatures because increased greenhouse gases from automobiles, diesel trucks and motorcycles have contributed to global warming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>Roger Acuna</td>
<td>This is a request to amend the RHNA to include universal housing access design for new developments. We are seeing a trend for access to all areas in and around living spaces. There is an increase in baby boomer population, injured war vets and accident related disabilities. There is a preference to live at home rather than a nursing home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td>William Bucher</td>
<td>[Open House] Station D - A Plan to Build On -- my concerns relate to a platform for advocacy. I don’t agree with efforts to reduce taxpayer approval % from 2/3 to 55%; maybe 2/3 to 60%. Also I don’t agree with efforts to revise CEQA. Infill development is a local issue, and the controls should be set at that level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td></td>
<td>I’m excited to see the logical connection between houses, jobs, and investing in infrastructure. I don’t want to commute 2 hours from a starter home to my job in the Bay Area! I want cities to get smarter and MTC to serve the existing densities in Oakland, Richmond, San Pablo, etc., Don’t ignore the majority! Good plan guys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Told us that the officers who are elected officials are deciding what will happen to their cities with the consent of the people living in their cities. Why is this being imposed on us? Why not put these on the ballot box and see what the majority of the residents want for their city?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td></td>
<td>If I wanted a controlled lifestyle, I would join a commune. Growing families don’t want their children to grow up in an apartment. Tight living spaces for kids encourages gangs. Boredom encourages drugs. Smart housing is a poor environment for children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors are not interested in downsizing. Their lifestyle includes &quot;elbow room&quot;. Downsizing comes when they enter a rest home. Don’t hurry the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing Marin written</td>
<td>B. Emily Sykes, Marin</td>
<td>Affordable Homes. Please consider allowing funding for Trailer Camp land purchase. This could be formulated; a trust for homes situated on the land. Consider Palo Alto trailer camp land sale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing Marin written</td>
<td>Cesar Lagleva, Marin</td>
<td>Great job! Check out website concernedmarinites.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Ericka Erickson, Marin County (#1)</td>
<td>First, I would like to call attention to the time and place of the public hearings: a public hearing held during a weekday in the morning - and where public transit doesn’t reach is not accessible to working families and the ones that are most affected by the plans regarding transit and affordable housing.</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Ericka Erickson, Marin County (#2)</td>
<td>I would also highlight the fact that the Alternative 5 - EEJ - is the environmentally superior alternative - and most of its aspects should be included in the final plan, especially the elements related to transit and housing (affordable).</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Gil and Jane Pruitt, Marin</td>
<td>Any plan needs to protect the current quality of life in the suburban communities (low housing density, open space and protect wildlife) New housing should follow a balanced housing model (20% low income in any new housing build). Higher density housing should not be built near transportation in suburban communities!</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Pam Drew, Marin County</td>
<td>You have not adequately dealt with 1) water supplies for increased population; 2) endangered species and Bay wet lands; 3) increased local traffic congestion and air pollution; 4) improper projections artificially inflated projections and your refusal to correct these projections; 5) densification being improper for the land form: 30 U/A not appropriate for Novato, San Rafael or any of the rest of Marin, aesthetically or other wise.</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Brenda Barron Oakland</td>
<td>There are other problems with current service levels. BART does not have enough trains so that people can sit down. I often have to stand when I catch BART to go to school. BART has been having some issues lately with the tracks. I was on BART for almost two hours, and many people were delayed when they had to get to work and school. I would also like to see cleaner buses and BART cars and stations.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Tehran K. Clark</td>
<td>I would like to see the sustainable community strategy’s Plan Bay Area incorporate open space conservation and include agricultural space in the plan. Food security is an often forgotten element of equity. Considering how far food travels can lead to a reduction in greenhouse gasses, if grown closer to where people are. PBA should include preservation of regional and state parks and local parks while promoting the use of taking public transportation to those areas instead of driving.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland written</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Ed Mason</td>
<td>Housing/land use is an unfunded mandate. 5.5% of federal discretionary budget is for housing and community proposed social security payment reduction attempts to balance the budget and I do not want to pay for this. Future housing will be funded by local bonds for below market rate housing.</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose written</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Michael Ludwig</td>
<td>It’s hard for me to judge the overall environmental impact of Plan Bay Area, because I feel some of the projects in it will increase pollution (many of the projects to add new general purpose lanes to roadways will just encourage people to drive more), while some of the other projects in it will decrease pollution (most of the projects that make taking transit easier, such as additional transit lines and/or service hours).</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose written</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR Hearing</td>
<td>Phyllis Cassel</td>
<td>Reducing greenhouse gasses by 15% is far too little for a goal. Note Palo Alto’s drop in greenhouse gasses. Effort and planning makes a big difference. Reduction of greenhouse gasses is not the only reason to concentrate transportation and housing. Keeping open space open provides for ground water recharge, space for natural fauna and animals, etc. and all those benefits. We need housing if employment increases. A rational density 20-30 units per acre allows for both housing and open space.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose written</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Angela Gott, Marin County</td>
<td>I have lived in Marin since 1989. I've never married, no kids, and always worked part-time mostly with multiple jobs to afford high rents. I was born in 1951 so I'm 62, poor, in severe need of senior subsidized housing. Many boomer-aged women never earned much due to a wide range of discriminatory practices. Now we are aging and need subsidized safe housing to be built with good public transportation so we can get around independently. Senior housing is desperately needed to be built for senior boomer generation women so we won't become homeless in Marin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Carla Giustino, Marin County</td>
<td>We do not want high density housing in an area that cannot support it, i.e., Marin Civic Center area. This area is not designed for high density housing. The water, traffic was designed for parks and open space by Frank Lloyd Wright and this should stay that way. I am for development but not in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Cesar Lagleva, Marin</td>
<td>I support it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>D. Jan Visaya, Marin County</td>
<td>Regional planning is a fantastic idea. It seeks to solve many problems that have plagued our communities for decades. Not only is it a plan to make the Bay Area resilient, but it sets forth a way to create/reshape &quot;smarter&quot; communities. Housing is needed in nearly every metropolitan region in the country. Growth is going to happen and it makes perfect sense to prepare for that growth. Many workers that work in Marin travel from outside of Marin. Until we build alternative transportation, which &quot;Marinites&quot; are up against, affordable housing/mixed income housing communities are necessary. Increasing density will make alternative transportation practical and a more reliable public transportation. The choices the Plan Bay Area sets forth are what I want my government to allow me to choose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Elizabeth Prior, Marin County</td>
<td>I support affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Jessica Williams, Marin County</td>
<td>I appreciate the extensive stakeholder engagement to produce a regional focused plan. I hope there are policies and funding sources developed to significantly encourage local governments and agencies to implement the plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>John Rojas, Marin County</td>
<td>With regards to low cost, affordable housing, they should not be built in clusters and in one location. Affordable housing needs to be dispersed in small amounts throughout Marin County. Market rate apartments and homes, condos or single family also need to be built for builder incentive. Schools will suffer if a non profit (builder) builds without paying fair share of property tax.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Judith McCord, Marin County</td>
<td>I am opposed to the housing plans, due to traffic concerns. As a resident of Marin Lagoon, I am only too familiar with the inability to leave or return to my home when the county fair or other popular events occur. The thought of having all the cars trying to enter and exit McInnis or get through the stop sign to enter 101-S, with the trains stopping at the station, it could turn out to be a real nightmare.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Liz Sprecht, Marin County</td>
<td>I am a founder of El Porvenir, a nonprofit organization which works with Nicaraguans to develop clean drinking water projects. For 23 years I have been studying and using facts and figures about potable water. If Plan Bay Area should actually be put into effect, where would the drinking water for all the additional homes come from? If PBA is considering a desal plant, they should realize this would defeat the purpose of the Plan: Increased greenhouse gases would result from any desalinating activity. The net result would be more greenhouse gases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Lois Riddick, Marin City</td>
<td>Seniors in Marin City were looking forward to a shuttle service that would enable them to get from Hillsides to shop in grocery stores, since there are few markets that are affordable. I do not wish to see seniors remain isolated from social times, or whatever use for transportation. I, as well as others, have spent so much money to get a cab up the hill. Taxi vouchers comparable to San Francisco would be helpful for seniors. Just volunteering has been strenuous and challenging financially to take care of my needs as well as to advocate for seniors and disabled populations. Whistlestop provides ride shares but some seniors can’t take it because the long rides. And time changes over night without being able to arrange for another ride other ways. Marin Catch-a-Ride only permits 4 round-trip rides only 3.5 miles requiring an additional $1.45 per ride for that short distance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Margaret K. Zegart, Marin County (#2)</td>
<td>P9: Main County’s Unincorporated Area Planning Commission’s decision on several occasions has Commissioners noting that existing “needs and aspirations of each Bay Area - &quot;Marin&quot; as identified in locally adopted general plans and zoning &quot;shall accommodate through a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, appropriate housing sites. Local not regional decisions. P10: Job growth in Marin has its primary one related to tourism and travel to West Marin. This city pattern of related housing formula is not appropriate to Marin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Margaret K. Zegat, Marin County (#1)</td>
<td>P2: PDAs originally developed to serve the infill areas “urban cities”. They [mistakenly] have been broadened to advance focused employment growth. Local jurisdictions - Marin Affordable Housing Advocates - supported by Supervisors to achieve money for transit “among other place types”. LOS F or worse where level of service is stand still traffic in Southern Marin on summer sunny days, all sunny weekends - and at all commute peak periods (not considered on the countywide plan analysis). It is not a transit center area as Tamalpais Junction serves Mill Valley on a limited schedule, and commuter period only bus along a portion of Shoreline Highway in Tamalpais Valley and minimal service weekdays on a West Marin shuttle. P7: Grand Jury notes senior populations (and all others, of course) have a lack of hillside transit service. The county has not accepted nor provided maintenance of first decade public use mapped 20th century (Tamalpais Land and Water) paths throughout the Tamalpais Planning areas - as well as “paper streets”. . Lanes on Almonte heavily used or a program of identified parking areas on streets. Eager to have funds for highway improvements, multi-modal lanes for safe cyclists and pedestrian paths, safe, sustainable sites for public housing in Southern Marin are compromised and affordable housing in hazardous sites have been identified as priority development areas. Deep bay mud, traffic congestion, increased air quality hazards because of (stalled, really) traffic. Two identified public hazards related to transportation are LOS levels; safe cyclist and pedestrian accidents/health air quality. High tides cause year round monthly access flooding, as well to 101/to Shoreline. Greenhouse gas reduction goals are now compromised; increased affordable and market rate housing in Mill Valley and Tamalpais planning are increasing/paralleling the ineffectiveness of performance scenarios. P.5: Introducing Plan Bay Area: Strategy for a Sustainable Region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Margaret K. Zegat, Marin County (#3)</td>
<td>P12: Plan Bay Area's &quot;Bold Step with Strategic Investments that provide support for focused growth in priority development areas, including the new One Bay Area grant program. &quot;Fix it First Highest Priority&quot; ensures that existing transportation assets are funded.&quot; Traffic signals when justified by LOS) if speed is your goal. 5 in a mile are necessary for existing Tamalpais planning area residents to reach highway 101 (or to return) some education of public media should address circulation issues. P13: The One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) is contra indicated in the unique congested area (Manzanita/Tenmassee Valley/ GGNRA Ocean Destination, Mill Valley Almonte Blvd/Mill Valley Shoreline Highway accessed Tamalpais Valley, West Marin residents and all state, county and federal open space destinations. P14: A Plan to Build On - Priority Development Areas were recommended by local governments, unfortunately these are not supported by citizens, aware of climate change mappings. Not considered beyond mid century sea level rise, impacting transportation corridors. (Already summer ice melts complete estimated to be by mid century levels by some scientists upon which used data in documents are made. For safety and sustainable land and transportation figures, 3,000 should be included as likely climate warming will be increased by China, India and other world wide populations their intercontinental trade and manufacturing growth with western hemisphere growth. Healthy communities should not be a compromised goal by PDAs planned and sites for affordable housing to gain transit funding as now Marin proposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Martha Vega, Marin County</td>
<td>Dear Representative, I requested that the Plan be made available in some manner in Spanish. My request was ignored. I think that every person who is a participant in this community has the right to be informed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Nicolas Adrian Mabey, Marin County</td>
<td>I support it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Without a just plan we will not be able to pay the high cost of living in the future. Our economy will fall because there will be less production workers for big businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing is treated with a discriminatory tone in Marin and at these hearings. Displacement of existing affordable units is an issue; much less construction of additional affordable units. Quality of life should be an index for the whole community, not just property owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.) In your &quot;Introducing Plan Bay Area&quot; document, pg. 7, it says &quot;increased racial &amp; ethnic diversity will increase demand for multi-family housing.&quot; Excuse me! You're saying, in effect, that minorities wish to live in multi-family housing. That is simply not true. It seems you're trying to prepare people to accept more multi-family housing, which of course is your agenda. Nice try, but we're not buying it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td></td>
<td>We in Marin must act to lower greenhouse gases by figuring out a way to make workers in Marin able to afford to live in Marin near their jobs. &quot;Affordable to the people who work here&quot; is different from &quot;subsidized&quot; and this plan must more clearly define how the housing and transportation goals can encourage workers in Marin to live in Marin. 65,000 of Marin's 110,000 workers drive into Marin in single occupancy vehicles every day. How does Plan Bay Area for Marin specifically address affordability for workers in Marin? Plan Bay Area is a good thought but the mechanism is not clear. Please clarify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>8.) You're assuming x many thousands of jobs will be created over the next 30 years. These are way overly optimistic. Because of this, you project substantial population increase, which are, thus, overly optimistic. Another assumption which is incorrect is that people will live in multifamily housing, if built. San Rafael built 33 San Pablo, a 3 or 4 story housing complex, and they couldn't sell them as condos, and now can't rent them.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>599 of the 852 affordable housing units slated for unincorporated Marin are planned for my District 1. 70% of the new housing units. This will create a huge influx of people and students in our school district. Affordable housing will mostly be exempt from paying property taxes -- leaving us -- our neighborhood -- with the responsibility to shoulder the added cost of this extra 20% increase in population. If the plan is developed it will severely impact our small (Marinwood/Lucas Valley) community. It will increase population and strain our schools. It will also result in displacement -- current and potential new families will leave or won't move in due to these changes. It will increase number of drivers in Marinwood and Lucas Valley and it will create a physical division of our community in the above ways. I am against accepting 70% of the new housing units slated for Marin to be built in our small 2,900 household community for these reasons.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Absolutely opposed to housing development plans and the autocratic/ undemocratic process of a few bureaucrats. Disrespectfully undemocratic.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>Highly opposed to housing development plans. Elected officials mustn't forget that their constituents have to live with the long-term repercussions of this badly thought-through project.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>The time allowed for comments on the plan -- only a little more than 1 month -- is much too short to honor the importance of the Plan.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>I support the overall vision of One Bay Area and the goal to reduce GHG. This is an important step for our children's future if we are to combat climate change impacts. I think there are too many misunderstandings/ fear mongering. Please present pictures of &quot;high density housing&quot; as people will be surprised at how much it fits in (2-3 stories) with existing buildings. Please explain that we are discussing primarily market rate housing and that small, walkable community condos are the types of places that hold their value and that young families desire. Please do a better job of educating the community about the plan's details, with pictures of what this could look like with current examples. Also please clear up the confusion over eminent domain. Nobody has to lose their suburban home. Finally, please clarify that this is not about attracting new &quot;growth&quot; but rather accommodating our anticipated future population growth more sustainably. Small, walkable communities are always more sustainable than suburban sprawl.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin written</td>
<td>I am concerned that the TIP provides &quot;Plans&quot; for motorized transport and neglects to provide a statewide impetus, framework, and support for efforts to improve bicycling, walking and other forms of active transportation. This is a huge gap in a greenhouse-gas-reducing program for transportation dollars! There should be a statewide active transportation plan and it should have dedicated funding. Statewide it could do things like arrange rebates for electric cargo bike purchase similar to the rebates for electric cars. E-cars produce far more greenhouse gas than e-bikes.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Why has Steve Heminger, President of the MTC, indicated to the California Air Resources Board that a part of the aggressive strategies to implement this plan included raising the cost of driving a private automobile by a factor of 10?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plan Bay Area -- Spring 2013 Public Hearings -- Written Comments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Jack Gray, City of Napa resident</td>
<td>Has any actual opportunity been afforded or will any opportunity be afforded for an open vote of the individual area residents to approve adoption of this plan? Who has provided definition of sustainability for this plan?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Jack Simonitch Napa County (#1)</td>
<td>Why does Napa County not require the Wine Train to provide service between Napa and Vallejo for connection to the Bay Area and other Interstate and nationwide transportation? Why build two bridges on the Napa River paid for by Flood Control funds?</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Jack Simonitch Napa County (#2)</td>
<td>Affordable Housing: I propose that funding for affordable housing be completely transferred to the wine industry, the hotel industry and to all other employers of low-income workers. Maybe a head tax of $150 to 200 per low-income employee per year. We are not building low-cost housing for people working in San Francisco. Would not the Fairgrounds be a good place to build affordable housing? Move the Fairground out of the center of the city.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Mike Costanzo, Napa</td>
<td>Does not seem to support needed transportation improvements in this county. While the overall goals are good, why not find a way to provide funding to improve or at least address our challenges as the third most visited destination in California?</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Nathan Stout, Solano County (#1)</td>
<td>Please make water taxi or vaporetti service a reality from Mare Island on the Napa River. Please make my comment part of the public record.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa written</td>
<td>Nathan Stout, Solano County (#2)</td>
<td>Please extend capability of Napa County Wine Train to reach Mare Island as a new destination and transfer point to the ferry in order to make a possible travel from San Francisco to Napa, which would generate more environmentally friendly tourism. Please make my comment part of the public record.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Angelica Mariano, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I particularly was interested in the transit system investments and am happy to hear that BART is expanding to the South Bay. The statistics shared about demographics were also interesting.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Blake Lyon, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Of particular concern is the use of the term “protected open space” without a proper definition of such a term as noted in Appendix 2. Secondly, the maps in Appendix 2 also reference an “urban growth boundary” that does not appear to reflect local land use policies.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Erik Larsen</td>
<td>Thank you for holding this public meeting. As someone who moved to the Bay Area for work and depends on public transportation across county lines, I'm keenly interested in affordable and equitable access.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Finau Faleofa, San Mateo County</td>
<td>There should be affordable transportation and housing. Transportation locations shouldn't just be in the downtown areas. There should be a schedule change for more transportation instead of just every hour. Samtrans should have a better plan for the future instead of [not legible]. There should be more awareness and involvement with the people in each community. The people of the community should be able to be involved in decisions being made. There should be a variety of ethnicities involved in Plan Bay Area organizations, because most communities are made up by other ethnic groups rather than just white. There should be notification of global harmony, recycling, compost and being Go Green.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Irvin Dawid, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I have to be one the 8:22 northbound Caltrain. If I’m not called by 7:50 p.m. please accept my comments: I am supportive of efforts to reduce transportation emissions by reducing driving by increasing growth in areas were jobs, transit and services are located. This means increasing density – something many cities are unwilling to do. I would like to see firmer ways to reward cities that increase residential density and for those that don’t, they need to feel the consequences.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Janet Borgens, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Clarification on “definition” of protected open space. RWC area designated “Urban Resource.” Need definition of terms. If this becomes an adopted plan what are the CEQA ramifications for local jurisdictions?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Jay Michlin, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I’m concerned about our planning for “sustainability.” Suppose we had done that in 1960, or even 1980? We would have strangled the otherwise organic growth that has made the Bay Area so successful. History shows that the future always astonishes us.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Johanna Coble, San Francisco</td>
<td>This plan has flown under the radar. It is a hugely expensive plan that is being foisted on the public without their knowledge. It should be brought out of the darkness and brought forth into the light so that the public an vote on it. Please bring this plan to the people and let us vote on it.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Kolsarina Hafoka, San Mateo County</td>
<td>We need affordable transportation and housing! What is affordable? Housing costs should not be increased. We are barely managing now so in the future we should look into helping the community with having affordable housing for all people. Transportation costs for the public need to be decreased for all people and not dent people's wallets.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Leonard W. Stone, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Could you have made a 25-year plan in 1988 that would make any sense in 2013? We do not know what will change but we know the rate of change is accelerating. If man is causing the climate to change, when did it start? The climate has always been changing. When did it stop changing so man could make it start changing again?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Marco Durazo, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I respect the outreach conducted for this process but have some feedback. I only got a 2-week notice for this meeting -- more time would have been helpful. Also, not sure if language translation was offered. How the Bay Area deals with population growth is critical but how we deal with those already living here -- those living on the margins -- is also important. There are many working poor in our region.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Mark Roest, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Rebuilding rural economies takes pressure off urban areas, which reduces pricing pressure on real estate, which can help make more housing affordable. I second the call for urban agriculture, and I support encouraging the services that could make regional food shed development more viable, including more affordable housing and flexibility in building codes. Instead of continuous high density a la strip malls, I suggest smaller high density buildings on open space, including food gardens, giving some of the benefits of single family homes. I encouraged the use of both natural building systems and advanced structural systems and materials to reduce the cost and environmental impact of housing and services</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Meletuna Pikula, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Being a teen, it is a struggle to see people trying to get houses and transportation. We need affordable housing and transportation. I’m looking forward to community with affordable houses.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Serena Ip, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I support the Plan Bay Area draft but after tonight’s hearing I do urge slowing down the timeline for more time for outreach and support. I enjoyed the smaller outreach groups and hope people here tonight were involved in those groups or were aware of them. However, I do not agree with the majority of what the speakers said tonight. I only agree there should be more time for comments and outreach. I do think the plan is heading in the right direction. Young workers, the ones who make up a large part of our unique economy, need to comment and be involved. Most of the people who spoke tonight do not fall in that category and likely do not share the same views. I know I don't. We need more affordable options for housing near transit and resources. Regional planning is important to coordinate environmental needs, housing and transit.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Sofia Lozano-Pallores</td>
<td>I am a community member interested in getting to know more about the ideas for future development. Great that you are having open houses to discuss this. I however would like to see what projects are ideas and which ones are already funded and development is starting or about to start. I would like to see concrete information or places where I can get it.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Uainani Pikula, San Mateo County</td>
<td>Well, being a teen and still attending high school, I don't have that much understanding of what’s going on. But with the information I know we should have affordable housing and transportation. I believe we should put money for mainly affordable housing for helping people at least have homes. Many are on the streets or living with other family because they can’t afford to pay own house. We should at least help these families keep their house in our community.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Vera Herrington, San Mateo County</td>
<td>I am concerned about the environment of the Bay Area for my grandchildren and their children. Will they have back yards to play in? Will people still be able to have gardens and little private back yards to work in? I see the Central Valley farmers denied water and the Siskiyou counties being threatened to lose their farms and ranches. Food will be more expensive and not natural.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td>Yesenia Ramos</td>
<td>I would like to know how the 2040 demographics (ethnic) were projected. I think the 3% for multiracial is not realistic nor are the PI numbers. Also, how is this information being translated into other languages to make it accessible to other people?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Let free markets build the housing people want. Don’t risk CALPERS retirement money funding stack and pack housing. If it’s financially sound banks will loan the money. I don’t want to bail out the state pension fund if such ventures fail.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo written</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am not interested in living in “stack and pack” housing by the railroad tracks. Neither do I support changing the character of our city (San Mateo).</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Anita Kearns, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Make it practical for the common homeowner to solar panel his/her home. The next major technological development most likely will increase our electrical usage. This will decrease the environmental impact in/on the desert and desert wildlife. Also allow the “middle income” person to have a slight increase in income.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Bena Chang, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>We support regional planning and like the progress MTC/ABAG are making to accommodate the number of homes we need in this region in the right places.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>The estimates indicate an increase in population. How accurate can this be with the increase in taxes, regulations and housing development restrictions? More people are leaving and will leave in the next 20 years because of these issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Will the $200+ billion need to be $500 billion by 2040? Increased costs and expenses. Will this be like another bullet train, underfunded, not budgeted, fiasco?!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>E. Jane Hendricks, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Leave the Plan to those who live locally - Plan #1 leave it as it is. High density steep stairs are not &quot;senior&quot; friendly. Loss of independence by not maintaining roads/highways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>1. Will this plan work? 1) Do not know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>1. Cost of 2-vol. EIR and Plan. 1) What is the cost of these documents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>G. Emergency Evacuation: 1) San Francisco unable to evacuate in a timely manner for an earthquake or atomic, biological or chemical attack. The 1989 earthquake during the Giants world series game demonstrates the severe problems to evacuate the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>[part of D from above] 3) Treasure Island Ferry -- BTU ratio per passenger mile will be excessive. Development for a new San Francisco neighborhood seems ill conceived.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>E) Baby Boomers Age in Place: 1) Articles locally written indicate California and San Francisco are not like the rest of the country. 2) Personal experience, round table discussions, etc. indicate seniors desire to age in place at home until an &quot;event&quot; occurs placing them in a care facility. They will not move to the downtown core. Only the few wealthy will move to downtown high rise such as Rincon Tower in San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>H. Social Justice: 1) People do not want to pay the full price at a restaurant for the dishwasher to afford housing. Rather government must implement below market rate housing burdening the property owner tax rate. 2) 40% of college graduates work in jobs requiring less qualifications and earning less money to pay off student debt that will quality for BMR housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>[part of H from above] 3) Ohlone-VTA Parking Lot conversion to housing has cars, garages, and has not increased light rail ridership to the projected 40,00 boarding predicted 20 years ago. Current light rail ridership is about 33,000 boardings even with all the expansions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>D) Transit 1) No mention of corporate commuter buses impacting/ clogging neighborhood streets in San Francisco. 2) 24% of San Francisco trips at 103,431 are outbound trips. ABAG housing requirement being imposed appears to satisfy the &quot;bedroom&quot; commuter to the South Bay and San Mateo County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>F) Short Commutes By Young Workers: 1) The young workers may desire a short commute but their actions indicate otherwise by riding corporate commuter buses for about an hour or more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>C) Plan Mitigates for Auto -- Poor Message to Change Transportation Habit 1) Old Oakland Road is parallel to Highway 880 which was widened over ten years ago. 2) 75% of Bay Area jobs within 1/2 mile of freeway exits and 25% within one half mile of 88 regional train stations or 50% with frequent bus service. 3) Allows PDA development to escape CEQA review, a sweet deal for developers.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Library hard copy available March 4, 2013 and review period too short for over 2,000 pages of EIR and Draft Plan.  A) Unfunded mandate for local general infrastructure such as schools, parks, police, fire and inadequate sewer treatment capacity in San Francisco. 1) Federal discretionary budget may be balanced with reductions to the entitlements budget and my social security. 2) MTC lobby for federal funds for Housing -- which may be reduced. Will MTC lobby for U.S. corporations to pay their fair share of taxes on overseas profits which have not been returned to U.S. shore.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Ed Mason, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>B) Sea Level Rise -- Commute with the Fish. 1) California contributes to 2% of greenhouse gas. 2) Transportation is 39% of greenhouse gas in Bay Area but no breakdown of heavy trucks, airplanes, ships, autos or light trucks. 3) Even if 15% reduction goals are met, what is total cost for small impact on world greenhouse gas.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>G. Scott, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>One Bay Area is an unattainable, unrealistic &quot;vision&quot; or scheme to make money and gain control over the people. The Plan is based on false, unsubstantiated data. The Plan targets minorities and is geared towards re-distributing the wealth. It uses terms such as social justice and environmental justice to try and make the ignorant feel like you are being &quot;fair&quot; to them. This is a destructive plan.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>J. McDonald, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>This plan is all about government control of land and citizens. It does not take into account better ideas and products and plans that will emanate in the next few years. Why do you want to lock progress in your box? You assume people have no initiative or responsibility to control their own lives. Keep our towns and cities local with local control. Bigger is not better. It's costlier and graft goes undetected.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Jean Ryan, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Are you planning on passing a vehicle miles driven tax (VMD)? It is mentioned in your EIR report on one of your proposals. Is this to discourage driving? Sounds like you want to get our cars off the road. Where's the fairness in that? You're hurting the farmers, businesses, and low income people.</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Michael Ludwig, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>I want to express my support for how Plan Bay Area conserves open space and makes it easier to take public transit by clustering development in small areas. These are goals that people want, are good, and are realistically achievable.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Molly Lee, Milpitas</td>
<td>I like the idea of what the Bay Area is planning but hopefully more people will be using public transportation. Sometimes, I feel it unsafe when it is a little bit dark to wait for transpiration and also some places are not safe to wait for a bus to come. Sometimes, I have heard people getting robbed or killed just waiting for public transportation. My biggest concern is a guarantee of safety to use public transportation.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Nu Ngo, Santa Clara</td>
<td>We need to improve public transportation. Less costly for low income people. Better scheduling to encourage ridership.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Raul Peralez, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Very informative. I appreciate this comprehensive work.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td>Ron Sackman, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>I live in Mountain View. Our city council is pursuing a mixed use high density housing project at Castro and El Camino. It is not within practical walking distance of public transportation, and will effectively add 200+ cars daily to a congested intersection. It will also destroy several extremely popular local businesses, and add traffic congestion to the middle school across the street. Can ABAG assist homeowners in voicing such concerns to our city council, specifically calling out projects counterproductive to ABAG's vision?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td></td>
<td>I was looking at the map of the PDAs, and I saw one thing that didn't make sense to me. It looks like the PDA in northern San Jose extends east along the Brokaw Road corridor to about Old Oakland Road. Why? This is an area very UNDER-served by public transit. Having a PDA in an area that you can't get to/from by public transit is insane!</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td></td>
<td>On Page 8 of the FAQ's - I object to &quot;environmental justice&quot; and &quot;social equity&quot;. Distributing benefits to include minority and low income communities and to make housing and transportation more affordable for lower income households indicates entitlement programs will increase and the impact will be on income-makers. California already has 33-50% indigents, will this also include non-citizens and illegal aliens? While citizens pay -- No!</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td></td>
<td>My concern is cost. Although there are billions raised, how much state, federal and local taxes will go to implement these projects? California is broke and cannot afford anything until our billions in debt is paid.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara written</td>
<td></td>
<td>I personally believe the most useful way to reduce traffic moving forward is to encourage companies to implement telecommuting policies for their employees. Is telecommuting an area which ABAG is working?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Alicia Garza, POWER (#1)</td>
<td>We (POWER) are concerned that the Plan does not go far enough to prevent displacement of low income residents and does not go far enough to ensure the preservation of deeply affordable housing.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Alicia Gazra, POWER (#2)</td>
<td>We also think there should be less money for highways and more for public transit.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Carlin Christy, POWER, San Francisco</td>
<td>The draft plan for the Bay Area needs to take a more integral look at affordable housing options for the Bay Area. Displacement is a real and serious concern and San Francisco has one of the highest displacement rates in the African American community in the country. Income disparity needs to be taken into account and steps need to be taken to increase the amount of affordable housing so that San Francisco is a city for all residents, not just those wealthy enough to pay extraordinary rental prices.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>D Jan Visaya, Marin</td>
<td>PlanBayArea has the chance to place California &quot;on the map&quot;. Again, having been a resident of the Bay Area for 5 years and a resident of California for my whole life, the Bay Area region is rich with culture, and balance. I applaud what PlanBayArea sets out to achieve. In order to protect our green space, enhance our neighborhoods, and form &quot;place&quot;, we need to change the way we live. I am for increasing density in all counties because we'd stop sprawl. I am all for public transportation because the automobile has been the only option for too long. There's something wrong when &quot;third world countries&quot; has a better idea of place. I hope PlanBayArea's work establishes that. My home is not my house but my neighborhood. Godspe. Please extend BART to the north bay.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft (as indicated by the commentator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>David Pilpel, San Francisco (#1)</td>
<td><strong>General:</strong> MTC, ABAG and other agencies need to document their public outreach. Those efforts need to be meaningful and engage the public with draft plans and options before final recommendations are made to decision makers. Final staff recommendations should change and evolve based in part on public comments, and the final staff recommendations should document those changes.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>David Pilpel, San Francisco (#2)</td>
<td><strong>Plan Bay Area:</strong> The planned level of housing, jobs, and population seem unnecessarily high. Support increased concentration of development in core urban areas. If investments are scaled and tied to development, they need to be phased with that development.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Edward Mason, San Francisco (#1)</td>
<td>The residential segment is an unfunded mandate. Anticipate future federal discretionary funding to be lacking. Thus causing local bond funds support below market rate housing. ABAG/City Planning designate the housing quantity, but will the San Francisco housing be occupied by south bay (Google, Apple, HP, EA, etc.) workers? Seniors I know indicate they plan to age in place in their residence until a significant event occurs requiring movement to a care facility. They have no current plan to downsize to the urban core.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Edward Mason, San Francisco (#2)</td>
<td>Lastly, the &quot;bottom of the iceberg&quot; infrastructure -- police, fire, sewer, water, power, etc. is not considered or funded -- will corporate offshore income be taxed to enhance federal and state tax revenue? What is the population capacity of San Francisco? No absolute number is provided. In four years, will we go through this &quot;shadow dance&quot; again. The plan mitigates conditions, but never makes the public statement that unless your auto/truck habits change, you will be commuting with the fish as the sea level rises.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Gwynn, San Francisco</td>
<td>Highways are not &quot;investments&quot;. It is throwing money away for an outdated destructive transportation system. The future is not highways, it is density, mass transit, walking and biking. Stop funding old school technology.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Jame Ervin, Alameda</td>
<td>I am concerned about the amount of transit spending. Transit expansion would help reduce the environmental impact. Although some PDAs are in areas where transit use is common, improved transit would increase the value of the PDAs in existing denser and transit friendly corridors.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>James B. Walsh</td>
<td>Global human over population will be the root cause of the collapse of the planet’s entire environment and the extinction of the human race. While planning for the future is all well and good, do recognize that these plans ultimately serve to accommodate more population and enable the ultimate destruction of our world. While this issue may lie beyond the purview of your focus, to not put into place some mitigating policies, to not even mention the over population issue within the context of the Plan, I find to be completely disingenuous in any discussion of our future.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Jane Martin, San Francisco (#1)</td>
<td>I am very concerned about PlanBayArea’s impact on displacing low-income communities in San Francisco. Transit Oriented Development is not deeply affordable and accessible to existing low-income people of color. It will have a devastating impact.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Jane Martin, San Francisco (#2)</td>
<td>The Plan spends too much on highway expansion and not enough on public transit. The Plan should prioritize affordable, good public transit for low-income transit dependent riders.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Jenn Fox, SF</td>
<td>Thank you for working on comprehensive planning for the Bay Area, and for limiting growth to within Urban Growth Boundaries. Open space and agricultural lands ALSO need our investment to remain viable. Please ensure that all Bay Area residents can access the Bay Area's parks and trails via public transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Juana Teresa Tello, San Francisco</td>
<td>I am concerned with the definition of &quot;affordable&quot; in relationship to housing. Representing a low-income community myself, I am concerned with the displacement of families as a result of large scale transit oriented development. We should be prioritizing truly and deeply affordable housing in all projects drafted. I also think the MTC should invest billions in public transportation, and shift the balance in the budget, away from highway expansion and roads - to prioritize environmentally sustainable options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Karla Dominguez, San Francisco</td>
<td>Access to affordable housing needs to be integrated into the Plan in a better way. The Plan does not do enough to address the problem of lower income families getting pushed out of this area. Transportation should help the families here now who are struggling to access more opportunities. It should not help gentrify neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td>Marcy Berry, San Francisco</td>
<td>Thank you for all the effort going into this Plan. However, although we all want clean air and abundant housing, I believe PlanBayArea is framing the argument to perpetrate the assumption that only government funded by taxes, can achieve these goals. Not so. Not only is this a spurious assumption, the fact that with PlanBayArea, all aspects of our lives are being forcefully affected is being glossed over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td></td>
<td>Even with an annual budget of over seven billion dollars, the government of the City and County of San Francisco is incapable of maintaining the basic infrastructure of the city. Even with hundreds of millions of dollars in extra &quot;pot hole&quot; bond money, the streets remain a mess. Even while adopting the catchy phrase &quot;Transit First City&quot;, MUNI is unreliable. The government is unable to handle the current level of population as it is. There is no political will. Why spend any time, money, resources and energy on future planning when you people can't manage as it is? How can you even dream of cramming more people into this city when the current physical facilities are so over taxed with the level of population you now have? How do you expect the citizens to have any faith whatsoever in any future &quot;plan&quot; that you might concoct when you seem in over your heads -at best- and just rank incompetent -at worst- with your handling of things now as it is?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF written</td>
<td></td>
<td>This process is too complicated and not transparent enough. I want to see the names, job titles, job responsibilities, salaries and benefits of all the government personnel working on this plan published online, along with any other costs associated with the planning process, broken down in detail. I want to see advocates of limited government -- libertarians, constitutionalists, Tea Party supporters, etc. -- included in the nuts and bolts of actual planning. I feel we are just being given lip service on a public process that will not really result in the plan being revised based on our concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano written</td>
<td>Michael J. Hayes, Solano</td>
<td>Need to stabilize, rather than accommodate population. Need language in plan that advocates for a stable population (no growth or loss). ABAG must not be a front for a home building industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano written</td>
<td>Mona Babauta, Exec. Director, Soltrans</td>
<td>I am fully supportive of the many policies and elements of the RTP. They will only help improve the quality and level of transportation services in Solano County. Thank you for all the good work!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Daniel P.</td>
<td>No more freeway lane additions, please, anywhere. By the time gasoline reaches $10 and more per gallon, there will be plenty of road room and people will be screaming for trains, buses and shuttles. Put transit in now - for the same reason you would put in solar, for the future.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerbein</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Nathan Daniel Stout</td>
<td>I am against the OneBayArea plan. Let the individual citizens determine the actions of their city government. I want my comments to be part of the public record.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Tom Ovens, Solano</td>
<td>Because Vallejo has much of the lowest priced housing, it is a magnet for low income people. An additional problem is that the historical downtown area has much of the cheapest housing. 40% of that area is rental with 59% of rental being subsidized housing of one form or another. Can ABAG be helpful in creating a more even distribution of low income housing throughout our city and county? Vallejo residents are organizing to create new priorities for housing in Vallejo. We need more middle class residents, more business downtown and protection of the character of our historical neighborhoods. High density is not appropriate in these areas. More affordable and convenient transportation to San Francisco can be of great help in attracting middle class residents who currently live in San Francisco but seek affordable and desirable housing options. Currently, the cost and scheduling restraints are a significant handicap. Vallejo residents want a new vision of the city. We want more control over our own destiny. We are fearful that ABAG will force its own specific ideas upon us which may not be in keeping with what we envision for ourselves. We need more services and employment opportunities for the low income people who are already here. We need more owner occupied houses, not high density rentals, especially if designed for low income.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>D. Ornelas</td>
<td>Apply more resources to protect the environment.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Daniel P.</td>
<td>I highly recommend more city buses running more frequently. It's ridiculous how long I had to wait for public transit transportation. It took me 3 buses and 3 ours to arrive at my one mile destination, which only takes me 45 minutes to walk.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Kerbein</td>
<td>No more freeway lane additions, please, anywhere. By the time gasoline reaches $10 and more per gallon, there will be plenty of road room and people will be screaming for trains, buses and shuttles. Put transit in now - for the same reason you would put in solar, for the future.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>David Torres</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>The streets and roads of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County need safer spaces/lanes for bicyclists.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Jose A. Carranza</td>
<td>Local bus service in the city of Santa Rosa needs to be more frequent...I would like to see more bus service in communities of need in Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>(#1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Jose A. Carranza</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Lisa Maldonado</td>
<td>Find a way to extend the SMART train and get more drivers off the 101. Increase bus service and add mini buses at rural small cities. More subsidies for buses! Tax incentives for housing built near public transportation.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Lynn McGarvey</td>
<td>1) Portland has had a 2040 plan for years. Has the plan gone far enough. 2) Plan needs specifics for each county. 3) Need connections to San Francisco – specifically! 4) Show environmental lands, especially connections for wildlife corridors, creeks, wetlands, forests. 5) Plan more affordable housing including seniors.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written</td>
<td>Sonoma County resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>M. Stamos</td>
<td>We need at least &quot;4 lanes&quot; on 101 heading toward San Francisco. We need a &quot;BART&quot; that will come to Sonoma County. The SMART train is not enough for people to find a job. The jobs are limited here in Sonoma County. We are limiting the next generations.</td>
<td>Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Martha Mendoza, Sonoma County</td>
<td>I would like very much to see safer streets for people who ride their bicycles; on many streets there is no bike lane and no protection for people who have to use bicycles. Bike lanes provide a safer trip for our communities/our county.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Robyn Anderson, Sonoma County</td>
<td>Nice job! Moving in the right direction! I support the Plan fully.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Roger Delaware, Sonoma County</td>
<td>Sustainable agriculture, local food production and distribution should be part of this plan. Review and consider signing the Good Food Pledge of the Los Angeles Food Policy Council. This will benefit local nutrition, air quality (less trucking), farm worker safety and rights.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sean Hamlin, Sonoma County</td>
<td>Great work!</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Stan Gow, Sonoma County</td>
<td>There should be more thought of the transit users (locations and times) when scheduling the hearings. There’s a disconnect between the policy makers and the end users.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Veronica Jacobi, Sonoma County</td>
<td>Alternative 5 - submitted by Transform and others. I strongly support this alternative. I strongly support SB375 and I encourage acceleration to combat climate change/destabilization. Transit Operating Funds - operating funds are needed. 395ppm - carbon must be reduced. 1% Climate Change. 5% Road and Bridge expansion. KBBF’s - study session for community input was very helpful.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Wayne Gordon, Sonoma County resident (#1)</td>
<td>Number 1 on &quot;Frequently Asked Questions&quot; says &quot;Plan Bay Area is an integrated long-range transportation and land use/housing plan in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area.&quot; The first question of &quot;6 more...&quot; will Plan Bay Area take away local control of land use development?&quot; Answer: &quot;No. Decisions remain in hands of local...&quot; Question Number 1 contradicts the answer to &quot;Will planning take away local control?&quot; How can we trust you?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Wayne Gordon, Sonoma County resident (#2)</td>
<td>Much of the material contains references to &quot;climate change&quot; and controlling CO2. However, many scientists more each day reveal the hoax of the [not legible] that CO2 or anything else man does causes climate. We know (fact) that the earth has been warming for well over a century -- and that since about 1998 it has been cooling (fact). Why should we believe anything else when you state as fact that there is &quot;climate change&quot; caused by man?</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>I hoped to see more reports on progress made towards 2030 and 2035 plans. Specific improvement projects would be more meaningful with target completion dates.</td>
<td>[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find a way to complete SMART to the Larkspur Ferry, especially with across the platform transfer. With this in place, and the now-firm connection to the Sonoma County Airport, a regional public transit corridor is born. This makes the SMART project a strong candidate for federal and regional investment.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment Applies to Which Draft [as indicated by the commentator]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma written</td>
<td>Adam Kirshenbaum</td>
<td>More spread-out affordable housing through sustainable affordable transit will bolster the economy across all social strata and ethnic groups, the disabled and people of color and age, as well as support cleaner air, water and physical and mental health. Speed up the Smart Train! And the Bay Area Plan! Three years more of limited transit (after waiting 11 years -- too long -- already). Please note that agencies such as the Post Sustainability Institute are front groups to realtors and developers who will price out the poor who need public transit for work, school, medical care, etc. (not legible) I ride my bike everywhere I can within Sonoma County and take buses through the Bay Area. I have no car and live in dense affordable housing because of my disability.</td>
<td>Draft Plan Bay Area; Draft EIR; Draft TIP &amp; AQ Conformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

The Bay Area has made farsighted regional planning a top priority for decades. Previous generations recognized the need for modern mass transit systems, state-of-the-art bridges and an array of parks and open space that would provide a balance between urbanized areas and open space. Past generations aimed to foster a healthy environment and vibrant communities through their visionary leadership.

Plan Bay Area extends this legacy of leadership, doing more of what we’ve done well while also mapping new strategies to face future challenges. In 2008, California’s landmark climate law — Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg) — required all metropolitan regions in the state to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks and accommodate all needed housing growth within the boundaries of their region. Plan Bay Area meets this challenge head on — without compromising local control of land-use decisions.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter is an executive summary of the elements of the draft of Plan Bay Area, highlighting the process of developing the Plan and outlining the goals and challenges we must face as a region:

- Building upon local plans and strategies;
- Setting our sights on the challenge by emphasizing an open and inclusive public process;
- Looking toward the future so that today’s decisions align with tomorrow’s expected transportation and housing needs;
- Building a development pattern that aligns with where we live and work; and
- Achieving key performance targets.

Read Introducing Plan Bay Area:Strategy for A Sustainable Region, and tell us what you think about the draft Plan Bay Area overall.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 347

Participants: 58

Hours of Public Comment: 2.9

29 participants posted comments
Mr. Ezra Rapport, Executive Director
Association of Bay Area Governments
101 Eighth Street
Oakland CA 94607

May 16, 2013

SUBJECT: Comments on Plan Bay Area Draft EIR and Draft Plan

Dear Mr. Rapport:

The Marin Conservation League has been involved in land use and conservation planning throughout Marin County since our founding in 1934. MCL's efforts have contributed substantially to creating and preserving the abundance of public parks, open space lands and productive agricultural resources which attracts visitors to the County from all over the world. Marin’s remarkable abundance of natural beauty and parklands is all the more significant to the region because it lies near the heart of one of the world’s great metropolitan areas.

MCL has been tracking the evolution of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (Plan Bay Area, or “Plan”) from the outset of the SB 375 process and has commented on previous scenarios and the scope of the DEIR. We understand that the basic mandate of SB 375 is to influence future land use development patterns, housing, jobs, and transportation investments so as to accommodate anticipated regional population and job growth in a manner that will reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions.

We appreciate the opportunity to present, first, our general comments on the Draft Plan and planning process, followed by more detailed comments on the Draft EIR.

General Comments on Plan and Plan Process

1. MCL Applauds Plan Bay Area’s Recognition That Marin Should Be a Low Growth Area. A fundamental premise of Plan Bay Area is that growth should be focused in the existing employment centers, namely, San Francisco, the South Bay (Silicon Valley) and the East Bay. This approach is supported by the fact that each of these employment centers is presently served by extensive and robust public transit systems. MCL supports the goal of focusing growth: (1) as compact infill in or near existing job centers to minimize urban sprawl, and/or (2) near major public transit systems such as BART or CalTrain. The conclusion that Marin should be a low growth area follows from this basic approach. Marin is not a major employment center and does not have a public transit network that is anywhere as robust as the other areas. In addition, we note that
because of its geography and water supply, Marin has limited growth potential. An important goal of SB375 is to preserve open space and parklands and this, too, supports the recognition that Marin should be a low growth area.

MCL fully recognizes that Marin County is part of a large metropolitan area and, as such, enjoys both the benefits and responsibilities of being a part of that region. MCL is particularly interested, however, in how Plan Bay Area might impact Marin County. In view of Marin’s distinctive geography and the long-established resource lands that make up almost 85 percent of the County, future growth in the County is highly constrained by limited available land. Even without urban growth boundaries (Novato is the only community with an UGB), Marin’s communities have little space to grow. Therefore, it is appropriate that the Plan has assigned Marin the lowest growth in jobs and households of any county in the regional planning area. This assignment recognizes that Marin is unique in that its public park and open space lands and agricultural resources benefit the entire Bay Area in environmental, economic, and equity terms. Even at that low growth rate, the employment projections for Marin exceed historic growth rates and are overly ambitious. Marin has other limits to growth: water supply is finite except where conservation and efficiency can free up in lieu supply, and extensive developed and undeveloped portions of the eastern county are susceptible to current flooding and future sea level rise.

2. Sea Level Rise. MCL is disappointed that Plan Bay Area fails to adequately address sea level rise. Despite California’s leadership in attempting to address climate change, it is now clear that the sea level will rise over the next few decades and that we face storms of greater frequency and intensity. It is essential that we begin planning for this eventuality rather than defer planning to an unspecified future time. We believe it would be tragic to channel any substantial development into areas that are subject to flooding now, and are vulnerable to future flooding. This is a very critical flaw in the Plan.

3. Feasibility and Certainty of Plan Strategy. The intent of employing land use as a means to reduce dependence on cars and light trucks, and thereby reduce GHG emissions, is an admirable goal. MCL questions, however, both the feasibility and the certainty of the Plan in realizing this intent. The process for projecting growth, employment, housing and related elements based on modeling is too complex to yield meaningful results. Moreover, the modeling employed to achieve the Plan integrates assumptions having a high degree of uncertainty, particularly since they rely on actions that are beyond the control of local, regional, and State government. For example, as noted below, it appears that the population and employment growth numbers for the Bay Area are excessive and completely out of line with historical data. The consequence of using these higher numbers causes the Plan to overstate the need for housing. This, in turn, causes the Plan to open up more areas to development than will be necessary,
thereby putting developers in the driver's seat when it comes to deciding where development will occur.

The DEIR addresses this somewhat, but what it says is not encouraging. First, as the DEIR points out (Page ES-11), MTC and AGAB cannot assure future development patterns since they cannot regulate local land use policy or zoning. This lack of authority is also the primary reason given for finding most of the 39 potentially significant impacts in the DEIR unavoidable, in that the regional agencies cannot require local jurisdictions to impose mitigation measures. Second, even if compact development patterns do successfully bring housing, jobs, and retail in close proximity, served by transit, no one can predict with certainty the extent to which residents will occupy nearby jobs, or choose to use public transit if jobs are distant. In spite of these uncertainties and the Plan's reliance on a host of other assumptions about future conditions, the Plan is confident that the goals and targets will be met (or, in the case of several voluntary goals, not met).

The DEIR states that with Plan implementation and growth estimates, there will be a per capita decrease in Btu consumption of about 1%. While this is certainly better than an increase, we question whether the effort was worth it, given the extraordinary planning effort and funds expended by the Plan to achieve such a minor reduction.

4. Need For Better Coordination Between Land Use and Transportation Elements.

Plan Bay Area does not adequately integrate its land use planning mandates with a transportation investment strategy. These should go hand-in-hand. For example, PDA’s should not be designated based on uncertain future transportation investments. Moreover, the Plan does not appear to recognize or reconcile the process for evaluating investments in transportation projects with the process for making housing investments. The Plan often treats all public transit systems as being equal. Access to an infrequent local bus service with one route is quite different than access to BART.

5. Affordable Housing. A goal of the Plan (and requirement of SB 375) is to provide housing within the region that is affordable to all economic levels, and to better align jobs with housing supply. MCL recognizes the need for diverse and affordable housing and supports such housing if it is developed in appropriate locations, i.e., as infill, accessible to transit and services, and without impacts on sensitive resources and public facilities. We understand that RHNA numbers have an independent origin and that SB 375 simply brings them together with transportation investments and a land use strategy that attempts to incentivize the development of affordable housing in a compact pattern, primarily within PDAs. Ultimately, however, locating affordable housing will depend on the availability of sites, local planning decisions, cost considerations and funding, willing developers, and receptive neighbors – a complex set of variables. In
one way or another, affordable housing is typically subsidized in one manner or another – whether in the form of direct payments to the developer, tax incentives, or accepting burdens on public facilities that would otherwise not be allowed. The Plan should evaluate the availability of money to pay for these subsidies. So we question the feasibility of promising to “house 100 percent of the region’s projected growth (from a 2010 baseline year) by income level.” (Plan, Page 19.) We also question the advisability of trying to force that goal. Housing prices will continue to be high in the Bay Area, and many commuting job holders will continue to opt for more affordable housing outside the region. Moreover, many people may opt for a larger home further from work than a small unit nearby.

The Plan should expand its definition of “housing units” to be counted, given the growing population of seniors and the limited supply of senior housing. To achieve equity goals, senior, assisted, 2nd and converted units should be included in those counted by the Plan in order to provide 100% housing for this population and to allow Plan incentives to encourage their construction in addition to brand new construction of multiple unit structures.

6. Four-year Plan Review. The Plan states that it is a work in progress that will be updated every four years (Page 121), but provides no further details as to how this might occur. For example, will interim targets be set so that progress (in four years) can be measured? And if targets are not being met, will they be adjusted and require shifting commitments of funds or land use decisions? Would such adjustments require further CEQA review if new impacts are identified or known impacts made more severe? How will local jurisdictions with limited resources be expected to adjust decisions every four years, a cycle that is unique to Regional Transportation Plan process but does not correspond to RHNA or other planning cycles? The adopted Plan should outline this process more clearly.

7. The Plan as a “Platform for Advocacy” to Modernize CEQA. MTC and ABAG purport to be strong supporters of the original goals of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and yet the Plan sponsors propose to wade into current legislative debate over active CEQA bills as “advocates,” with incomplete evidence and an obvious bias. (Plan, Page 129-130.) It is enough that SB 375 has outlined mechanisms and conditions for streamlining CEQA as an incentive to promote new housing and commercial buildings. It is highly inappropriate for the Plan, whose life span is 25 to 30 years into the future, to become a “bully pulpit” for advocacy where differing legislative views are still in play.

MCL believes that, rather than weakening CEQA, current legislative efforts should focus on strengthening a number of sections of the Act. A recent analysis of California’s
8. Public Outreach. Throughout the planning process, MCL has been frustrated by the apparent inability of ABAG and MTC to communicate effectively with the general public. The Plan claims to be the product of a highly collaborative process of surveys, stakeholder sessions, public workshops and meetings, and “countless other means” of communication. It is possible that the majority of these meetings involved local planning professionals and elected representatives, leaving much of the task of public outreach in the hands of local governments. Unfortunately, the opportunities for ABAG and MTC staff to hear directly from the general public have been limited to a few large, highly programmed public meetings and workshops, where listening has not been matched by responsiveness to public concerns. As a consequence, to ordinary citizens and non-profit organizations like MCL, the outcome has seemed pre-ordained from the beginning. The short time allowed to digest and to respond to the Draft Plan and a huge Draft EIR has done nothing to dispel that perception.

General Comments and Questions on Draft EIR

1. Areas of Known Controversy, and Issues to be Resolved (DEIR page ES-11 and 12)

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the Executive Summary section of the Draft EIR provides a list of known controversial issues raised by the public and agencies, and a list of issues to be resolved. MCL agrees with the listed issues, but wishes to add several other controversial issues that have been raised by many individuals and public agencies, and/or are in need of resolution, as follows:

- The jobs, population, household, and housing numbers forecast for the Bay Area as a whole and for specific communities are considered by many to be too high. MCL continues to believe that the Plan overstates growth for the Bay Area as a whole, as well as for Marin. Inflated population growth could lead to excessive development outside PDAs and to unintended sprawl. Given the critical role that population and job growth numbers play in forecasting housing needs, it is vital that the discrepancies between ABAG forecasts, Department of Finance forecasts and historical trends be resolved before major funding or planning commitments are made, such as rezoning.

- Loss of local control over general plan policies, zoning, and community character is the most-often-cited area of controversy. This point is raised in the second bullet, Page ES-11, which acknowledges public concerns about possible conflict with existing plans and local regulations, but nowhere in the Plan is it made clear that the Plan can only recommend and offer incentives in the form of grants and CEQA streamlining, but is
otherwise has no authority over local land use decisions. The relationship between regional authority and local control needs to be more explicitly stated.

- Local traffic congestion is attributed to regional growth and not to transportation improvements, and is therefore considered by the DEIR to be less than significant (DEIR, Page 2.14-14). Yet this issue has been raised by the public frequently as an inherent and pervasive consequence of the Plan (i.e., as a “paradox of densification”). Notwithstanding the goal of the Plan, which is to reduce vehicle miles overall, more concentrated housing and commercial development in PDAs promoted by the Plan will increase local congestion on collectors and arterials. These local facilities are not included in regional traffic models or are unlikely to be improved through transportation investments. This will be a continuing area of controversy.

2. Use of EIR as first tier program document. Page 1.1-11 states that the EIR can be used as a first tier document for environmental review of specific development or transportation projects. Unlike typical program EIRs, such as on local general plans or on comparable projects within a region, this EIR analyzes conditions at a high level of generality and therefore misses many local and subregional contextual elements necessary for analyzing development projects in or out of a PDA. The Plan EIR provides broad cumulative analysis (it is a cumulative EIR by definition), but does not provide an adequate program coverage of most CEQA issues. Given the generality of the EIR, it should not be used as a first tier document.

3. Mitigation: The DEIR provides an abundance of mitigation measures under every topical area and admits that many are advisory, for consideration by project sponsors of individual projects – that is, MTC and ABAG cannot require local implementing agencies to adopt them. At the same time, the DEIR, Page 1.1-3, Para. 1 under Mitigation, states that in those cases where MTC and ABAG do not have regulatory or approval authority (the majority of potentially significant impacts) that Project sponsors shall (emphasis added) commit to mitigation measures at the time of certification of their project environmental review documents . . . and that these commitments obligate project sponsors to implement measures that would minimize or eliminate significant impacts pursuant to CEQA.” Para. 2 further notes that projects taking advantage of CEQA Streamlining provisions must apply the mitigation measures to address site-specific conditions” if impacts are to be reduced to levels of insignificance. Since MTC/ABAG cannot require local implementing agencies to adopt mitigation measures, the DEIR finds these impacts significant and unavoidable.

The last sentence of paragraph 1 states that “MTC shall be provided with status reports of compliance with mitigation measures.” How will MTC possibly track implementation of projects throughout the Bay Area to ensure that “status reports” are submitted? Will this
requirement apply only to projects that take advantage of CEQA streamlining provisions, or does it apply to myriad other projects and jurisdictions over the life of the plan? Will this be a transparent public process, and if so how will MTC report on compliance? These two paragraphs raise a multitude of questions about whether potentially significant impacts, all of which are cumulative in nature, will be mitigated and by whom. The DEIR takes a conservative approach and identifies 39 significant unavoidable impacts, either because the regional agencies lack authority, or because the effectiveness of mitigations cannot be assured. Therefore, there is no guarantee that significant cumulative impacts will ever be mitigated.

4. Alternatives. The small differences across alternatives for many of the targets should be interpreted carefully, in that they rely on a host of assumptions about prevailing economic, political and technological conditions expected in 2040. When these assumptions are combined, the resulting lack of certainty prevents identifying clear-cut differences across the range of alternatives. DEIR ES-9 states that “Variation in impacts among alternatives are minor.” Given that outcome differences are so minor, we must ask if the Alternatives offered are really alternatives, or just very minor variations on the basic Plan Bay Area theme. The FEIR should provide alternatives that are distinctly different from the Plan. MCL previously submitted comments on alternatives that it believes the DEIR should have considered, but all of the alternatives identified by MCL were ignored. Indeed, it appears that ABAG never even considered MCL's comments.

Detailed Comments on the DEIR

1. Climate Change and Sea-level Rise. The ramifications of climate change and consequent sea level rise are of central importance to the feasibility of the Plan. The Plan defers solutions to an unspecified future time. The subject receives considerable attention in the DEIR, and for that reason MCL focuses it comments on that topic. (Page 2.5-22, et seq.) A number of existing laws and regulations are aimed at reducing GHGs, but it is not clear which of these are incorporated into the estimates for GHG reductions to be achieved by the Plan? When the reductions required by existing laws are accounted for, what is the actual reduction due to the Plan? If the Plan just acts to support enacted legislation, the FEIR should estimate the GHG reductions without that support and evaluate whether the reduction due to the Plan alone justifies the complex, expensive and ongoing implementation of the Plan.

(Page 2.5-41) The DEIR takes the position that under the 2011 Appeals Court decision in the Ballona case, CEQA does not require analyzing the effects of the environment on the project in an EIR. We believe that this is a narrow decision and is distinguishable because placing development in an area subject to sea level rise will inexorably have an
environmental impact. Specifically, once sea level rises, either measures will be taken to protect the development, which measures will have environmental impacts, or the development will be abandoned, requiring the need for replacement housing, which likewise will have impacts. We anticipate that Ballona will not stand, and that the California Supreme Court or the State Legislature will have the last say on this important issue. Nonetheless, the DEIR does analyze these impacts comprehensively “for informational purposes.” It would be irresponsible not to do so, in that the low-lying areas around the Bay contain significant transportation corridors and infrastructure and are home to Bay Area residents and businesses. More than a few PDAs coincide with these areas. Planned enhancements, expansions and improvements under the proposed Plan (DEIR 2.5-49) will require some form of flood protection – whether engineered structures like a levee or flood wall, managed retreat, or other strategy. These related projects should be evaluated on a regional basis and their impacts comprehensively assessed across all CEQA topics, including cumulative impacts. The impact of repairing facilities in the event of flooding from sea level rise should also be anticipated in the EIR.

(Page 2.5-67) Recognizing the importance of this issue to the Plan, the DEIR recommends mitigations for proposed transportation projects (and land use development) subject to regular inundation by midcentury sea level rise, but these appear to be “plans to make a plan.” That is, the DEIR recommends continued collaboration with BCDC and provides a long list of adaptation strategies that might be considered in the future. In effect, it defers mitigation to project-level and/or local planning. The FEIR should provide more rigorous regional and subregional approaches that avoid or aggressively reduce project areas and transportation improvements in areas susceptible to sea level rise.

(Page 2.5-76) Further, given the likelihood of continuing sea level rise past midcentury and projected greater impacts over time, the FEIR should give a reasonable time frame in which to address sea level rise beyond mid-century, allowing sufficient time to assess and implement, the best adaptation strategy. (Page 2.5-67) The discussion of mitigations should also to assess the economic feasibility of such strategies. Otherwise, impacts from sea level rise would make significant portions of the Plan impractical. (Page 2.5-62) Table 2.5-11 shows the percentage of proposed transportation projects that will be inundated by midcentury sea level rise. Whether it is 5% or 100% may be unrelated to the GHG emissions associated with solving the problem, including the need to reroute to avoid the area completely and/or to replace/repair affected projects. The FEIR should estimate the regional increase in GHG emissions associated with solving sea level rise inundation issues for the Plan’s proposed projects.

(Page 2.8-34) Impact 2.8-7 deals with the 100-year flood hazard zones as mapped by...
FEMA. Do such areas account for projected sea level rise? If not, using these zones to assess impacts for a Plan that extends to 2040 is inadequate and misleading. The FEIR should describe how these zones will be changed when sea level rise is factored in and reassess the magnitude of impact for the region. Tables 2.5-16-21 show different areas affected by midcentury sea level rise inundation zone. Does the “inundation zone” account for storm surge as well as mean high tide levels? If not, the tables should be expanded to show storm surge impacts.

2. Land Use and Physical Development.

Chapter 2.3. The Tables below are provided showing the Plan’s impact on different kinds of acreage. The FEIR must provide mapping that shows where these impacted acres are located so that the public can ascertain whether they are correct. Our initial impression is that the numbers are wrong. If these numbers are found to be inaccurate, significant questions are raised about the accuracy of the numbers in the whole document, which should then be double checked. In particular, we request sources of data and mapping to support the numbers provided for Marin in the following tables:

- Table 2.3-10 – PDA & BCDC Priority Use area acres of overlap. 110 acres could be so affected in Marin.

- Table 2.3-13 - Protected Open Space acres potentially affected by Proposed Development, by County. 135 such acres could be affected in Marin.

- Table 2.3-15. Farmland acres potentially affected by proposed transportation project, by County. 88 acres in Marin could be so affected.

- Table 2.3-16 – Williamson Act acres potentially affected by proposed Transportation Projects, by County. 47 acres could be so affected in Marin.

- Table 2.3-17. Protected Open Space acres potentially affected by proposed transportation projects, by County. 31 such acres could be affected in Marin.

- Table 2.3-18: Forest & Timberland acres potentially affected by proposed development, by County. For Marin, 255 acres (19% of County forest & timberland) could be affected.

ES-23 & 2.3-51, Impact 2.3-4 discusses the conversion of substantial acres of important farm land, land under Williamson Act, and Open Space. Why not take these areas out of the Plan and eliminate these impacts? What percentage of the whole Plan acreage is involved here? What percentage of housing units and GHG emissions reductions are accounted for in the proposed use of these areas that are so vital to the continuation of local agriculture?
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Page 2.3-53. Where there is forest removal, the FEIR should provide figures showing the impact on CO2 reduction due to loss of this resource, compared to lower GHG emissions achieved by developing these areas as PDAs.

3. Biological Resources.

(Page 2.9-71, et seq.) In this section, a minimum 1:1 ratio is proposed for restoration and preservation of impacted resources, with the caveat that local policy shall prevail. Given the general rate of success of such efforts, the 1:1 ratio is inadequate. While the Plan cannot mandate local mitigations, it should recommend realistic mitigation by proposing a higher ratio.

(Page 2.9-72 & 79) Success standards are stated for some mitigations, e.g., special status communities, but not for others, e.g., trees (Page 2.9-79). The Plan should consistently state success standards for all proposed biological resource mitigations to ensure their application and subsequent monitoring that is meaningful.


(Page 2.12-48) The DEIR states that, on a regional basis, the major water agencies (with the exception of Solano County Water Agency) have adequate water supplies to serve expected growth under the proposed Plan. The ability to meet demand in a single dry year varies across the region, however, with some agencies anticipating a shortage in future years that will have to be made up either through conservation or developing new supplies. MCL has a particular interest in Marin Municipal Water District, whose supply sources are limited. The availability of water in Marin limits its growth potential. The District has consistently claimed a deficit by the year 2025. The DEIR, in contrast, states that land development through 2040 served by MMWD should have adequate water supplies in both regular and single drought years. The same measures are applied to all of the major water agencies. Climate change does not enter into this discussion nor does the possibility of two or more sequential drought years. For the region, about two-thirds of water supplies originate in the Sierra Nevada and Northern California and are either diverted from, pass through, or bypass completely, the Delta. In all these cases, projected decreases in the depth and location of the snowpack will influence the timing of runoff and ultimate quantity of stored water. In Marin, the possibility of sequential drought years poses a bigger threat to future water supplies. The DEIR should add analysis in this section that anticipates the consequences of climate change on precipitation patterns, including snow fall as well as sequential drought years, and their impact on regional and local water supplies.

5. Public Services and Recreation.
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(Page 2.14-14) The DEIR asserts that “congestion is not a result of the transportation improvement investment strategy, but rather of regional growth”…so “impacts on public services as a result of transportation improvements…are considered less than significant…no mitigation required.” By incentivizing more and denser housing and commercial space than currently allowed, the Plan is indeed responsible for some percentage of the increase in congestion across the region. The FEIR should offer mitigation. (See also Issues of Known Controversy, above).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Very truly yours,

David Schnapf, President
I have attended 4 PBA town hall meetings. I have also read the Draft plan. My input is that it's not OK to skim over the particulate matter (PM) reduction targets like they didn't mean anything. MTC needs to get more aggressive in addressing SB 375 goals both in planning and projects.

The bay area transit system is uncoordinated and redundant. There needs to be one transit planning agency that responds both to people's transportation needs, and also to spending transit funds for maximum effectiveness.

Consider that the Bay Bridge had a much higher people-moving capacity before 1958, when the trains were removed from the lower deck, yet, when rail was proposed for the bridge re-build, MTC didn't pursue this, even with the possibility of high-speed rail on the visible horizon.

The best way to address equity in planning is to set targets to reduce the jobs/housing imbalance. When you eliminate the need for a poor or working family to own a car, they save $5-8K/year. Today, many workers commute from the less expensive housing markets in the eastern counties to the richer job markets in Marin, Napa, and Sonoma Counties. This is a huge issue that needs addressing through more affordable housing developments, and making wealthier cities like Palo Alto and towns in Marin accommodate their fair share of below-market-rate housing. MTC's pandering to the NIMBY elements is not productive for anyone. Educating town populations that more density and mixed-use in their downtown areas is an asset for everyone, and supports the small businesses that give each town its character.

Freight and goods movement are a blaring omission from PBA, yet trucks are responsible for a large percentage of PM. Where is the plan to reactivate rail freight, and even electrify rail systems?

Turning HOV to HOT lanes also increases the number of cars using the freeways, and potentially slows lanes that can be used for rapid bus routes by filling them with toll-paying single-occupant cars. Why not toll the general traffic lanes instead?

This stuff moves us in a good direction, but trying to put a happy face on the plans failings insults the seriousness of the issues, and fails to address the health hazards and thousands of premature deaths resulting from PMs. The ideas presented aren't rocket science, and they are not even untried. Most European cities have had similar and stronger policies for years.

MTC needs to come up with some real solutions. The people of the Bay Area deserve a world class transportation system, and smarter planning.
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Name not shown inside San Francisco  May 13, 2013, 4:34 PM

I am personally a proud, long-time resident of the Bay Area, and happy to see that -- for the first time -- there's a comprehensive plan that looks at the entire 9-county region wholistically. We are an inter-dependent economy dependent on one environment, and I appreciate this effort to properly plan to accomodate our expected population growth in a way that provides increased housing and transportation options, but in a less consumptive land use pattern.

1 Supporter
As a service to the Bay area, Plan Bay Area fails:

a. Plan Bay Area will support "building" more high-density housing. The fundamental problem is just it will actually be less affordable to the people who live in it based on the transfer costs involved and the larger amount of low-income funds required from recipients, fixed-in persons, etc.

b. It is advocating 'regionalization' which takes away from the individuality of cities and towns, imposing concepts of a one-size-fits-all mentality and some idea that bigger is better. Those two concepts are flawed, unforgiving and not keeping with the spirit that is an American. Citizens' want their area uniqueness to be the draw bringing people who will enjoy, expand and advocate for something they like, relate to and desire for a future.

c. Developers, financiers, bankers--the 1%--will get richer for building the properities, but people in poverty will be required to sink more of their limited income into transportation than they do now. The ultimate result can only be ghetto's and squalor - not the intent of the richness and diversity that is American and the 9 Bay Area counties.

d. Given the propensity of some major 9 Bay Area cities to act as asylums for the poor and indigent aliens who cross borders without papers, the densification of housing will establish a slave corridor and those that follow it will become 'slaves' to the economic elite concocting this nonsense. The 9 Bay Area Plan needs economic development to sustain the area and importing low income, uneducated in lieu of persons who would actually have sufficient education, training and skills to advance the area is folly at best, stupidity as worst.

1 Supporter
I understand that the majority of comments for Plan Bay Area are those compelled to comment because of their resistance to change and inevitable growth of the Bay Area. I understand that there are climate change deniers, those who still live in the 1950s, and those who will "NIMBY" any proposed development for fear of the "other." However, those comments are not representative of the potential for the future of the Bay Area, and we can only anticipate changes by planning for growth in ways that are sustainable environmentally, socially, and economically to continue to make the Bay Area the best place to live.

I strongly support Plan Bay Area. I support that it prioritizes our existing transportation system, that it focuses on growth in the areas that can already support it, and that it emphasizes the One Bay Area Grant program to incentivize more transit oriented development.

I have two suggestions:

(1) I encourage the MTC to add elements of the Equity, Environment, and Jobs alternative, as it adds more homes in areas with more jobs, schools, and transportation while also focusing on a stronger public transit. Politically, this alternative is one of the most challenging, so…

(2) I encourage ABAG and MTC to find more political will from elected officials and residents who will be most affected by the plan (ie, those who will still be alive in 2040), who both have huge stakes in it. Our elected officials have the privilege to promote the plan as a more sustainable future, and the young residents have the biggest stakes for how they see the region over the next decades. Thank you.

6 Supporters
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I just posted this to my Nextdoor.com neighborhood blog for the San Miguel neighborhood in Sunnyvale, but it pretty much summarizes my overall view of "the plan": "Although I generally agree with the stated goals of this plan, I don't think it's a good idea for Sunnyvale to sign onto any regional "master plan" that would sacrifice local planning and oversight of development issues. My guess is that Sunnyvale will be tagged as a "high-income / high-cost" city and will thus be forced to accommodate more low-income housing at the high densities that adherence to this plan requires. Although I recognize that housing affordability is a real problem (and I'd love to see the city require more BMR units for ownership and affordable rental units mixed into new market-rate developments), I think that developing large blocks of designated low-income housing is just asking for trouble down the road. Furthermore, if you look at the areas of Sunnyvale that are being targeted in this plan, you'll see that they are talking about the North-East Sunnyvale ITR areas (i.e. OUR NEIGHBORHOOD). Unfortunately, these areas already bear the burden of supporting the highest concentrations of poverty in the city. You will not find a statistic anywhere illustrating the benefits of concentrating poverty and how much more manageable a city becomes in doing so, because in fact the truth is the exact opposite. If we're going to get involved in this level of social engineering, our focus should be on economic INTEGRATION wherever possible, not low-income CONCENTRATION; otherwise we'll just be investing in the ghettos of the future.

Another issue is that the reality of business economics in the U.S. does not support the European / Asian urban model of commercial space supported by adjoined high-density housing supplying resident shoppers. Although many "mom-and-pop" or small local-chain restaurants seem to hold their own in the Bay Area, there is no way for small businesses selling goods or groceries to compete with the mega-chains. This is unfortunate, but again it's a reality that is only getting worse. Almost every neighborhood strip mall in the valley suffers from multiple vacancies due to this problem, and one has to look no further than the Tasman Crossing area and the recent failure of "Fresh and Easy" (a fairly large international chain, no less) to illustrate how this phenomenon can send site-focused and neighborhood planning into disarray. Again, I wish this were not the case, but it is the existing reality and I fear that even the best attempts at urban planning will fall victim to it.

Also of note (pg. 108) is that this plan openly allows for REGRESSIONS rather than improvements in the areas of household income consumed by transportation and housing, fatalities and injuries due to collisions, and highway and transit maintenance. In other words they ultimately admit that in terms of overall quality-of-life, we'll just be "getting it wrong" on a grander scale. All environmental issues aside (and yes these do matter a lot to me), I think Sunnyvale is better off staying out of this mess. The more you read of this plan, the more it will reveal itself as a sweetheart deal for big developers.
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with a thin veneer of "greenwashing". "By the way, I'm a city-loving, Leaf-driving, die-hard liberal who will gladly side with the Tea Partiers and general Gov't haters on this issue. This plan is a turd in gift wrap!

2 Supporters
Here are several comments on “Smart Growth” in general:

Where’s the water going to come from? The Bay Area experienced a severe drought in 1997 and there’s no new supply. Residents are expected to bear the responsibility through expensive (and non-workable) solutions such as low flow toilets and shower heads and high efficiency washers.

Where’s the garbage going to go? San Francisco is already planning to export its garbage to a new landfill 100 miles north of the city.

Where’s the new transportation? Mass transit is totally inadequate for the existing population and only 9% use transit for commute travel. However the MTC has been using bridge tolls for so called “Transit Oriented Development”. But there is no effective transit to handle the growth. The remainder of the commuters use their cars and more freeways will be required to handle the growth.

High density and transit oriented development has ruined the quality of life in San Francisco and the city is becoming just another Los Angeles.

More population growth is unsustainable and any plans for managing it through Smart Growth are just plain nonsense.

3 Supporters
The visioning sessions for this Draft were pre-set with pre-set questions and no real or authentic citizen participation. How can the results from such sessions produce anything valuable in a Draft? Besides, the bureaucrats involved in this Plan are trying to ban any comments that really show who they are and why they are doing what they are doing. There are no "civil" or "nice" words to describe them or this Plan.

2 Supporters
This plan utterly violates everything I understand as my rights as an American and violates everything I understand as to what is a community. A bunch of unelected bureaucrats deciding my future, my friends' futures, my children's futures, my business, and my living conditions --- ain't anything I call American and ain't anything I want.

4 Supporters
Some have complained that the MTC process is undemocratic and it is attempting to force an unwanted urban lifestyle on suburbanites. Yet, for the decades that MTC underinvested in cities and built a vast highway network coupled with a rotten transit system, we heard not a peep from these people. In other words, the issue is not "democracy"; it's about getting what you want by any means.

I've been a veteran of the MTC planning process for three decades, and I can tell you it's no more undemocratic now than it ever was; it was always undemocratic. They built a highway system largely because real-estate promoters wanted it and made clear to politicians that if they wanted to get elected, they better build what those promoters wanted. I've funneled numerous comments to MTC in countless hearings and submissions, containing many ideas including many of very low cost, as to how transportation could be improved in the Bay Area. I've been blown off every time. I'm convinced that no Commissioner has EVER read ANYTHING I wrote. In most hearings, they're barely paying attention, often playing with phones and laptops. MTC promises to respond to every communication, yet my letters are routinely ignored. If you are a commenter on this site and you think even a single commissioner or other elected official will EVER read ANY of this material, you're fooling yourself. Those constituents who really count: primarily the corporate sector such as the Silicon Valley Manufacturers Association and the like, make their desires known in let us say more private settings. You'll notice that these "workshops" never have ANY (identified anyway) corporate representatives. They know perfectly well that these workshops are a farce and that nobody is listening. So is public comment of this type. Thus, my comments here are not directed towards MTC, ABAG, etc; it's directed towards YOU.

These public workshops are invariably conducted by a consulting company whose employees know nothing about transportation; their only duty is to keep order and move the process along a pre-determined track. In that, I agree with the suburban complainers. Where we differ is that I experienced all this while supporting public transit, and those car-centric complainers on this site are whining that now THEY aren't being listened to. Great! Welcome to the club. Now you're getting some of your own medicine. How does it taste?

Now fact is that the Plan under discussion will not force zoning changes, in particular MTC promised that no single-family area will be changed (unless residents want it of course). SO what's the beef? If you want to live in auto heaven, do so. If you like sprawl'n'crawl, go ahead and crawl. So why are so many upset? First, some people disguised as "simple residents" (the "Joe the Plumbers" of the piece) are actually land developers or others who see more profit in current development patterns than in denser ones. Second, others believe sincerely, but mistakenly, that policies that go
against their desires constitute social engineering, but those which support their desires are "democratic" and "capitalist". This is probably due to what we might term "propinquity bias". Your friends have a life-style similar to yours, so you assume that EVERYBODY wants that life-style.

Yet, why does San Francisco - home of the hated "stack'n'pack" life-style about which the car-centric set is complaining - have higher real estate prices than anywhere else in the Bay Area? Communism? Get real. It's due to a good 'ol capitalist principle: the law of supply and demand. What this means is that the demand for San Francisco life-style is not being met by the supply. Therefore, logically, we should be building more places like San Francisco. Funny how the exact same people who go on and on about capitalism don't know even the first things about its principles and reject its conclusions the moment it indicates something they don't like.

Let's deconstruct "social engineering". Once a couple decades ago I was at, guess what, an MTC hearing attended by many politicians. After putting in my two cents, strongly supporting public transit and criticizing highway construction, the mayor of San Pablo got up and said (directed to my comments): "What you are proposing is social engineering". I replied, "Yes, Mayor. Why did you offer yourself as a candidate for Mayor if you didn't want to do some social engineering? What policies are NOT social engineering?" He sat down.

Even a policy to do NOTHING is still a decision. There will always be those who object to anything. The modern crisis of America, probably most clearly seen right now in the high-speed rail debate, is the legions of do-nothing, sky-is-falling, tax-whining, we're-doomed losers who are blocking any progress at all. The result? Endless paralysis while China builds thousands of miles of high-speed rail. These do-nothings are right in one sense: America IS doomed, as long as it listens to these people who are so frightened of change that if they lived in 1900 they'd be condemning electricity. After all, weren't candles more common then, so they were the "democratic" choice?

7 Supporters
A severely polarized debate in which both parties seem to be highly vocal minorities. For better or for worse, transportation and development policy are taken for granted or otherwise not considered very much by the general public. One possible reason for this is that they are very complicated, relatively unscientific fields which have to make great leaps toward what might happen in an unpredictable future.

Folks, this is why we elect officials to take care of these issues, and why they in turn appoint professionals to study the complexities of these systems, not simply “unelected bureaucrats.” I’m not saying the general population isn’t smart enough; they simply don’t have the time to properly educate themselves on the complex web of competing financial, economic, social and environmental concerns. It would be rather foolish to think we should all be voting directly on such a variety of policy issues.

Does MTC think they have all the answers in their plan? Certainly not. There is no “right” answer. There is no “reliable” prediction about 2040 or even 2014. Most of them are simply doing the best they can with the info they have available. They have to make some practical decisions about what’s feasible economically and politically.

Yes, I’m part of this community of professionals, a civil engineer, not a planner, though I probably am more knowledgeable on the issues (and their realities) than most. To those who figure I’m pro-MTC because I’ll benefit from their growth plans, you’re wrong. I’m needed whether we let our infrastructure fall apart around us, continue to build roads every which way, or attempt to improve on the status quo.

There is good reason to be wary of what planners tell us. They “socially experimented” with America while advocating sprawl for decades, creating the car-culture and fenced in lawn lifestyle so many defend or hate vehemently to today.

But one thing is clear to those who actually understand the costs of our infrastructure and subsequent lifestyle: it’s going to get worse if we don’t start changing direction. We’re going to be paying more for over-built, inefficient transportation (roads). We’re going to be sitting in more traffic rather than at home enjoying whatever lifestyle it is we choose. We’re going to become even more economically segregated. We’re going to do more environmental damage. And we’re going to hurt are businesses by relying on infrastructure that is falling behind the rest of the world.

Something has to be done. There are growing demographics that need better options than the current system provides. The MTC policies aren’t taking away anything from the lifestyle you’ve chosen (we can’t just remove sprawl and force people into apartments), but I should be entitled to a safe bike ride home the same way you’re entitled to a safe drive. Yes, we all have to shoulder the cost of expanding our options,
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just like how I pay taxes toward roads and transit I don’t use. Let’s come together with constructive comments. Let’s put some trust in the professionals who are studying the alternatives and presenting us with the ones they feel will serve the overall community best.

4 Supporters
I very strongly support the overall goals of the plan - to promote smart growth, with walkable neighborhoods around transit stations. This will make cities more livable and more convenient. It will provide more transportation choices, reducing the economic burden of automobile ownership. It will reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, as required by state law.

It is unfortunate that some people are saying this is a top-down process. In reality, planning for smart growth is required by SB 375, passed by representatives of the majority of California voters. A small but very vocal minority has been attacking smart growth and attacking this planning process as undemocratic, but in reality, they are the ones who are trying to disrupt a decision that our democratically elected state government made when it passed SB 375. There is nothing democratic about a small minority that tries to disrupt and block the will of the majority.

Though I support the goals of the plan, I don't believe it goes far enough. It has two glaring defects:

-- It involves extensive highway widenings to create new HOT lanes, spending billions of dollars on new highway capacity that will only generate more traffic and weaken our attempt to control greenhouse gas emissions. Because it relies on an obsolete 1970s Caltrans policy that only allows newly added lanes to be used as HOT lanes, it also leaves gaps in the system of HOT lanes in the most congested parts of the Bay Area, which need those lanes most. Instead of building new lanes, the plan should convert existing mixed-use lanes to HOT lanes, saving billions of dollars that can be used for maintaining existing roads and providing better transit service.

-- It does not provide enough housing. MTC's goal is to build enough housing to reduce the cost of housing from the current 66% to 56% of the income of low-income families, but instead, this plan is projected to increase the cost of housing to 73% of income, putting a huge economic burden on low-income families. The plan should require more housing near transit nodes - including both affordable housing and market-rate housing. The only way to reduce the very high housing costs in the Bay Area is to build *much* *more* housing. The only environmentally sound way to build the needed housing is to locate it in walkable, transit-oriented neighborhoods.
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Name not shown inside Marin        April 24, 2013, 8:05 AM

Nobody has proven anywhere that the claims made by the plan are valid. In fact, I would suggest that by moving more people into a smaller area will create WORSE problems than the ones this plan is intending to solve. Even environmentalists should be wary of this plan as eventually they will not be allowed to use the land they seek to protect! And those who live in the wide open spaces will not be allowed to. This plan is an outrage and should be cut off at the knees.

2 Supporters
I support the Plan bay Area overall and think it can go further to provide equity for all.

Most Marin properties had this in their deeds:

"No portion of the property... shall be conveyed, transferred, let to, or held, Occupied or possessed by anyone other than a person of the Caucasian or White race. This indenture is upon the further condition and covenant (independently of the preceding paragraph) that no portion of said property shall be occupied or possessed, or used as a place or residence by any person not of the Caucasian or White race, but subject to the right of any occupant to have the customary and reasonable domestic servants of other races."

Most White homeowners benefiting from wealth growth through property accumulation did so when others, mainly Black residents and Latinos didn't have the same opportunities nor were treated equally under the law. That social engineering produced residents in Marin that have and those that have not.

Clearly the existence of restrictive covenants has helped shape the demographics in Marin County today, and certainly has had much to do with the large Black population existing in Marin City.

As noted by one long time Mill Valley resident, “In Marin County, we didn’t let supply and demand work fifty years ago, so now we have homes that are three times the cost of [those in neighboring counties], and now people don’t want to change because they are happy with their economic position if they own a house here.”

He pointed out that when people say that the expense of building affordable housing in Marin County is prohibitive so it should be built elsewhere, it is an old idea of outsourcing poverty to other areas. People employed in lower-paying jobs cannot afford to live in the area and must commute, increasing congestion.

All this, the resident claims, has profound practical and moral consequences for Marin County residents and future generations.

In our Marin County ABAG - MTC meetings we had East Bay and North Bay Tea Party interlopers agitating and spreading lies about Agenda 21 propaganda, using Tea Party Code words and phrases like Stack-n-Pack, Take Away Our cars, Force Us to Live in Apartments, Take our Homes. One of the interlopers was even in the John Birch Society's video that tried to connect sustainability and Agenda 21 to a Communist plot.

Their outbursts at our meetings actually prevented any constructive dialog and or solutions from coming forward. They just constantly were disruptive.
Then Marin's own version of Tea Party Republicrats created a coalition of White Homeowner groups under the banner of Citizen Marin, whose membership posted racist and homophobic images and articles on their websites and social media pages as well as promoting John Birch Society and Tea Party Talking points promoted by people in the John Birch Society anti-sustainability video, http://youtu.be/OzoN0IQsTAE

Due to the historic racism and transference of wealth from one group to another because of being excluded from equal rights under the law, I feel the Plan Bay Area can do more in Marin county to provide opportunity to the protected classes that have been prevented from participating fully in the fruits of society. I know I'm not alone in asking for both our local officials and our regional representatives to step up and do the right thing and ignore all the right wing propaganda about Agenda 21 nonsense, we already have a dysfunctional federal government due to the Tea Party, let's not let it happen locally.

2 Supporters
I agree that these two agencies have for years thought that they should be making all decisions and that the general population is not smart enough to call a halt to all this 'pie in the sky'.

My initial reaction is that anything proposed by these agencies are not in my best interests - not in the past, not now and not in the future. Mass transit will not work for many Californians since they do not live in dense enough population centers to make it worthwhile. Explain to me the cost benefits mass transit in our agricultural areas within the nine bay area counties. As I see it, why should I pay for and be forced into an unworkable lifestyle that I don't want and is based on the wishes of a few people.

1 Supporter
I am 100% in agreement on the goals of Plan Bay Area. I also think they are doing a terrible job on outreach. Unfortunately, people like me aren't being heard. I want and choose to live in a denser area with transit access. I would willingly give up my car if transit was more convenient. Now I regularly choose to ride transit because it is a more convenient option. If I had a family, my choice would be to live in a town home in a PDA. Some people it sees do not think I should have this choice. We have prioritized the opposite of my choice for the last 60 years. Why don't people like me have the choice to get what we want?

7 Supporters
Every home will have Solar Panels and a Wind Turbine on its roof.

Battery ENERGY DENSITY will be 10 times more than it is today. Thus every single family home will be generating more electricity than consumed.

Charging the electric car every night. Home insulation will become irrelevant.

Solar panels and wind turbines on the roof of an multi-family apartment building can never be enough to meet the needs of the multi-families below and will not be ENERGY COST EFFICIENT.

But Single-family houses will be net ENERGY PRODUCERS -- when multi-family cannot.

So OneBayArea's multi-family philosophy is going to make air-pollution and Global Warming WORSE! To find out how this will also facilitate CARBON SEQUESTRATION:

http://populationalert.org/GlobalWarming/wind_solar.htm

1 Supporter
"Plan Bay Area" aims to convey an aura of public participation and bottom-up democracy, but that is an illusion.

Those in charge have already drawn up their plans, with the real decision-making happening behind the scenes. This whole dog-and-pony show of public hearings, opportunity to post web comments, and so on, is designed to get public buy-in for that pre-determined outcome by making us feel like there has been a process in which our voices have been heard, when in fact we have no say.

There is a method of orchestrating public meetings called the Delphi Technique. It is being used by the backers of PBA to manipulate people into believing this plan is being formulated and revised with the public's input. This video explains the technique and shows it in action, documenting how forums supposedly about planners listening to the public are not actually meant to allow any public input that would alter the plan from their pre-determined goals:

<iframe width="560" height="315" src="http://www.youtube.com/embed/-zpA1althjo" frameborder="0" allowfullscreen></iframe>

[Much more below!]

Lots of tables, confident projections of future demographics, housing needs, and so on, make the PBA materials appear impressive, but the simple truth is that predictions of who's going to live in the Bay Area decades from now, how many jobs there will be in different cities, how much housing will be needed and of what types, etc., are nothing but guesses. Yet the manner in which the information is presented is designed to give the impression that these convenient projections are factually detailing a future that is guaranteed to occur as described.

Beneath all the hype, all the lip service paid to recognizing different "stakeholders", etc., the plan is designed to push a statist agenda of more taxes, more government spending, and more top-down control.

Crucial to understanding this is to know one's history. The history of government urban planning in the United States is steeped in racism and classism. It has led to the destruction of neighborhoods and lives, disproportionately those of poor people and minorities, to benefit a wealthy and politically connected government elite. "The Tragedy Of Urban Renewal" is a short video (under 7 minutes) that tells the story of one such planning project:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mWGwsA1V2r4&feature=share&list=PL72CB73E3DA157AD6
Introducing Plan Bay Area: Strategy for a Sustainable Region

What do you think about the draft Plan Bay Area overall?

When confronted with these historical facts, government officials today will typically assure you that neighborhood-destroying government redevelopment schemes of the kind documented above were tragic mistakes that won't be repeated. Yet they show little interest in holding anyone accountable, let alone analyzing the elitist attitudes that led to these "mistakes", to make sure they aren't repeated. Justin Hermann, the man who headed the redevelopment agency that destroyed San Francisco's primary African-American neighborhood, the Western Addition, in the 1960s, today has a prominent city plaza named after him. And redevelopment continues under other names and guises (aka "planning"), using methods that are less overtly racist, classist, and statist, but ultimately no less destructive. Most government officials remain addicted to power and control, thinking they know best; the cronyism and gravy-train mentality flourishes, as the economic situation grows ever bleaker and liberty is violated more and more routinely. They defiantly refuse to acknowledge or consider the growing mountain of evidence that freedom is fairer, more harmonious, and simply works better.

If we are to stop this elitist oppression, we must demand an honest public debate about the premises underlying this latest manifestation of "urban renewal", the Plan Bay Area/Agenda 21 being pushed in this region by ABAG (the Association of Bay Area Governments), and look at some of the realities ignored by their elitist assumptions:

• Elitist ABAG premise: People making their own voluntary economic choices without government interference is bad.

----> BACK TO REALITY: Worldwide data show that countries with more economic freedom have healthier economies with more jobs on average, more prosperity on average, better environmental protection on average, etc. See among other sites http://www.freetheworld.com/release.html .

• Elitist ABAG premise: Government planners know how to run your life better than you do.

----> BACK TO REALITY: Individuals know more about themselves, their families, their needs, their desires, etc., than government planners do, and attempts to impose top-down, one-size-fits-all solutions in the name of making things better have in fact caused massive suffering and economic harm. Watch the video linked above if you haven't already.

• Elitist ABAG premise: Using mass transit protects the environment, so we're going to restrict your other options.

----> BACK TO REALITY: Technology is making cars more and more environmentally friendly. Along with other emerging technologies like electric bicycles, Segways, and new innovations scarcely imagined by government planners (see e.g.
http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/03/general-motors-en-v/, this means that mass transit, with its large vehicles, sprawling stations, government control, and so on, is not necessarily going to remain more environmentally friendly than independent vehicular traffic in coming decades.

• Elitist ABAG premise: Only government can provide mass transit, so you need to pay higher taxes to fund it.

---> BACK TO REALITY: The truth is that government has effectively outlawed independent transit operators by subsidizing government-run competition to undercut their prices, burying them in bureaucratic regulations and expenses, etc. In San Francisco, MUNI essentially forced competing privately-run streetcar companies out of business in the early 20th century, and then once it had a monopoly, began jacking up rates from the 5 cents that was once the norm to $2 a ride today. Jitneys remain banned or highly regulated.

• Elitist ABAG premise: Single-family homes create urban sprawl, so we're going to restrict your options and try to force all but the elite into what we euphemistically call "multi-family housing" (i.e. big apartment buildings) and pretend that this is the way people from non-European cultures naturally want to live.

---> BACK TO REALITY: Attempts to engage in economic engineering produce unintended consequences, resentment, and blowback from the people whose choices you are trying to manipulate and whose lives you are trying to control. There are better and more creative ways to reduce sprawl that don't rely on top-down coercion. Eliminating or reforming zoning laws, so that people can make more efficient use of existing land and buildings, including more live-works spaces, farming on unused patches of urban land, allowing people to engage in small scale manufacture or retail sales out of residences or other spaces, and allowing property owners to easily subdivide their parcels and sell off or lease out small sub-parcels without onerous government permits or bureaucracy, would be a more market-oriented and more community-minded approach. Many existing streets are far wider than they need to be; areas around freeways and government buildings are often surrounded by large amounts of unused or underused land. Letting people homestead this wasted public land and turn it into farms, gardens, parking places, art installations, small retail booths, etc., will make urban areas much more walkable, livable, and interesting, giving people more reasons to want to live and work in these urban areas instead of trying to coerce them to do so by restricting development and taking away choices.

Isn't it time we had some real transparency and accountability from the people running ABAG and coming up with all these far-reaching plans to reshape the lives of Bay Area residents? Here are a few key questions to consider, and for which to demand answers:
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• What are their names of the planners, where do they live, what are their jobs, and how much are they being paid, including benefits?

• What are the planners’ ideological biases, what special interest connections do they have, and who put them in their positions?

• Which specific decisions have been made and are being made by which specific individuals?

• How do we replace those specific individual planners if we don't like the decisions they are making?

• What is the precise nature of the connection between "Plan Bay Area" and the United Nations' "Agenda 21"? (They'll say there is no connection, or downplay it, but without verification of full disclosure, the denials fall flat.)

• When do the various communities who will be affected by all this get to VOTE on "Plan Bay Area" as a whole, and on its various components?

Let me leave you with a couple quotes:

“If the natural tendencies of mankind are so bad that it is not safe to permit people to be free, how is it that the tendencies of these organizers are always good? Do not the legislators and their appointed agents also belong to the human race? Or do they believe that they themselves are made of a finer clay than the rest of mankind?”

– Frederic Bestiat

“Most people prefer to believe that their leaders are just and fair, even in the face of evidence to the contrary, because once a citizen acknowledges that the government under which he lives is lying and corrupt, the citizen has to choose what he or she will do about it. To take action in the face of corrupt government entails risks of harm to life and loved ones. To choose to do nothing is to surrender one's self-image of standing for principles. Most people do not have the courage to face that choice. Hence, most propaganda is not designed to fool the critical thinker but only to give moral cowards an excuse not to think at all.”

– Michael Rivero

6 Supporters
I have attended a Plan Bay Area "community" meeting. It was quite obvious from the start of the meeting that the officials (!) holding the meeting weren't the least bit interested in hearing what the people of the community thought about the Plan. The officials only wanted the meeting held in order to tell all of us who attended what THEY thought about the Plan. It was a total sham and a waste of community time. I've read what others are posting about Plan Bay Area and I agree 100% with all the negative comments made. This is clearly an attempt by so-called officials to ram Plan Bay Area down the throats of the various communities. There is absolutely no regard for what the people really and truly want. No concern for freedom or Constitutional rights. In short, Plan Bay Area is all about control. Control by "officials" over the people of the communities. I have no doubt it will be pushed through. What a shame and a pity for those of us who still believe in individual choice. Good-bye America as we know and love it. Hello Big Brother.

7 Supporters
I found out about PDA after digging through the 'Sunnyvale Sustainability' website. Buried in the information was an announcement about an 'outreach' meeting. I was shocked at the plans for our cities, decided by a few, with most citizens having no knowledge of it. I have discussed PDA with my neighbors and friends - none of them have ever heard of Plan Bay Area, and all were alarmed that this plan can take place without our vote. It seems you go about your 'business' of making drastic changes to our communities without the knowledge of the citizens. We are not given the right to vote on any of it. This plan defies our Constitutional rights. I strongly disagree with Plan Bay Area overall.

6 Supporters
I disagree with this plan overall. Grandiose planning done by intellectuals is never a substitute for the movements and choices of a free people.

In no way can you actually know what is best for those living under your planning umbrella.

There is no need to dictate other people’s life-choices and to tell others how to assemble or where to make their homes.

Whether you desire a certain outcome or not you have no right to design our lives for us.

5 Supporters
I attended the MTC/ABAG visioning session in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The goal seemingly was for public input. It did not take long to realize the public was being steered into the vision that MTC/ABAG wanted. Wishes of the public were totally ignored. Orinda citizens have been kept in the dark even though I have asked the City Council to hold Town Hall meetings to inform the electorate. Orinda has set aside a Priority Development Area (PDA) in Orinda without citizen participation. Within the past 15 months the Orinda Planning Commission has not agendized Plan Bay Area. Citizens are being denied the right to make local decisions for their communities. This MTC/ABAG rezoning without citizen input is the most important issue we have faced in Orinda. We fought England for local control. We fought other tyrannies like Hitler to prevent top down decisions, and now we have MTC/ABAG through Sacramento telling us how we should live based on their questionable figures and premises. My residential road has huge dangerous pot holes. We owe millions in unfunded liabilities for our fire district. The State owes billions in unfunded liabilities. Many actually paying taxes are moving out of state. Yet Sacramento comes up with new financial obligations for taxpayers based on ill conceived projections. Plan Bay Area is just about power, control and money. I say NO to the Plan Bay Area.

8 Supporters
I find myself in limbo with this entire philosophy. On the one hand the concept of helping lower income working families and seniors find affordable housing sounds grand. However when the concept is matched with the reality there is a major disconnect. The entire premise of supporting the lowering of GHG through high density housing is counter intuitive. I read a proposal from one resident offering a compromise of building suburban default density housing (20 units per acre plus density bonus, up to 35%) and offering an additional 10% bonus for only owning and using one vehicle per household. He was told that would be a dis-incentive to developers. So I ask if we really have such a huge need why is there no effort made to actually do anything that supports the contention? I have read numerous articles discussing this top down one size fits all plan and haven’t heard a single person address the needs of the current residents. Where are the resources being supplied for this grandiose scheme? Schools struggling to stay afloat, cities and towns barely able to provide basic services being asked to stretch past the breaking point and guess what all this new housing comes with a zero contributory tax base. It seems if I read the proposal correctly most developers make their profit and the rest is filled with 100% tax deferred incentives for wealthy investors. In almost every county study the major bulk of the housing is concentrated, not where the employment base is located but rather shuffled off away from the financially affluent enclaves. In many cases, like Marin and Sonoma, there is a vacuum of mass transit options and as in most cases folks are commuting in cars from their homes to these locations. Why isn't the state participating in this exercise? Why are towns and communities being thrown under the bus by Sacramento politicians who refuse to actually deal with GHG and reasonable, sustainable, integration of working families into our communities? This plan is another pass the buck, move it down the road failure. I believe it should be scrapped and a citizens committee formed to deal with real programs, with real solutions for real lower income and seniors and actually bring real housing in a sustainable manner instead of this imaginary feel good developer/investor give away.

2 Supporters
Plan Bay Area is based on several faulty assumptions. One assumption is that unelected bureaucrats should be making decisions regarding land use and housing that should be left to local elected officials and the free market. Another assumption is that these unelected bureaucrats are prescient enough to predict what will happen in the next 25 years.

There is no way this plan will succeed with heavy subsidies. ABAG and MTC do not respond to any feedback mechanisms. When public transit systems are a disaster, they recommend building more. When cars and roads are the preferred method of transportation they write policies to restrict parking and purposely cause congestion to "nudge" people out of their cars. When people don't want stack and pack housing in their communities, they insist that those types of units be built and punish towns by withholding road repair funds for non-compliance.

Unfortunately, this is not a Plan that will respond to public input. These arrogant bureaucrats will be forcing this down our throats and the Bay Area will become the Calcutta of California.

15 Supporters
I've noticed a geographic contrast in attitudes toward this plan. While I support most of the tenets and proposals of the plan in its current state, many of the strongly voiced opinions I read online are not in support of it. In particular I read variations of the view that Plan Bay Area "disempowers local governments and citizens." Regional planning inherently suggests some shift from local to regional decision making. Regional planning is not undemocratic, but democracy by its nature often supports the many at the expense of the few.

As a supporter of the plan and a resident of a semi-urban Alameda County neighborhood, I am also feeling disempowered. A case in point is last fall's Alameda County transportation measure B1. That measure, related to Plan Bay Area, lost by an estimated 721 out of the 527,403 votes cast in Alameda County. However, post-election analysis revealed that cities west of the hills overwhelmingly supported the measure, while cities east of the hills did not:

http://www.ebcitizen.com/2012/12/recount-for-measure-b1-is-short-lived.html

While voters in Albany, Berkeley, Oakland and parts of San Leandro and Hayward easily approved the transportation tax, a large swath of the electorate in the Tri Valley and Tri Cities failed to reach even 60 percent approval.

We Alameda County residents west of the hills are almost unable to tax ourselves! Perhaps much of the tension around this plan comes from too coarse a geographic granularity.

As someone who has happily resided in dense, transit-rich cities outside of the US, I wonder about what kinds of experiences inform the Plan Bay Area opponents. There are many possibilities afforded by measured increases in density, yet most of what I read is in fear of the worst cases. We Americans are notoriously insular and poorly traveled, though we have to acknowledge that one person's feast is another's appetizer. While Paris has an estimated density five times that of Washington DC, Paris is in many ways more livable:

http://thinkprogress.org/yglesias/2010/07/01/197745/paris-denser-than-you-think/

Measured increases in density do not always mean misery, and a house in the suburbs does not offer unequivocal freedom.

--Happily living in semi-urban north Oakland

8 Supporters
Introducing Plan Bay Area: Strategy for a Sustainable Region

What do you think about the draft Plan Bay Area overall?

Name not shown inside San Mateo  March 29, 2013, 11:30 AM

These are question that need to be asked, these are from another forum. I believe this utopian plan needs this question answered before it is implemented.

1. How much is each scenario going to cost?
2. What is social equity?
3. Why are we making decisions based on race?
4. Show me where in SB375 it says that social equity is a factor in reduction of GHG emissions?
5. What does race have to do with sustainability?
6. SB375 states that race, gender, color, etc. should not be taken into consideration. This is a violation of that bill and is completely un-American.
7. Why are we using social justice? I thought our country was founded on Equal Justice?
8. Isn't justice supposed to be bind?
9. If stack and pack housing is environmentally better why are the developers going to get GHG waiver?
10. If the point of SB375 is to reduce GHG emissions why are these stack and pack developments going to get CEQA (Calif. Environmental Quality Act)?
11. I read SB375 and nowhere in that document does it say that "Social Justice" should be used as a factor for the reduction of GHG emissions.
12. Assuming you get people to live in these stack and pack villages. How are you going to force them not to use their cars?
13. How are you going to force people to work at businesses under the stack and pack housing?
14. How are you going to force companies to open up businesses on the bottom floor of these stack and pack buildings?
15. Are you going to require businesses to only employ people who live in the stack and pack buildings?
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16. Are you going to limit how far a person can drive to a job?

17. Are you going to raise toll bridge rates and parking rates to penalize drivers?

18. Are you going to eliminate parking to try to frustrate and change the behavior of people who drive?

19. Are you going to reduce the toll prices given that you just used of it to $179,000,000 to purchase a new building in SF for MTC and ABAG Headquarters?

20. How much money did you spend bringing President Clinton to Richmond last year? Over $150,000. Why are you wasting our tax payer money on this type of stuff?

21. Why are you trying to dictate how and where people will live and work? Shouldn't we the people be able to choose where we live and where we work?

22. Are these stack and pack units going to be subsidized with our tax payer money?

23. What if these units are not occupied and the development goes belly up? Will the tax payers be on the hook for these losses?

24. Will tax payer money be used to bailout/guarantee there will be no loss to the developer?

25. Do your population numbers include illegal aliens?

26. Once these stack and pack units are funded and built with tax payer money will the tax payers then have to also subsidize those that live there?

27. What impact will these high density units have on the schools as well as a local jurisdictions fire and safety needs?

28. How much money will it cost the local community to house, educate and provide community services to low income families that will be occupying these new stack and pack units?

29. What happens if a local jurisdiction says no?

30. Why is there no choice for Single Family Residential units in any of these plans?

31. How are you going to build stack and pack housing in PDAs where existing neighborhoods and/or businesses exist?

32. Will you be recommending rezoning? What will that do to the property values?
33. Will you be recommending shrinking the urban growth boundary to keep land owners from exercising their rights to develop their own properties?

34. Open space is not public land. It is private property. You do not have a right to dictate how someone else can and should use their private property.

35. The federal govt. owns over 50% of all the land in Calif. And over 85% of the land in Nevada. Why do they keep saying that there is not enough open space?

36. When the govt (uses tax payer money) to buy private property and then converts it to open space the property taxes for that property are lost. Why would we do that in a cash strapped state?

37. Why are you pushing to spend tax payer money to purchase land that will be unused and will reduce a local jurisdictions revenues?

38. What policies are you advocating to reduce the use of cars?

   a. Increased tolls? Parking? Reduce the number of parking spaces? Roundabouts? Toll roads?

39. Bicyclists do not contribute to the tax base for bicycle lanes. Gas taxes are used to repair roads. Are you suggesting that we divert gas and toll money to pay for bicycle lanes?

40. Bicycle riders make our roads more dangerous for drivers
It's disingenuous to ask us what we think of the plan when there is less than zero opportunity for us to modify it. Your decisions were set in stone before you asked our opinion. As usual, the wealthy areas are spared (Oh, to live in Orinda), and the poor or badly managed areas are burdened. Just like most HUD programs, your mindset is "Housing is enough". That's not true. Your high density housing plans contain a large % of very-low and low income, but there are no services to support the poor that you force into PDA zones. One question: How many people in working at ABAG and MTC live in PDA's? That will be my question at the town hall. The answer to that question is the litmus test to my hypothesis that the this plan is ABAG's calculated move to centralize poverty.

14 Supporters
Plan Bay Area takes highly questionable assumptions and projections, then inflates these into a utopian vision. In practical terms, Plan Bay Area amounts to a persecution of the middle class suburban population with over-regulation, high taxes, and micro-management of our lifestyles. The population and job growth assumptions are obviously inflated in order to justify the whole structure. The environmental assumptions are equally questionable, since global warming theory continues to lose scientific support.

Given this kind of bureaucratic over-reach, it's no surprise that California has the worst business climate of any of the 50 states. It's estimated that 250,000 businesses have left California in the last 10 years. We're losing population, too. For the first time since statehood, California lost a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives due to out-migration. The people who leave are mostly middle class taxpayers, homeowners, and small business owners. As a result, California is becoming increasingly bi-polar, a state with a small number of very wealthy residents, a shrinking middle class, and a swelling population of low income residents who depend on taxpayer subsidies. This is unsustainable.

Plan Bay Area purports to be all about sustainability, but the exact opposite is true.

13 Supporters
As much as I like the sound of the vision, the sad fact is that this plan is dis-empowering our local government and silencing the voice of it's citizens. I see this as a plan to crowd our cities and towns and remove it's historical character.

Very little consideration has been given to city/town infrastructure, with no plans to address our already over crowded schools & roads. No thoughts to over burdened city services such as water, sewage, police or fire fighters. No consideration for open space, or the impact to the environment and ever increasing traffic, noise, air or water pollution.

Where are the jobs for the proposed new residents who will occupy these compact "urban condos"? Where will their children play or attend school? How does this plan IMPROVE our quality of life?

The fact is, the wealthy will be impacted the least by this ill conceived plan to over populate our towns. Many of the wealthier Americans live on large, 1/2 acre or more plots of land outside the proposed locations for the new "stack and pack homes". Their children attend private schools. Their neighborhoods will not make room for the proposed stack and pack type housing, nor will they welcome a transit station.

I urge you to return the governance and planning of our cities and towns to it's citizens.

15 Supporters
Chapter 1: Setting Our Sights

What do you think about the "Setting Our Sights" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

All comments sorted chronologically
As of close of comment period, May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM
Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

MTC and ABAG tackled the assignment of crafting a draft plan to meet the challenges and opportunities of the coming quarter-century with enthusiasm — emphasizing an open and inclusive attitude and a commitment to analytical rigor. What are we aiming for in Plan Bay Area, and how can we measure our success in achieving it? The answer to this question guided our development of the draft Plan Bay Area.

Before proposing a land use distribution approach or recommending a transportation investment strategy, our planners had to formulate in concrete terms the desired outcomes we seek. Establishing these outcomes, or performance objectives, and developing the draft plan required a collaborative process.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter traces the overall development of the draft Plan Bay Area, with special attention to the public process followed, and to the setting, adjusting and assessment of key performance objectives. MTC and ABAG engaged a broad spectrum of regional stakeholders in order to:

- make the targets as meaningful as possible in measuring the plan's success;
- evaluate quantitative measures of equity concerns; and
- identify the most promising growth scenario, especially with respect to the attainment of the statutory requirements for greenhouse gas emission reductions and for the provision of an adequate amount of housing.

Draft Plan Bay Area resulted from three rounds of scenario analyses and vigorous public outreach. Read Chapter 1 and give us your comments on the Setting Our Sights chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 183
Participants: 30
Hours of Public Comment: 1.5

13 participants posted comments
1. I strongly support the process of regional planning in order to successfully coordinate land use and transportation planning for the Plan Bay Area. Without a coordinated approach to planning, the Bay Area will just become a chaotic group of disconnected parts. No community is isolated from another. We all need to work together. Who wants to sit in hours of traffic, heating up the planet and our tempers when we could have a modern, comfortable, efficient system of public transportation to meet everyone's needs?

2. We all need to work on reducing carbon and other emissions that worsen air quality and the impacts of climate change. The cost of increasing sea levels, worsening storms, and drought is a very high price indeed. There are solutions available to lessen the impact of climate change and to begin to move us in the right direction. The Bay Area Plan moves us in the right direction.

3. Draft Plan Bay Area places primary emphasis on maintaining the existing transportation system and its expansion. This is the correct priority, but long term commitments must be kept to communities such as Livermore while providing services to new areas such as San Jose. Expansion of in-city bus services must not be sacrificed for larger regional transportation. All communities need equitable access to high quality, accessible public transportation. If we could do it in the 30's, it seems we should be able to do it today.

4. The need for public transportation is expanding, partly do to a growing population and partly due to years of underfunding. The economy of the Bay Area is beginning to sore. Transportation and housing are core to the health of that expansion. A public education program needs to be started immediately so that the people are conversant with the issues, understand the needs, able to dream what is feasible and practicable, and want to make the investment to see it come to fruition.

5. All regional policies should support the development of the urban core rather than encouraging suburban sprawl. Decisions in the recent past to benefit small, local populations at the expense of the health, wealth, and welfare of the greater good have been unwise and destructive and must stop.

6. Four alternatives to the “preferred” draft Plan were evaluated as part of the draft EIR, and several among them include elements that perform somewhat better than the draft Plan. For example, the “Equity, Environment, and Jobs (EEJ)” alternative is judged the “environmentally preferred alternative,” and the “Transit Priority Focus (TPF)” alternative
is judged superior for transportation. I strongly urge that the elements of the alternatives that offer superior benefits to the environment, provide robust incentives for affordable housing, and enhance the services of the transit systems be included in the draft Plan.

3 Supporters
Here it is May 11, and out of the 7,000,000 residents in the nine-county Bay Area, only 490 people have responded to this online survey that has been up for a few weeks. Even though this chapter says that Plan Bay Area reached out to "thousands," most people I know (including many who are college-educated and otherwise up-to-date on other newsworthy events) have never even heard of Plan Bay Area. I would say the effort to get the public involved and informed has been a total disaster--a planned disaster. Otherwise why didn't Plan Bay Area get on the radio, newspapers, and TV to get the word out? Is it possible the bureaucrats don't want the public to find out what's going on right under our noses?

Another problem I have with the "reaching out" part is why didn't they "reach out" to the most important group (as far as I see it)--the folks who will be paying the considerable bills for Plan Bay Area--the taxpayers? Many (but not all) of the public input meetings were held in the daytime when the folks who keep this economy going (the taxpayers) were at work. Shameful.

Lastly I found one good target of Plan Bay Area: target #10 which is to "maintain the transportation system in a state of good repair," i.e. better paved roads, decreased distressed lane-miles of state highways, and reduced share of transit assets that are past their useful life. These are functional, reasonable goals that most people would expect of government, and if MTC and ABAG had stuck to these areas, they would not have encountered the opposition they ran into. However, when they ventured into social engineering by focusing on "social equity" and "communities of concern" (by their own admission in this chapter, this part of Plan Bay Area is voluntary and not required by SB375), they're totally off base and clearly pushing income redistribution. Therefore I say the "No Project" option is best until they go back to basics.
To the extent that a more realistic future might not favor MULTI-FAMILY development, please consider the following scenarios in your planning:

RESIDENTIAL ENERGY

Every home will have 2-3kw Solar Panels and a 2-3kw Wind Turbine on its roof.

Battery ENERGY DENSITY will be 10 times more than it is today. (A Berkeley company is manufacturing these batteries right now). Thus every single family home will be generating more electricity than consumed.

Charging the electric car every night.

(Using this excess electricity to indirectly manufacture these Solar Panels, Wind Turbines and Batteries).

Home insulation will become irrelevant.

Solar panels and wind turbines on the roof of an multi-family apartment building can never be enough to meet the needs of the multi-families below and will not be ENERGY COST EFFICIENT.

But Single-family houses will be net ENERGY PRODUCERS -- when multi-family cannot.

WASTE RECYCLING

Water will be stored and re-processed for reuse and for (not so greywater) irrigation.

Solid human waste and previously un-processable waste will be locally processed and put back into the ground (remember - with excess energy all things are possible). We will no longer be wasting so much water to "flush it" to sewage treatment. (1. more research needed). Composting's methane emission - not necessarily being a better option.

This is yet another reason why the single-family detached home, with a garden, is the way of the future for CARBON SEQUESTRATION and WATER RECYCLING & STORAGE as well as ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

(Garden and roof enables drinkable rain Water Capture and storage tanks.)
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(2-way Satellite Internet will then allow homes to be totally OFF THE GRID and can be built anywhere.)

BUSINESS OF THE FUTURE

Retail outlets like Best Buy (which is going bust right now) and even clothing and general goods retailers could be replaced by independent showrooms instead - charging admission with online purchase credits. Purchases made in these showrooms could be delivered to your door on a subsequent day. Most businesses will be online except for food, restaurants, entertainment and a few others. Deliveries being made in electric trucks.

All kinds of different businesses will share showrooms and strategically placed warehouses (to increase delivery efficiency).

Commuting will only be to these kind of jobs in businesses that do not sell much online and to manufacturing (which will continue to become more robotic).

Telecommuting will be the norm.

PLAN for an ENERGY EFFICIENT FUTURE NOW

Make land available for MANUFACTURED (cheap) detached housing -- otherwise building so much multi-family now, will create energy slums - a liability -- as living with your own energy producing roof and conserving garden will be, -- not only cheaper, -- but a source of income.

And also be "SAVE THE PLANET NECESSARY".

Keep and add to the RENEWABLE ENERGY SUBSIDIES. Lets divert money from otherwise wasted $'s on PLAN BAY AREA transit and dense residential.

Recompense for residential excess energy production so we can have finance companies invest in energy installations on residential roof tops - now.

Alan Scotch  http://populationalert.org/GlobalWarming/wind_solar.htm
I, too, attended the visioning sessions from which this Orwellian fantasy called a Draft was created, and I can tell you for sure and outright as a fact that the entire outreach to the public was rigged, had its own secret agenda and was NOT in any way a public outreach participation program. The "results" as displayed in this Draft are nothing but con-artistry.

1 Supporter
I attended 4 Plan Bay Area meetings and I thought they were quite democratic. People were informed about the costs and benefits of different scenarios and were asked to vote how they wanted growth to happen. People got to spend their "play money" on different programs and different outcomes.

The undemocratic part was being shouted down by attendees who came with their own anti-growth agenda. or paranoia about "Agenda 21." They complained about not being heard, but they didn't come to hear or learn anything, they came to shut down the conversation.

These people were stunningly ill-informed, and had no research or data to cite that would verify their predictions. Most had not even read the Bay Area Plan, let alone the full text to UN Agenda 21.

I think that if they want to have meetings to teach us about their conspiracy theories, they should go rent a hall and invite the public to attend, and buy their own sandwiches. Instead, they came and partook of MTC's hospitality and then complained about just everything.

I hope they do some homework before this next round of meetings.

1 Supporter
If transportation accounts for 40% of California's CO2 emissions, why does Plan Bay Area include a reduction target for the year 2040 of only 15% instead of our state's target of reducing our CO2 emissions approximately 55% by the year 2035? (See ARB, Scoping Plan, Figure 6, at p. 118) Doesn't such lenient action on reducing transportation emissions mean that other ways of mitigating CO2 emissions must pick up the slack? Global climate change is accelerating and bringing more costly impacts as we go. Reversing that trend requires us to make major and rapid reductions in our transportation CO2 emissions.

2 Supporters
Setting one sights sounds like a fine sound bit. So I guess if you set a goal and ask for feedback and suggestions the assumption is there is the possibility of being a positive influence to the process. However if you are only interested is gaining consensus to support your theory and close minded to what "we the people" think this renders this debate a fraud, sham and disguised effort to pass one by us, the people, you purport to represent. There is a process that ABAG & MTC might not be aware of that could help foster understanding and encourage meaningful dialogue. In our society I believe we still call it voting. That is where the people not some bought and paid for politicians funded by the development lobby actually get an opportunity to hear, discuss and debate the merits and offer possible amending ideas and then decide the best course of action. I realize that is a tedious and often mis-used avenue to have issues that have a huge effect on their lives resolved but who knows maybe we can actually use that old fashioned democratic process as a starting point. btw I also attended one of your so-called inclusionary meetings and watched you simply ignore any statement that was inconvenient. I am sorry to say you came not for dialogue but to simply pretend to include the unwashed masses known as the working lower and middle class you claim to be there for. I have not been privy to any scoping or community outreach sessions prior to your proclamations. Perhaps before you put your crosshairs on so many communities it might be nice for you to do a little research and offer some insight into your own reasoning.

10 Supporters
People who prefer to live in large cities create problems due to high density, and they should not expect smaller more rural communities to have to solve those problems in their own communities. Let each community go its own way, there may be need for coordinated transportation but not housing- preserve local regulations.

8 Supporters
I went to numerous visioning sessions throughout the Bay Area. I went with an open mind. To keep this short - these plans were a setup. The groups involved already have plans in the works - our feedback was not taken into consideration, although they expect us to believe they are making an effort to consider our feedback. In fact, they would not answer questions from those they KNEW did not agree with them. Need I say MORE!

11 Supporters
First and foremost this is not a good idea. We the people like the life we live and want nothing to do with your idea of a Plan for the Bay area.

I attended the meeting here in my city and it was just like the town hall meeting with Mike Thompson, already a done deal, he never really wanted to hear our side, as his side was what he was peddling. He like most of us had no real idea just what was in the bill, but as usual they shoved in down our throats, just doing what the government thinks they know what we need better than we do. This is the same crap!!!!

I do not want stack and pack housing and live over the work place, really are they nuts??? This is not Europe( well not yet) but if all this goes thru that's just we will be like.

This plan is just another scam to take a power grap and make the fat cats fatter. Do your homework folks, they do not have our (WE THE PEOPLE) in their beat interest. If you want to live close to mass transit do so, I however don't feel the need.

I also do not want to be a TEST to see just how their PLAN could or could not work. Our world right now is in such a bad place, really one I never dreamed of.

I guess we did get CHANGE and soooo not for the better, we are a divided nation, now they want to divide us in our cities. Well I for one will not stand for this, I will fight the good fight by any means necessary I am willing to go down with the ship as they say, just what do I have to lose, because if this goes thru my god all hell will break lose. STOP and just think about the power you will be giving these un elected body of people. It's just crazy and scary, so I say the setting our sights SUCK!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

16 Supporters
I don't understand what is meant by "house 100 percent of the region's projected growth by income level". Does that mean separated by income level? Because the Bay Area has far too much of that already.

Also, I don't understand why so much is voluntary. We face enormous crises of obesity, diabetes, asthma, and global warming. Reducing injuries, deaths, pollution, and vehicle mile traveled is essential to public health, as Steinberg has said is the main focus of SB375. Public health is not optional. You can't have livable communities when people aren't safe crossing the street or when they drive to most destinations. If you're doing it right, the voluntary goals will all be side benefits of increasing walkability, density, and equity, but they should be required targets.
First of all, it is not the government's business to promote jobs or housing. Those things should occur naturally through the free market. Local governments do a roll in zoning but not to the draconian extent that it is being done in the Bay Area where you are setting up urban growth boundaries and depriving people of their rights to their private property through such phony public policies as "open space".

Secondly, what has equity got to do with anything. You are promoting equal outcomes, not equal opportunity and you are hurting the very people that you purport to help.

This plan should approve Option 1 which would essentially leave control in the hands of local elected officials. MTC should stick to caring about the roads and bridges and ABAG should stick to buying group insurance. Your meddling in the area of land use and housing is positively disgusting.

16 Supporters
"Setting Our Sights" is one long poem of self-congratulation by the planning staff. The chapter touts the "open" and "inclusive" process through which the plan was developed. In reality, the plan ignored the torrent of negative comment that cascaded from the public in the so-called public meetings. I attended the first one in Marin County full of enthusiasm, because I've been an environmentalist for many years. I left feeling disgusted and appalled by the closed, manipulative quality of the meeting.

It was obvious that everything had been decided in advance and that public input was no more than a facade. Nothing has changed since then; in fact, the manipulation and misrepresentation have only gotten worse. The Plan Bay Area staff lives in an echo chamber, where only in-group actors such as the Marin Community Foundation actually matter. "Setting Our Sights" is also an example of circular reasoning, AKA a tautology. Goals are selected a priori: equity, environment, and economy. Then these "goals" are defined in such a way as to make central planning the only possible way to achieve them. The whole sham process of "Setting Our Sights" is a justification for transitioning the Bay Area away from local self-government to an administered region, where our votes are meaningless and everything of importance is decided by unelected bureaucrats. It is impossible to achieve a thriving economy without individual and economic freedom. Central planning leads to crony capitalism, corruption, and incompetent, abusive government. We have 100 years of evidence of this from all over the world, but the Plan Bay Area staff seems to think that once they're in charge of everything and everybody, it's all going to be perfect.

13 Supporters
Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040

What do you think about the "The Bay Area in 2040" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

All comments sorted chronologically
As of close of comment period, May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM
Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) track and forecast the region's demographics and economic trends to inform and guide investments and policy decisions. These forecasts form the basis for developing the regional land use plan and transportation investment strategy for Plan Bay Area, and they reflect the best picture we have of what the Bay Area may look like in 2040 so that today’s decisions align with tomorrow's expected transportation and housing needs.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter explains the process used to develop the draft Plan Bay Area growth forecasts, and it describes the most recent planning assumptions used to develop the forecasts, including local general plans and other factors. It also looks at three main demographic categories that informed development of the plan: employment, population and housing.

Read Chapter 2 and give us your comments on the The Bay Area in 2040 chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 118
Participants: 22
Hours of Public Comment: 1.1

7 participants posted comments
No one really knows what's going to happen 25 years from now. Look at all the changes that have occurred in the last 10-15 years in the areas of communication, electronics, technology, and healthcare. Things are changing very quickly, and the so-called experts who have conjured up the charts and data shown in this chapter could be completely right--or full of baloney. Plan Bay Area qualifies its predictions by saying that it will adjust and re-evaluate them every 4 years. Sounds wonderful, but what if they've already doled out millions of tax dollars to a company to start building a high rail project and then decide maybe their predictions weren't so aligned with reality after all? Too bad--those were only taxpayer dollars wasted on another government boondoggle.

Another problem I had with this chapter is the assumption that the "Bay Area and national economies will be healthy with an average unemployment rate of 5% or less." In view of what even Plan Bay Area refers to as the "Great Recession" several times in this chapter, that statement is a doozie in itself and should give pause to any credibility of the Plan Bay Area folks.

What's always been nice about the Bay Area is the variance of lifestyles within a reasonably compact area--crowded urban areas with lots of activities going on and smaller communities away from the urban centers where you can breathe a bit, live a slower pace, and have a larger piece of the pie to live on. Different strokes for different folks--something for everyone. However, clearly the Plan Bay Area planners want to limit choices for everyone. They state in this chapter, "Market demand for new homes will tilt toward townhomes, condominiums, and apartments in developed areas." How do they know where millions of individual people will choose to live and what kind of dwellings they will choose to live in? How do they know?

They don't know. No one does. Central planning hasn't worked well in other areas and there's no overwhelming reason to believe it will work here. No Project is the best option until they can prove they're smarter than the rest of us.
I think the entire Plan Bay Area is the worst possible plan for any area. The plan basically takes away the rights of citizens to live their lives as they choose. Your plan has forgotten the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The high density housing and shopping areas that are currently built or in the process of being built have destroyed the integrity of our communities. They look like something from a third world country. The entire plan needs to be STOPPED NOW.

1 Supporter
Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040
What do you think about the "The Bay Area in 2040" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Name not shown inside San Francisco

I think the plan for 2040 is a terrible fiction and a waste of time, resources and is essentially destructive to the San Francisco Bay Area.

3 Supporters
Ay Ca-rumba I just read chapter 2. To say you are putting the cart before the horse is probably the kindest way of saying you are dead wrong. Your assumptions are so out of reality it is difficult to begin to critique. Ok lets say the current Bay Area population as stated is 7.2 million. The current overall unemployment rate is around 9% but let's call it 8%. In your assumptions you claim unemployment will be less than 5%. So that equates to roughly over 200,000 jobs from your forecast or about 20% being off a to growth vs. simply re-employment of current residents. oops. Your assumptions of continued historic levels of funding for public housing are well silly. Most financed Affordable Housing comes from money invested for 100% tax exchanged deferred dollars. Basically if you invest $2 million in some AH project by a non-profit you get a $2 million dollar tax write off good for any of your other mega earnings. With the country circling the fiscal drain these loopholes will most likely be eliminated or at least severely curtailed. ABAG refuses to explain why their forecasts are coming from a different galaxy for population growth when compared to recent CA Dep't of Finance, the gold standard forecast. ABAG claims they think that CDF is wrong and will be discussing that with them. Short of a complete change by CA Dep't of Finance ABAG is seen as manipulative and arbitrary lacking any credibility and trying to force feed from a infected data source. MTC has in many regions yet to explain exactly what they mean by mass transit. In the Northbay, Marin & Sonoma etc Counties the only mass available in transit is more than 3 people waiting at the bus stop for the incredibly under-funded Golden Gate Transit bus. The Smart Train yet to be built much less proven to have any effective impact on commuting and transit still unless I missed something connect to any real mass transit going anywhere else in the Bay Area. There is so much wrong with the premises of the draft I have to say it would be easier simply starting from reality and then attempt to forecast some type of realistic scenario rather than even begin to address this ill conceived forecast. I might add it appears it is designed to fit some alternative agenda than stated. I believe it is designed to build and simply cross ones fingers and pray for supposed non-existent jobs.
Your projections are way off. What are you people smoking? First of all the projections of HCD are wildly inflated in terms of growth. The Department of Finance numbers are much more reasonable reflecting very little growth. You are required by law to use the DOF numbers. Why do you insist on using the phony HCD numbers.

Secondly, what give you, the STATE and then the region, to DICTATE to local communities what housing they should be prepared to build. You are forcing many communities that are already built out to add more housing. This is unconscienable.

Where is the money coming from for this? The State is broke. The Feds are broke. You are putting unfair burdens on the local community to add this population.

Let the free market decide. No 25 year plans !!!
Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040
What do you think about the "The Bay Area in 2040" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Name not shown inside Marin  March 29, 2013, 5:17 PM

Chapter Two is much like Chapter One, full of circular reasoning. The only assumptions allowed are those which are compatible with the a priori goals of The Plan, which are to increase housing density by any means necessary and to move people around like pawns on the chessboard. The assumptions lead to unconvincing projections which are conjured out of thin air, and then finally to The Plan itself. What if we were permitted to start from different and more realistic assumptions? 1.) What if Bay Area population stabilizes or declines slightly, as people move out of California to states with more freedom and opportunity? We know from the 2010 US Census that people are voting with their feet, OUT of our formerly Golden State. 2.) What if the people who leave are young, entrepreneurial, and educated, leaving behind aging Boomers and poor people with low skills? Who will pay the taxes to support the ever-increasing amount of subsidized housing and subsidized transportation? We know that few of the wealthy actually pay California income taxes, since they can afford second homes in states with no income taxes, and only spend 6 months minus one day in California. Subsidized housing is exempt from property taxes for 55 years. This means that a shrinking and aging middle class will be forced to support ever more people demanding subsidized government services, plus the bureaucracy needed to administer it all. We know that California is always short of "revenue", despite ever-rising taxes, fees, and fines. We also know that even the largest and most successful businesses increasingly locate new facilities out of California. Chapter Two pretends that California is still a great place to start a business, when the opposite is true. In the absence of a good business climate, we won't have population growth or job growth or the tax base to support Utopia. 3.) Most people want single family homes, and will buy one as soon as income permits and stay as long as age-related health issues permit. The assumption that people prefer stack n' pack housing is simply wrong. The Plan intends to restrict built-up areas to the present urban / suburban footprint. Of necessity, then, the vast majority of new housing will have to be high-density and multi-family. The existing stock of single family homes will be bid up in price due to artificial scarcity. This increases the incentive to move out of California.

19 Supporters
Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040

What do you think about the "The Bay Area in 2040" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Name not shown inside Solano          March 29, 2013, 12:02 PM

The Bay Area in 2040 is a very broad chapter, which incorporates projections which are conventional and certainly easily defended as reasonable given the trends of the past decades. What seems to be missing is the acute realization that the coming 30 years will not be like the past 30 years. Listing some of the changes that we know about should begin to lend dimension to the vulnerabilities in the Plan Bay Area approach.

The is no mention of the effects sea level rise on existing housing, commercial, retail, transportation, sewage or water treatment facilities or the costs associated with mitigating and adapting to these effects. It should be noted that ABAG, after agonizing discussions, projected recognition of the need to mitigate sea level rise less than half of what environmental scientists are predicting. It has been shown that the environmental effects causing sea level rise are accelerating faster than anticipated. The draft plan assumes that everything currently in place will remain usable, with "maintenance", and the infrastructure necessary for jobs, housing and transportation will be "additive" in nature. One can find maps within Google to add sea level rise to the Bay Area, in as much detail as one wants, and examine these effects. Just as the new Bay Bridge span was planned and executed without the realization that the ramps leading to it would be periodically under water within 20 years, the One Bay Area Plan needs to realize that it would be unwise to plan to build on the existing infrastructure in a 30 year timeframe without accounting for the impacts of sea level rise. Both of our Regional Airports, as well as the transportation links leading to them, will be periodically under water. The effects of these impacts seem to be recognized nowhere in the Plan.

Additionally, there seem to be no inclusion of assumptions regarding the rise in cost, and reduction in availability of oil. This will affect anything made of oil or plastic, and any oil dependent human activity. Asphalt, plastic pipe, and the cost of all infrastructure will be affected. The Plan seems to ignore the effects of the exponential curve, and appears to create an atmosphere of false complacency by ignoring certain realities. This is not 1958, you will not be taking your Buick cross country on the interstate.

I am suggesting that it will not be business as usual, and that the provision of transportation systems which enable the single family vehicle will increasingly be provided for the wealthy, or wealthier segment of the population. Any enhancements or improvements of a Bay Area automobile transportation modality will by definition add to resource depletion, and global warming. This contradicts the directives in the Steinberg initiative. Initiatives which discourage single family auto transportation, and weaning ourselves from this model as quickly as possible, will create demand for mass transportation systems which are more egalitarian, more affordable to operate, more
environmentally friendly, and more sustainable. For the past 100 years, as we improve roadways, vehicles have always crowded them to over-capacity. We need to stop. We have what we have. The existing highways and transportation corridors are best used, primarily for commercial vehicles, and the public transportation system needs to receive the financial focus to allow it to absorb growth in demand.

If the focus on local job development received the attention it truly deserves, the transportation elements in the One Bay Area Plan could be reduced.

Lastly, for the plan to work as it is currently laid out, only the "outplacement" or "outmigration" of financially marginalized populations, including 70% of the Boomer population who will not be able to afford to live in the described environment, will allow the plan to work. There is a vast underestimating of social, medical, and housing needs for the Bay Area fair share of 70 million Boomers, even though your population projections show an enormous increase in this population.

Additional Concerns: Continued erosion of the standard of living, continued degradation in the value of the dollar, associated accelleration in the real costs of new construction in relation to wages and salaries, creating a nexus of unreachable costs for public projects. Critical mass, in which the shear costs of managing municipal infrastructure cannot be borne by the citizens, and all but critical priority projects will need to be abandoned. The energy and environmental costs of a hotter environment. The increased costs of water, water treatment, and water transportation in a hotter, drier California. The increasingly unsustainable costs of sewage treatment for an increased population. Increased energy costs. Impacts on the production and distribution of food. More severe weather events, flood and drought cycles.

While I agree that a plan needs to be put in place, it should be real. Generally, I see the plan as glossing over the issues required in the Steinberg initiative. Perhaps the task of the Town Hall participation should be to compare the draft plan to the goals in the Steinberg initiative.

2 Supporters
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What do you think about the "Where We Live, Where We Work" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?
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Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

ABAG and MTC developed five land use and transportation scenarios that distributed the total amount of growth forecasted for the region to specific locations. After extensive modeling, analysis and public engagement, the five initial scenarios were narrowed down to a single preferred land use scenario. This scenario and resulting development pattern represent the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that Plan Bay Area must include in the Regional Transportation Plan, as mandated by Senate Bill 375.

The preferred land use scenario is a flexible blueprint for accommodating growth over the long term — making Plan Bay Area the first truly integrated land use and transportation plan for the region’s anticipated growth.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter outlines the land use distribution approach, which includes the distribution of jobs and housing.

Read Chapter 3 and give us your comments on the Where We Live, Where We Work chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

- Attendees: 110
- Participants: 22
- Hours of Public Comment: 1.1

9 participants posted comments
Planning for where we live and where we work makes sense to me. It is about creating options for people from all income levels to afford to live closer to where they work. Too often I have seen family, friends and acquaintances move away to outer suburbs like Pittsburg and Antioch, not by choice, but because they can no longer to afford to live near the city centers where cost of housing continues to rise. Moving away from their jobs, they end up spending two hours a day driving to work. This trend I've witnessed not only takes a toll on their quality of life (less time spent with family, stress from traffic, etc.), but causes detrimental effects for everyone. People living far from their jobs means increased traffic on the freeway, and of course increased pollution.

I know that some people intentionally choose to live far from where they work. Hats off to them for having the patience to endure that commute everyday. Personally, though, I don’t want a long freeway commute to be part of my lifestyle. I want to continue to be able to afford a home where I can access job opportunities just a short drive or train ride away. I appreciate that the draft Plan Bay Area tries to create more of those options while considering the growth that is expected for our region.
This chapter states that "small cities, single-family neighborhoods and rural areas throughout the Bay will take on a very small share of the region's overall growth and are expected to retain the same scale and character." This is total baloney. If you have followed the battles that have ensued in East Bay cities like Dublin, Pleasanton, and Livermore, it is obvious smaller suburban cities are being forced to accept stack and pack housing in their cities, which will change their scale and character. Families move to these smaller towns to get away from the crowded congestion of cities like San Francisco, San Jose, and Oakland--why would they want a bunch of "affordable" (whatever that means) high-rise government housing in their towns? This trend has already started by the implementation of RHNA numbers and will only increase if Plan Bay Area is allowed to proceed.

Also, the "fair share" component talked about in this chapter in regard to housing is disturbing. The bureaucrats rank each city by income and even the test scores of its schools, and if it rates too rich or too high in school scores, it must bear its "fair share" of the total housing need--which means it will be forced to have its "fair share" of very-low and low income units. This is another top-down approach to taking away local control and forcing folks who have moved to the suburbs to have the quality of their towns ruined in the name of "fairness."

Furthermore what is this CEQA relief all about? I thought Plan Bay Area was supposed to be all about improving the environment and the greenhouse gases. However, the latter part of this chapter says that "certain projects consistent with the adopted plan of Plan Bay Area" can qualify for CEQA relief. In other words, if you are a large developer and build the kind of housing projects that Plan Bay Area approves of (stack and packs near mass transit), then you don't have to go through all the environmental requirements to build your projects. But isn't CEQA supposed to protect the environment? Doesn't this seem inconsistent?

Lastly, if you look at the final map in this chapter, even areas in the western half of San Francisco (the neighborhoods) have sufficient density to be areas targeted for high density housing. So even established neighborhoods of single-family homes could see stack and packs forced on their neighborhoods. With Plan Bay Area not many parts of the Bay Area will be safe from the central planners' dreams.
Chapter 3: Where We Live, Where We Work
What do you think about the "Where We Live, Where We Work" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Name not shown inside San Francisco

April 26, 2013, 9:57 PM

Where I live and where I work is none of your DAMN business! Who do you people think you are?

You ain't God!

3 Supporters
Individual cities and towns should have control over zoning and density.

3 Supporters
Section 2.3 of the Draft EIR identifies potential adverse impacts due to the implementation of this proposed plan including:

- Community Disruption/Displacement

  o DEIR identifies the addition of new housing units and commercial spaces in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) could stimulate demand and attract new residents and businesses, resulting in new development types, higher prices and leading to displacement of existing residents

  o DEIR projects that this Plan will significantly increase the density within the Bay Area's densest urban centers impacting local land uses, desirability, and rents resulting in “permanent localized displacement and disruption.”

  o This Plan calls for 160 major transportation projects around the Bay Area, impacting 12,200 households. The DEIR specifically calls out the potential of this Plan to disrupt and displace communities.

- Mitigations

  - Mitigations must be implemented by any project taking advantage of CEQA streamlining provisions of SB 375. However, the mitigations proposed do not go far enough to address the human impact of the proposed development in this Plan, including:

    o An analysis of mitigating long term impacts of displacement and disruption of communities

    o An analysis of housing affordability needs within PDAs today compared to post-Plan implementation and how increased density within PDAs will impact affordable housing needs

    o An analysis of how to link housing density increases to creation of new affordable housing for low- and moderate- income people so as to offset displacement

    o A principle of 1-to-1 replacement and relocation of all low-income households directly displaced by this Plan’s transportation projects either on-site or off-site within a local radius at an affordable rent
Thank you MTC for your thorough and transparent approach. The work you do is commendable and your plans seem realistic within the mandate of Senate Bill 375 and also the population growth projections.

Some people in the Bay Area wish for a lifestyle that is more akin to what they would find in Lubbock, Texas. Well maybe that's where they should be now, although ultimately change will be necessary there, too. Looking at the forecasts for increased housing and population density in the Bay Area over the next 25 years, it is clear things will change quite dramatically here. We must adopt new ways. The carefree profligate lifestyle of the 1950s and 60s USA was a hedonistic folly that is gone forever, and good riddance too. That lifestyle was unsustainable and should not be seen as a golden age, rather as one of wasteful stupidity. Our grandchildren will certainly view it that way.

We have a responsibility to future generations. Part of that is to create efficient transportation infrastructures and localized communities, with air that is fit to breathe, and sustainable systems for food, water and energy production.

These are not new ideas. Sir Richard Rogers, the great British architect, outlined a similar view in 1995 when he was commissioned to redesign the Chinese city of Shanghai. The Chinese are quickly realizing the dangers of unchecked industrial and vehicle emissions and are beginning to enact much-needed regulation. I am sure many residents there feel the need of something like SB375!

Some suburban Americans float on an ideological cloud with a belief-based system of knowledge and still live like there is no tomorrow. They have much to thank the environmentalist for. Without them we would have air quality akin to Beijing.


Their resistance to continued progress in city planning and vehicle emissions has to stop, and I am so thankful that planners such as the MTC are now taking a more realistic view of the future. If the people refuse to be responsible, then I am thankful the planners are taking the appropriate steps.
There are many bedroom communities in the United States- it is beyond reach of government or any planning agency to say that each town must create jobs and house its own employees.

8 Supporters
The Plan envisions high density vertical slums in PDAs, where lower income residents will be concentrated. More than half a million new housing units (not homes, but units) will be crammed together. With the evasiveness we've learned to expect, nothing is said about whether parking facilities will be available for cars and trucks. Instead, it seems that people will be expected to live and work in one neighborhood. If they leave at all, only public transit will be available. Nothing is said about how all this will be financed. Since all the new housing will be subsidized, and subsidized units don't pay property taxes, obviously we need a Vehicle Miles traveled tax and tax-base sharing so middle class areas can subsidize necessary services. The middle class can't bear such a huge burden. Secondly, we're seen the vertical slum movie before. It was called "public housing projects". We should have learned from hard experience that the projects were a disaster that played a role in increasing the oppression of the poor. Public housing projects lend themselves to takeover by gangs. These urban terrorists make life miserable for the law-abiding residents. For an example of where this will lead, consider Chicago, my home town. Gangs only started to take over the South and West sides once poor but viable neighborhoods were bulldozed and the projects were erected. The people of the neighborhoods protested, but elite opinion and big redevelopment bucks were on the side of the bulldozers. No one with power cared what the residents thought -- the best and brightest know how everyone else should live, and coercion is the default option. Eventually, the projects became such sinkholes of crime and violence that even Chicago police officers and firefighters kept their distance. Today we have 100,000 heavily armed gangsters in charge of whole sections of Chicago. Mayor Rahm Emanuel is helpless. Most of the middle class has fled Chicago, except for a few boutique neighborhoods catering to hip young singles. Chicago has a huge budget deficit, too, because when the middle class flees, business follows, and there's no one left to tax.
Are you kidding me? It is none of your business where people live and work. You should be responding to free market development not dictating it with top down central planning schemes.

And how realistic is it that you are going to be able to put housing near jobs and visa versa. You can't do that without force and cohersion and that is the bottom line of what this plan is about.

13 Supporters
Chapter 4: Investments

What do you think about the "Investments" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?
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Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

In crafting an investment program for Plan Bay Area, MTC and ABAG had to grapple with a number of important, but often competing, questions. How to best support the expected growth in jobs and housing over the next quarter century? How much do we invest to maintain, expand and improve the efficiency of our regional transportation system, when the needs exceed available revenue? How should we weigh specific project performance characteristics in assembling a package of investments to address the plan’s economic, environmental and equity goals?

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter describes Plan Bay Area’s financial assumptions and outlines a series of transportation investment strategies that will support key priorities to help our region reduce greenhouse gas emissions, deliver the long-term land use strategy, maintain the infrastructure investments made by past generations, and provide for future economic growth.

Read Chapter 4 and give us your comments on the Investments chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 106
Participants: 26
Hours of Public Comment: 1.3

10 participants posted comments
SMCUCA (the San Mateo County Union Community Alliance) is focused on the economic impacts of the investments that are outlined in the plan. With $256 billion to be invested in transportation projects alone between now and 2040, there will be approximately 7,680,000 jobs created. (Note below) Commercial and high-density residential construction in the Transit Oriented Development projects envisioned by the Plan will have similar multiplier effects. These important economic impacts should be noted in the Plan. While other sections of the plan note the impact of the proposed plan on reducing commute times for workers and thereby improving worker productivity, the primary economic impact of the plan is the direct impact of investment in local projects that will create good jobs.

As a second concern, the plan does not make any policy recommendations with respect to labor standards. In this chapter (or in other places in the plan), we should encourage (incentivize) local project sponsors to pay their workers Area Standard Wages and require local apprentices who are enrolled in State of California approved Apprenticeship Programs to be part of the construction team. (Local hire could be defined as residents who live within 25 or 30 miles of the job sites).

There are at least four reasons to include labor standards in the Plan:

1) Without labor standards clearly articulated in the Plan and EIR, the transit-oriented housing that will be developed as part of this plan will not necessarily benefit local workers or pay decent wages. Creating middle class jobs is a key to improving the health of our local communities.

2) Decent wages will ensure that construction workers can afford housing in the Bay Area. This will allow them to travel fewer miles per day to get to work, thereby improving their health and decreasing air pollution from vehicles.

3) Local hiring requirements will encourage the hiring of apprentices, thereby creating new training opportunities so that local residents will gain skills and access to careers in the construction industry.

4) Highly skilled and continuously trained local workers will be committed and accountable to implementing the best environmental mitigation measures envisioned by the Plan and the EIR for construction projects. The outcomes of the proposed mitigation measures in the EIR will depend on the quality and commitment of the workforce who will implement them. Project labor agreements can ensure a high quality workforce.
Chapter 4: Investments

What do you think about the "Investments" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

We appreciate the work of the MTC and ABAG staff on this plan and hope that these requests will be seen as positive policy enhancements to the final plan.

NOTE: The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) estimates of jobs supported by federal highway investments indicates that a $1 billion expenditure on highway construction in 2007 supported a total of 30,000 jobs: 10,300 construction-oriented jobs (i.e., jobs at construction firms working on the projects and at firms providing direct inputs to the projects, such as guard rails); 4,675 jobs in supporting industries (i.e., jobs at companies providing inputs to the firms directly supplying materials and equipment used in highway construction, such as sheet metal producers who supply guard rail manufacturers); and 15,094 induced jobs (i.e., jobs dependent on consumer expenditures from the wages of workers in "construction-oriented" and "industry-supporting" jobs). (http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42018.pdf)

1 Supporter
Chapter 4: Investments
What do you think about the "Investments" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Marcy Berry inside San Francisco May 14, 2013, 10:24 PM

After several minutes downloading the PDF file, I was able to read Chapter 4; except for the “Congestion Pricing” section, which would not download properly. I will simply assume Congestion Pricing in City streets will be accomplished either by surveillance cameras or transponders, both of which will track our every move.

My first reaction to Chapter 4 is “Investment?!?” The word “investment” describes risk taken by the investor. In the case on Plan Bay Area, there is no such thing. Planners will not be using their own money, nor will they be kicked out of office should their plan fail (they are not elected officials).

Funding is projected as 53% coming from local sources, such as transit fares, dedicated sales tax, and bridge tolls. The rest will come from state and federal grants, mainly derived from fuel taxes. No problem with fares and tolls, they can be increased at any time without voter approval. But not in the case of sales taxes, rendering probably the major source depending on voters’ mood. Same with state and federal grants. Plan Bay Area seems to be counting on a lot of chickens before they hatch.

Local city governments decide their cities are PDA’s – high density areas along transit corridors. No PDA, no money for the city; so the city either dies, or generates its own means of development. Therefore, expensive to be in Plan Bay Area as the grandiose projects experience the predictable cost overruns; and expensive not to be in Plan Bay Area due to the necessity of generating local funds for all projects.

1 Supporter
While this chapter mentions a few things that are positive like improvements to the freeway system (paid for by gas-taxes and bridge tolls, so we ought to get something useful for every gallon of gas we buy and every time we cross a bridge) and PASS (synchronizing traffic signals), I find the stated objective of Plan Bay Area to "reward jurisdictions that produce housing and jobs in PDA's through their planning and zoning policies" very troubling. This goes back to the fight that's being going on for well over a year of regional versus local control. The bureaucrats claim that local communities will have complete local control and nothing is being forced on them. Bull. Since virtually all cities and counties have all sorts of budget woes these days (due to irresponsible government spending), how likely is that cash-strapped communities will turn down the "rewards" of OBAG money? This is already happening with the RHNA allocations and "efforts to produce low-income housing." Local communities should say forget it to the carrot dangled in front of their noses, but I doubt most politicians have the spine for that.

Another area of concern in this chapter is to "purchase conservation lands for long-term protection and use by Bay Area residents." Governmental acquisition of land is not a legitimate purpose of government and the record of the government's stewardship of land is not impressive--they usually just let it go to pot and you get a bunch of forest fires. Not to mention their heavy-handed tactics to force private property owners to "donate" part of their land to the government.

Lastly, the commuter benefit ordinance mentioned in this chapter is yet another idea that will make employment in the Bay Area less attractive for employers. Sure it's great for the employees that your company will be forced to pay for employer-provided subsidies and free shuttles, but companies just might decide that the costs of employment here are too high. In this ever-changing world, companies are looking to reduce their costs to be competitive in their industry. Plan Bay Area is going to have a very high price tag, and more ordinances and constraints on businesses will cause them to move to other areas.

1 Supporter
Chapter 4: Investments
What do you think about the "Investments" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Getting peak time commuters out of cars and onto bicycles has the greatest impact at the least cost of any potential transit investment. Completing key segments of bicycle paths and routes allows cyclist to make safe and fast commutes of 3-15 miles. Shifting commuters to bicycles reduces road congestion, cost commuters less, requires little taxpayer support, and improves the health and well being of the commuter and make them more productive at work. My 10 mile commute on local streets including north bound 85 and north bound 101 through Mountain View, Palo Alto and Menlo Park averaged less than 30 miles an hour so I switched to a bicycle. After a year of riding my average speed on a bike has gotten up to 18.8 mph. With the bike commute taking 32 minutes and a car commute taking 25 minutes and bus commute taking over an hour, I have become a daily bike commuter and have an extra $200 per month to spend along with better health through daily exercise.

The investments chapter does not discuss the impact and costs of improving multi-city bike routes in key areas of congestion that would enable a large portion of people with 3-15 mile commutes to shift to bicycle commuting a few times per week. More effective programs by local cities and counties that implement safer connected bike routes that cross city lines and remove key obstacles, will attract many more people to cycling and reduce pressure on local governments to fund expensive road expansion.
Comments On Projected Job Growth

Just how much of the projected job growth is from private industry and how much is from an increase in government jobs and government spending?

The Bay Area economy is becoming more and more of a “Government Economy” with an increasing number of people working directly for the government or indirectly through subsidies and tax breaks or from government contracts.

In addition to local and state government spending, the Bay Area is a huge consumer of federal funding for a lot of useless transit projects. More and more government spending on huge and wasteful projects is not an investment.

The real solution is to layoff huge numbers of nonproductive government employees and cut subsidies to private industry that’s feeding at the public trough.

1 Supporter
Chapter 4: Investments
What do you think about the "Investments" chapter of draft Plan Bay Area?

Name not shown inside San Francisco

April 26, 2013, 10:22 PM

North Beach does NOT need a subway transit system! Polk Street needs more parking spaces!

1 Supporter
There is definitely some strong backlash coming from the suburban car-oriented set, who are making the same old tired anti-transit anti-city arguments:

1. Claim: "Nobody wants to ride transit, everybody wants a private home": Not true. Maybe those who are commenting this way don't know of any such, but it's clearly a false statement, disproved by even a single counter-example. I offer myself as such. Saying that "anybody who could buy a private home would do so" is absurd, even if true, since many people simply can't afford one, and there are no conceivable policies that would permit that. You might as well say that everybody would prefer a helicopter ride to sitting in traffic; possibly true, but irrelevant.

2. Claim: "Subsidizing transit is socialism and social engineering. Subsidizing automobiles is capitalism and freedom": Not true. This is a long-term lie told by the auto/air/oil/sprawl industry for their own self-interest. Why is subsidizing one mode of transport any more or less "socialistic" than any other? If you park for free on a city street, YOU'RE GETTING WELFARE. You don't like the term, but that's what it is.

3. Claim: "Transit is empty while highways are full": False. People making this claim never ride transit so they're just blowing Fox News smoke. They have no idea how heavily used it is. The reason roads are full is the same reason Soviet citizens had to wait in line to buy things: under-priced road capacity. The funny thing is that this group, after whining about socialism and transit, then almost always asks for more money for roads, but refuses to support raising gasoline taxes to pay for them.

1 Supporter
It seems highly unlikely that state and Federal funds will be available at the level The Plan assumes.

California has just had a whopping tax increase on the evil rich people, plus a sales tax increase on everyone. Supposedly the tax increase will help our schools, but in reality the money will be sucked into underfunded teacher pension plans. In a similar way, City and County pension plans are also grossly underfunded, not to mention enormous hidden debts incurred by special districts. The Plan ignores competition for tax money as the debt mountain slowly collapses and crushes our economy.

Already, there are rumblings in the state Legislature about repealing Proposition 13, so there's a growing danger that we'll be taxed out of our homes. Secondly, California's highly progressive income tax system produces wildly fluctuating revenues, but The Plan ignores this fact. As for the Federal government, interest on the debt plus entitlements will eat up virtually all tax revenues. Already, with the sequester, we're seeing cuts in the rate of increase to Federal discretionary spending. We can expect high inflation, destructive asset bubbles, intense public resistance to more tax increases, the end of the US dollar as the world's reserve currency, and a fall in the US standard of living. None of these conditions will permit large investments in transportation systems. That leaves a Vehicle Miles Traveled tax and a regional income and/or sales taxes as likely default options when money from the State and the Feds isn't forthcoming. The Bay Area middle class can't support 500,000 new subsidized apartments and a new transportation infrastructure. The entire scheme is an exercise in redistribution, since some scam all the benefits while others carry all the burdens. A subsidy for A is automatically a higher cost for B.

14 Supporters
On reading the Investments chapter, I had the unerring sense that I was being sold something that had gaping flaws in its basic assumptions. One basic assumption is that the next 30 years would look like the last 30 years, and that the recession we are in, not yet recovered from, will recover completely and will not reoccur. One does not have to look too far in the world of finance to see strong evidence that contradicts this basic assumption.

I understood that this was to be a sustainable budget for a sustainable plan, yet it projects an annual inflation rate of 2.2%. The simpliest research will show that the government promulgated inflation rates are fiction, just as the government promulgated rates of unemployment are fiction. Shall we base a 30 year, multi-billion dollar plan on such fictions, or shall we simply state that the "Emperior has no clothes"? Our real rate of inflation is upwards of 5%, some say 8%. Look at what you actually spend money for as a guide; medical insurance, fuel, groceries. Go shopping for groceries and ponder as you pay more for less. My family pays $15,000 per year for medical insurance. Just because these items are removed from the "basket" used to calculate the annual inflation rate, does not mean that the costs do not exist. A plan based on artifical inflation rates is artificial, and doomed to over-runs, unanticipated, and unfunded costs. The Plan seems to turn a blind eye towards the effects of material costs in an era of dwindling resources. Either materials costs estimates need to include a factor beyone the inflation in the dollar, based on this phenomena, or an overall, dedicated percentage needs to be applied to contingency just to bridge this fact. The financial portion of the Plan states that it has shortfalls, and imagines sources of funding for these shortfalls. This is another example of magical thinking. If the Plan starts out with shortfalls, it can only get worse. Either the Plan needs to be trimmed to meet identified sources of funding, or sources need to be identified to meet the shortfalls. This is not a creative writing exercise, this is a budget.

On the Federal level, government printing presses are running day and night, printing dollars to cover budget excesses for which we cannot even make our interest payments. We are borrowing money to make our interest payments. What is wrong with this picture?

Anticipating somehow that all of this will magically go away, and that our resultant interest rate will be 2.2%, is ignoring the basic economic facts of life. If the finance plan is this unrealistic, how can anything else in the Plan be credible? This is not a "Republican" issue, or a "Tea Party" issue, or a "Democratic Party" issue, this is math. I anticipate inflation to soar above 10% for an extended period of time. This will weigh heavily on growth and profitability, jobs, and tax revenues as a result. This will point to a
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inflation/recession cycle that will dog us for almost the whole period of the Plan. Costs exceeding revenue point to a failed Plan. In light of these facts, I believe the contingency built into the Plan at this stage should be 20%, after the corrections are made. This exercise may help to develop a more realistic budget.

The other fact of life is that China and India are very rapidly achieving developed nation status. Our ability to achieve the Plan's job and economic growth projections belie the fact that we have not had to compete with countries of this size in the past to market our products and services. You may note the deterioration of the Middle Class as a result of world market forces, a commonly known phenomena, yet one that is ignored in the Plan financial projections. The Plan assumes, again, some magical reversal of this trend line. This points to a tendency of the Plan authors to "pick and choose" which statistics they want to employ. I believe the Plan has to meet real world financial tests, not simply assume the trendlines of the past 30 years.

Note that the High Speed Rail System is not a done deal, and given the budgetary constraints that are likely to linger for some time, the tax constraints, the spending constraints, projects like the High Speed Rail are vulnerable for cutbacks and/or elimination. What is the Plan B? Does the One Bay Area financial Plan incorporate the real history we have experienced in the operating costs, expansion costs, maintenance costs, ticket receipts and ridership levels of BART? I see a lot of red ink here.

It is apparent that the Plan needs more than Bridge Tolls, but let's look at another assumption. Fully 26% of the Plan budget is expended for maintaining an existing roadway system that is unsustainable, polluting, and has been proven to be the main source of atmospheric pollution in the Bay Area. The Plan includes major funds to expand this type of transportation system, and does not analyze the costs to reduce these impacts by more than 6-7% over 28 years. A huge portion of the Plan income requirements are derived from gas tax funds; which means that rather than holding out alternatives to the present polluting, unsustainable stranglehold the automobile has on the Bay Area, the Plan is dependant upon it, is funded by it, and works to maintain it. Even at that, the Plan states that Bridge Tolls are not enough, and there are soft cost shortfalls that are unexplained in the Plan. Who should we trust to put such a plan into action? What will be the long term effects of another 28 years of business as usual? We have to turn the corner, and cannot spend billions of dollars propping up a personal automobile-based transportation system that is doomed to failure. For every freeway, every roadway fix that is proposed, there will be more single rider vehicles to fill it until it is no longer effective. We have seen this over the past 50 years, and every best plan for the automobile ends up the same; more pollution, more congestion, fewer parking places, longer travel times. If nothing were done to the roadways for 30 years, the resultant delays and travel times would push people into mass transit. This is where
they belong in the future. If the money spent attempting to support the automobile was spent instead on extending and improving mass transit alternatives, we may make it through the next 30 years. The roadways need to be for commercial vehicles and public services such as ambulances, police, and fire, bicycles and motorcycles.

The Plan feeds off the increases in fuel costs, to fund roadway improvements, which in turn adds to pollution and congestion, atmospheric warming of the Bay Area, more fuel use, and more fuel costs. In this sense, The One Bay Area Plan is part of the problem, not part of the solution. We are in the midst of profound global warming, and cannot afford to continue down this path. A "business as usual" approach to transportation in the Bay Area cannot be adequately funded, and cannot meet the objectives of the Steinberg initiative. The 1% allocated in the Plan for climate is wholly inadequate.

The financial plan does not take into account extraordinary costs associated with rising sea levels. Google Earth allows anyone with a desktop computer to project a sea level rise in the Bay Area, and examine in detail the impacts to our roadways, bridge ramps, Ferry Terminals, BART facilities, airports, etc. I'm thinking of Hwy 80, Hwy 101, Hwy 37, Hwy 880; over vast stretches, traveled by the Bay Area millions of trips per day; going under water periodically at high high tide, or due to storm driven tidal surges.

To say that the Financial Plan is compromised would be the mildest of statements. Given the dismissal of some of our basic facts of life as we enter into the timeframe of the One Bay Area Plan, it appears to be more of a self-serving, than an objective document. Culturally, it should make us very comfortable, adding to our collective denial. Am I to believe that the world of 2040 will operate the same as the world of 2004? We need to step outside our middle class mind-set, our bias toward normalcy, to create, and finance a plan that will provide effective transportation for our citizens in the coming 30 years. We have more knowledge about the financial world we are entering that the Plan utilizes.

The sad fact is that an increasing percentage of the Bay Area residents will not be able to afford cars, and will depend wholly on public transportation in the future. This is a transportation system that is not up to the task, and based on the financial portion of the plan, cannot grow to meet increasing ridership of an increasing population with fewer transportation options. Should we expend an extraordinary amount of the Plan finances to enable the privledged and wealthy members of our society to have a smooth commute in their personal vehicles, or should we spend ALL of the money on the public part of public transportation?

I would suggest modularizing the Plan, in which the first 5 years are projected in more finite detail, and the remaining 25 years are extrapolated from this. If there are unfunded costs, The Plan begins to lop off years at the end of the period, or adjust the scope of
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the plan. I believe the Plan should work less on its scope, and more on deliverables.

10 Supporters
The government does NOT INVEST !!! You are wasting taxpayer money on a pipe dream for an unacheivable utopia. I am not interested in seeing money squandered on public transit services that few people use and on high density, stack and pack housing that no one would want to live in if they had an option to purchase a single family home (even a modest one)

17 Supporters
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All comments sorted chronologically
As of close of comment period, May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM
Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

At both the scenario and project levels, draft Plan Bay Area has been tested against rigorous performance targets. Plan Bay Area achieves the greenhouse gas emissions reduction target required by state law. It also achieves the housing target required by state law to provide housing for all of the region’s population over the next three decades.

At the same time, the draft Plan Bay Area struggles to achieve many of the region’s ambitious voluntary targets. Thanks to investments in transportation alternatives, the plan moves in the right direction when it comes to increasing active transportation and reducing the number of automobile miles driven per capita, though it falls short of the “aspirational” goals set in these areas.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter provides a target-by-target breakdown of how well the draft Plan Bay Area performs.

Read Chapter 5 and tell us what you think about the Performance chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 73
Participants: 16
Minutes of Public Comment: 48

6 participants posted comments
Plan Bay Area sounds scarier the more you read about it. "Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation by 70% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day)." So now it's the purpose of government to get all of us off our behinds and exercising so many minutes per day? If this isn't 1984, then I don't know what is.

Then there's a lot of talk in this chapter of "communities of concern." This is absolutely disgusting-- class warfare and nothing more. If the bureaucrats behind Plan Bay Area really wanted to help "communities of concern," they would be encouraging less governmental regulation and red tape so more folks could start businesses of their own. Instead they propose to create urban ghettos of poor folks living in high rise tenements near freeways and mass transit (and a lot of pollution). And what jobs will there be in these urban ghettos? What businesses would be stupid enough to open up shop in an environment with high taxes (and even higher taxes proposed by Plan Bay Area in this chapter such as a VMT tax, congestion pricing taxes, and higher bridge tolls)? The inevitable higher taxes of Plan Bay Area will encourage more businesses to leave the Bay Area.

Lastly this chapter also talks about transit assets past their useful life. By Plan Bay Area's own estimates, the percentage of mass transit assets past their useful life will increase from 13% in 2012 to 24% in 2040. So they force us out of our cars either through higher gas taxes, new or higher tolls, or reduced parking spaces, and what will we have to look forward to? Crowded buses or trains that either can't stick to a normal schedule (SF's Muni nightmare) or break down a lot. And will break down a lot more. This is an improvement of quality of life?

The No Project Option is the best option at this point.
No government has ever "encouraged" job growth successfully to the point of actually creating jobs and it never will. This Chapter can't wash over that truth, even though it tries. The drafters of this chapter are career bureaucrats who know nothing about job creation, never worked at job creation, and on-the-job training is not available or affordable. So I think the "Performance" chapter is flaccid.

3 Supporters
Many may disagree about the global climate change theory, but I doubt that anyone would argue that we are drastically using up precious resources and polluting the planet at an ever increasing rate.

The answers to the pollution problem do not reside with a dictatorship forcing middle class and low income families into stack and pack slums. Everyone sees where this government fantasy is heading: the elimination of a middle class.

The government will soon repeal Prop 13, they will punish commuters with a miles traveled tax & gas tax will go way up. We will be taxed into submission!

Rather than punishing citizens, how about focus efforts on improving public education at every level. The US education system cannot compete with most Asian or European countries.

3 Supporters
The "Performance" chapter is an exercise in science fiction, though not as much fun as the real thing, since the text doesn't include any space travel or telepathic aliens. It's absurd to think that the planners can predict Bay Area housing and transportation needs 25 years hence, especially not in such micro detail. If we think back to predictions made twenty five years ago, back in 1998, do you remember anyone whose crystal ball revealed the rise of China, the rise of political Islam, billions of cheap mobile phones, the rise of the Internet, the US shale gas boom, the Crash of 2008, or the shakiness of the European Union? None of this was imagined by anyone. In its usual reality-challenged fashion, Plan Bay Area demands gigantic public investment based on projections that are almost certainly wrong, especially since the underlying assumptions are wrong. In order to have a more viable future, the first step would be to repeal SB375. Global warming theory -- ops! "climate change" -- is coming under more and more skeptical criticism. Even the United Nations now agrees that there's been no evidence of global warming for 20 years. Global warming theory is being revealed as a dog's breakfast of measurement errors, inadequate theoretical understanding of atmospheric physics, poorly constructed computer models, dishonest statistical manipulation (as in the East Anglia University email scandal), cherry-picking of only the most supportive data, and censorship of scientifically sound alternative explanations. Fluctuations in climate are a normal part of the Earth system and have gone on for billions of years. In the historical record, we find much evidence of major fluctuations from colder to warmer than today, including the Roman Climate Optimum, the Medieval Warming, and the Little Ice Age of the 17th century. If the computer models favored by climate alarmists are run backward, none of these well documented climate fluctuations are "discovered" by the model. Therefore, the model is wrong, the data set is wrong, and the theory is wrong. Huge public investments should not be made on the basis of junk science.
BEHOLD: EVIDENCE CONTINUES TO MOUNT THAT GLOBAL WARMING IS NOT HAPPENING "Over the past 15 years air temperatures at the Earth’s surface have been flat while greenhouse-gas emissions have continued to soar.

Temperatures fluctuate over short periods, but this lack of new warming is a surprise. Ed Hawkins, of the University of Reading, in Britain, points out that surface temperatures since 2005 are already at the low end of the range of projections derived from 20 climate models (see chart 1). If they remain flat, they will fall outside the models’ range within a few years."

Source: The Economist, Mar 30th 2013

"Since Sir David’s [The government’s chief scientific officer] exhortations, some 250,000 Brits have died from the cold, and 10,000 from the heat. It is horribly clear that we have been focusing on the wrong enemy. Instead of making sure energy was affordable, ministers have been trying to make it more expensive, with carbon price floors and emissions trading schemes.

Much political attention is still focused on global warming, and while schemes to help Britain prepare for the cold are being cut, the overseas aid budget is being vastly expanded. Saving elderly British lives has somehow become the least fashionable cause in politics."

Source: The Telegraph, Apr. 1 2013

PLEASE STOP THIS HORRIBLE PLAN, it is based on FALSE SCIENCE

2 Supporters
You put numbers in these plans to give the appearance of "scientific" legitimacy when all you are doing is making stuff up. Your projections are wrong, your underlying assumptions are wrong. This is a wrong headed plan developed by unelected bureaucrats who have nothing better to do but collect large salaries and force the rest of us who work for a living to pay for your unrealistic pipe dreams. Enough !!!

13 Supporters
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Introduction

For over a decade, local governments and regional agencies have been working together to encourage the growth of jobs and production of housing in areas supported by amenities and infrastructure. Draft Plan Bay Area charts a course for accommodating projected growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area while fostering an innovative, prosperous and competitive economy; preserving a healthy and safe environment; and allowing all Bay Area residents to share the benefits of vibrant, sustainable communities connected by an efficient and well-maintained transportation network.

Background

No single level of government can be expected to address all the critical components needed to create a stronger and more resilient Bay Area. It will take a coordinated effort among diverse partners to promote regional economic development, adapt to climate change, prepare for natural disasters, get creative about how to provide affordable housing for all Bay Area residents, ensure clean and healthy air for our communities, and prepare for emerging technologies that will change the way people work and get around.

Tell Us What You Think

This chapter identifies the most important challenges for implementing Plan Bay Area’s policies and programs and proposes steps to address them. These complementary initiatives include legislative advocacy objectives and updated regulations that seek to increase additional resources, promote a vibrant economy, clean our air and address climate change and sea level rise.

Read Chapter 6 and tell us what you think about the A Plan to Build On chapter of draft Plan Bay Area.
As of May 16, 2013, 4:00 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 94
Participants: 22
Hours of Public Comment: 1.1

10 participants posted comments
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Aubrey Freedman inside San Francisco May 15, 2013, 2:40 AM

The first part of this chapter sounds reasonable talking about positive steps like ride-sharing networks, corporate shuttles getting folks to and from work, improving efforts to get ready for natural disasters, and even streamlining the CEQA process which it correctly declares to be a "major impediment to infill development in the Bay Area...often lengthy project entitlement process...increases Bay Area housing prices which rank among the highest in the nation." However, skip to the last two or three pages of this chapter and you will see what Plan Bay Area is really all about---taxes, taxes, and more taxes. Under the heading Support Local Self Help (which sounds innocuous enough), "MTC and ABAG will strongly support efforts to lower the vote threshold for local and regional transportation tax measures from two-thirds to 55%." And, "a 55% voting standard also could aid the passage of a regional gasoline tax that MTC is already authorized to place on the ballot." The 2/3 requirement of Prop 13 that has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars over the years is a menace to governmental bureaucrats who just can't wait to get their grubby hands on all that extra "revenue source."

Another thing mentioned in this chapter is "newly authorized tax-increment financing," which is a fancy name for another tax scheme. I saw a memo written by Steve Heminger, head of the MTC, less than a year ago regarding this same subject. Here's the link: http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_1883/6_SB214.pdf. Please note, "Eliminate the voter approval requirments to create the district." In reality they don't even want the 55% requirement! How inconvenient to ask the voters to approve something they'll have to pay for. They also talk about 100% of the new housing in the Bay Area being high-density and mixed use, so I wonder just where that leaves single-family home neighborhoods that don't want stack and packs to change the character of their areas.

Plan Bay Area is a disaster from beginning to end. I'd like to see the taxpayers get a chance to vote on it, not just self-serving central planners.
Thank you for the opportunity to participate--and for the amazing effort you have put into this draft plan.

First, I must say that I am very disappointed with my fellow citizens' comments. Most appear to disagree with the premise that we should plan rationally for the future and take into account our best available knowledge and information about patterns of growth and development. Once that premise is discarded we are left to the whims of the marketplace that created the serious problems we face. We have to build and rebuild an infrastructure for growth (including the basics of streets, roads, utilities, public safety, and such); to identify and perhaps thereby avoid the full impact of present and impending environmental challenges that scientists have documented; and to integrate all citizens into the process of rebuilding our communities.

That said, I applaud the proposals you have identified for addressing these major problems and I have a suggestion for identifying linkages that I did not see addressed. In general, you link housing, transportation and economic development in a thoughtful way. I especially appreciate your specific support for transportation enhancements such as bike sharing, electric vehicles, driverless cars, and corporate shuttles. I also appreciate your proposal to change the transportation funding formulas for local transportation funding approval. The two-thirds majority rule applied to the recent Alameda County Measure B-1 denied a basic democratic right of the vast majority of taxpayers in AC, almost two-thirds of whom voted to tax themselves to repair our streets and roads and improve our transportation options. Your proposed plan identifies another cause of our crumbling transportation infrastructure--the failure to index the gasoline tax to inflation. Now that we face crumbling streets and roads, the resources to accomplish the needed rebuilding have declined. In these ways, funding for transportation basics have decreased just when our needs have increased.

The plan concentrates on traditional planning variables--land use, transportation, housing, environment, and economic development. These are no doubt major variables that affect overall community development. Yet they fail to link other variables on which the success of the plans depend. For example, economic development is tied to land use and the identification of preferred development areas (PDAs). Missing from the picture, however, is the development of employment opportunities that will contribute to the success of the PDAs. Employment of local residents in the housing, transportation, and economic development projects funded in whole or part by the public sector can improve both the economics of the PDA and the safety of the environment.

It appears that public safety is not a variable that planners generally incorporate into their methodology, but our current public safety crises call for attention to the need for
policies that draws young people away from street crime and into the social and economic community envisioned in the plan. The need to rebuild our infrastructure and create new employment opportunities sets up the occasion for including those who have been to date excluded from the prosperity that the majority experiences. Specifying policies designed to share and distribute fairly the wealth created by our public infrastructure will inure to the benefit of all. Linking employment of local residents to the development of our PDAs is one specific step in that direction.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Tom Willging

Oakland

2 Supporters
What do I think about "A Plan to Build On"?

Not much. I support the EEJ alternative. I would prefer an even stronger "growth without growth" alternative.
San Francisco is already built on silt and sand. This Plan doesn't even have THAT much grounding to it.
You can deny it all you want, but this plan is Agenda 21-influenced and is overseen by ICLEI. If I wanted Bolsheviks to run my life, I'd take a time machine back to Russia, 1911.

3 Supporters
I think the plan is terrible. I think it lacks vision for all your "vision planning." It's a draconian waste of money and resources.
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RESIDENTIAL ENERGY

Every home will have 2-3kw Solar Panels and a 2-3kw Wind Turbine on its roof.

Battery ENERGY DENSITY will be 10 times more than it is today. (A Berkeley company is manufacturing these batteries right now). Thus every single family home will be generating more electricity than consumed.

Charging the electric car every night.

(Using this excess electricity to indirectly manufacture these Solar Panels, Wind Turbines and Batteries).

Home insulation will become irrelevant.

Solar panels and wind turbines on the roof of an multi-family apartment building can never be enough to meet the needs of the multi-families below and will not be ENERGY COST EFFICIENT.

But Single-family houses will be net ENERGY PRODUCERS -- when multi-family cannot.

WASTE RECYCLING

Water will be stored and re-processed for reuse and for (not so greywater) irrigation.

Solid human waste and previously un-processable waste will be locally processed and put back into the ground (remember - with excess energy all things are possible). We will no longer be wasting so much water to "flush it" to sewage treatment. (1. more research needed). Composting's methane emission - not necessarily being a better option.

This is yet another reason why the single-family detached home, with a garden, is the way of the future for CARBON SEQUESTRATION and WATER RECYCLING & STORAGE as well as ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

(Garden and roof enables drinkable rain Water Capture and storage tanks.)

BUSINESS OF THE FUTURE

Retail outlets like Best Buy (which is going bust right now) and even clothing and general goods retailers could be replaced by independent showrooms instead - charging admission with online purchase credits. Purchases made in these showrooms could be
delivered to your door on a subsequent day. Most businesses will be online except for food, restaurants, entertainment and a few others. Deliveries being made in electric trucks.

All kinds of different businesses will share showrooms and strategically placed warehouses (to increase delivery efficiency).

Commuting will only be to these kind of jobs in businesses that do not sell much online and to manufacturing (which will continue to become more robotic).

Telecommuting will be the norm.

PLAN for an ENERGY EFFICIENT FUTURE NOW

Make land available for MANUFACTURED (cheap) detached housing -- otherwise building so much multi-family now, will create energy slums - a liability -- as living with your own energy producing roof and conserving garden will be, -- not only cheaper, -- but a source of income.

And also be "SAVE THE PLANET NECESSARY".

Keep and add to the RENEWABLE ENERGY SUBSIDIES. Lets divert money from otherwise wasted $'s on PLAN BAY AREA transit and dense residential.

Recompense for residential excess energy production so we can have finance companies invest in energy installations on residential roof tops - now.

TODAY'S PLANNER THINKING:

people will NOT continue to use their cars for most trips, when they will.

it is better to raise children on condominium balconies (next to freeway noise and pollution) than with gardens.

herding millions into densely packed urban corridors won't make traffic even worse.

can increase transit's share of travel to more than a measly 4% (from its current tiny 2%) when they can't.

http://populationalert.org/GlobalWarming/wind_solar.htm
I consider these plans social engineering. It is reason enough for me to stop paying taxes in California and leaving the state. I am not a proponent of socialism.

3 Supporters
In "A Plan to Build On", the section about streamlining building permits actually means that crony capitalist affordable housing developers will get automatic approval, while cities and towns are stripped of control over their own planning and zoning. The section of legal and regulatory reform actually means higher taxes, imposed by a new and unelected regional government. The section on prosperity actually means central planning of the regional economy, with bureaucrats picking winners and losers. The more socialist an economy, the greater the corruption and malinvestment. Winners are picked according to their political correctness and influence-peddling skills, so a closed system of favoritism is constructed, with politicians, crony capitalists, and bureaucrats all scratching each other's backs. Hard experience from all over the world has proven time and again that over-centralization of this kind is a recipe for poverty and social instability. It is also profoundly undemocratic. We have already experienced the arrogant elitism exhibited by ABAG and MTC planners, who ignore public criticism, refuse to answer valid questions, and communicate mainly with big money insiders such as the Marin Community Foundation, the San Francisco Foundation, and the Silicon Valley Foundation. California has changed completely since the state's glory years in the 1960s. Then the great governor Pat Brown built the infrastructure that supported a strong free market economy and also advanced the middle class. Today, California is run for the benefit of the public employees unions, the very rich, and the very poor, in that order. The middle class no longer matters. Plan Bay Area is based on the unstated assumption that there's always more blood in the turnip. The planners seem to think that the Bay Area middle class can be squeezed, micro-managed, and taxed ad infinitum. Reality is not like that. California lost 4% of its population between 2000 and 2010, mostly middle class taxpayers and business owners. The only state that lost more population was New York, which lost 9%. No doubt, Plan Bay Area will be adopted as written, to the sound of loud hosannas. It's going to be one more nail in California's coffin. Texas or bust!

5 Supporters
Your "plan to build on" should be scrapped. This is completely unrealistic. People who understand what you are really trying to do, which is control the population and force us in to stack and pack housing and out of our cars, are NOT in favor of this plan. You had a lot of opposition in the last set of visioning sessions and instead of listening to the people you conducted a false and disingenous marketing survey to make it look like people wanted this plan.

Stop wasting our money. Let the local city elected officials figure out what they want to do in their towns and let the chips fall where they may. That is the free market and the most efficient way to handle these issues.

14 Supporters
APPENDIX D

What We Heard: Public Opinion Poll

Appendix D documents can be found immediately following this cover sheet, or online at: http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html
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Background and Methodology

Background and Purpose
On behalf of the Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Committee (MTC), Corey, Canapary & Galanis (CC&G) undertook a study of Bay Area residents. The primary goal of this study was to assess public opinion concerning attitudes, preferences, priorities, and trade-offs on key regional environmental and transportation issues.

Methodology
This study was conducted as 4 focus groups and telephone interviews with 2,516 Bay Area residents. The survey was conducted in English, Spanish, and Cantonese. Questions asked on the survey were developed by staff from MTC and Corey, Canapary & Galanis Research.

The field interviewing was done between March 13 and May 11, 2013. Residents were randomly contacted from a mixed sample of listed, Random Digit Dial (RDD), and cell phone numbers, in an attempt to reach a goal of 2,500 interviews. Interviewers made a minimum of three to four attempts for each contact. Once contacted, the respondent was given the opportunity to participate in the study by completion of a short telephone survey. Interviews were categorized by the home zip code of the respondent. This was used to ensure that sample was drawn to represent a geographically representative sample. Following the telephone interviewing, data from the survey was collated and open-ended responses analyzed and coded. All data was then processed and statistical tables generated.

Reporting
The report begins with Key Findings. The next section, Detailed Results, presents this data on a question by question basis. This is followed by a breakout by demographic grouping, then by county. The final section is the Appendix which includes the questionnaire. Crosstabulated tables are included under a separate cover.

Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Key Findings – Management Summary

Plan Bay Area Initial Reaction
- After hearing a brief description of Plan Bay Area, a large share of residents feels that this type of plan is important to the region. 84% rate it as very or somewhat important.
  - Across counties, this rating is relatively constant. No county is lower than 77%.
  - Younger residents and transit users rate the importance even higher than others.
- Three key components of the plan were initially highlighted – improving the local economy, providing access to housing and transportation for everyone, and reducing driving and greenhouse gases.
  - Improving the local economy was considered the most important part of the plan for many (40%);
  - Providing access to housing and transportation was equally important (40%);
  - Reducing driving and greenhouse gases was lowest (18%).
- By county, providing access to housing and transportation was ranked more important among respondents from San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties.

Reducing Driving / Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Despite ranking lowest of the three key components of Plan Bay Area, reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (as a stand-alone issue) is actually supported by two-thirds (67%) of respondents. Respondents seem to support this goal even though it does not resonate as strongly as the economy or housing/transportation in general.
- Urban residents were most likely to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and were generally more favorable towards the various measures being considered to reach greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Regional vs. Local Development
- Residents are split on who should guide housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. This appears to be a particularly divisive issue surrounding the plan. Overall, slightly more than half of residents (53%) think this development should be done locally, while 44% think this should be part of a regional plan.
  - Among counties, San Francisco has the highest percentage supporting a regional plan (48%), while Napa has the highest percentage supporting local (75%).
- Some of the key reasons that respondents oppose a regional plan for development include:
  - Local government knows the needs of its own citizens better.
  - Unrealistic/Too difficult to get counties to agree.
- Some also indicate local control should stay – but local agencies/decision-makers should be able to work together to address regional issues.
Attitudinal Statements

- The most highly rated attitudinal statements were (*percent who agree shown in parenthesis)*:
  - Government agencies should play an active role in attracting jobs and promoting the economy in the Bay Area (80%);
  - I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving (78%);
  - There should be a focus on walking and biking rather than having to rely on a car (70%);
  - Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations (70%);
  - In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid (70%)

Funding Priorities

- Among the transportation related issues tested, the ones that were considered the highest priority for funding include:
  - Extend commuter rail, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area;
  - Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes;
  - Providing more frequent public transit service.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

- Among the greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the most strongly supported strategy was: building more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less, with 65% of respondents supporting this measure strongly (rating it a ‘4’ or ‘5’).
- The strategy opposed by most residents was: charging drivers a new fee based on the number of miles driven. More than half of respondents (64%) said they oppose this idea (rated a ‘1’ or ‘2’), with nearly half (46%) strongly opposing.

Residents’ Perception of Key Issues in Bay Area

- Residents rate the Bay Area highly on open space preservation and air quality, but lower on other key issues asked about.
- When asked, “How are we doing now?,” residents rate the Bay Area as follows:
  - Preservation of open space and parks (64% excellent/good);
  - Air quality (58% excellent/good);
  - Economic growth and prosperity (51% excellent/good);
  - Quality of public transit (37% excellent/good);
  - Upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways (26% excellent/good);
  - Availability of affordable housing (10% excellent/good).
- The above ratings vary some depending on the area. For example, those in the outer Bay Area rate availability of affordable housing more highly; but suburban and urban residents rate economic growth and prosperity more highly than those in the outer Bay Area.
Key Findings – Summary and Charts

Plan Bay Area Initial Reaction

When asked for an initial assessment, 84% of respondents believe a regional plan like Plan Bay Area is important,

In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan? Use a 5-point scale where ‘5’ is Very Important and ‘1’ is Not at all Important.

![Chart showing survey results](image-url)
Level of importance by individual county remains fairly high as well, ranging from 89% (in San Francisco) to 77% (in Napa).

A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?
Plan Bay Area – Importance of Key Components

Three key components of Plan Bay Area were initially highlighted – improving the local economy, providing access to transportation for everyone, and reducing driving and greenhouse gases.

- Improving the local economy was considered the most important part of the plan for most (40%);
- Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone was next most important (40%);
- Reducing driving and greenhouse gases was lowest (18%).

Five counties indicated improving the local economy was the most important part of the plan; however, residents in San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties said providing access to housing and transportation for everyone was most important.

Marin County showed the strongest support for reducing greenhouse gases as a priority, at 28%, while Solano County showed the weakest support, with just 11% of respondents from that county saying it was most important.

Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future . . . ?
Regional vs. Local Development

Which statement do you agree with more?

a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area.
b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

- Residents are split on who should guide housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. This appears to be a particularly divisive issue surrounding the plan. Overall, slightly more than half of residents (53%) think this development should be done locally, while 44% think this should be part of a regional plan.

- Among counties, San Francisco has the highest percentage supporting a regional plan (48%), while Napa has the highest percentage supporting local (75%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By County</th>
<th>Local Cities &amp; Counties</th>
<th>A Regional Plan</th>
<th>A Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These options were not read to respondents.
- Some of the key reasons that respondents oppose a regional plan for development include:
  - Local government knows the needs of its own citizens better.
  - Unrealistic/Too difficult to get counties to agree.
  - Some also indicate local control should stay – but local agencies/decision-makers should be able to work together to address regional issues.

In the Bay Area map at right, red areas are urban, yellow areas are Suburban, and blue areas are Outer Suburban. White areas are outside of the Bay Area counties.

The definitions used are:
Urban – Primarily the urban areas of San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose
Suburban – Areas immediately outside urban areas
Outer Suburban – The outer geographic band of the Bay Area, including areas such as northwest Marin County, eastern Alameda County, and southern Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Area Type (Based on ZIP Code)</th>
<th>Local Cities &amp; Counties</th>
<th>A Regional Plan</th>
<th>A Mix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reducing Driving / Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Despite ranking lowest of the three key components of Plan Bay Area, reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (as a stand-alone issue) is actually supported by two-thirds (67%) of respondents. Respondents seem to support this goal even though it does not resonate as strongly as the economy or housing/transportation in general.
- Urban residents were most likely to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and were generally more favorable towards the various measures being considered to reach greenhouse gas reduction goals.
Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

- Among the greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the most strongly supported strategy was: building more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less, with 65% of respondents supporting this measure strongly (rating it a ‘4’ or ‘5’).
- The strategy opposed by most residents was: charging drivers a new fee based on the number of miles driven. More than half of respondents (64%) said they oppose this idea (rated a ‘1’ or ‘2’), with nearly half (46%) strongly opposing.
Additional Express Lanes

Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways?

- Over half of respondents (55%) supported the idea of establishing additional express lanes.
  - Respondents from suburban areas were the most likely to support these lanes.
  - Respondents making $150K or more were the most likely to support the express lanes, respondents making between $25K and $75K were the least likely.
  - Respondents from Santa Clara County were the most likely to support these lanes, respondents from Marin County the least.
Funding Priorities

- Among the transportation related issues tested, the ones that were considered the highest priority for funding include:
  
  o Extend commuter rail, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area;
  o Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes;
  o Providing more frequent public transit service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3/DK</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain highways and local roads</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more frequent public transit service</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives to cities for multi-unit housing near public transit</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand bicycle &amp; pedestrian routes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase freeway lanes for carpool/bus</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most highly rated attitudinal statements were *(percent who agree shown in parenthesis)*:

- Government agencies should play an active role in attracting jobs and promoting the economy in the Bay Area (80%);
- I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving (78%);
- There should be a focus on walking and biking rather than having to rely on a car (70%);
- Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations (70%);
- In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid (70%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>3/DK</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local/regional government agencies should attract jobs/promote the economy</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11% 4% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a focus on walking/biking, rather than relying on a car</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19% 6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life for future generations.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20% 6% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, warnings about greenhouse gases causing climate change are valid.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16% 5% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support building a High Speed Rail system connecting the Bay Area with LA</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14% 7% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping, restaurants</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20% 12% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better amenities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23% 12% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5 a gallon</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22% 14% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density housing near transit could destroy my town’s character</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26% 20% 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents’ Perception of Key Issues in Bay Area

• Residents rate the Bay Area highly on open space preservation and air quality, but lower on other key issues asked about.

• When asked, “How are we doing now?,” residents rate the Bay Area as follows:
  o Preservation of open space and parks (64% excellent/good);
  o Air quality (58% excellent/good);
  o Economic growth and prosperity (51% excellent/good);
  o Quality of public transit (37% excellent/good);
  o Upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways (26% excellent/good);
  o Availability of affordable housing (10% excellent/good).

• The above ratings vary some depending on the area. For example, those in the outer suburban area rate availability of affordable housing more highly; but suburban and urban residents rate economic growth and prosperity more highly than those in the outer suburban area.
Detailed Results
Results By Area Type

Respondent zip codes were plotted on a zip code map and colored by area type. On the following map: red is Urban areas, yellow is Suburban areas, blue areas are Outer Suburban, and white areas are outside of the Bay Area.

The definitions used are:
Urban – Primarily the urban areas of San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose
Suburban – Areas immediately outside the urban areas
Outer Suburban – The outer geographic band of the Bay Area, including areas such as northwest Marin County, eastern Alameda County, and southern Santa Clara County.
Perception Of General Issues (Overview)

Overall, two thirds of respondents (64%) rated preservation of open space excellent or good (5 or 4). Only 10% rated the availability of affordable housing similarly.

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of open space</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth/prosperity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of roads and freeways</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable housing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Perception Of General Issues (Detail)

Overall, preservation of open space was rated most highly among respondents (3.73), while the availability of affordable housing was rated the lowest (2.24).

The rating for availability of affordable housing increased the further from the urban area the respondent was. Notably, the ratings for preservation of open space, air quality, and upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways were highest among suburban respondents, while outer suburban residents rated the quality of public transit nearly as high as respondents from urban areas, who rated this attribute the highest of the three subgroups.

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Of General Issues (Detail)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate preservation of open space and parks in the Bay Area?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents .......................</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban .....................................</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban ..................................</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ..........................</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate air quality in the Bay Area?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate economic growth/prosperity in the Bay Area?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?
Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
<th>Other 4</th>
<th>Other 3</th>
<th>Poor 2</th>
<th>Don't Know [ ]</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate quality of public transit in the Bay Area?</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, how would you rate upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
<th>Other 4</th>
<th>Other 3</th>
<th>Poor 2</th>
<th>Don't Know [ ]</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate availability of affordable housing in the Bay Area?</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception Of Plan’s Importance

Overall, 84% of respondents rated the need for a regional plan at least a four out of five. Urban respondents rated the importance of the plan the highest at 4.47 out of 5.00.

A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)...........</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)...........</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)...........</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)...........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>(1)............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>..................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (Out of 5.00)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important (4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important (2 or 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..........................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>..................</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that? (Rated plan as important)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 4 or 5)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better ..........</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It's important, We need it, etc.) .....................</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability ........................................</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/People can’t afford to live near their work, school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.) ..........</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/highways are too congested/In bad repair/no parking..............................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to maintain/improve the quality of life in the area...............................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to move away from car-based transportation/Need to make it possible to live without owning a car/use electric cars/carpooling/bikepaths ..................</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to reduce commute times/sprawl/Redevelop land ..................................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay Area is too expensive/Middle/Working class being squeezed out .......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
## Why is that? (Rated plan as unimportant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/people can’t afford to live near work/school ........</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability ...............................................</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.)........</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better..........</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (it’s important, We need it, etc.) ......................</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust the government .......</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t see a problem/Things are good as they Are/Plan is unnecessary...............</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust a central planning agency/Would prefer more local control ......</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan is too broad/Not an achievable goal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government can’t afford it/Don’t want my taxes/prices raised to pay for it/What is cost .................................................................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much government regulation/Government will take people’s houses/force people to live in apartments or condensed housing/take public transit/drive electric cars..........</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 5% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.

^ Caution-Low base
What Should Be The Plan’s Focus?

Overall, respondents rated improving the local economy as the highest priority and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone as the second highest priority for the plan.

Both suburban and Outer suburban respondents felt that improving the local economy should be the plan’s priority; however, urban respondents felt the plan’s focus should be on providing access to housing and transportation for everyone.

Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone? (select one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN 858</th>
<th>SUBURBAN 1,279</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN 316</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the local economy ..........</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone ....</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions ....................</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know .........................</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which is next most important? (select one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN 858</th>
<th>SUBURBAN 1,279</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN 316</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone ....</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the local economy ..........</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions ....................</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know .........................</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities (Overview)

Overall, three quarters of respondents (78% and 77% respectively) felt that the maintenance of highways and local roads and expanding of commuter rail lines should be funding priorities for the plan. One third (39%) felt that funding should be allotted to Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders.

I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain highways and roads</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public transit service</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for multi-units</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand ped. and bicycle routes</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase freeway lanes</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities

Overall, respondents felt the expanding of commuter rail lines and the maintenance of highways and local roads should be funding priorities for the plan. They felt expanding bicycle and pedestrian routes and increasing the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders to be the least important funding priorities.

Public transit related priorities tended to rate lower the further the respondent was from the urban area and road and highway maintenance and improvement priorities tended to rate higher the further the respondent was from the urban area.

I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(5 Pt. Scale)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>4.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extend commuter rail lines, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4.20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide more frequent public transit service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3.91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Outer Suburban</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide financial incentives to cities to build more multi-unit housing near public transit</strong></td>
<td>22 29 28 12 9 &lt;1</td>
<td>27 29 28 10 7 &lt;1</td>
<td>21 29 27 13 10 1</td>
<td>16 26 30 15 12 1</td>
<td>3.43 3.59 3.38 3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes</strong></td>
<td>24 26 27 14 9 1</td>
<td>24 27 26 13 10 1</td>
<td>25 26 26 14 8 &lt;1</td>
<td>20 22 31 16 10 &lt;1</td>
<td>3.41 3.41 3.46 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders</strong></td>
<td>18 22 28 17 13 1</td>
<td>17 21 31 17 13 2</td>
<td>18 24 28 17 13 1</td>
<td>18 17 28 18 14 &lt;1</td>
<td>3.15 3.12 3.17 3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Of Reducing Driving To Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Overall, two thirds (67%) of respondents supported reducing driving to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, however, the further from an urban area the respondent was, the less likely the respondent was to support this.

The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy? Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5).............</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4).............</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3).............</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2).............</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1).............</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (Out of 5.00) 3.87 3.90 3.89 3.70

RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (4 or 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (2 or 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support of Other Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Overview)

Overall, two thirds of respondents (65%) supported the idea of building more housing near public transit. Only 16% supported the idea of charging drivers a new fee based on the number of annual miles driven.

I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose strongly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing near transit</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require building in city limits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee based upon miles driven</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Support Of Other Policies To Reduce Use Of Cars And Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Overall, respondents most supported building more housing near public transit, rating the measure 3.79.

As might be expected, the further from the urban core, the less likely the respondent was to be in favor of a miles driven fee, but all respondents strongly opposed charging drivers a new fee based on the number of annual miles driven, with a rating of 2.11 and only 16% of respondents saying they would support the measure.

I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 is Support Strongly and 1 is Oppose Strongly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Strongly</th>
<th>Oppose Strongly</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(5 Pt. Scale)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Build more housing near public transit for residents who want to drive less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents.........................</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>3.79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban .....................................</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban ..................................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...........................</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Limit urban sprawl by requiring most additional housing and commercial buildings to be built within current city or town limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents.........................</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban .....................................</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban ..................................</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...........................</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Charge drivers a new fee based on the number of annual miles driven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Respondents.........................</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban .....................................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban ..................................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...........................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Planning Vs. Local Planning

Overall, half of respondents (53%) felt that local cities and counties, instead of a regional agency should plan. Only 1% felt that regional and local agencies should be equal. Outer suburban respondents overwhelmingly favored planning by local cities and counties, with 63% favoring local planning and only 35% favoring regional planning, urban and suburban residents were split more evenly.

Which statement do you agree with more:
a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. OR
b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local cities and counties should plan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local should be equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that? (Favor regional planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Response</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS %</th>
<th>URBAN %</th>
<th>SUBURBAN %</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple responses accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area counties/cities interconnected/interdependent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive/Long-term planning/Broad perspective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits whole Bay Area/Common good/Fairness/Avoids conflict &amp; abuse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government is ineffective/has narrow focus/negative results/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/doesn’t have resources/Don’t trust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective/Efficient planning/Provide direction/expertise/authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan will get better results/Centrally controlled/More knowledge/Integrated/Makes sense</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/more organized/regulated funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency/Continuity/Uniformity/Coordinated/cohesive results</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transportation/traffic congestion/traffic issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective/Makes financial sense/Financial control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides balance between big picture/overall plan and local needs/issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing/Make affordable housing/housing development/Land use issues/closer to work &amp; transit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
**Why is that? (Favor local planning)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local knowledge/Locals know community needs/issues/resources better</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community/government capable/effective/should have say/make own plan/get it done faster/balance budget/control money/makes sense</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One plan doesn’t fit all/Communities have unique qualities/different needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control own destiny/future/Make own decisions/Take responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust government/regional committees/Don’t want to be told what to do/Implications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government is ineffective/doesn’t consider enough/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/too broad/complacent/imposes limits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big government bureaucracy/interference/regulation/biases/laws..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One agency can’t have control over everything in the Bay Area/Bay Area too big to govern the entire area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement/input/live in/vote in community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/better priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment/Makes sense/Is obvious/Need a plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 2% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.*
Tradeoffs (Overview)

Overall, three quarters of respondents (78%) would take public transit more if it took less time than driving. Nearly half (49% and 48% respectively) would live in a smaller house or a more densely populated neighborhood if it meant more neighborhood amenities.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit - if took less time</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller house</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More densely populated</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit – if high gas prices</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Tradeoffs

Respondents further from the urban core are less likely to live in a smaller house or more densely populated area, even if it meant better amenities. They are also less likely to use public transit despite time savings, although outer suburban residents would be slightly more likely than suburban residents to use public transit if it meant a monetary savings.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents..................</td>
<td>Urban .......................</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9 3 7 &lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban..........................</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9 4 7 1</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...................</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14 8 10 1</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping, and restaurants.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19 12 20 1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents..................</td>
<td>Urban .......................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18 10 17 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban..........................</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18 14 20 1</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...................</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23 10 24 1</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better neighborhood amenities (restaurants, shops, etc.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22 12 17 1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents..................</td>
<td>Urban .......................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21 10 13 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban..........................</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22 13 18 1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...................</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25 11 24 1</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5 a gallon.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19 14 24 3</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents..................</td>
<td>Urban .......................</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21 9 20 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban..........................</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20 16 27 2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban ...................</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16 16 27 1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Statements (Overview)

Overall, 80% of respondents felt that local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area. Only a third (32%) felt that encouraging high density housing would change their neighborhood’s character.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 5+4*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Should Attract Jobs/</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Economy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk Focus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas emissions &amp; climate change</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed in community</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed rail</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging high density housing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Attitudinal Statements

Generally, the further from the urban core the respondent was, the less likely they were to agree with the statement. The exceptions to this was: “Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town,” where the further the respondent was from the urban core the more likely they were to agree, and “Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area,” where outer suburban respondents were the most likely to agree.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area</td>
<td>53 26 13 3 3 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>55 26 13 3 3 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>51 27 14 4 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>59 24 11 3 2 &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip</td>
<td>45 25 19 6 5 &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>49 25 17 5 5 &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>44 26 19 6 6 &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outer Suburban</td>
<td>39 25 21 8 6 &lt;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate change are valid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate change are valid</td>
<td>49 21 15 5 9 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51 22 12 4 8 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>50 20 15 5 9 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>40 21 17 8 14 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE (5 Pt. Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed in my community to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations</td>
<td>42 28 18 6 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>47 26 18 4 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>38 31 18 7 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>45 22 22 4 8 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support building a high speed rail system connecting the Bay Area with the Los Angeles Area</td>
<td>46 15 13 7 17 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>52 16 12 5 17 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>44 14 13 9 19 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>40 16 14 6 22 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town</td>
<td>16 16 25 20 22 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>14 12 27 22 24 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>16 19 21 20 23 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Suburban</td>
<td>17 14 31 19 18 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support Of Additional Express Lanes

Overall, half (55%) of respondents supported additional express lanes. Respondents from suburban areas were the most likely to support these lanes.

The Express lanes are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the carpool lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4).............</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3).............</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2).............</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1).............</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (Out of 4.00)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support (3 or 4)...........</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (2 or 1)............</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Why is that?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support if charge those willing to pay/offer the option</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS (%)</th>
<th>URBAN (%)</th>
<th>SUBURBAN (%)</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would help reduce traffic/congestion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to low income people/favors the rich (pay to play)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to pay more/Already pay for roads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute too long/would put more cars on the road/more congestion/carpool lanes too slow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes should only be for multiple people/defeats purpose of lanes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use revenue from fee to make Improvements/infrastructure/public transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Good idea (general)/Seen it work other places/Something needs to be done</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should improve access to public transit/carpooling/reducing greenhouse gases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already enough lanes/people don’t use them enough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would promote carpooling/public transit usage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on price/design/Need more info</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop burden shifting/Everyone should pay the same or no one pays/free access to all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t drive/use the highways/Doesn’t affect me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t need added government control Government money grab/Extortion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Results By Selected Demographics

Results by voting propensity,* age, transit use, income, and home ownership.

*Likely voters have voted in at least three of the last five elections. Unlikely voters are not registered to vote, or have voted in fewer than three of the last five elections.
Perception of General Issues - Overview

Overall, preservation of open space was rated most highly among respondents, while the availability of affordable housing was rated the lowest.

To some degree, respondent knowledge/use of a particular attribute may have contributed to rating differences. For example, those who used transit in the past two months rated the quality of public transit higher than those who did not. Similarly, lower income respondents rated the preservation of open space lower, than high-income respondents – possibly because lower-income residents find it more difficult to access open space areas.

Notably, unlikely voters tended to rate attributes higher than likely voters. This may be, in part, due to the percentage of 18-34 year olds in the unlikely voter subgroup, who also tended to rate attributes higher.

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of open space</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth/prosperity</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transit</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of roads and freeways</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable housing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | ALL RESPONDENTS | HOUSEHOLD INCOME | USED TRANSIT |
|                                |                 | <$25K             | $25-$75K    | $75-$150K | $150K+ | YES | NO |
| Base                           | 2,516           | 219               | 575          | 754        | 504     | 1,637 | 879 |
| Preservation of open space     | 5+4*            | 5+4*              | 5+4*         | 5+4*       | 5+4*    | 5+4* | 5+4* |
| Air quality                    | %               | %                 | %            | %          | %       | %    | %    |
| Economic growth/prosperity     | 58              | 53                | 60           | 65         | 73      | 66   | 60   |
| Quality of public transit      | 51              | 53                | 59           | 58         | 60      | 59   | 57   |
| Upkeep of roads and freeways   | 26              | 33                | 31           | 23         | 20      | 28   | 23   |
| Availability of affordable housing | 10             | 17                | 12           | 7          | 8       | 10   | 11   |

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Perception of General Issues – Preservation of Open Space and Parks in the Bay Area

Overall, respondents rated the preservation of open space and parks 3.73 out of 5.00 (with 5.00 being “Excellent”). Higher income respondents, voters, transit users, and those 55 years of age and older were more likely to rate the preservation of open space more favorably.

Overall, how would you rate preservation of open space and parks in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (3)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (2)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.73 3.74 3.70 3.71 3.72 3.77 3.74 3.72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (3)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (2)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.73 3.56 3.68 3.74 3.84 3.75 3.68
Perception of General Issues – Air Quality in the Bay Area

 Respondents overall rated air quality 3.63 (out of 5). Younger respondents and those with higher incomes tended to rate this attribute higher.

Overall, how would you rate air quality in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00)  3.63  3.61  3.66  3.73  3.58  3.58  3.65  3.61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00)  3.63  3.48  3.60  3.65  3.67  3.64  3.60
Perception of General Issues – Economic Growth/Prosperity in the Bay Area

Respondents overall rated economic prosperity 3.47 (out of 5). Not surprisingly, those with higher incomes tended to rate this attribute higher.

Overall, how would you rate economic growth/prosperity in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>3.47</th>
<th>3.49</th>
<th>3.43</th>
<th>3.57</th>
<th>3.44</th>
<th>3.40</th>
<th>3.34</th>
<th>3.54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>3.47</th>
<th>3.06</th>
<th>3.40</th>
<th>3.49</th>
<th>3.71</th>
<th>3.52</th>
<th>3.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VOTING ALL PROPENSITY AGE HOME

RESPONDENTS LIKELY UNLIKELY 18-34 35-54 55+ RENT OWN

Base 2,516 1,767 752 766 983 699 821 1,670

Excellent (5) 14 14 13 15 13 12 11 15

(4) 37 38 35 40 36 36 34 39

(3) 33 33 34 30 35 35 36 32

(2) 11 10 12 10 10 12 12 10

Poor (1) 4 4 3 2 5 4 6 3

Don’t know 1 1 3 2 1 1 1 1

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.47 3.49 3.43 3.57 3.44 3.40 3.34 3.54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>3.47</th>
<th>3.06</th>
<th>3.40</th>
<th>3.49</th>
<th>3.71</th>
<th>3.52</th>
<th>3.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>3.47</th>
<th>3.06</th>
<th>3.40</th>
<th>3.49</th>
<th>3.71</th>
<th>3.52</th>
<th>3.38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS

YES 1,637 879

NO
Perception of General Issues – Quality of Public Transit in the Bay Area

Overall, respondents rated the quality of public transit 3.17. Those who said they have used public transit in the past two months (3.19) rated the quality of public transit higher than those who have not used public transit in the past two months (3.12). Those with the lowest incomes, as well as younger respondents (both sub-groups more likely to have used transit recently) also rated the quality of public transportation higher. Notably, respondents more likely to vote rated the quality of public transit much lower than those who are unlikely to vote (3.10 vs. 3.32).

Overall, how would you rate quality of public transit services in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of General Issues – Upkeep and Repair of Local Roads and Freeways in the Bay Area

Overall, respondents rated the upkeep and repair of Bay Area roads at 2.78. Respondents 55 years of age and older rated upkeep and repair the lowest, followed by those likely to vote, those making over $150K, and those who have not used transit in the past two months (and are more likely to be drivers).

Overall, how would you rate the upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>OWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 2.78 2.62 3.16 3.13 2.68 2.53 2.94 2.70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUShold INCOME</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 2.78 2.98 2.94 2.68 2.66 2.84 2.67
**Perception of General Issues – Availability of Affordable Housing in the Bay Area**

Overall, respondents rated the availability of affordable housing 2.24 (out of 5.00) – the lowest rating given to any of the attributes asked.

Newer residents may be finding it easier to find housing. Renters rated this attribute much lower than did home owners (2.16 vs. 2.28), indicating that there may be difficulty obtaining affordable housing for rent. However, younger respondents and those in lower income brackets (who may be newer to the area) rated availability higher than did older and more affluent respondents.

Overall, how would you rate availability of affordable housing in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOME RENT</th>
<th>HOME OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREDICTED LIKELY</td>
<td>1,767 (70%)</td>
<td>821 (50%)</td>
<td>1,670 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>752 (30%)</td>
<td>749 (45%)</td>
<td>1,000 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>&lt;$25K</th>
<th>$25-$75K</th>
<th>$75-$150K</th>
<th>$150K+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>2.24</th>
<th>2.18</th>
<th>2.39</th>
<th>2.38</th>
<th>2.08</th>
<th>2.29</th>
<th>2.16</th>
<th>2.28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN (out of 5.00)</th>
<th>2.24</th>
<th>2.45</th>
<th>2.29</th>
<th>2.14</th>
<th>2.07</th>
<th>2.20</th>
<th>2.31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Perception of Plan’s Importance

Overall, respondents rated the need for a regional plan at 4.39 (out of 5.00). Those with the lowest income rated the need for a plan the highest.

A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.39 4.33 4.53 4.56 4.41 4.17 4.54 4.32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>&lt;$25K</th>
<th>$25-$75K</th>
<th>$75-$150K</th>
<th>$150K+</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.39 4.57 4.54 4.35 4.35 4.46 4.26
Why is that? (Rated plan as important)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 4 or 5)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better ..........</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It’s important, We need it, etc.) ...............</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability ..........................</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/People can’t afford to live near their work, school.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.) ............</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 4 or 5)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better ..........</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It’s important, We need it, etc.) ...............</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability ..........................</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/People can’t afford to live near their work, school.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.) ............</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Why is that? (Rated plan as important)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 4 or 5)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/highways are too congested/In bad repair/no parking....................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to maintain/improve the quality of life in the area........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to move away from car-based transportation/Need to make it possible to live without owning a car/use electric cars/carpooling/bikepaths..................</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to reduce commute times/sprawl/Redevelop land........................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay Area is too expensive/Middle/Working class being squeezed out .....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
<td>$75-$150K</td>
<td>$150K+</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/highways are too congested/In bad repair/no parking....................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to maintain/improve the quality of life in the area........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to move away from car-based transportation/Need to make it possible to live without owning a car/use electric cars/carpooling/bikepaths..................</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to reduce commute times/sprawl/Redevelop land........................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay Area is too expensive/Middle/Working class being squeezed out .....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Why is that? (Rated plan as unimportant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 2 or 1)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/people</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can’t afford to live near work/school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It’s important, We need it, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 2 or 1)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/people</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can’t afford to live near work/school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It’s important, We need it, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 5% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.  
^ Caution-Low base
Why is that? (Rated plan as unimportant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 2 or 1)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE 18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>HOME RENT</th>
<th>HOME OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust the government ......</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t see a problem/Things are good as they Are/Plan is unnecessary...............</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust a central planning agency/ Would prefer more local control.......</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan is too broad/Not an achievable goal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government can’t afford it/Don’t want my taxes/prices raised to pay for it/What is cost ................................................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much government regulation/Government will take people’s houses/force people to live in apartments or condensed housing/take public transit/drive electric cars.................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 2 or 1)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8^</td>
<td>20^</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust the government ......</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t see a problem/Things are good as they Are/Plan is unnecessary...............</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t like/trust a central planning agency/ Would prefer more local control.......</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan is too broad/Not an achievable goal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government can’t afford it/Don’t want my taxes/prices raised to pay for it/What is cost ................................................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much government regulation/Government will take people’s houses/force people to live in apartments or condensed housing/take public transit/drive electric cars.................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 5% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
^ Caution-Low base
What Should Be the Plan’s Focus?

Respondents overall felt the highest priority of the plan should be to improve the local economy.

Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone? (select one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>LIKE</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the local economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to housing and</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation for everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing driving and</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | ALL RESPONDENTS | HOUSEHOLD INCOME | USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS |
|                                | 2,516           | <$25K | $25-$75K | $75-$150K | $150K+ | YES | NO |
| Improving the local economy    |                 | %    | %        | %    | %    | %   | %   |
|                                | 40              | 40   | 37       | 41   | 42   | 37  | 47  |
| Providing access to housing and| 40              | 41   | 45       | 39   | 38   | 43  | 34  |
| transportation for everyone     |                 | %    | %        | %    | %    | %   | %   |
| Reducing driving and            | 18              | 18   | 17       | 18   | 18   | 19  | 18  |
| greenhouse gas emissions        |                 | %    | %        | %    | %    | %   | %   |
| Don’t know                      | 2               | 1    | 1        | 1    | 2    | 2   | 2   |
|                                | 100             | 100  | 100      | 100  | 100  | 100 | 100 |
What Should Be the Plan’s Focus? (continued)

Respondents overall felt the second priority of the plan should be providing access to housing and transportation for everyone.

Which is next most important (select one)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</th>
<th>VOTING</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PROPENSITY</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>&lt;$25K</th>
<th>$25-$75K</th>
<th>$75-$150K</th>
<th>$150K+</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities (Overview)

Overall, respondents felt that expanding BART and Caltrain, as well as maintaining and repairing the current infrastructure should be priorities. Respondents felt that increasing freeway lanes and expanding pedestrian and bicycle routes should have the least priority. As might be expected, transit priorities fared better with transit riders and road/highway priorities fared better with non-transit riders.

I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain highways and roads</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public transit service</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for multi-units</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand ped. and bicycle routes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase freeway lanes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>&lt; $25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain highways and roads</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public transit service</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for multi-units</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand ped. and bicycle routes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase freeway lanes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities – Maintain Highways and Roads

Overall, respondents rated maintaining highways and local roads 4.17, one the two highest ratings among the funding options. Older respondents, non-transit users, and voters were more likely to rate this priority highly.

Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities – Extend Commuter Rail Lines

Overall, respondents rated extending commuter lines 4.20, one the two highest ratings among the funding options. Transit users and home owners were more likely to rate this priority highly.

Extend commuter rail lines, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities – More Frequent Public Transit Service

Overall, respondents rated providing more frequent public transit 3.91 out of 5.00. Lower income respondents, transit users, and renters were more likely to rate this priority higher.

Provide more frequent public transit service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) | 3.91 | 3.86 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 3.88 | 3.86 | 4.02 | 3.85 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) | 3.91 | 4.10 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 3.81 | 4.02 | 3.69 |
Overall, respondents rated this priority 3.43 out of 5.00. Not surprisingly, transit users and renters rated this priority higher than did non-transit users and home owners.

Provide financial incentives to cities to build more multi-unit housing near public transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority (5)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.43</th>
<th>3.34</th>
<th>3.63</th>
<th>3.59</th>
<th>3.39</th>
<th>3.30</th>
<th>3.73</th>
<th>3.28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority (5)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3.43</th>
<th>3.67</th>
<th>3.63</th>
<th>3.38</th>
<th>3.32</th>
<th>3.55</th>
<th>3.21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities – Expand Ped. And Bicycle Routes

Overall, respondents rated increasing bicycle and pedestrian routes 3.41 (out of 5.00). Lower income, younger, renters, and those who have used transit in the last months rate this priority higher than do other respondents.

Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.41 3.34 3.57 3.59 3.42 3.23 3.51 3.36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.41 3.55 3.53 3.37 3.39 3.48 3.28
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities – Increase Freeway Lanes

Overall, respondents rated increasing freeway lanes 3.15 out of 5.00. This was the lowest rated priority.

This priority was the most popular with lower income and younger respondents, as well as those who had not used transit in the past two months.

Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PROPS</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% % % % % % % %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority (5)</td>
<td>18 15 26 22 18 14 22 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>22 22 24 21 22 22 22 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>28 30 28 29 30 26 30 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17 19 15 19 19 17 18 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority (1)</td>
<td>13 14 10 12 13 14 11 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 1 2 - 1 2 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT</th>
<th>IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
<td>$75-$150K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% % % % % % % %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priority (5)</td>
<td>18 25 21 16 17 17 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>22 19 20 26 20 21 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>28 27 28 27 33 31 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17 18 16 18 18 18 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority (1)</td>
<td>13 7 15 14 12 12 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 4 1 &lt;1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**
Support of Reducing Driving to Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Overall, two thirds (67%) of respondents supported this strategy, rated it 3.87 (out of 5.00). Younger respondents, renters, and those who earned between $25K and $75K, transit users were most likely to support the strategy.

The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy? Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>SUPPORT PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly (5)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly (5)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support of Other Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Overview)

Overall, respondents felt that building new housing near public transit for residents without cars who depend on public transit was the best alternative strategy for decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. The fee for miles driven was, by far, the least popular option.

I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose strongly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY (5+4^*)</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing near transit</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require building in city limits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee based upon miles driven</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing near transit</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require building in city limits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee based upon miles driven</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).*
Potential Car Use/Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies – More Housing Near Transit

Overall, respondents rated this strategy 3.79. It was most popular with renters and respondents between 18 and 34 years of age.

Build more housing near public transit for residents without cars who want to drive less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Car Use/Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies – Require Building in City Limits

Respondents overall rated this strategy 3.24. It was most popular with respondents whose income was between $25K and $75K, respondents between 18 and 34 years of age, and renters.

Limit urban sprawl by requiring most additional housing and commercial buildings to be built within current city or town limits.

| Support strongly | (5) | 19 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 19 | 19 |
| Oppose strongly  | (1) | 12 | 14 | 9  | 8  | 13 | 16 | 9  | 14 |
| Don’t know        |     | 2  | 1  | 3  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 2  | 1  |

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.24 3.18 3.36 3.29 3.21 3.20 3.34 3.19

| Support strongly | (5) | 19 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 17 | 20 | 17 |
| Oppose strongly  | (1) | 12 | 12 | 8  | 13 | 14 | 10 | 12 |
| Don’t know        |     | 2  | 3  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  |

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.24 3.32 3.44 3.22 3.17 3.30 3.11
Potential Car Use/Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies – Fee Based Upon Miles Driven

Respondents overall rated this strategy 2.10 – the lowest-rated strategy among any of those asked about in this group of car use/greenhouse reduction strategies.

Those making more than $150K and renters rated this strategy higher than did other subgroups.

Charge drivers a new fee based on the number of annual miles driven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Planning Vs. Local Planning

Overall, half of respondents (53%) felt that local cities and counties, instead of a regional agency should plan.

Which statement do you agree with more:

a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area.
OR

b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>LOCAL CITIES AND COUNTIES</th>
<th>REGIONAL PLAN</th>
<th>REGIONAL AND LOCAL SHOULD BE EQUAL</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW/REFUSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cities and counties should plan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local should be equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>BASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cities and counties should plan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local should be equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 2,516
Why is that? (Prefer regional planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>RENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area counties/cities interconnected/interdependent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive/Long-term planning/Broad perspective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits whole Bay Area/Common good/Fairness/Avoids conflict &amp; abuse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government is ineffective/has narrow focus/negative results/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/doesn’t have resources/Don’t trust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective/Efficient planning/Provide direction/expertise/authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area counties/cities interconnected/interdependent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive/Long-term planning/Broad perspective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits whole Bay Area/Common good/Fairness/Avoids conflict &amp; abuse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government is ineffective/has narrow focus/negative results/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/doesn’t have resources/Don’t trust</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective/Efficient planning/Provide direction/expertise/authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COREY, CANAPARY & GALANIS
Why is that? (Prefer regional planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan will get better results/ Centrally controlled/More knowledge/ Integrated/Makes sense ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/more organized/ regulated funds ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency/Continuity/Uniformity/ Coordinated/cohesive results ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transportation/traffic congestion/traffic issues ..................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective/Makes financial sense/ Financial control ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan will get better results/ Centrally controlled/More knowledge/ Integrated/Makes sense ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/more organized/ regulated funds ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency/Continuity/Uniformity/ Coordinated/cohesive results ..................</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transportation/traffic congestion/traffic issues ..................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective/Makes financial sense/ Financial control ..................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that? (Prefer regional planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides balance between big picture/overall plan and local needs/issues ....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing/Make affordable housing/housing development/land Use issues/closer to work &amp; transit ....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides balance between big picture/overall plan and local needs/issues ....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing/Make affordable housing/housing development/land Use issues/closer to work &amp; transit ....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
### Why is that? (Prefer local planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local knowledge/Locals know community needs/issues/resources better</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community/government capable/effective/should have say/make own plan/get it done faster/balance budget/control money/makes sense</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One plan doesn’t fit all/Communities have unique qualities/different needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control own destiny/future/Make own Decisions/Take responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local knowledge/Locals know community needs/issues/resources better</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community/government capable/effective/should have say/make own plan/get it done faster/balance budget/control money/makes sense</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One plan doesn’t fit all/Communities have unique qualities/different needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control own destiny/future/Make own Decisions/Take responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that? (Prefer local planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>514</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust government/regional committees/Don’t want to be told what to do/Implications .........................</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government is ineffective/doesn’t consider enough/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/too broad/complacent/imposes limits ..............................</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big government bureaucracy/interference/regulation/biases/laws...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One agency can’t have control over everything in the Bay Area/Bay Area too big to govern the entire area ........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th></th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
<td>$75-$150K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust government/regional committees/Don’t want to be told what to do/Implications .........................</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government is ineffective/doesn’t consider enough/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/too broad/complacent/imposes limits ..............................</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big government bureaucracy/interference/regulation/biases/laws...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One agency can’t have control over everything in the Bay Area/Bay Area too big to govern the entire area ........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that? (Prefer local planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>LIKELY UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement/input/live in/vote in community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/better priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment/Makes sense/Is obvious/Need a plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement/input/live in/vote in community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/better priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment/Makes sense/Is obvious/Need a plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 2% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Tradeoffs (Overview)

Overall, respondents indicated that they would be most likely to accept more homes and traffic in their community if it was ensuring a robust and prosperous Bay Area economy. They would be less likely to accept increased housing density if it meant more neighborhood amenities such as restaurants and shops.

In most cases, younger respondents, lower-income respondents, transit riders and renters were the most willing to make the tradeoffs.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit - if took less time</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller house</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More densely populated</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit – if high gas prices</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit - if took less time</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller house</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More densely populated</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit – if high gas prices</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Tradeoffs – Public Transit – If Took Less Time

At 4.18 (out of 5.00) overall, this was the highest rated tradeoff. Younger respondents, respondents who made between $25K and $75K, and renters were the most willing to make this tradeoff.

I would take public transit more often if I took less time than driving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
<th>AGE 18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>HOME RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly (5)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.18 4.09 4.38 4.43 4.17 3.92 4.32 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME &lt;$25K</th>
<th>$25-$75K</th>
<th>$75-$150K</th>
<th>$150K+</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly (5)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.18 4.11 4.27 4.22 4.16 4.38 3.81
Tradeoffs – Smaller House

Respondents overall rated this tradeoff 3.26. Lower-income respondents, renters, younger respondents, and transit users were the most willing to make this tradeoff.

I would be willing to live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping, and restaurants.

| Agree strongly | 28 | 27 | 32 | 31 | 28 | 26 | 33 | 26 |
| Agree strongly | 21 | 21 | 22 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 24 | 19 |
| Agree strongly | 19 | 17 | 22 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 18 |
| Agree strongly | 12 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 9  | 10 | 13 |
| Disagree strongly | 20 | 22 | 14 | 13 | 20 | 26 | 13 | 23 |
| Don’t know | 1  | 1  | 1  | <1 | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  |

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.26 3.19 3.45 3.45 3.25 3.08 3.55 3.12

| Agree strongly | 28 | 36 | 29 | 26 | 27 | 30 | 24 |
| Agree strongly | 21 | 22 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 16 |
| Agree strongly | 19 | 16 | 21 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 18 |
| Agree strongly | 12 | 9  | 10 | 15 | 11 | 10 | 15 |
| Disagree strongly | 20 | 15 | 19 | 19 | 22 | 16 | 25 |
| Don’t know | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | <1 | 1  | 1  |

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.26 3.56 3.31 3.22 3.21 3.41 3.00
Tradeoffs – More Densely Populated

Respondents overall rated this tradeoff 3.27 out of 5.00. Upper-income respondents, transit riders, renters, and younger respondents were the most willing to make this tradeoff.

I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better neighborhood amenities (restaurants, shops, etc.)

| Agree strongly | (5) | 25 | 23 | 29 | 30 | 24 | 21 | 30 | 23 |
| Agree strongly | (4) | 23 | 22 | 24 | 27 | 23 | 19 | 27 | 21 |
| Agree strongly | (3) | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 |
| Agree strongly | (2) | 12 | 12 | 11 | 9  | 13 | 13 | 10 | 13 |
| Disagree strongly | (1) | 17 | 20 | 12 | 11 | 18 | 24 | 11 | 20 |
| Don’t know | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**

| Agree strongly | (5) | 25 | 28 | 25 | 22 | 29 | 27 | 22 |
| Agree strongly | (4) | 23 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 19 |
| Agree strongly | (3) | 22 | 23 | 23 | 22 | 17 | 22 | 21 |
| Agree strongly | (2) | 12 | 8  | 13 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 14 |
| Disagree strongly | (1) | 17 | 14 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 14 | 23 |
| Don’t know | 1  | 3  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**
Tradeoffs – Public Transit – If High Gas Prices

Overall, this tradeoff was rated 3.04 by all respondents. Lower-income respondents, renters, younger respondents, and transit users were the most willing to make this tradeoff.

I would take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5 a gallon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>(5) 26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>(1) 24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**  3.04  2.82  3.56  3.51  2.90  2.72  3.41  2.86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K $25-$75K $75-$150K $150K+</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>(5) 26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>(1) 24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**  3.04  3.59  3.33  2.93  2.68  3.23  2.68
Attitudinal Statements – Overview

Among all respondents, the idea that local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area was the highest rated. The thought that encouraging high density housing near public transit would destroy the character of a neighborhood was the lowest rated.

I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies should attract jobs/ Promote economy</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk focus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas emissions &amp; climate change</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed in community</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed rail</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging high density housing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
<td>$75-$150K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies should attract jobs/ Promote economy</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk focus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas emissions &amp; climate change</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed in community</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed rail</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging high density housing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Attitudinal Statements – Local/Regional Agency Role in Attracting Jobs/Promoting Economy

Among all respondents, 80% agree that local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area. Respondents with lower incomes were most likely to agree with the statement and respondents 55 years of age and older were the least likely to agree.

Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIKELY UNLIKELY</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767 752</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agree strongly | (5) | 53 | 52 | 55 | 51 | 55 | 52 | 55 | 53 |
| Agree         | (4) | 26 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 27 |
| Disagree      | (3) | 13 | 14 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 13 |
| Don’t know    | (2) | 3  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 3  |
| Don’t know    |     | 1  | <1 | 1  | <1 | 1  | <1 | <1 | 1  |

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.23 4.20 4.31 4.22 4.27 4.19 4.26 4.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>$&lt;25K $25-$75K $75-$150K $150K+</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219 575 754 504</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agree strongly | (5) | 53 | 58 | 55 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 55 |
| Agree         | (4) | 26 | 24 | 25 | 27 | 29 | 27 | 26 |
| Disagree      | (3) | 13 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 12 |
| Don’t know    | (2) | 3  | 2  | 4  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 3  |
| Don’t know    |     | 1  | 1  | <1 | <1 | 1  | 1  | 1  |

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

MEAN (out of 5.00) 4.23 4.35 4.25 4.25 4.29 4.21 4.27
Attitudinal Statements – Bike/Walk Focus

Among all respondents, 70% agree that throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip. Younger and lower-income respondents were most likely to agree with this and non-transit users were the least likely.

Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (out of 5.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Statements – Gas Emissions & Climate Change

Nearly three quarters (70%) of all respondents agree that greenhouse gas emissions warnings are valid. The subgroup most likely to agree with this is those making between $25K and $75K a year. The subgroup least likely to agree with this is those who have not used transit in the past month.

In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid.

| Agree strongly | 5 | 49 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 48 |
| Agree strongly | 4 | 21 | 20 | 23 | 24 | 22 | 18 | 21 | 21 |
| Agree strongly | 3 | 15 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 11 | 15 | 14 |
| Agree strongly | 2 | 5  | 6  | 5  | 5  | 6  | 5  | 5  | 5  |
| Disagree strongly | 1 | 9  | 11 | 6  | 5  | 9  | 14 | 6  | 11 |
| Don’t know       | 1 | 1  | 3  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 1  |

| MEAN (out of 5.00) | 3.96 | 3.93 | 4.02 | 4.04 | 3.97 | 3.86 | 4.06 | 3.92 |

| Agree strongly | 5 | 49 | 46 | 54 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 42 |
| Agree strongly | 4 | 21 | 25 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 |
| Agree strongly | 3 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 14 |
| Agree strongly | 2 | 5  | 5  | 4  | 6  | 6  | 5  | 5  |
| Disagree strongly | 1 | 9  | 7  | 8  | 10 | 9  | 6  | 15 |
| Don’t know       | 1 | 1  | 4  | 1  | <1 | 1  | 1  | 2  |

| MEAN (out of 5.00) | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 3.73 |
Attitudinal Statements – Lifestyle Changes

Among all respondents, 70% agree that “Changes will be needed in my community and in my lifestyle to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations. Younger and lower income respondents were the most likely to agree.

Changes will be needed in my community to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIKELY</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNLIKELY</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75-$150K</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150K+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Statements – High Speed Rail

Among all respondents, 61% support building a high speed rail system between the Bay and Los Angeles areas. Younger respondents and lower-income respondents were the most likely to support the high speed rail system. Respondents 55 years of age and older were the least likely.

I support building a high speed rail system connecting the Bay Area with the Los Angeles Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.67 3.51 4.03 4.12 3.62 3.27 3.93 3.54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree strongly</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00) 3.67 3.92 3.88 3.68 3.57 3.83 3.37
Attitudinal Statements – Encouraging High Density Housing

Only a third of all respondents (32%) felt that encouraging high density housing near public transit would destroy the character of their city. Respondents who had not taken public transit in the last two months were the most likely to agree and those respondents who had taken public transit in the last two months were the most likely to disagree.

Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>BASE</th>
<th>APPLY TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>YES 1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td>APPLY TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>NO 879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agree strongly | (5) | 16 | 16 | 16 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 15 | 16 |
| Agree strongly | (4) | 16 | 15 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 16 | 16 |
| Agree strongly | (3) | 25 | 30 | 28 | 24 | 22 | 26 | 24 |
| Agree strongly | (2) | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 20 |
| Disagree strongly | (1) | 22 | 17 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 23 |
| Don’t know | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

MEAN (OUT OF 5.00) | 2.82 | 2.78 | 2.92 | 2.74 | 2.78 | 2.93 | 2.81 | 2.83 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>&lt;25K</th>
<th>25-75K</th>
<th>75-150K</th>
<th>150K+</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLY TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Agree strongly | (5) | 16 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 20 |
| Agree strongly | (4) | 16 | 21 | 14 | 16 | 18 | 16 | 16 |
| Agree strongly | (3) | 25 | 29 | 26 | 23 | 22 | 24 | 25 |
| Agree strongly | (2) | 20 | 13 | 21 | 20 | 24 | 22 | 17 |
| Disagree strongly | (1) | 22 | 16 | 22 | 25 | 23 | 24 | 19 |
| Don’t know | 1 | 4 | 2 | <1 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |

MEAN (OUT OF 5.00) | 2.82 | 3.11 | 2.82 | 2.78 | 2.73 | 2.72 | 3.02 |
Support Of Additional Express Lanes

Overall, half (55%) of respondents supported additional express lanes. Respondents making $150K or more were the most likely to support the express lanes, respondents making between $25K and $75K were the least likely.

The Express lanes are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the carpool lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (out of 5.00)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why is that?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if charge those willing to pay/offer the option</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help reduce traffic/congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to low income people/favors the rich (pay to play)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to pay more/Already pay for roads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute too long/would put more cars on the road/more congestion/carpool lanes too slow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes should only be for multiple people/defeats purpose of lanes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use revenue from fee to make Improvements/infrastructure/public transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>&lt;$25K</td>
<td>$25-$75K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support if charge those willing to pay/offer the option</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help reduce traffic/congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to low income people/favors the rich (pay to play)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to pay more/Already pay for roads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute too long/would put more cars on the road/more congestion/carpool lanes too slow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes should only be for multiple people/defeats purpose of lanes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use revenue from fee to make Improvements/infrastructure/public transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Plan Bay Area Survey | Summary Report

### VOTING PROPENSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Type</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Responses Accepted

| Response Description                                                                                           | ALL RESPONDENTS | HOUSEHOLD INCOME | USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
|          |                                                              | ALL          | <$25K | $25-$75K | $75-$150K | $150K+ | YES | NO |
| Convenient/Good idea (general)/Seen it work other places/Something needs to be done.......................... | 6               | 9    | 4    | 5     | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Should improve access to public transit/carpooling/reducing greenhouse gases                              | 5               | 2    | 6    | 7     | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Already enough lanes/people don’t use them enough .................................................................................. | 5               | 7    | 4    | 5     | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Would promote carpooling/public transit usage......................................................................................... | 5               | 5    | 4    | 5     | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Depends on price/design/Need more info..................................................................................................... | 4               | 3    | 2    | 5     | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Stop burden shifting/Everyone should pay the same or no one pays/free access to all ................................| 3               | 5    | 5    | 2     | 2 | 3 | 3 |

**Note:**
- MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED
- BASE: 2,516 respondents
Plan Bay Area Survey | Summary Report

### VOTING ALL RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING PROPENSITY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>LIKELY</th>
<th>UNLIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTING LIKELY</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RENT</th>
<th>OWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTING LIKELY</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED

- Don’t drive/use the highways/Doesn’t affect me................................. 3 3 3
- Don’t need added government control Government money grab/Extortion ... 3 3 1

### HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD INCOME</th>
<th>&lt;$25K</th>
<th>$25K-$75K</th>
<th>$75K-$150K</th>
<th>$150K+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTING LIKELY</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Don’t drive/use the highways/Doesn’t affect me................................. 3 5 4 2 1
- Don’t need added government control Government money grab/Extortion ... 3 1 1 2 4

### USED TRANSIT IN PAST 2 MONTHS

- Yes 1,637
- No 879

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Select Results By County

Results were weighted to provide proportional representation on the county level. The bases displayed in this section are the weighted bases. The actual number of surveys recorded in each county is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of General Issues

Most county subgroups were slightly above or below the average for all respondents. Notably, respondents in Marin and Napa counties were much more likely to rate the upkeep of roads and freeways excellent or good than the average respondent. Respondents in Napa and Solano counties were much more likely to rate the availability of affordable housing excellent or good, than the average respondent.

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate __________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of open space</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth/prosperity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of roads and freeways</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable housing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Perception of Plan’s Importance

Respondents in San Francisco County were most likely to feel it is important to establish a regional plan; residents of Napa County were the least.

A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECAP</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRACOSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECAP</td>
<td>ALL RESPONDENTS</td>
<td>ALAMEDA</td>
<td>CONTRACOSTA</td>
<td>SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>SAN MATEO</td>
<td>MARIN</td>
<td>NAPA</td>
<td>SOLANO</td>
<td>SONOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important (4 or 5)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important (2 or 1)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 5.00)  4.39  4.46  4.31  4.36  4.54  4.35  4.25  4.23  4.34  4.42
### Why is that? (Rated plan as important)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Rated Plan Importance 4 or 5)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit needs to expand/connect more areas/be more available/be less expensive/Different transit agencies need to work together better..........</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment (It’s important, We need it, etc.)..................</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a regional plan to make sure goals are met/avoid inefficiency/problems/allocate funds properly/have accountability ........................................</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing/People can’t afford to live near their work, school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to meet environmental challenges (fossil fuel availability, pollution, global warming, etc.).........</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better transportation system/planned housing would help economic growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/highways are too congested/In bad repair/no parking........................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to maintain/improve the quality of life in the area..........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to move away from car-based transportation/Need to make it possible to live without owning a car/use electric cars/carpooling/bikepaths...............</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a way to reduce commute times/sprawl/Redevelop land..........................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay Area is too expensive/Middle/Working class being squeezed out .....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
What Should Be the Plan’s Focus?

Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone? (select one).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the local economy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which is next most important (select one)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the local economy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities (Overview)

Overall, respondents felt that maintaining highways and roads and expanding BART and Caltrain should be a priority. Within individual counties, however, there was some variation about which priority should be top.

I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain highways and roads</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More frequent public transit service</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives for multi-units</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand ped. and bicycle routes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase freeway lanes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
**Support of Reducing Driving to Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Respondents in Marin County were most likely to support the strategy. Respondents in Solano County were the least likely to support the strategy.

The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy? Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly (5)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN (out of 5.00)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (4 or 5)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (2 or 1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
Support of Other Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Decrease Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Overview)

While overall, allowing new housing, offices and shops to be built in the centers of cities and towns near public transit was the highest rated strategy, respondents in San Francisco County were most likely and respondents in Marin County were less likely to rate it highly.

I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose strongly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More housing near transit</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require building in city limits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee based upon miles driven</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Regional Planning Vs. Local Planning

Respondents in Napa and Sonoma counties were much more likely to prefer local instead of regional planning than the average respondent.

Which statement do you agree with more:

a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area.

OR

b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local cities and counties should plan</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and local should be equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Why is that? (Prefer regional planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Regional Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area counties/cities interconnected/interdependent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive/Long-term planning/Broad perspective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits whole Bay Area/Common good/Fairness/Avoids conflict &amp; abuse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government is ineffective/has narrow focus/negative results/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/doesn’t have resources/Don’t trust...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective/Efficient planning/Provide direction/expertise/authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan will get better results/Centrally controlled/More knowledge/Integrated/Makes sense</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/more organized/regulated funds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency/Continuity/Uniformity/Coordinated/cohesive results</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transportation/traffic congestion/traffic issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective/Makes financial sense/Financial control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides balance between big picture/overall plan and local needs/issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing/Make affordable housing/housing development/Land use issues/closer to work &amp; transit ...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.

^Caution-Low base
### Why is that? (Prefer local planning)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base (Local Preferred)</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE RESPONSES ACCEPTED</strong></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local knowledge/Locals know community needs/issues/resources better</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community/government capable/effective/should have say/make own plan/get it done faster/balance budget/control money/makes sense</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One plan doesn’t fit all/Communities have unique qualities/different needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control own destiny/future/Make own Decisions/Take responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t trust government/regional committees/Don’t want to be told what to do/Implications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government is ineffective/doesn’t consider enough/selfish/puts own interests first/crooked/too broad/complacent/imposes limits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big government bureaucracy/interference/regulation/biases/laws</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One agency can’t have control over everything in the Bay Area/Bay Area too big to govern the entire area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement/input/live in/vote in community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local plan avoids politics/special interests/corruption/better priorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General positive comment/Makes sense/Is obvious/Need a plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative effort/Work together/Share knowledge/information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 2% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Tradeoffs (Overview)

Respondents in San Francisco County were more likely use public transit if it took less time than driving than the average respondent.

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>5+4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit - if took less time</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller house</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More densely populated</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit – if high gas prices</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
# Attitudinal Statements – Overview

I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+4*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies Should Attract Jobs/</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Walk Focus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas emissions &amp; climate change</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes will be needed in</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High speed rail</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging high density housing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure is the percentage of respondents who selected the top two ratings (5 or 4).
Support Of Additional Express Lanes

Overall, half (55%) of respondents supported additional express lanes. Respondents from Santa Clara County were the most likely to support these lanes, respondents from Marin County the least.

The Express lanes are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the carpool lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support strongly</td>
<td>(4)............. 28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)............. 27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)............. 17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose strongly</td>
<td>(1)............. 21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>............................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN (out of 4.00) | 2.67 | 2.74 | 2.64 | 2.76 | 2.54 | 2.58 | 2.45 | 2.62 | 2.66 | 2.60 |

RECAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support (3 or 4)</td>
<td>.................. 55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (2 or 1)</td>
<td>.................. 38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>............................</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100
### Why is that?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Responses Accepted</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ALAMEDA</th>
<th>CONTRA COSTA</th>
<th>SANTA CLARA</th>
<th>SAN FRANCISCO</th>
<th>SAN MATEO</th>
<th>MARIN</th>
<th>NAPA</th>
<th>SANTA ROSA</th>
<th>SOLANO</th>
<th>SONOMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support if charge those willing to pay/offer the option</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help reduce traffic/congestion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair to low income people/favors the rich (pay to play)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want to pay more/Already pay for roads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute too long/would put more cars on the road/more congestion/carpool lanes too slow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool lanes should only be for multiple people/defeats purpose of lanes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use revenue from fee to make improvements/infrastructure/public transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient/Good idea (general)/Seen it work elsewhere/Something needs to be done</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should improve access to public transit/carpooling/reducing greenhouse gases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already enough lanes/people don’t use them enough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would promote carpooling/public transit usage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on price/design/Need more info</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop burden shifting/Everyone should pay the same or no one pays/free access to all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t drive/use the highways/Doesn’t affect me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t need added government control/Government money grab/Extortion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only responses stated by 3% of responses overall are shown. For a complete list of responses, see the crosstabulated tables.
Demographics
Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 people</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean (People in household)...... 3.20 3.22 3.15 3.35**

2 or more in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is anyone in your household under the age of 18?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have at least one child in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many are under the age of 18?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean (Children in household).... 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.9**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including yourself, how many of the people in your household work outside the home, either on a full-time or part-time basis?

| No one                  | 13             | 12    | 14       | 11            |
| 1 person                | 30             | 33    | 30       | 25            |
| 2 people                | 40             | 38    | 40       | 45            |
| 3 people                | 11             | 11    | 10       | 13            |
| 4 or more people        | 5              | 5     | 5        | 6             |
| Refused                 | 1              | <1    | 1        | <1            |

100 | 100 | 100 | 100

**MEAN (Workers in household)....** 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.8

How many registered vehicles are available to members of your household?

| None                     | 4              | 8     | 1        | 2             |
| 1 vehicle                | 21             | 26    | 18       | 15            |
| 2 vehicles               | 38             | 40    | 38       | 33            |
| 3 or more vehicles       | 37             | 25    | 42       | 49            |
| Refused                  | 1              | <1    | <1       | 1             |

100 | 100 | 100 | 100

**MEAN (Vehicles in household)....** 2.4 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.7

Have you or anyone in your household used public transit in the past two months?

| Yes                      | 65             | 74    | 64       | 45            |
| No                       | 35             | 26    | 35       | 55            |
| Don’t know               | <1             | -     | <1       | <1            |

100 | 100 | 100 | 100

Have you or anyone in your household ridden a bicycle in the past two months?

| Yes                      | 51             | 49    | 52       | 56            |
| No                       | 49             | 51    | 48       | 44            |
| Don’t know               | 1              | <1    | <1       | -             |

100 | 100 | 100 | 100
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you own or rent your home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (live w/relatives, friends, etc)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I ask your approximate age?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24 years old</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years old</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years old</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years old</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years old</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years of age or older</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN (Years of age)</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What ethnic group do you consider yourself a member of? (Multiple responses accepted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your approximate annual household income (before taxes)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $15,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $25,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $50,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to $75,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001 to $100,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 to $150,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001 to $200,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused/Don’t know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN ($1000)</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>126.2</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Plan Bay Area Survey | Summary Report**

### Are you currently registered to vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

### REGISTERED TO VOTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Base 2,098</th>
<th>URBAN 703</th>
<th>SUBURBAN 1,091</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN 272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you currently registered to vote?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of the past 5 elections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of the past 5 elections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of the past 5 elections</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the past 5 elections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %

### In about how many of the past 5 elections have you voted? Would you say . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Past Elections</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 5 of the past 5 elections</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are you registered as a Democrat, Republican, or with some other party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state/independent registration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Independent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Freedom</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 %
### Plan Bay Area Survey | Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Language of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>OUTER SUBURBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Survey Questionnaire
PLAN BAY AREA SURVEY
Version 4.2 (April 10, 2013)

Introduction
Hello, I’m _____________ calling on behalf of MTC (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission) and the Association of Bay Area Governments. We are conducting an important survey with Bay Area residents. Your input will be used to help develop a 30 year regional plan for our area.

(INTERVIEWER NOTES: If necessary, explain:

- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is a transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area
- The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is a regional planning agency and Council of Governments for the nine counties and 101 cities and towns of the San Francisco Bay region. ABAG is focused on advocacy, collaboration, and excellence in planning, research, and member services.
- The (regional) plan seeks sustainable regional growth to preserve the quality of life in the Bay Area. This includes: improving the economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, accommodating housing needs and growth, and other regional issues that we face.
- The survey should take between 12-14 minutes to administer
- No selling is involved
- Responses will be treated in confidence
- If Spanish or Chinese monolingual household, flag for callback.)

1) About how long have you lived in the Bay Area? (Read list if necessary)
   1. Less than one year
   2. One – five years
   3. Six – ten years
   4. Eleven – twenty years
   5. Over twenty years
   6. Don’t know (do not read)

2) Which county do you live in? (Read list if necessary)
   1. Alameda
   2. Contra Costa
   3. Santa Clara
   4. San Francisco
   5. San Mateo
   6. Marin
   7. Napa
   8. Solano
   9. Sonoma

   Other county outside Bay Area (thank and terminate. Code as NQ-BA)
   Don’t know / Refused (thank and terminate. Code as Term-Q2)
Current Perception of Region
Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate ________ (ask for each) in the Bay Area? (Randomize)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Quality of public transit services ....</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Up-keep and repair of local roads and freeways.................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Preservation of open space and parks .........................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Economic growth and prosperity ...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Availability of affordable housing...</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Air Quality ........................................</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan Bay Area – General
A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it.

9. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?

Use a 5 point scale where 5 is Very Important and 1 is Not at all important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not at All Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don’t know (Do Not Read)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Why is that?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
11. Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone?* (select one)

11a. Which is next most important? (select one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Imp (Q11)</th>
<th>Next Most Imp (Q11a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improving the local economy</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Don’t know (Do Not Read)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: If needed, re-read the options: “the first one is..., the second one is..., the third one is...”

**Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities**

Next I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

(interviewer note: If asked, the funding itself is coming from Federal, State and local sources for projects related to this plan. These questions are asking how to allocate - or divide up - those funds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Extend commuter rail lines, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Maintain highways and local roads, Including fixing potholes</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Provide more frequent public transit service</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Provide financial incentives to cities to build more multi-unit housing near public transit</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

18) The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing (the amount of) driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy? Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support Strongly</th>
<th>Oppose Strongly</th>
<th>Don't know (Do Not Read)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oppose Strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Don't know (Do Not Read)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose Strongly)

19) Build more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less ....................... 5 4 3 2 1 0

20) Limit urban sprawl by requiring most additional housing and commercial buildings be built within current city or town limits 5 4 3 2 1 0

21) Charge drivers a new fee* based on the number of annual miles driven .... 5 4 3 2 1 0

(Note: Expansion of Express Lanes is another greenhouse gas reduction strategy. A specific question about this is being asked later in the questionnaire – Q34)

*New fee: Specifics are still being developed, this could be an annual fee using vehicle registration or a vehicle device which calculates mileage at the fuel pump
**Regional vs. Local**

22. Which statement do you agree with more:
   a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. OR
   b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

   1 Regional Plan
   2 Local Cities and Counties Should Plan
   3 Regional and local should be equal (do not read)
   4 Don’t know (do not read)
   5 Refused (do not read)

23. Why is that?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

**Trade Offs and Attitudinal Statements**

Next I’d like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree. *(Randomize)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24) I would be willing to live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping and restaurants ............... 5 4 3 2 1 0

25) I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better neighborhood amenities (restaurants, shops, etc.) ... 5 4 3 2 1 0

26) I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving ........... 5 4 3 2 1 0

27) I will take public transit more often if gas prices reach $5.00 a gallon ...... 5 4 3 2 1 0

28) Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip .............................................. 5 4 3 2 1 0
29) Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area.................. 5 4 3 2 1 0

30) I support building a High Speed Rail system connecting the Bay Area with the Los Angeles area ................. 5 4 3 2 1 0

31) In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid .................................... 5 4 3 2 1 0

32) Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town .................. 5 4 3 2 1 0

33) Changes will be needed in my community to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations .................. 5 4 3 2 1 0

**Express Lanes**

Express lanes* are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

34) Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways? *(Get answer, then ask): Is that strongly or somewhat?*

*If necessary, Express Lanes are also called High Occupancy Toll Lanes or HOT lanes.*

1 Support Strongly
2 Support Somewhat
3 Oppose Somewhat
4 Oppose Strongly
5 Don’t know (Do not read)
35) Why is that? (Express Lanes response)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Demographics
These next few questions are for classification purposes only.

D1) Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?

Record number .................. ______

*(Ask if more than one person in household)*

D2) Is anyone in your household under the age of 18?

1  Yes  >>>Record number ______

2  No

3  Refused

D3) Including yourself, how many of the people in your household work outside the home, either on a full-time or part-time basis?

Record number .................. ______

D4) How many registered vehicles are available to members of your household?

Record number .................. ______

D5) Have you, or has anyone in your household,
a) used public transit in the past two months?

1  Yes

2  No

3  Don’t know

b) ridden a bicycle in the past two months?

1  Yes

2  No

3  Don’t know
### D6) Do you own or rent your home?

1. Own
2. Rent
3. Other (specify) _______________________
4. Don’t know / Refused

### D7) What is your (5 digit) home zip code?

Record zip______________________________    _____ _____ _____ _____

### D8) May I ask your approximate age?

________

### D9) What ethnic group do you consider yourself a member of? (If hesitates, ask) Are you white, African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian or some other ethnic or racial background?

1. White
2. African American
3. Hispanic / Latino
4. Asian / Pacific islander
5. Other (specify) _________________________
6. Refused

### D10) What is your approximate annual household income (before taxes)? (Read responses if necessary)

1. Under 15,000
2. $15,000 - $25,000
3. $25,001 – $50,000
4. $50,001 - $75,000
5. $75,001 - $100,000
6. $100,001 - $150,000
7. $150,001 - $200,000
8. More than $200,000
9. Refused (Do not read)

### D11) Are you currently registered to vote?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t know / Refused

### D12) In about how many of the past 5 elections have you voted, would you say...?

(Read List)

5. All 5 of the past 5 elections
4. 4 of the past 5 elections
3. 3 of the past 5 elections
2. 2 of the past 5 elections
1. 1 of the past 5 elections

0. None of the past 5 elections
6. Don’t know / Refused (Do not read)
D13) Are you registered as a Democrat, a Republican or with some other party?
1 Democrat
2 Republican
3 Decline to State / Independent registration
4 Green Party
5 American Independent
6 Libertarian
7 Peace and Freedom
8 Other party (specify) _____________________________
9 Don’t know / Refused

D14) And for validation purposes, may I please have your first name...
______________________________

Comments
Those are all the questions I have.

Comments (If volunteered)
*Interviewer note: Prompt for comments only if comments mentioned during the interview.*

________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________

Record:
D15) Gender (by observation)
1 Male
2 Female
3 Uncertain

D16) Language
1 English
2 Spanish
3 Chinese

Pick up from Sample Sheet:
• Phone Number: ________________________________
• Sample type:
  1 Listed
  2 Random Digit
  3 Cell Number
APPENDIX E

Open House/Public Hearings

Appendix D documents can be found immediately following this cover sheet.
The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will release for public review and comment the Draft Plan Bay Area on March 22, 2013. This will start the public comment period for the long-range plan that has been discussed and developed over the past two years.

Plan Bay Area looks forward to the year 2040 and charts a course for the Bay Area’s first-ever Sustainable Communities Strategy, accommodating needed housing growth within our nine counties while at the same time decreasing greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks. Plan Bay Area meets these challenges without compromising local control of land-use decisions.

Please attend one of the nine Plan Bay Area Open Houses listed inside to view displays and ask questions about the Draft Plan Bay Area. We encourage attendees to stay to offer comments at the Public Hearing held the same evening, adjacent to the Open House, or leave your comments at the comment station at the Open House. No registration is needed.

Multiple ways to submit your comments!

- Give us your oral comments at one of the public hearings listed inside.
- Submit your comments via e-mail to info@OneBayArea.org
- Once the Plan is released, participate in an online forum — Plan Bay Area Town Hall — at www.OneBayArea.org
- Send your comments via mail to:
  MTC-ABAG,
  Plan Bay Area
  Public Comment
  101 8th Street
  Oakland, CA 94607

Draft Plan Bay Area

An integrated long-range transportation and land use/housing plan

Release Date:
Friday, March 22

Close of Comments:
Thursday, May 16, 4 p.m.
**Draft Plan Bay Area:**

**Attend an Open House and Public Hearing in Your County**

**Open House Hours:** 6 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.  **Public Hearing Hours:** 7 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Attend an Open House to view displays and learn about the Draft Plan Bay Area. Provide oral comments on several documents related to the Draft Plan at the Public Hearing.

**Monday, April 8, 2013**  
**Napa County**  
Elks Lodge  
2840 Soscol Ave., Napa

**Sonoma County**  
Friedman Center  
4676 Mayette Ave., Santa Rosa

**Thursday, April 11, 2013**  
**San Francisco County**  
Whitcomb Hotel  
1231 Market St.  
San Francisco

**Monday, April 22, 2013**  
**Solano County**  
County Fairgrounds  
McCormack Hall  
900 Fairgrounds Dr., Vallejo

**Contra Costa County**  
Marriott Hotel  
2355 North Main St.  
Walnut Creek

**Monday, April 29, 2013**  
**Marin County**  
Marin Center  
10 Avenue of the Flags  
San Rafael

**San Mateo County**  
Crowne Plaza Hotel  
1221 Chess Dr., Foster City

**Monday, April 29, 2013**  
**Alameda County**  
Mirage Ballroom  
4100 Peralta Blvd., Fremont

**Santa Clara County**  
Hilton Hotel  
300 Almaden Blvd., San Jose

**Wednesday, May 1, 2013**

**For transit directions visit 511.org.**

---

**Draft Environmental Impact Report Public Hearings**

**Tuesday, April 16, 2013**  
10 a.m. to 12 noon  
Embassy Suites Hotel  
Novato/Larkspur Room  
101 McInnis Parkway, San Rafael

**Tuesday, April 16, 2013**  
7 p.m. to 9 p.m.  
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Auditorium  
101 8th Street, Oakland

**Wednesday, April 17, 2013**  
1 p.m. to 3 p.m.  
Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library  
Rooms 225/229  
150 East San Fernando St., San Jose

**Also comment on these two related documents:**

- **Draft 2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** — implements Plan Bay Area by identifying surface transportation projects over the next six years that are regionally significant or will receive federal funds.

- **Draft Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis for Draft Plan Bay Area and 2013 TIP** — an analysis to determine if transportation investments are consistent with goals to improve air quality.

**Release Date:** Friday, March 29

**Close of Comments:**  
Friday, May 3, 4 p.m.

---

If you need a sign language interpreter, if English is your second language and you need translation services, or if you require any other type of assistance please contact us by calling 510.817.5757 or 510.817.5769 for TDD/TTY.

We require at least three days’ notice to provide reasonable accommodations.

Si necesita un intérprete del lenguaje de señas, si el inglés es su segundo idioma y necesita un intérprete, o si necesita cualquier otra ayuda por favor comuníquese con nosotros al número 510.817.5757 o al 510.817.5769 para TDD/TTY. Requerimos tres días de anticipación para proveer asistencia razonable.

如果您需要手語翻譯員，或如果英語是您的第二語言，您需要翻譯服務，或者您需要任何其他類型的協助，請致電510-817-5757或510-817-5769。我們要求獲得至少三天提前通知才能提供合理的配合安排。
Thank you for attending tonight’s Open House on the Draft Plan Bay Area.

6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.  Open House
Visit a series of stations that present information from the Draft Plan. Staff are available to answer questions. Submit your written comments at the Comment Station.

7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.  Public Hearing
Attend the Public Hearing to offer your oral comments on the Draft Plan or one of its supplemental documents.

Tonight!  Submit written comments at the Open House or offer oral comments at the public hearing.

E-mail  Submit your comments on the Draft Plan or the Plan’s Draft Environmental Impact Report by Thursday, May 16 at 4 p.m. via e-mail to info@onebayarea.org

Mail  Send written comment via mail to:
MTC-ABAG
Plan Bay Area Public Comment
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA  94607

Online Forum  Participate in an online forum called Plan Bay Area Town Hall at www.onebayarea.org
How We Grow
Creating a Vibrant, Healthy Region for Current and Future Generations

Substantial shifts in housing preferences are expected as the Bay Area population ages and becomes more diverse.

Bay Area Population by Age, 2010 and 2040

Sources: 2010 Census, California Department of Finance, ABAG
Open Space:
Protecting the Region’s Unique Natural Environment

- Priority Conservation Areas identified locally
- Developing in existing downtowns, main streets and neighborhoods allows us to preserve small towns, open space and agricultural land for future generations
Creating a robust growth economy requires smart investments in housing supply and infrastructure.
Economic growth could be compromised without significant increase in housing production.

Draft Plan Bay Area County Job Growth: 2010-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Total Average Growth</th>
<th>% Average Growth</th>
<th>Total Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>694,447</td>
<td>947,635</td>
<td>8,440</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>253,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>344,921</td>
<td>467,000</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>122,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>110,733</td>
<td>129,128</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>18,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>70,651</td>
<td>89,530</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>18,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>568,724</td>
<td>759,467</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>190,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>345,200</td>
<td>445,312</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>100,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>926,264</td>
<td>1,229,797</td>
<td>10,118</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>303,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>132,346</td>
<td>179,904</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>47,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>192,013</td>
<td>257,446</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>65,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>3,385,300</td>
<td>4,505,218</td>
<td>37,331</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,119,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Plan Bay Area Housing Unit Growth: 2010-2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Total Average Growth</th>
<th>% Average Growth</th>
<th>Total Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>582,549</td>
<td>730,522</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>147,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>400,263</td>
<td>480,396</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>80,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>111,214</td>
<td>118,719</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>7,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>54,759</td>
<td>60,809</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>376,941</td>
<td>469,347</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>92,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>271,031</td>
<td>326,733</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>55,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>631,920</td>
<td>843,110</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>211,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>152,698</td>
<td>175,518</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>22,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>204,572</td>
<td>236,446</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>31,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGION</td>
<td>2,785,947</td>
<td>3,441,602</td>
<td>21,855</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>655,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where We Live
Embodying Local Visions to Create Healthy Communities

• More housing options
• Better access to jobs
• Access to open space and recreation
• Improved infrastructure
• Cleaner air
• Fewer greenhouse gas emissions
Where We Live
Relying on Local Plans, Creating Housing Choices

• Complete communities – where people walk more and live near shops, transit and local parks
• More housing choices – neighborhoods with a greater variety of multi-family and single-family housing available
Station A: Where We Live, Where We Work
Learn more about how the Draft Plan focuses future jobs and housing growth into areas nominated by local jurisdictions to create a network of complete communities and expand a prosperous and equitable regional economy. (Chapter 2: The Bay Area in 2040 and Chapter 3: Where We Live, Where We Work)

Station B: Investments
Learn more about strategies for maintaining and boosting the efficiency of the existing road and transit system, while making investments in projects that support the focused growth land-use framework. (Chapter 4: Investments)

Station C: Setting Our Sights on Performance
Learn more about how the Draft Plan meets mandated and voluntary performance objectives to accommodate future growth in a way that preserves the character of our communities and our region. (Chapter 5: Performance and Chapter 1: Setting Our Sights)

Station D: A Plan to Build On
Learn more about ongoing and future efforts to achieve the Draft Plan Bay Area vision through policies, programs and legislative advocacy. (Chapter 6: A Plan To Build On)

Station E: Comment Station
Pick up a form and submit your written comments on the Draft Plan Bay Area or one of its supplemental documents.
The draft plan forecasts $289 billion in available funding over the 28-year period of the plan. Over two-thirds (68 percent) of these funds are from regional and local sources, primarily transit fares, dedicated sales tax programs and bridge tolls.

Revenues for Plan Bay Area are either committed to existing purposes – such as to maintain our existing transportation system or committed by voters to specific projects – or considered discretionary and available for assignment to new projects or programs through the plan.

Committed Revenue by Function
$232 Billion
- Road and Bridge: Expansion
  5%
- Transit: Expansion
  5%
- Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing System
  30%
- Transit: Maintain Existing System
  60%

Discretionary Revenue by Investment Strategy
$57 Billion
- Support Focused Growth – OneBayArea Grant Program
  25%
- Build Next Generation Transit
  9%
- Boost Freeway & Transit Efficiency
  7%
- Maintain Our Existing System
  26%
- County Investment Priorities
  29%
- Protect Our Climate
  1%
- Reserve
  3%

Draft Plan Investments
Maintain the Existing Transportation System: $15 Billion

- Support the operating needs of transit operators
- Fund high-priority transit capital investments, such as new buses, railcars and ferries; and needed improvements to tracks, bridges, tunnels, power systems and communications equipment
- Invest in local streets and roads
- Invest in state bridges and highways

Support Focused Growth — One Bay Area Grant Program: $14 Billion

Under the OneBayArea Grant framework, funds will support jurisdictions that produce housing near transit. The OneBayArea Grant program is locally administered and gives communities flexibility to support infill development by providing funding for items such as:

- bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- local street repair
- planning activities
- specific funding for Safe Routes to Schools projects
- specific funding for Priority Conservation Areas

Build Next-Generation Transit: $5 Billion

Plan Bay Area identifies significant future transit investments to the region’s core transit systems and assumes the region can attract federal “New Starts and Small Starts” funding through 2040 to support these projects.

NEW STARTS AND SMALL STARTS – PLAN BAY AREA “NEXT GENERATION” PROJECTS

- BART: Berryessa to San Jose/Santa Clara
- Transbay Transit Center/Caltrain Downtown Extension: Phase 2
- AC Transit Enhanced Bus/BRT: Grand-MacArthur Corridor
- Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project
- AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit
- New Starts and Small Starts Reserve
Boost Freeway and Transit Efficiency: $4 Billion

- Squeeze more efficiency out of the existing system using low-cost technology upgrades to improve the speed and reliability of roadways and transit service.
- Freeway Performance Initiative (includes ramp metering, changeable message signs, Freeway Service Patrol and Call Box programs)
- Transit Performance Initiative – funding for performance improvements in major transit corridors
- Regional Express Lane Network – improve reliability and reduce delay in congested corridors
- San Francisco Pricing Program – charge a fee to drive in specific congested spots to fund transportation improvements, reduce traffic

County Investment Priorities: $16 Billion

This strategy directs funds to key local transportation priorities identified by the county congestion management agencies during the development of their county transportation plans.

- 66 percent of the funds are dedicated to maintaining and sustaining current transportation systems
- The county programs include “complete streets” programs that will deliver substantial bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- More details can be found in the Online Project Database

Protect Our Climate: < $1 Billion

This investment strategy focuses on technology advancements and provides incentives for travel options to help meet the state-mandated targets to reduce emissions from cars and light trucks.

Summary of Climate Program Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Initiative</th>
<th>Cost (In Year of Expenditure, Millions of $)</th>
<th>Per Capita CO₂ Emissions Reductions in 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Benefit Ordinance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Sharing</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Incentives</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Vehicles Feebate Program</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Driving Strategy</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Buy-Back &amp; Plug-in or Electric Vehicle Purchase Incentive</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Electric Vehicle Charger Network</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Initiatives Innovative Grants</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Station B: Investments

A Vibrant Economy
• Between 2010 and 2040, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area is expected to grow by 1.9 million people. The Bay Area is poised to take advantage of the demographic trends driven largely by the Baby Boomers who will retire in the next two decades. This surge in population will create significant demand for a variety of goods and services - including housing, healthcare, transportation, and education.

A Plan to Build On

Association of Bay Area Governments

www.onebayarea.org

Highway System Improvements

Legend

PROJECTS
• New/Improved
Interchange
• Highway Operational Improvement
• Highway Widening

LAND USE
• Urbanized Area
• Priority Development Area (PDA)

ROADS
• Freeway
• Major Road

2010 POPULATION

Oakland
> 350,000

Nestico
50,000–350,000

Pacific
<50,000

Cleaning our Air
• Curbing Greenhouse Gases (picture on page 86): Inform future investment planning development decisions.

Earthquake Mitigation and Recovery
• Substantial shifts in housing and indicators will likely rebound.

Resilience Initiative, launched by ABAG next 30 years. The Regional Disaster States Geological Survey estimates that there is a 63 percent chance of a major earthquake.

Improvements

• Improvements in transportation- related emissions, including a regional projects to reduce transportation-decisions by implementing pilot education program

The United markets is showing signs of recovery. For example, strong job growth is expected in the professional services, and indicators will likely rebound. Market related trends are expected as the Bay market is showing signs of recovery. For example, strong job growth is expected in the professional services, and indicators will likely rebound. Market related trends are expected as the Bay
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## Highway System Improvements

### US-101 Corridor
1. Widening from Story Road to Yerba Buena Road
2. Operational Improvements along Presidio Parkway/Doyle Drive and in the Twin Cities/Greenbrae Corridor
3. New Auxiliary Lanes from Oyster Point to San Francisco county line and from Marsh Road to Embarcadero Road
4. Interchange Improvements at: Petaluma Boulevard, Greenbrae, Candlestick Point, Produce Ave, Broadway, SR-92, Woodside Road, Willow Road and Oregon Expressway
5. New Interchanges at: Zanker Road/Skyport Drive and Mabury Road/Taylor St

### I-80 Corridor
6. Widening from I-680 to Airbase Parkway
7. Integrated Corridor Management (Emeryville to Crockett)
8. Interchange Improvements at: I-680/SR-12, San Pablo Dam Road, Ashby Ave, and Yerba Buena Island

### I-280 Corridor
9. Interchange Improvements at: SR-85 and Senter Road

### I-580 Corridor
10. Widening from Greenville Road to North Flynn Road
11. Interchange Improvements at: Vasco Road and Greenville Road

### I-680 Corridor
12. Interchange Improvements at: SR-84 and SR-4
13. New Interchange at: Norris Canyon Road

### I-880 Corridor
14. Interchange Improvements at: Jackson St, 23rd Ave, 29th Ave, A St, Industrial Parkway, Whipple Road, and SR-262

### SR-4 Corridor
15. Widening from Somersville Road to SR-160 and from Lone Tree Way to Balfour Road
16. Interchange Improvements at: SR-160/Phillips Lane

### SR-12 Corridor
17. Jameson Canyon Widening
18. New Interchange at: Fulton Road

### Other Projects
19. Willow Road Expressway (SR-84 to US-101)
20. SR-84 Widening (I-680 to Jack London Boulevard)
21. SR-262 Widening (I-680 to I-880)
22. SR-1 Widening (Fassler Ave to Westport Drive)
23. Redwood Parkway/Fairground Drive Widening
24. SR-238 & SR-185 Operational Improvements
25. SR-85/SR-237 Interchange Improvements
26. SR-92/Clawiter Road/Whitesell St Interchange Improvements
A Vibrant Economy

Between 2010 and 2040, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area is projected to add 1.1 million jobs, 2.1 million housing units, and 9.3 million people. This growth, however, is expected to be more diverse.

As the Bay Area continues to recover from the lingering effects of the Great Recession, certain economic trends are expected in the professional services, finance, and education sectors. For example, strong job growth is expected in the legal and accounting professions. In the housing market, the median household income is showing signs of recovery, and indicators will likely rebound. By 2040, people and 3.4 million homes are projected to join the Bay Area population ages and become commuters.

The Bay Area has a total of 4.5 million jobs, 9.3 million people, and 3.4 million homes. Between 2010 and 2040, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area is projected to add 1.1 million jobs, 2.1 million housing units, and 9.3 million people. This growth, however, is expected to be more diverse.

The Bay Area is well prepared for the next major earthquake. With local governments and the private sector engaging in collaborative efforts, most communities to increase preparedness and resilience to sea level rise and extreme weather events. MTC is partnering with government agencies and local officials to develop a cohesive regional policy platform to ensure the sector can take and develop a cohesive resilience strategy.

Planning for Resilience

In 2009, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission identified 671 miles of existing and 337 miles of infrastructure at risk of being affected by sea level rise. MTC is partnering with government agencies and local officials to develop a cohesive regional policy platform to ensure the sector can take and develop a cohesive resilience strategy.

The Bay Area Resilience Initiative, launched by ABAG in late 2011, will prioritize next steps on addressing local pollutants in the Bay Area through an education program and an enhanced youth outreach campaign to increase demand for electric vehicles and an enhanced youth outreach campaign to increase demand for electric vehicles. The United Nations analysis shows that 100,000 people are vulnerable to sea level rise.

Healthy Infill Development

In 2010, the Bay Area had 280,000 housing units and 10.2 million people. According to the 2010 census, 3.9 million people were employed and 1.4 million residents were enrolled in post-secondary education. In addition, 1.3 million people were enrolled in post-secondary education.

Projects to reduce transportation-related emissions include curbing greenhouse gases, healthy infill development, and strategies to achieve the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan emission reduction goals. The plan is updated every four years to reflect new initiatives and best practices for local governments on addressing local pollutants in the Bay Area through an education program.

Earthquake Mitigation and Recovery

The Bay Area is well prepared for the next major earthquake. With local governments and the private sector engaging in collaborative efforts, most communities to increase preparedness and resilience to sea level rise and extreme weather events. MTC is partnering with government agencies and local officials to develop a cohesive regional policy platform to ensure the sector can take and develop a cohesive resilience strategy.

Substantial shifts in housing preferences are expected as the Bay Area’s population ages and becomes more diverse.

Healthy Infill Development

In 2010, the Bay Area had 280,000 housing units and 10.2 million people. According to the 2010 census, 3.9 million people were employed and 1.4 million residents were enrolled in post-secondary education. In addition, 1.3 million people were enrolled in post-secondary education.

Projects to reduce transportation-related emissions include curbing greenhouse gases, healthy infill development, and strategies to achieve the Bay Area’s Regional Transportation Plan emission reduction goals. The plan is updated every four years to reflect new initiatives and best practices for local governments on addressing local pollutants in the Bay Area through an education program.
**Regional Transit System Improvements***

**BART Projects**
1. BART Extension to San Jose/ Santa Clara

**Commuter Rail Projects**
2. Caltrain Electrification & Frequency Improvements
3. Caltrain Downtown Extension (4th & King to Transbay Transit Center)
4. eBART to Antioch
5. SMART Commuter Rail (Larkspur to Windsor)

**Infill Stations & Bus Terminals**
6. Transbay Transit Center
7. Irvington BART Station
8. Union City Commuter Rail Station
9. Hercules Commuter Rail Station

**Ferry**
10. New Ferry Routes: Treasure Island, Berkeley, Richmond, Hercules, Redwood City

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Projects**
1. Van Ness BRT
2. Geary BRT
3. Geneva-Harney BRT
4. East Bay BRT
5. Grand-MacArthur BRT
6. Alameda-Oakland BRT
7. El Camino BRT
8. Santa Clara-Alum Rock BRT
9. Stevens Creek BRT
10. King Road Rapid

**Light Rail (LRT) Projects**
11. Central Subway (Chinatown to Caltrain)
12. Embarcadero Streetcar (Fort Mason to Caltrain)
13. Parkmerced Light Rail Extension
14. Bayshore Light Rail Extension
15. Oakland Airport Connector
16. San Jose Airport People Mover
17. Vasona Light Rail Extension
18. Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension

**Other Projects**
19. Transit Effectiveness Project
20. Dumbarton Express Bus Frequency Improvements

*For clarity, only major expansion projects or operational improvements with costs exceeding $50 million are depicted.*
How Does the Draft Plan Bay Area Perform?

Performance targets are an essential part of the Draft Plan. Two of the targets — the greenhouse gas emissions reduction and housing targets — are mandated by state law. Eight of the targets are voluntary or aspirational. Some targets, including the state-mandated targets, are met or even exceeded. In other cases, the plan makes progress but falls short. And in other metrics, the plan actually loses ground.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN MEETS OR EXCEEDS TARGET</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Protection</strong></td>
<td>Target #1:</td>
<td>Reduce per-capita CO₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces per-capita emissions of CO₂ by 18 percent (by 2040).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequate Housing</strong></td>
<td>Target #2:</td>
<td>House 100 percent of the region’s projected growth by income level without displacing current low-income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houses 100 percent of population growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy and Safe Communities</strong></td>
<td>Target #3a:</td>
<td>Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM₁₀) by 10 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates by 71 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy and Safe Communities</strong></td>
<td>Target #3c:</td>
<td>Achieve greater reductions in highly impacted areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan meets target; achieves greater particulate emission reductions in highly impacted neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space and Agricultural Land</strong></td>
<td>Target #6:</td>
<td>Direct all non-agricultural development within existing urban development and urban growth boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan meets target; directs all non-agricultural development within the existing urban footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Vitality</strong></td>
<td>Target #8:</td>
<td>Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 110 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119 percent increase in GRP is forecasted over the life of the plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Performance

### Table 1 Results of Plan Bay Area Target Assessment

#### Plan Bay Area Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved/Failed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy and Safe Communities</strong></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Reduce particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transport</strong></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Increase active transport by 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation System Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Increase non-auto mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce VMT per Capita</strong></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Decrease VMT per person by 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Road Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>Improve pavement condition of local roads to a PCI of 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Moves in Opposite Direction From Target</strong></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>Injury and fatality collisions are projected to increase during plan period by 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equitable Access</strong></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>The share of household income needed to cover transportation and housing costs is projected to rise to 69% for low-income and lower-middle income residents during the Plan Bay Area period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation System Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>The percentage of poor quality state highway lane-miles in the region will rise to 44% of the regional highway system by year 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>The share of transit assets past their useful life is projected to increase to 24% of all assets during the Plan Bay Area period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Targets Achieved

- **Reduce VMT per Capita**
- **Healthy and Safe Communities**
- **Active Transport**
- **Transportation System Effectiveness**
- **Reduce Injuries and Fatalities from Collisions**
- **Equitable Access**
- **Adequate Housing**
- **Climate Protection**
- **Economic Vitality**
- **Agricultural Land Open Space and Natural Areas**
- **Increase the Number of Congestion-Reducing Projects**
- **Reduce per-capita CO2 emissions from cars and light-duty trucks**
- **Reduce VMT per person by 10 percent**
- **Increase the percentage of trips not requiring a car to 20 percent of all trips**
- **Reduce Particulate Matter**
- **Reduce by 5 percent the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian)**
- **Reduce by 10 percentage points (to 56 percent from 66 percent) the share of household income needed to cover transportation and housing costs**
- **Reduce highway lane-miles in the region to less than 10 percent of total highway system**
- **Replace all buses, trains and other transit equipment on schedule**

## Breakthrough Strategies Needed for Some Targets

- **Healthy and Safe Communities**: Strategies to achieve the four targets where we are falling behind.
- **Active Transport**: Plan boosts per-person active transportation by 17 percent.
- **Transportation System Effectiveness**: Plan meets or exceeds six targets, including the statutory green house gas emissions and housing targets, narrowly misses three targets, falls well short of five targets.
- **Reduce VMT per Capita**: Plan improves VMT per person by 9 percent.
- **Local Road Maintenance**: Plan improves pavement condition of local roads to a PCI of 68.
- **Reduce Injuries and Fatalities from Collisions**: Injury and fatality collisions are projected to increase during plan period by 18 percent.
- **Equitable Access**: The share of household income needed to cover transportation and housing costs is projected to rise to 69 percent for low-income and lower-middle income residents during the Plan Bay Area period.
- **Transportation System Effectiveness**: The percentage of poor quality state highway lane-miles in the region will rise to 44 percent of the regional highway system by year 2040.
- **Transit Maintenance**: The share of transit assets past their useful life is projected to increase to 24 percent of all assets during the Plan Bay Area period.
### Highest-Performing Transportation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BART Metro Program (including Bay Fair Connection &amp; Civic Center Turnback)</td>
<td>Multi-County</td>
<td>Increases the efficiency of BART in the urban core by constructing new turnbacks and providing new express train service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Treasure Island Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Charges a $5 toll for residents to enter/exit Treasure Island during peak hours; net revenues designated for transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Congestion Pricing Pilot</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Charges a $3 toll to enter/exit the northeast quadrant of San Francisco during peak hours; net revenues designated for transit service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AC Transit Grand-MacArthur Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Constructs a bus rapid transit line along the Grand Avenue and MacArthur Avenue corridors in Oakland, providing faster service for AC Transit Line NR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Maximizes the efficiency of the roadway network through arterial signal coordination and freeway ramp metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Improvements in San Mateo County</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Maximizes the efficiency of the roadway network through arterial signal coordination and freeway ramp metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ITS Improvements in Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Maximizes the efficiency of the roadway network through arterial signal coordination and freeway ramp metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Irvington BART Station</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Constructs a new infill BART station in the Irvington district of Fremont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Improves reliability and reduces travel times on key Muni bus corridors through signal prioritization and bus lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Caltrain Service Frequency Improvements (6-Train Service during Peak Hours) + Electrification (SF to Tamien)</td>
<td>Multi-County</td>
<td>Electrifies the Caltrain line and purchases additional train vehicles to provide faster, more frequent service during peak hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BART to San Jose/ Santa Clara (Phase 2: Berryessa to Santa Clara)</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Extends BART from the Phase 1 terminus in Berryessa (North San Jose) through a new BART subway to Alum Rock, Downtown San Jose, Diridon Station, and Santa Clara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Van Ness Avenue BRT</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Constructs a bus rapid transit line with dedicated lanes along the Van Ness corridor in San Francisco (from Lombard to Mission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Better Market Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Increases transit speeds along San Francisco’s Market Street between the Embarcadero &amp; Octavia by restricting auto traffic on the corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realizing the Vision

Plan Bay Area is a work in progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities. In some cases, new legislation, updated regulations or additional resources will be needed to fully realize the Plan Bay Area vision and implement the plan’s policies and programs. Here are some of the most important of these challenges, and steps proposed to address them.

A Vibrant Economy

- **IMPROVE PERMITTING**: Speed approvals in permitting and environmental review for new housing projects.

- **IMPLEMENT THE BAY AREA PROSPERITY PLAN**: Encourage stronger, more sustainable communities by completing the Bay Area Prosperity Plan that focuses on expanding economic opportunities and housing the workforce.

- **LINK HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE DEVELOPMENT**
  Continue work to better understand how land-use patterns and transportation investments affect the region’s economy.
Towards a Healthier, More Resilient Bay Area

Cleaning our Air

- **HEALTHY INFILL DEVELOPMENT:** Develop best practices for local governments on addressing local pollutants in planning development decisions.

- **CURBING GREENHOUSE GASES:** Inform future investment decisions by implementing pilot projects to reduce transportation-related emissions, such as:
  - regional bike-sharing pilot program
  - educational campaign to increase demand for plug-in electric and plug-in hybrid vehicles

Planning for Resilience

- **CLIMATE ADAPTATION AND SEA LEVEL RISE:** Some 1,000 miles of existing and future road, rail, air and other infrastructure are at risk of being affected by sea level rise. Regional agencies and local communities are working together to increase resilience to sea level rise and storm events while protecting critical ecosystems and community services.

- **EARTHQUAKE MITIGATION AND RECOVERY:** While the region has made great strides in improving our resilience to natural disasters, ABAG is working with businesses and local governments and others to help ensure an effective recovery of housing, businesses and infrastructure.
A Platform for Advocacy

**Land Use:**

- **SUPPORT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT WITH LOCALLY CONTROLLED FUNDING:** Consider replacing redevelopment funds with a new revenue source to support housing construction and infrastructure improvements.

- **MODERNIZE THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA):** Update CEQA to encourage infill development.

- **STABILIZE FEDERAL FUNDING LEVELS:** Advocate for stable and reliable federal funding for housing.

- **ADJUST TAX STRUCTURE:** Adjust commercial or residential tax structures to balance the financial incentives for new development.

**Transportation:**

- **SUPPORT LOCAL SELF-HELP:** Local voter-approved measures generate about 2/3 of the state’s transportation funding. Support efforts to lower the vote threshold for local and regional transportation tax measures from two-thirds to 55 percent.

- **SEEK RELIABLE AND FLEXIBLE FEDERAL FUNDING:** The current federal transportation bill ends in 2014. Congress should identify a long-term, user-fee based funding source to maintain and improve our nation’s transportation infrastructure.

- **GROW STATE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING:** New state funds are needed to maintain and increase the efficiency of the existing transportation network and make needed improvements.
Station E: Comment Station
Reaching Out

• Comments are logged, summarized and presented to decision makers

• 25 public workshops and hearings in all nine counties (2010-2012) attended by nearly 2,000 residents

• 12 additional open houses/public hearings in all nine counties slated for 2013 (including tonight)

• Local Government Summit (2010) drew over 300 local elected officials; additional 40 presentations to elected officials

• More than 65 presentations to civic groups throughout the Bay Area

• Partnerships with community groups in low-income communities and communities of color (1,600 completed surveys, 21 focus groups)

• Online comment opportunities (Virtual Workshop taken by 1,300 residents and recently launched Plan Bay Area Town Hall on onebayarea.org)

  • Over 270,000 page views and 50,000 unique visits to onebayarea.org website

  • Three statistically valid telephone polls (late 2010/early 2011, spring 2012 and spring 2013 surveying some 5,200 residents)
Public Hearing

- The purpose of this public hearing is to receive oral comments from the public.

- All comments from tonight’s hearing will be transcribed by a court reporter, entered into the official record and shared with MTC Commissioners and ABAG Board Members.

- Thank you for taking the time to comment!

**Public Hearing Procedures:**

- If you wish to speak, please fill out a Blue Card. When the hearing starts, you will be invited to come up to the microphone.

- Each speaker will be given 2 minutes to comment.

- If you would like to make additional comments, please use the comment form.

- Please state your name and city of residence when you begin your remarks.

- Please be respectful of others. Please do not shout or interrupt.
A Guide to the San Francisco Bay Area’s Transportation Improvement Program, or TIP

Updated to reflect the Draft 2013 TIP

March 2013

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Introduction

This guide explains how the public and interested stakeholders can get involved in the San Francisco Bay Area’s transportation project development process. Specifically, the focus is on the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP, which is compiled and approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. A major milestone occurs when a highway, transit or other transportation project is added to the TIP. A project may not receive federal funds or receive other critical federal project approvals unless it is included in the TIP. This guide focuses on the TIP – what it is and how the public can use it to keep informed about projects in their communities.
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What is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission?

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was created by the California State Legislature in 1970 and is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC functions as both the region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO) – a federal designation – and, for state purposes, as the regional transportation planning agency. As such, it is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, local streets and roads, rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The RTP includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates planning for transportation, land use and housing. The Commission screens requests from local agencies for regional, state and federal grants for transportation projects to determine their compatibility with the RTP, and coordinates the participation of governments and the general public in the planning process.

MTC also functions as the Bay Area Toll Authority and the Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways.

The San Francisco Bay Area is served by seven primary public transit systems as well as over 20 other local transit operators, which together carry over 500 million passengers per year. There are nearly 20,000 miles of local streets and roads, 1,400 miles of highway, six public ports and three major commercial airports. The region includes nine counties and 101 municipalities; more than 7 million people reside within its 7,000 square miles.

The Commission is governed by a 21-member policy board. Sixteen commissioners are appointed directly by local elected officials. In addition, two members represent regional agencies – the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Finally, three nonvoting members represent the U.S. Department of Transportation, the State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
What is the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP?

The TIP lists the near-term transportation projects, programs and investment priorities of the region’s surface transportation system that have a federal interest – meaning projects or programs for which federal funds or actions by federal agencies are anticipated – along with locally and state-funded projects that are regionally significant. A regionally significant project, generally large scale, changes travel patterns over a relatively large geographic area. The TIP signifies the start of implementation of the programs and policies approved in the Bay Area’s long-range transportation plan. It does this by identifying specific projects over a six-year timeframe that will help move the region toward its transportation vision. Locally funded transit operations and pavement maintenance are generally not included in the TIP.

The TIP is multimodal.
The TIP lists highway, local roadway, bridge, public transit, bicycle, pedestrian and freight-related projects.

The TIP covers a six-year period.
The TIP lists projects for a period of six years. MTC is required by federal law to update the TIP at least one time every four years.
The TIP identifies future commitments of funding and signifies that a project may move ahead to implementation.

A project’s inclusion in the TIP is a critical step. It does NOT, however, represent an allocation of funds, an obligation to fund, or a grant of funds. For projects funded with federal dollars, this may occur only after the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and/or either the U.S. Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration review the design, financing, and environmental impacts of a project; consult with other transportation and resource agencies; and review public comment. Beyond this point, a project sponsor works with Caltrans or the federal agencies to guarantee the federal funding identified in the TIP. This federal guarantee is referred to as an “obligation.” To secure non-federal funds, projects are subject to final approval from state, regional or local agencies.

The TIP shows estimated project costs and schedules.

The TIP lists specific projects and the anticipated schedule and cost for each phase of a project (preliminary engineering, final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction). Any project phase included in the TIP means implementation of that phase is expected to begin during the six-year timeframe of the TIP. Funding shown outside the TIP period is for informational purpose or to display total project cost. The TIP schedule of project implementation is NOT fixed. The timeframe shown in the TIP is the “best estimate” at the time it is first listed in the TIP. Sometimes projects cannot maintain that schedule and will be moved to a later year. Conversely, to accelerate implementation the project sponsor can request that the project be moved to an earlier year.

The TIP must reflect realistic revenues and costs.

The list of projects in the TIP must be able to be funded within the amount of funds reasonably expected to be available over the six-year timeframe of the TIP. To add projects to the TIP, sufficient revenues must be available, other projects must be deferred, or new revenues must be identified. As a result, the TIP is not a “wish list” but a list of projects with funding commitments during the timeframe of the TIP.

The TIP may be changed after it is adopted.

An approved TIP may be revised in order to add new projects, delete projects, advance projects into the first year, and accommodate changes in the scope, cost or phasing of a project. MTC encourages public comment on significant proposed changes to the TIP.

The TIP is NOT a guarantee that a project will move forward to construction. Unforeseen problems may arise, such as engineering obstacles, environmental permit conflicts, changes in priorities, or cost increases or declining revenues. These problems can slow a project, cause it to be postponed, change its scope, or have it dropped from consideration.
A summary of the Draft 2013 TIP

The Bay Area’s Draft 2013 TIP includes approximately 880 transportation projects, and a total of approximately $16.9 billion in committed federal, state and local funding over the six-year TIP period through fiscal year 2018. See the next page for a map of projects with costs greater than $200 million.

Draft 2013 TIP Investment Analysis:
Focus on low-income and minority communities

To address the equity implications of the proposed 2013 TIP investments, MTC has conducted an investment analysis with a focus on minority and low-income residents. The key question addressed is: “Are low-income and minority populations sharing equitably in the TIP’s financial investments?” To answer this question, the investment analysis uses demographic criteria to calculate the shares of 2013 TIP investments that will flow to the identified communities, and compares those shares with the proportional size of this group’s population and trip-making, relative to those of the general population.

Results of the Investment Analysis of the Draft 2013 TIP can be viewed on MTC’s web site at: www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/
Projects in the Draft 2013 TIP
Over $200 Million

1. San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Replacement
   Alameda County
   $5.71 billion

2. BART – Berryessa to San Jose Extension
   Santa Clara County
   $3.96 billion

3. Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension, Phase 2
   San Francisco County
   $2.60 billion

4. BART – Warm Springs to Berryessa Extension
   Santa Clara County
   $2.52 billion

5. US-101 Doyle Drive Replacement
   San Francisco County
   $1.97 billion

6. Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension, Phase 1
   San Francisco County
   $1.59 billion

7. SF Muni Third St LRT Phase 2 Central Subway
   San Francisco County
   $1.57 billion

8. Caltrain Electrification
   Multiple Counties
   $1.23 billion

9. Transbay Transit Center – TIFIA Loan Debt Service
   San Francisco County
   $1.08 billion

10. BART Railcar Replacement Program**
    Multiple Counties
    $1.03 billion

11. BART – Warm Springs Extension
    Alameda County
    $0.890 billion

12. I-80/680/12 Interchange Project
    Solano County
    $0.718 billion

13. Toll Bridge Rehabilitation Program**
    Multiple Counties
    $0.629 billion

14. BART Car Exchange (Preventative Maintenance)**
    Multiple Counties
    $0.603 billion

15. Valley Transportation Authority: Preventative Maintenance**
    Santa Clara County
    $0.571 billion

16. Sonoma Marin Area Rail Corridor
    Sonoma/Marin Counties
    $0.532 billion

17. San Jose International Airport People Mover
    Santa Clara County
    $0.508 billion

18. SR-1 Devils Slide Bypass Tunnel
    San Mateo County
    $0.505 billion

19. BART Oakland Airport Connector
    Alameda County
    $0.484 billion

20. E-BART – East Contra Costa County Rail Extension
    Contra Costa County
    $0.460 billion

    Contra Costa County
    $0.425 billion

22. US-101 Express Lanes in Santa Clara County
    Santa Clara County
    $0.425 billion

23. SR-24 – Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore
    Alameda/Contra Costa Counties
    $0.420 billion

24. AC Transit: Preventative Maintenance Program**
    Alameda County
    $0.392 billion

25. SR-4 East Widening from Somersville Rd to SR-160
    Contra Costa County
    $0.385 billion

26. US-101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (Sonoma)
    Sonoma County
    $0.373 billion

27. US-101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (Marin)
    Marin County
    $0.341 billion

28. Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point Local Roads**
    San Francisco County
    $0.338 billion

29. Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)**
    Multiple Counties
    $0.328 billion

30. Dumbarton Rail Service (PE and ROW only)
    Alameda/San Mateo Counties
    $0.301 billion

31. Capitol Expressway LRT Extension, Ph. 2
    Santa Clara County
    $0.294 billion

32. BART Transbay Tube Seismic Retrofit
    Multiple Counties
    $0.276 billion

33. Golden Gate Bridge Seismic Retrofit, Ph. 1-3A
    Marin/San Francisco Counties
    $0.274 billion

34. Southeast Waterfront Transportation Improvements**
    San Francisco County
    $0.254 billion

35. El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit
    Santa Clara County
    $0.234 billion

36. Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Ramp Improvements
    San Francisco County
    $0.233 billion

37. Caltrain Positive Train Control**
    Multiple Counties
    $0.231 billion

38. SF Muni Rail Replacement Program**
    San Francisco County
    $0.223 million

39. 7th Street Grade Separation and Roadway Improvement
    Alameda County
    $0.221 million

40. Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements
    Alameda County
    $0.215 million

41. SFMTA ADA Paratransit Operating Support**
    San Francisco County
    $0.207 million

42. Better Market Street Transportation Elements
    San Francisco County
    $0.206 million

43. Enhanced Bus – Telegraph/International/ East 14th
    Alameda County
    $0.205 million

** These projects not shown on map
Projects in the Draft 2013 TIP With Costs Greater Than $200 million
How does the TIP relate to the long-range regional transportation plan?

Regionally significant projects must be first identified in the region’s long-range transportation plan, and projects in the TIP must help implement the goals of the plan. The long-range plan is required by federal law and is a blueprint for transportation investment decisions over a 25- to 30-year horizon. The long-range plan establishes policies and priorities to address mobility, congestion, air quality and other transportation goals. The Draft 2013 TIP translates recommendations from the Draft Plan Bay Area into a short-term (six-year) program of improvements focused on projects that have a federal interest. Therefore, the earlier (and more effective) timeframe for public comment on the merits of a particular transportation project is during the development of the long-range plan.
How does the TIP relate to the Clean Air Act?

Transportation activities funded with federal dollars must be consistent with air quality standards called for in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. A TIP and Regional Transportation Plan are said to “conform” to those standards if they do not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay attainment of the air quality standards. Along with adoption of the TIP and RTP, MTC must make a conformity finding that the quality standards are met. To determine this, MTC conducts a transportation air quality conformity analysis. MTC encourages the public to review and comment on this analysis.

How is the TIP funded?

Funding for projects in the TIP comes from you – through taxes, tolls and fees, including local, regional, state and federal programs. Major fund sources are administered through the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, and by the State of California. Various county sales tax measures and regional bridge toll measures provide additional funds. The state of California, transit agencies and local jurisdictions provide dollars to match federal funding or to fully fund certain local projects.
Who develops the TIP?

MTC develops the TIP in cooperation with the Bay Area Partnership of federal, state and regional agencies; county congestion management agencies (CMAs); public transit providers; city and county public works representatives; and the public. The Bay Area Partnership subcommittees provide a forum for managers of the region’s transportation system to contribute to the policy-making and investment activities of MTC, and to improve coordination within the region.

Project sponsors must be a government agency (or other qualifying entity, such as certain non-profit organizations that are eligible for some transportation funds) and are responsible for initiating funding requests, applying for funds, and carrying their projects to completion. In the Bay Area, project sponsors include public transit operators, Caltrans, MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the congestion management agencies, the nine Bay Area counties, the individual cities within each county or other special districts.
How does a project get in the TIP?

Often years of planning and public input precede a project’s inclusion in the TIP. Although there are several ways in which a project can get in the TIP, the most typical course is described here. The chart on the next page shows where the TIP lies on the path to completion of a project.

First, a particular transportation need is identified. In many cases, planners and engineers generate lists of potential improvements based on their needs analyses and public inquiries. The local proposals are in turn reviewed by a city, county, transportation authority, transit operator, or state agency. If the public agency agrees that a particular idea has merit, it may decide to act as the project sponsor, work toward refining the initial idea, develop a clear project cost, scope and schedule, and subsequently seek funding for the project.

Once local agencies develop their list of projects and priorities, they are submitted to MTC for consideration to include in a regional transportation plan. Even if a project is fully funded with local funds, if it is a major project it must still align with the regional plan’s goals in order to be included in the plan. Many project sponsors will request funding for their projects that is subject to MTC approval. MTC must balance competing needs and assure that the most critical investment priorities are being addressed within the limits of available funds and that there is consistency among projects and with the region’s goals as embodied by the Regional Transportation Plan.

When federal and state discretionary funding becomes available to the region, MTC, guided by the long-range plan in consultation with transportation stakeholders, develops a transportation program for those funds. This involves deciding on criteria for project selection and setting funding levels per project. Depending on the program, either MTC, the county congestion management agency, transit operator, or county may propose projects.
Follow a Transportation Project From Idea to Implementation

New Project Ideas and Local Review

Idea
An idea for a project starts when a transportation need is identified and a new idea is put forward. The idea can surface in any number of ways — from you, a private business, a community group or a government agency.

Local Review
The project idea must be adopted by a formal sponsor — usually a public agency — that may refine the initial idea and develop details for the project. To move forward, the project must be approved by local authorities such as a city council, county board of supervisors or transit agency.

To be eligible for certain regional, state and federal funds, projects must be cleared through the county congestion management agency (CMA), and become part of the Regional Transportation Plan.

How You Can Make a Difference

Get involved in your community!

- Follow the work of your city council, county board of supervisors or local transit agency.
- Take notice of plans or improvement programs developed by your city, county or transit agency.
- Comment on projects proposed by your county CMA or on transportation

MTC’s Long-Term Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Every four years MTC updates the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), looking forward two to three decades. The plan identifies policies, programs and transportation investments to support the long-term vision for the Bay Area.

The RTP also must identify anticipated funding sources. The RTP can include only those projects and programs that can be funded with revenues reasonably expected to be available during the plan’s timeframe. Projects identified in the RTP are generally drawn from the planning efforts of MTC, county congestion management agencies, transit agencies and local governments.

State legislation now requires that regional transportation plans incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) — provisions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks by integrating transportation, housing and land-use planning.
Implementation

MTC’s Project Selection Process

Once long-term goals, policies and funding initiatives have been set in the RTP, MTC develops program criteria and funds specific projects.

Project Selection Process

**Funding Levels Established for RTP Programs/Initiatives:** Guided by the RTP and short-term revenue estimates, MTC decides how much funding to apply to programs over a two-to-four-year period at a time.

**Project Selection Criteria Developed:** For competitive programs under its control, MTC is guided by the RTP and develops and adopts minimum project requirements and criteria to evaluate and prioritize projects.

**Project Selection:** Depending on the program, projects may be selected using MTC’s criteria or by the county congestion management agency, the California Transportation Commission or a transit agency board. Some funding programs are non-competitive, meaning projects are funded according to a pre-determined formula or voter-enacted initiative.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The production of the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP is the culmination of MTC’s transportation planning and project selection process. The TIP identifies specific near-term projects over a six-year period to move the region toward its transportation vision.

The TIP lists all surface transportation projects for which federal funds or actions by federal agencies are anticipated, along with some of the larger locally and state-funded projects. A project cannot receive federal funds or receive other critical federal project approvals unless it is in the TIP. MTC must update the TIP at least once every four years. It is revised several times a year to add, delete or modify projects.

Environmental Review and Project Development Activities

The project sponsor conducts an environmental review, as required by either the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Final approval of the project design and right-of-way is required by the sponsoring agency and appropriate federal agency (Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration) if federal funds and/or actions are involved.

Funding is fully committed by grant approval (once the project meets all requirements and moves forward to phases such as preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, or construction.

Get involved in planning for the whole Bay Area at MTC!

- Comment at MTC committee-level and Commission-level meetings, special public hearings and workshops.
- Follow the work of MTC’s Policy Advisory Council which advises the Commission

Comment on a project’s impacts

- Comment on the environmental impacts of the project before the environmental document and project receive final approval by the board of the sponsoring agency, or in advance of federal approval, if required.
What happens after a project is included in the TIP?

Once a project is in the TIP, a considerable amount of work still remains to bring it to completion. The designated project sponsor is responsible for ensuring the project moves forward. Projects typically proceed in phases (preliminary engineering, final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Each phase is included in the TIP showing funding and the anticipated schedule. Ideally, a project will advance according to its listed schedule. However, tracking each project’s progress is important so that delays can be identified and remedied as soon as possible, and so that funding can be reallocated as necessary.

Once federal funds have been made available for a project’s final construction phase, they usually no longer appear in future TIP documents – even though the project may not yet be completed.
In what ways can the public participate?

Public participation occurs during all stages of a project’s development. Communicating support or concern to municipal and county officials and transit agency managers is one of the most effective starting points. As local review begins, public input may be provided at formal meetings or informal sessions with local planning boards and staff. Members of the public may also be asked to participate in special task forces to review transportation improvement concepts at the corridor, county and regional level. The MTC’s long-range transportation plan has an extensive public involvement program including but not limited to workshops, focus groups, surveys, public hearings and opportunities to comment at Commission meetings. Finally, once a project is in the TIP and it enters the preliminary engineering phase, the detailed environmental review process affords yet another opportunity for the public to offer input. An overview of opportunities to get involved during every stage of a project is provided on pages 12 and 13.

MTC’s public involvement process aims to give the public ample opportunities for early and continuing participation in transportation project planning, and to provide full public access to key decisions. The public has the opportunity to comment before the draft TIP is officially adopted by the Commission. MTC conducts a public comment period and holds public meetings to allow the public an opportunity to ask questions about the process and projects. Copies of the draft TIP are distributed to major libraries; notices are mailed out to an extensive mailing list of interested individuals and agencies along with instructions on how to access and comment on the TIP on the MTC website; and the TIP documents can be viewed on the MTC website at www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/.

MTC extends an open and continuing invitation to the Bay Area public to assist in developing transportation solutions for the region. A comprehensive Public Participation Plan details the many avenues available to groups and individuals who would like to get involved in MTC’s work. The plan can be found on MTC’s website at www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm.
Where to turn for more information

Visit the MTC website at www.mtc.ca.gov for more information about the transportation planning and funding process and to obtain schedules and agendas for MTC meetings. Below are direct links to key documents. Some publications mentioned are available at the MTC-ABAG Library.

Resources
The Transportation Improvement Program
www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/
MTC Public Participation Plan
www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm
The ABCs of MTC
www.mtc.ca.gov/library/abcs_of_mtc/
Project Listing: MTC Fund Management System
www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/fms_intro.htm

MTC Staff Contacts
Program and Fund Management
Ross McKeown (510) 817-5842
rmckeown@mtc.ca.gov
Transportation Improvement Program
Sri Srinivasan (510) 817-5793
ssrinivasan@mtc.ca.gov
Adam Crenshaw (510) 817-5794
acrenshaw@mtc.ca.gov
Federal Highway Administration Programs
Craig Goldblatt (510) 817-5837
cgoldblatt@mtc.ca.gov
Federal Transit Administration Programs
Glen Tepke (510) 817-5781
gtepke@mtc.ca.gov
State Funding Programs
Kenneth Kao (510) 817-5768
kkao@mtc.ca.gov
MTC Public Information
(510) 817-5757 or info@mtc.ca.gov
MTC-ABAG Library
(510) 817-5836 or library@mtc.ca.gov
Request assistance

If you need a sign language interpreter, if English is your second language and you need translation services, or if you require any other type of assistance please contact us by calling 510.817.5757 or 510.817.5769 for TDD/TTY. We require at least three days' notice to provide reasonable accommodations.

Si necesita un intérprete del lenguaje de señas, si el inglés es su segundo idioma y necesita un intérprete, o si necesita cualquier otra ayuda por favor comuníquese con nosotros al número 510.817.5757 o al 510.817.5769 para TDD/TTY. Requerimos tres días de anticipación para proveer asistencia razonable.

如果您需要手語翻譯員，或如果英語是您的第二語言，您需要翻譯服務，或者您需要任何其他類型的協助，請致電510-817-5757或致電TDD/TTY電話510-817-5769。我們要求獲得至少三天提前通知才能提供合理的配合安排。
Transportation agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area

**Major Transit Operators**

Altamont Commuter Express (ACE)
209.944.6220

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)
510.891.4777

Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)
510.464.6000

Bay Area Water Emergency Transit Authority
415.291.3377

Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (County Connection)
925.676.1976

Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority (Tri Delta)
925.754.6622

Fairfield/Suisun Transit (FAST)
707.422.2877

Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District
415.921.5858

Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (WHEELS)
925.455.7500

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (VINE)
707.259.8631

Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)
650.508.6200

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)
415.701.4500

San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)
650.508.6200

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)
408.321.2300

Santa Rosa Department of Transit and Parking
707.543.3333

Solano County Transit (SolTrans)
707.648.4666

Sonoma County Transit
707.585.7516

Transbay Joint Powers Authority
415.597.4620

Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WestCAT)
510.724.3331

**Major Airports and Seaports**

Port of Oakland
510.627.1100

Port of San Francisco
415.274-0400

Oakland International Airport
510.563.3300

San Jose International Airport
408.392.3600

San Francisco International Airport
650.821.8211
Regional Agencies
Association of Bay Area Governments
510.464.7900
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
415.771.6000
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
510.817.5700
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
415.352.3600

Congestion Management Agencies
Alameda County Transportation Commission
510.208.7400
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
925.256.4700
Transportation Authority of Marin
415.226.0815
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency
707.259.8631
San Francisco County Transportation Authority
415.522.4800
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
650.599.1406
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
408.321.2300
Solano Transportation Authority
707.424.6075
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
707.565.5373

State Agencies
California Air Resources Board
916.322.2990
California Highway Patrol, Golden Gate Division
707.551.4180
California Transportation Commission
916.654.4245
Caltrans, District 4
510.286.4444

Federal Agencies
Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
415.947.8021
Federal Highway Administration, California Division
916.498.5001
Federal Transit Administration, Region 9
415.744.3133
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Frequently Asked Questions

Overview

What is Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area is a state-mandated, integrated long-range transportation, land-use and housing plan that will support a growing economy, provide more housing and transportation choices and reduce transportation-related pollution in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It builds on earlier efforts to develop an efficient transportation network and grow in a financially and environmentally responsible way. It is a work in progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities. By planning now, we will create a Bay Area we will be proud to leave to future generations.

Why is there a Plan Bay Area?

By law (Senate Bill 375), all regions in California must complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SB 375 requires California’s 18 metro areas to integrate transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. In the Bay Area, this requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to adopt an SCS that meets greenhouse gas reduction targets adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Who is responsible for doing this planning?

Within the Bay Area, the law gives joint responsibility for Plan Bay Area to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). These two agencies work with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). They also partner with local communities, agencies, and a wide range of stakeholders to ensure broad public input into Plan Bay Area’s preparation.

What does the Metropolitan Transportation Commission do?

MTC is the transportation planning, financing, and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC operates the regional transportation network as smoothly and efficiently as possible now and for the future.

Under what authority does MTC exist?

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), a statutorily created regional transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq., is for the
purposes of the Political Reform Act, a local government agency pursuant to Government Code Section 82041. Federal law [Title 23, United States Code, Section 134 (d)] designates MTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. As such, MTC must adopt and regularly update a long-range regional transportation plan.

The Commission's work is guided by a 21-member policy board, with 18 of the commissioners designated as voting members. Sixteen of the voting commissioners are appointed by local elected officials in each county. The two most populous counties, Alameda and Santa Clara, each have three representatives on the Commission: the county board of supervisors selects one member; the mayors of the cities within the county collectively appoint another; and the mayors of the biggest cities in these two counties (Oakland in Alameda County and San Jose in Santa Clara County) each appoint a representative.

**What does the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) do?**

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the regional planning agency and council of governments (COG) serving the people who live and work in the 101 cities and towns of the Bay Area, including coastal communities, older industrial centers, rural towns and big cities. ABAG was formed by local government leaders in 1961 who recognized the need to address common issues from a regional perspective.

ABAG’s mission is promoting good planning to build a better Bay Area in order to enhance the quality of life here by supporting regional collaboration, planning, research and member services. ABAG also houses the San Francisco Bay Trail project, the San Francisco Estuary Project, and a Risk Management and Insurance Services program that provides cost effective self-insurance to over two dozen local jurisdictions. ABAG also conducts regional population and employment projections and the state-mandated Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process (Government Code Section 65584 et seq.).

**Under what authority does ABAG exist?**

ABAG is a joint powers agency formed in 1961 pursuant to California Government Code Section 6500, et seq., and the council of governments (COG) for the San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG is governed by a 38-member Executive Board comprised of locally elected officials based on regional population. A General Assembly made up of elected officials from every member jurisdiction determines policy matters and reviews major Executive Board actions and recommendations. Each delegate has one vote, and a majority of city and county votes are required for action.

**So why are regional agencies involved in planning?**

As required by State legislation (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.) and by federal regulation (Title 23 USC Section 134), MTC is responsible for preparing the RTP for the San Francisco Bay Area Region. An RTP is a long-range transportation plan, updated every four years, that identifies the strategies and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the region’s transportation network. In 2009, MTC adopted its most recent RTP, known as the Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.

As the Council of Governments for the Bay Area, ABAG is responsible for providing a forum for local jurisdictions to work out issues with impacts that cross jurisdictional boundaries. ABAG
also is required by state law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) to update the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) every eight years, and to allocate specific housing targets to individual cities and counties. State law (Senate Bill 375) also requires ABAG and MTC to plan jointly for transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks.

What will Plan Bay Area do?

State law requires Plan Bay Area to:

1. Identify “areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region” — where people will live, including all income groups, for at least the next 25 years; and
2. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by an amount specified by the CARB.
3. Meet the federal requirements for an RTP.

How does the Plan Bay Area affect me, personally?

This Plan looks ahead to 2040 and seeks to preserve what we love about our small towns, cities and farmlands; maintain key transportation infrastructure; and offer more choices in where we will live and how we will get around. As a long-range initiative, Plan Bay Area will have more of an impact on future generations than it will on those of us here today. The goal is to reduce traffic congestion, improve transit options, create more opportunities to walk or bike, strengthen existing neighborhood infrastructure and support the creation of more affordable housing options within Bay Area communities.

Will Plan Bay Area change the character of the region’s rural communities, small towns and suburban residential neighborhoods?

No. Most single-family neighborhoods will remain unchanged. Plan Bay Area recognizes the diversity of communities across our region. The Plan concentrates new growth in areas nominated by local governments, with most of the growth taking place toward the center of our region in cities like San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. Overall, over two-thirds of all regional growth by 2040 is allocated to Priority Development Areas. As a result, small cities, single family neighborhoods and rural areas throughout the Bay Area will take on a very small share of the region’s overall growth. Local land use authority is retained by the region’s cities and counties. Local jurisdictions will continue to determine where future development occurs.

How do smaller suburban job centers benefit from Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area supports growing suburban job centers such as the Tri-Valley by maximizing the amount of forecasted employment growth in these jurisdictions given the amount of housing that they deem appropriate. The Draft Plan invests in the region’s transportation network to support job growth and housing in existing communities by focusing the lion’s share of funding on maintaining and improving the efficiency of the existing transit and road system.

The Draft Plan also includes strategic transportation investments that benefit suburban cities by addressing management, reliability and safety of the existing freeway, highway and arterial infrastructures while targeting freeway improvements to most congested locations.
Why would local governments want to support the Plan Bay Area?

Implementation of Plan Bay Area is intended to improve the quality of life of neighborhoods by providing cleaner air, improved public health, better mobility, more walkable streets, and homes closer to transit, jobs and services. Plan Bay Area redirects some regional resources to more closely align with local community development visions, as adopted in local plans. This includes funding from the One Bay Area Grant Program and assistance in meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This sounds like a big effort. Are we starting from scratch?

Not at all. For decades, the Bay Area has been encouraging more focused and compact growth. Plan Bay Area builds on this history and places even greater emphasis on the integration of transportation and land use planning. Plan Bay Area continues our traditional emphasis of investing in operating and maintaining our existing transportation system, and builds on successful regional programs centered on focused growth around high quality transit, including affordable housing, complete streets that serve pedestrians and bicyclists and well as motorists, and protection and preservation of open space.

When will the Draft Plan Bay Area be complete?

MTC and ABAG issued a Draft Plan Bay Area for public comment in April 2013, after more than two years of public dialogue and consultation. The agencies are scheduled to consider adoption of the Final Plan in July 2013. If adopted, Plan Bay Area will be updated every four years, as required by law, to reflect the region’s changing needs and priorities.

What are the consequences of delaying the adoption of Plan Bay Area?

The schedule to develop Plan Bay Area has been extended several times over the past three years in response to input from stakeholders and local jurisdictions. There was no additional time in the schedule for further extension without impacting federal air quality conformity requirements and the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which are directly tied to the schedule for the adoption of Plan Bay Area following certification of the EIR.

What does it cost to conduct and complete a planning process like this?

The budget for the planning portion of Plan Bay Area (that is, the costs associated with conducting the process versus the funding the plan directs toward programs and projects) is approximately $3.1 million over 3 years. This includes consultant assistance and staff costs to update the regional travel model; to create a new, integrated economic and land use model for the current Plan and future updates to the Plan; to conduct model analyses; to evaluate the performance of plan scenarios, alternatives and projects; to prepare the Draft Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report; to complete supplementary reports and to conduct public engagement. Funding comes from the region’s annual allocation of federal, state and local planning revenues.

What are some of the other regional efforts related to Plan Bay Area?

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) are considering how to improve the region’s land use pattern
and placement of public infrastructure, including transportation. To reduce air pollution (smog, particulate matter and airborne toxins), the Air District is considering how to address the air quality impacts of transportation and other sources associated with land development. BCDC is preparing for rising sea levels and storm surges affecting areas on and near the Bay shoreline. Future sea levels will have implications for the location of development and transportation infrastructure.

**About Forecasts**

**How can ABAG and MTC predict the future?**

We do not predict the future. For several decades, both MTC and ABAG have been developing and updating long-term regional plans for the Bay Area by using computer modeling to forecast transportation and housing demand, economic growth, demographics, and land-use changes, among others. These forecasts are used to inform planning and investment decisions. The forecasts are updated every two to four years to make sure they are based on the most reliable data, including locally adopted plans for development and conservation.

**How many people will Plan Bay Area need to accommodate?**

The Bay Area is currently home to about 7 million people. Data suggests that over the next 30 years the region will attract another 2 million people. The rate of growth depends on several variables, including job growth, age distribution, predicted birth and death rates, and estimated migration into the Bay Area.

**Why do the Department of Finance population numbers differ from ABAG’s projections?**

California’s Department of Housing and Community Development, the Department of Finance, and ABAG all agree that economic trends need to be addressed in Plan Bay Area. ABAG’s 2.1 million population growth projection is directly tied to employment growth. The Department of Finance’s 2013 projections do not take into account the high rate of growth in jobs, population and migration into the region. The Department of Finance population projections depict only one possible course of future population change, i.e., the one reflecting assumed trends in fertility, mortality, and migration. The model does not consider employment, which is a major driver of migration. The Department of Finance will incorporate ABAG employment forecasts in the future. The Department of Finance, and Department of Housing and Community Development agree with ABAG’s methodology and projections.

**Why are your population estimates based on one number and not a range?**

We recognize that there is a range of future population estimates; however for planning purposes we have to arrive at a single number. Based on the current population and assumptions for fertility rates, death rates and future jobs (which affects job seekers moving to the Bay Area), the Plan Bay Area estimate represents what we believe is the most likely future population. To ensure the forecast is as accurate as possible, it will be updated every four years.
Why should we have confidence in the population/demographic models used to support the plan?

The Plan Bay Area forecast was developed by ABAG with extensive assistance and peer review by a team of economists and other state agencies including the California Department of Finance. The forecast uses demographic data from national and state sources, such as the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Census, and the California Department of Finance. It relies upon standardized forecasting methods to estimate the Bay Area's share of expected national employment growth and the detailed demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) of the region's future population. The methodology for forecasting the region’s future population is based on natural increase of the existing population (births minus deaths) and expected job growth (which draws people to the region). A detailed description of the forecasting methodology is available in the Draft Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing.

The forecast includes these inputs and is based on the best professional estimates of ABAG staff. In addition, although the SCS forecasts population growth out to 2040, by law the SCS must be updated every four years. This provides ABAG the opportunity to continually refine the assumptions and data used in its forecasts.

Why are natural hazards such as earthquakes, sea level rise and flooding not integrated more directly into the plan?

Plan Bay Area is a long-term, regional-scale plan covering 101 cities and nine counties, over 150 major transportation projects, and many other transportation and land use projects over the next approximately 27 years. The Plan and the Environmental Impact Report address natural hazards at the level appropriate for long-term, programmatic regional plans. Potentially significant site-specific natural hazards caused by projects implemented under Plan Bay Area will be addressed at the project-specific level. MTC and ABAG will continue to monitor these issues and revise Plan Bay Area in response to the changing environment every four years, as required by law.

About Transportation

How does Draft Plan Bay Area invest transportation funds?

Draft Plan Bay Area focuses the lion’s share of investment on maintaining the existing transit and road system and boosting the transportation system’s efficiency. The Plan also provides support for focused growth in Priority Development Areas, including the new One Bay Area Grant program.

How much transportation revenue is expected to be available?

The Draft Plan Bay Area forecasts transportation revenue totaling $289 billion over 28 years. However, most of this money will be needed just to maintain the existing transportation network. Of the total amount, $57 billion is “discretionary,” or available for assignment to new projects and programs.
How does Plan Bay Area invest future transportation funds?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Committed YOES billions</th>
<th>Discretionary Revenue YOES billions</th>
<th>Total YOES billions</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit: Maintain Existing System</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing System</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: Expansion</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Bridge: Expansion</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$232</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$289</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does the Draft Plan Bay Area propose to invest future discretionary funds?

The Draft Plan invests discretionary funds into six key investment strategies: (1) county investment priorities would receive $16 billion, or 29 percent of available funds; (2) system maintenance would receive $15 billion, or 26 percent; (3) programs to support focused growth are slated to garner $14 billion through the One Bay Area Grant program, or 25 percent of expected discretionary funds; (4) transit expansion projects would receive $5 billion, or 9 percent; (5) freeway and transit efficiency projects would receive $4 billion, or 7 percent; and (6) $1 billion (less than 1 percent) would go toward programs specifically designed to combat climate change. The plan includes a $2 billion reserve fund set aside for future rail expansion projects.

What is OBAG?

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is designed to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation process. The program totals $320 million over the next four years ($14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, which amounts to 5 percent of overall funding and 25 percent of discretionary funding in the plan). The program grants local communities the flexibility to invest in transportation infrastructure that supports infill development by providing funds for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local road repair and planning activities, while also providing funds for Safe Routes to School programs and for Priority Conservation Areas.

How does the Draft Plan propose to support bicycle and pedestrian travel?

State Transportation Development Act (TDA) and local sales tax funds committed to bicycle and pedestrian improvements total $4.6 billion during the Plan period. The One Bay Area Grant program, $14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, is another fund source that can be used to pay for ‘Complete Streets’ projects. These projects can include stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian paths, bicycle lanes, pedestrian bulb-outs, lighting, new sidewalks, Safe Routes to Transit, and Safe Routes to Schools projects that will improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and travel.

In addition to this funding, cities and counties that wish to use OBAG grant funds must adopt a ‘Complete Streets’ resolution and in the future an updated general plan element to improve the delivery of Complete Streets projects serving all road users, including pedestrians and bicyclists. During MTC’s last survey of project sponsors in 2006, over 55% of transportation projects surveyed already included complete streets elements. The resolution requirement is expected to increase the rate of complete street implementation.
What does the Plan propose to fund for the region’s Climate Initiatives Program?

The Climate Initiatives Program invests in eight programs focused on technology advancements and incentives for travel options to help the region meet the SB 375 GHG emissions targets. The programs include: implementing the Commuter Benefit Ordinance, authorized by SB 1339; expanding car sharing to ensure vehicles are available at high-demand locations and expanded to suburban communities; providing incentives to reduce the cost of vanpools; establishing discounted fees charged on new vehicles with low miles-per-gallon rating to help purchase fuel-efficient vehicles; a public education campaign and rebates for tools that encourage “smart driving”; establishing a voluntary vehicle buy-back incentive program to accelerate the removal of low-mpg vehicles coupled with incentives towards the purchase of plug-ins or electric vehicles; and investing in a regional electric vehicles charger network. In addition, the Plan calls for the expansion of the most successful strategies identified in the Climate Initiatives Innovative Grants program, which is currently underway.

About Housing and Land Use

Why do we have RHNA – Regional Housing Need Allocation?

California Housing Element law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) requires each jurisdiction to plan for housing for all income levels by ensuring that local zoning and planning support the production of a diverse range of new housing. The RHNA is the state-mandated process to identify the share of the state’s housing need for which each jurisdiction must plan over an 8-year period. Jurisdictions are not responsible for building the housing: only for demonstrating in their local Housing Element that it could be built under current zoning. ABAG oversees the RHNA process in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

How does Plan Bay Area relate to the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA)?

Plan Bay Area combines these three initiatives into a single, integrated regional plan. For example, RTPs traditionally include land use projections. Plan Bay Area’s distribution of growth is the SCS. Senate Bill 375 also stipulates that the SCS will identify areas to accommodate the RHNA. State law requires that the RHNA follow the development pattern specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Does Plan Bay Area override local land use control?

No. Cities and counties, not MTC or ABAG, are ultimately responsible for the manner in which their local communities continue to be built out in the future. For this reason, cities and counties are not required to revise their “land use policies and regulations, including [their] general plan, to be consistent with the regional transportation plan or an alternative planning strategy.” [Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(2)(J)]. The Plan’s SCS merely provides a land use vision that “if implemented, [would] achieve the greenhouse gas emission reductions targets” for the region. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21155, subd. (a) (emphasis added).) The proposed Plan will only be implemented insofar as local jurisdictions adopt its policies and recommendations.

Rather than increase regional land use control, the Plan facilitates implementation by expanding incentives and opportunities available to local jurisdictions to support growth in Priority
Development Areas (PDAs). In addition to funding transportation and planning projects in PDAs, the Plan sets the stage for cities and counties to increase the efficiency of the development process, if they choose, for projects consistent with the Plan and other state legislation.

What is a Priority Development Area?

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally designated areas within existing communities that have been identified and approved by local cities or counties for future growth. These areas are typically accessible to transit, jobs, shopping and other services. Over 70 local governments have voluntarily designated some 170 PDAs, which are proposed to absorb about 80 percent of new housing and over 60 percent of new jobs on less than five percent of the Bay Area’s land. The result is a locally supported, compact and efficient growth pattern that meets CARB’s GHG reduction targets and provides adequate housing for the Bay Area’s growing population.

What is a Priority Conservation Area?

Priority Conservation Areas are identified in partnership with land trusts, open space districts, parks and recreation departments, local jurisdictions and property owners to preserve the region’s diverse farming, recreational, and resource lands for future generations. This process builds on a century of park development and open space protection. The purpose of designating Priority Conservation Areas is to protect key natural lands in the San Francisco Bay Area through purchase or conservation easements with willing property owners.

If Plan Bay Area includes additional housing units in my community, does this guarantee that those units are going to be built?

No. The pace at which new housing is built will be determined by various factors, including local zoning, the financial feasibility of building the new housing permitted under this zoning, and ultimately the decision by a city council, town council, or board of supervisors to approve each housing project. Cities and counties will continue to retain all control over local building decisions following adoption of the Plan. Over the long term, communities may change zoning, provide incentives for developers, or adjust other land use policies to increase or decrease the feasibility of building the levels of housing projected in the Plan.

Have ABAG and MTC investigated whether Plan Bay Area’s development is feasible?

The regional land use plan, or distribution of growth to individual jurisdictions, was developed through a variety of land use and transportation scenarios that distributed the total amount of growth forecasted for the region to specific locations. These scenarios sought to address the needs and aspirations of each Bay Area jurisdiction, as identified in locally adopted general plans and zoning ordinances, while meeting Plan Bay Area performance targets adopted by ABAG and MTC to guide and gauge the region’s future growth.

The framework for developing these scenarios is based as Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) nominated by local governments, not ABAG or MTC. ABAG and MTC incorporated local feedback from individual jurisdictions, relying on their best assessment of feasible growth over the plan period and then applied a series of additional factors to achieve Plan Bay Area’s goals. The scenarios were then developed through an open, deliberative process, during which public input was sought at every step along the way. After
further modeling, analysis, and public engagement, the five initial scenarios were narrowed down to a single preferred land use scenario.

Feasibility of this scenario was further tested by an assessment of a representative sample of PDAs from throughout the region by consultants at Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) deeply familiar with the market characteristics of each jurisdiction in the Bay Area. Overall, the study concluded that the proposed development pattern contained in the preferred scenario, while ambitious, represents an achievable level of growth with sufficient policy changes, some of which are now underway or currently being examined.

**So all projects in Plan Bay Area will require further environmental review?**

It’s important to note that while Plan Bay Area includes a “Program-level” EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (or CEQA), any major transportation, housing or other project included in the plan must still comply with CEQA, and in some cases the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For example, if a project to add bicycle lanes is listed in the Plan, separate environmental review specific to that project is still required under CEQA and will be conducted by the jurisdiction with approval authority over the project. Likewise, if the Plan describes new housing units or jobs within a city or county, the actual planning and development enabling any proposed project that might be brought forward to a city or county would fall under a local environmental review and still need local approval. SB 375 provides CEQA streamlining benefits that local jurisdictions can take advantage of, but it the Plan Bay Area EIR does not preclude future environmental review.

**What is open space and who owns it?**

Open space generally refers to undeveloped land or water that could be either publicly or privately owned.

**Is Plan Bay Area consistent with Urban Growth Boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls in many Bay Area counties?**

Yes. The Draft Plan accommodates 100% of new growth within existing urban growth boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls. It also emphasizes protection for the region’s farmland and scenic and natural resource areas, including Priority Conservation Areas.

**How will local sewer, fire, water and other local infrastructure be impacted by housing growth? What about schools, libraries, and other public services?**

Infrastructure, school, police, and fire service effects will vary in different locations, with those locations experiencing more growth likely requiring additional services. Funding for many of these services will be locally determined, as public service standards, performance measures, and policies related to police and fire are typically set by local jurisdictions and agencies; and library and recreation facilities are typically set in city and county general plans. For schools, standards relating to class size are primarily determined at the state level, although local school districts are responsible for the planning and construction of school facilities. Additional funding may come from developer agreements, which can include impact fees to support schools and other community benefits, such as parks and libraries.
As a regional plan encompassing nine counties, Plan Bay Area cannot provide a detailed assessment of local needs. However the compact growth pattern in the SCS should allow jurisdictions to leverage existing facilities and absorb some of the increased demand with facilities that are currently underutilized. Overall, more compact urban development costs less for upfront infrastructure, saves on ongoing delivery of services, and generates more local tax revenue per acre than conventional suburban development. New employment associated with providing public services is recognized in the Plan Bay Area jobs forecast, with increases in every county consistent with population growth.

The SCS DEIR found that impacts to schools, libraries, and parks from land use development are Potentially Significant, and therefore would have to undergo environmental review during the approvals process to determine feasible mitigations. For additional information, please see the Draft EIR, chapters 2.12 and 2.14.

**How are water needs for new development proposed in this plan being addressed?**

Plan Bay Area is a programmatic document and the Draft EIR includes a program-level assessment of impacts related to water supply. The Draft EIR demonstrates the region faces questions regarding water supply deficiencies particularly during drought years. While numerous factors influence water demand, including employment growth, socio-economic characteristics, geographic distribution of the population, variation in precipitation levels, and water conservation practices, overall population growth is the most important factor. The projected population growth will occur with or without the Plan.

The proposed Plan Bay Area concentrates the projected growth within currently developed areas in the region, which reduces per capita water consumption. As a result, the proposed Plan should help protect the region’s water supply by reducing development pressure on rural areas; areas where per capita water use is typically higher and new water infrastructure would be needed to accommodate growth.

With a few exceptions, the areas anticipated for new development conform to local general plans and specific plans. Each of the Bay Area’s urban water suppliers must prepare an Urban Water Management Plan that assesses current and future demands for water. The potential future development would have been accounted for in the local Urban Water Management Plan.

**About Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**What are the greenhouse-gas reduction targets?**

In 2010, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets for regions across California, as required by law. For the San Francisco Bay Area, this means a 7 percent per capita reduction target for the year 2020 and 15 percent per capita reduction target for 2035, based on 2005 levels. CARB set the GHG emissions reductions targets for the various regions in the state as a per capita metric. The DEIR of the Plan included both this “SB 375 metric” focused on reducing per capita emissions from cars and light duty trucks related to transportation and land use planning, as well as an overall GHG emissions metric in its analysis of Plan Bay Area.
Why is lowering greenhouse gas emissions important?

Lowering greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions protects public health, lowers energy consumption, and reduces our contribution to global warming. More immediately, strategies to reduce emissions emphasize creating more options to take public transit, walk or use a bicycle for transportation instead of a car, when viable and appropriate. In addition, other laws require Plan Bay Area to meet federal and state air quality health standards for several pollutants.

Why the focus on cars and light trucks?

Transportation is the biggest single source of greenhouse gases in California. In the Bay Area, it accounts for 41 percent of our overall emissions, most of that comes from personal travel in on-road vehicles. To reduce our contribution to global warming, the region must pursue multiple transportation and land use strategies.

Plan Bay Area will:

1. Reduce the separation of land uses (jobs, stores, schools, and homes) and encourage more complete, mixed-use communities, so people can drive less and walk, bike or use more transit;
2. Cluster more homes, jobs and other activities around transit, so people can more easily use transit rather than drive; and
3. Plan land uses and transportation together, to reduce traffic congestion, improve vehicle speeds, reduce emissions from idling and other inefficiencies.

What about low-carbon fuels, more efficient cars, and solar/green buildings? Won’t that reduce the region’s greenhouse gas emissions? Why do we even need SB 375?

Vehicle technology and transportation pricing (e.g., parking) are likely to have a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The impact of more efficient vehicles would be significantly reduced, however, if we continue to drive more and congestion increases because of inefficient land uses. Experts agree that there is no single answer. Changes in technology as well as changes in travel behavior will be necessary to reduce emissions to healthier levels in the future. There are other planning and implementation efforts that address building energy efficiency, renewable energy production, and additional GHG reduction approaches (for example, local Climate Action Plans and Energy Upgrade California (https://energyupgradeca.org/overview.)

Further, SB 375 requires regional planning agencies in the state to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region could achieve the GHG emissions reductions targets through integrated land use and transportation planning. The CARB Scoping Plan, developed to implement AB 32 as a comprehensive statewide strategy to reduce GHG, specifically charges CARB with implementing GHG reduction strategies related to clean vehicles and fuel efficiency. Therefore, the SB 375 targets analysis does not include the GHG emissions reductions and benefits of statewide standards that are anticipated as the result of fuel efficiency standards and the low carbon fuels standards (LCFS) as part of the region’s efforts to reduce GHG emissions through integrated land use and transportation planning. Were MTC/ABAG to include those benefits in the SB 375 analysis, the region would be taking credit for emissions reductions in the land use
and transportation planning sector that the state is taking credit for as part of ARB’s responsibilities, thus double counting.

**What if Plan Bay Area can’t meet its targets?**

If we cannot meet the greenhouse-gas reduction targets in Plan Bay Area, then we must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) to accompany the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The APS would identify the physical, economic or political conditions required to meet the regional greenhouse gas targets.

**Equity**

**What does “social equity” mean?**

Social equity is the idea that all persons should have fair and equal access to opportunity. Plan Bay Area is designed to find housing for all persons at all income levels in the region, improve air quality in polluted areas and to make housing and transportation more affordable for lower-income households. For more information, visit the One Bay Area web page on equity.

**What does “environmental justice” mean?**

Environmental justice stems from a Presidential Executive Order to fairly distribute benefits and burdens for disadvantaged communities and to include minority and low-income communities in decision-making. The federal government oversees regional planning. As a recipient of federal funds, MTC is required to incorporate environmental justice principles in all its planning efforts, including Plan Bay Area.

**Public Input**

**How are local governments and other organizations involved?**

Local officials, as well as environmental, social justice, faith-based, public-health and business leaders, are engaging in Plan Bay Area through a Regional Advisory Working Group that provides input on planning and policy issues. The agencies also get input from several other interest groups through MTC’s Policy Advisory Council and ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee. These meetings are open to the public and broadcast live via streaming audio. For more details, visit OneBayArea.org.

**How are you involving residents in low-income communities and communities of color?**

MTC and ABAG are partnering with nonprofit groups working in low-income communities and communities of color, selected through a competitive procurement process, to involve residents in those communities in development of the Plan.

**Are businesses involved in the Plan Bay Area process?**

Yes. MTC and ABAG have been working with business leaders from throughout the region, especially at key points during development of the Plan.
Is my input really considered by ABAG and MTC?

Absolutely. Oral and written comments from workshops, telephone survey results, a web survey and focus groups, have been analyzed, summarized and presented to ABAG and MTC decision makers at key milestones in the development of the plan. The Draft Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) were released March 22 and April 2 respectively for public review and comment. All oral and written comments will be summarized and presented for review by ABAG and MTC board members to inform their final action on the Draft Plan, which is slated for adoption in July 2013.

How can I get involved?

Public engagement is essential to the success of all the regional planning efforts. Plan Bay Area needs the input of all stakeholders — especially the people who live and work in Bay Area communities — to build a plan that meets their vision, goals and aspirations for a prosperous future.

There are many ways to get involved. You can go to our Get Involved page to sign up for alerts about meetings and other opportunities to have your voice heard. We also encourage you to visit our Public Process page, which explains the nuts and bolts of what can be an admittedly complicated multi-year planning process.

Plan Bay Area is based on the work of hundreds of local planning efforts that have taken place around the Bay Area. We encourage you to get involved in local planning efforts, including neighborhood plans, General Plan and Housing Element updates. A second regional planning effort, the Bay Area Prosperity Plan, is engaging a broad range of community organizations and partners around the region on economic development and housing strategies to implement Plan Bay Area. You can learn more about this effort at http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/Bay-Area-Prosperity-Plan.html.

Why don’t you do more to publicize opportunities to comment on this plan?

MTC and ABAG are conducting an extensive public engagement program. Methods for publicizing comment opportunities include:

- Regular press releases to the news media outlets about comment opportunities
- Numerous presentations to local elected officials and civic groups.
- Social media (Facebook and Twitter)
- An interactive web site that has drawn some 50,000 unique visitors to learn about Plan Bay Area and comment via a “Virtual Workshop” and an online “Plan Bay Area Town Hall”
- Email and direct mail
The Role of Regional Government

Some claim that Plan Bay Area is part of an ill-intended global agenda to force lifestyle changes — is this true?

Plan Bay Area is a home-grown effort to plan for future transportation and land use needs. Most of us who live here are accustomed to saying that we live in “The Bay Area.” That simple phrase speaks volumes. It shows we already share a regional identity. We have a history of joining together on issues that cross jurisdictional lines. Notable examples include working to save San Francisco Bay, set aside land for a vast system of interconnected parks and open space, and pioneer a regional rapid rail system. All these efforts have shaped our collective identity and put us on the map as a region. Our first long-range comprehensive regional plan was completed in 1964 by ABAG. MTC has been adopting and updating regional transportation plans since 1971, the most recent of which was adopted in 2009. Plan Bay Area is a work in progress that will be updated every four years. While it is done in part to meet state and federal laws that require metropolitan areas to plan for regional needs, the Plan furthers a very important conversation in the Bay Area about the quality of life we enjoy today, and how to leave a better region for future generations.

Is there any relationship between Plan Bay Area and U.N. Agenda 21?

No. Plan Bay Area is mandated by California Senate Bill 375. For more information, read the American Planning Association fact sheet “Agenda 21: Myths and Facts” available online at http://www.onebayarea.org/pdf/Agenda21mythsfacts.pdf.

Does Plan Bay Area force local governments to accept regional dictates in order to receive transportation funding?

Plan Bay Area does not require local governments to implement regional requirements in order to receive transportation funding. The majority of funding in the Plan ($232 billion, or 80%) is already committed for specific purposes. The remaining $57 billion in revenues are available for assignment through the plan. As revenues become available, MTC assigns these funds to specific projects and programs, and may, at its discretion, include specific requirements. For the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG) — which is slated to receive 5% of funding included in the Plan — MTC requires recipients to comply with existing state law by having an approved housing element. MTC directs the majority of OBAG funds to areas that local jurisdictions have nominated and have been approved as Priority Development Areas, though it is not a requirement to be designated a PDA in order to receive funding. So the Plan itself does not dictate specific requirements to local governments, rather the subsequent funding programs may include policies to ensure scarce transportation revenues are invested appropriately and in a manner that supports implementation of the Plan.

Will Plan Bay Area be on the ballot for approval by voters?

Rather than asking voters to adopt the long-range transportation and land use plan, state law requires this action from ABAG (as the state-designated Council of Governments) and MTC (as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization). Both boards consist of locally elected officials.
Use the space below to submit your comments. Please check if this comment applies to:

☐ Draft Plan Bay Area
☐ Draft Environmental Impact Report
☐ Draft Transportation Improvement Program & Air Quality Conformity Analysis

Please use the other side if additional space is needed.
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Would you like to be added to the Plan Bay Area e-mail notification list? (optional)
By providing the following information, I consent to and agree that the information may be used by MTC and ABAG to keep me up to date via email on Plan Bay Area and related planning work.

Name: _______________________________________________________________________________________________

County of Residence: _______________________________________________________________________________

E-Mail: ______________________________________________________________________________________________
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METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
APPENDIX F

Community-Hosted Focus Groups

Appendix E documents can be found immediately following this cover sheet.
Appendix F1

Participants in the Spring 2013 focus groups submitted the following written comments at the conclusion of each of the meetings. Please note these are only the written comments received at these meetings.

**ALAMEDA COUNTY**
There were no written comments received at the Alameda County focus group.

**CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**

- **Concord – April 15**
  - How about combination public transportation with used bicycle?
  - I’d like to know if a traffic light or cross light can be installed where O’Reilly’s and 7-11 is.
    - Also, create a program for teenagers to be able to get driving classes at a reduced price.
  - We need more programs for our children.
    - Better bus service.
    - Discount fares for our children.
    - Streetlights in areas that don’t have any (like Ellis Street).
  - There is a concern that new housing near transit may replace low-income housing like what happened near the Pleasant Hill BART.

- **Richmond – March 20**
  - I would like to continue to learn more about Plan Bay Area and MTC.
  - Routine police patrols on every BART train
    - Clean restrooms on BART trains & at stations
    - General routine cleaning of BART trains
  - So glad I participated – it was really great to hear about the plans that are in the works to improve transit in the Bay Area – especially public transportation. One thing I wasn’t able to mention is affordable housing assurances in the “Support Focused Growth” strategy with any transit-centric housing in (downtown) Richmond. I think that one issue (downtown) Oakland has is that the majority of the housing near BART is not affordable for the local population. I would hate to see that happen in Richmond.
  - More ferries in the bay to and from more destinations.
**Marin County – March 21**

- I would like to see regional agencies use funding incentives as a way to motivate local governments to be inclusive and equitable in how funds are allocated & public projects are implemented.
  - Needs to review statistics
  - Include ethnicity and minorities
  - Make sure statistics reflect the reality
  - Include parking spaces
  - Invest in education and information

- Thanks for holding this meeting & for including me.

- Access & collective impact
  - Do you integrate these findings and suggestions with community master planners (smaller communities)?
  - “Collective impacts” is a framework used for social change planning. Concept is trending across America.

- Very good.
  - This would have been an interesting forum a year ago – during the public meeting process.
  - Prior knowledge to attendance about the influence of County vs. Plan Bay Area.
  - Prior knowledge of attendee stakeholders would have been interesting.
  - Follow up: A list of all attendees. This is a great opportunity for this group to continue to organize & use this forum as a springboard.

- I feel that the plan presented will be great for the Bay Area but in Marin County we need more in terms of transportation services along with a supply of affordable housing and a train to the city.

- Plan for all communities; take inputs before the plan
  - Small, big, healthy, wealthy, low-income, educational, needs, jobs, safety – all of these aspects have more factors than were mentioned
  - All agencies who are involved need to be familiar what job they all do – partnership
**MONOLINGUAL SPANISH** (including monolingual Spanish-speaking participants from Contra Costa County, San Francisco and Sonoma County)

- **San Francisco – April 3**
  - Yes, they should modify the plan so that transit service is cheaper and that way we can stop driving and help the environment; that way we can have better economic development and good service.
  - The meeting was clear and informative. I had the fortune of learning different comments and answers; everything is very important for the Latino community. I’m very excited to have learned so much at this meeting. Everybody’s voice counts so that we are heard. Thank you for all the information and your good disposition.
  - Well, I liked everything that was discussed. And I hope to be in the next meetings so I can learn more because to me it was very, very important. Thank you all, the meeting was very important.
  - Please do not forget that we need more invitations for meetings like this so that our opinions and our voice are heard in order to improve our needs.
  - The importance of having more people represented from each of the counties would be more relevant to support these types of programs. Thank you for your support and collaboration.
  - Thank you for giving the community the opportunity to give their voice and opinion and that they are informed about what is happening around them.

**SAN FRANCISCO**

- **Chinatown CDC – March 14**
  - There is a lack of understanding of low-income immigrant communities and needs and daily patterns of jobs, services, transit/transportation needs. Presentation doesn’t reflect these communities.
  - To improve the bus service, increasing the spending on current bus operator’s training is more efficient than increasing the routes and schedules.
  - Other than reducing the noise level of public transit facilities near residential areas, it’s more important to fix the safety problem. Homeless people tend to gather around those public transit facilities and it strongly impacts the area’s safety.
  - Many investment projects are focused on improving and increasing the tourism facilities, but less on improving the residential facilities.
  - It’s mostly important to improve the traffic condition in the Bay Area. There is too much congestion.
  - We hope that during the Plan Bay Area implementation process, there will be more coordination between different agencies and fewer conflicts.
  - Cleaner and safer buses.
    - Reduce delays; better to be on time.
    - I hope to find a job locally so I don’t need to take the bus to commute.
I like the idea of the Plan Bay Area, but I think the “funding” is very important, as well as the execution – to ensure equity amongst stakeholders.

A more coherent explanation of tools being used to accomplish Plan goals.

Thank you for helping me see projected growth in the City.

---

**POWER (Bayview Hunters Point/Mission District) – March 27**

- A wide overview of transit concepts was well displayed to people at hand.

---

**SAN MATEO COUNTY**

**Redwood City – March 6**

- PDAs and TOD are positioned still in conflict with air quality requirements for residential building near major roadways
- Does the Bay Area community accept as a cultural norm that our young adults, seniors and working families with modest incomes will find a spectrum of housing priced to be accessible to many income levels?
- What new income streams for housing/transit can be developed with gas tax, vehicle registration fees, etc.?
- Local hiring as a way of shortening commutes?

- Good meeting and well organized. A couple of questions came up for me throughout the meeting:
  1a) How do we get this information out to communities that speak other languages other than English?
  1b) Can we do this same meeting in Spanish, Tongan, Mandarin, Tagalog?
  2) The faith community has a lot of influence in communities of color—and many faith leaders lead community churches. How about a meeting with just faith leaders?

- How about displaying your website address at all Bay Area bridge toll crossings?

- Please consider the following when planning:
  - access to healthy food near transportation sessions
  - walkability to and from stations
  - extended operating hours for public transit
  - better lighting near transportation
  - smoke-free housing units
  - more affordable public transit

- Discussions were very useful and I appreciate any opportunity to hear what matters locally. Regional plans can be hard to understand or relate to because it seems too large-scale but the presentations included local impacts/examples which made it easier to understand. A meeting space closer to public transit may have been better, but otherwise the logistics of the meeting worked well. I appreciate the emphasis on discussion time.

- Health services accessibility.
  - Awareness around public transportation.
- Policy that holds local government accountable to fulfilling goal of providing low-income housing/affordable/adequate.
- Continued outreach on the plan. Build foundation
  1) People need to know they have a voice.
  2) Take back to community neighborhood.
  3) Invest/Inclusion/Respect.
- Dialogue with labor about employer subsidized transit.
  o I think it's imperative to include in these meetings a section on how to communicate about these issues in a comprehensible and compelling way to our neighbors and community, along with specially designed materials—as hard copies, supported with a website. There should also be a way for people to share their personal stories as they relate to these issues.
  o Two thoughts:
    1) In addition to the “trip” count for employers, the length of the trip is very important. Facebook agreed to limit “trips” but should limit trip miles.
    2) Employment and housing should be encouraged to be more closely aligned. Prioritize local hiring.
  o In order to get grassroots, community resident buy-in to engaging in this process, you must make the impact(s) relevant to their communities. Most folks living in underserved communities are struggling to make ends meet and aren’t necessarily concerned with regional matters. If you can present or break-down this information down to the local level, I believe that you’ll get more resident buy-in.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY

• VIVO (San Jose, Vietnamese Community) – March 15
  o PDA and community meeting process re zoning & policies for seniors.
  o The information was appreciated. I recommend shortening the presentation. Two hours is a long meeting.
  o - Concern:
    (1) “Rocketship schools” – dropped in the middle of neighborhood = causes for family to drive to school, not walk/bike to school.
    (2) Safe routes to school.
  - Questions: Will VTA/MTC work at the policy level, at school district or city jurisdictional level? Implementation of Safe Routes to School is difficult and policy changes can work better than just infrastructure improvements alone. What about working w/enforcement agencies?
  o Great presentation, all sounds promising. However, I feel the need to underline the need for senior adults to be taken into account. There are several areas where there used to be business and have been traditionally commercial. But now they
are senior residential zones. We need to ready our areas to be more pedestrian friendly, especially towards senior community.

- Great workshop! I’m glad we had a chance to voice our concern in this focus group.
- Focus on senior needs: - Access, - Isolation, - Safety
  - More linguistic sensitive materials (signage, etc.)
  - Zoning and planning with senior housing near cultural shopping areas.

- **San Jose Downtown Association (San Jose Downtown) – March 19**
  - Well done – everyone had time to both give and elaborate their ideas and opinions.
    - Education cannot be overstressed. Everyone needs to gain a perspective of the present situation and how each person’s future will be improved.
  - I think that information with approved projects/actual funding (timeline) would help in educating the public re the Plan. I agree that the VTA website needs more user friendly capabilities for those interested in certain areas/projects.
  - Good meeting format. I encourage these meetings as future PDAs are up. Find local leaders and get in on their meetings and newsletters. Great resources. Very informative and easy to understand. Please provide PDFs of materials so we can pass along.
  - This was a good broad-brush introduction to what happens “up there” versus what we’re used to dealing with “down here” when the dirt starts flying in the neighborhoods when new development starts. We really do need to champion Plan Bay Area in our neighborhoods as leaders to whom others look for education and direction.
  - Residents of downtown San Jose are enthusiastic for expanded transportation options (BART, BRT, light rail, etc.). Generally the demographics that come into downtown for work/live are progressive & open to mass/public transit options; they want to drive less, walk more, be outside in open/green spaces. Their main concerns are centered around safety and access. They want these areas to be clean, safe and easily accessible for as close to 24/7 as is realistic.
  - The information presented was very clear. The Plan Bay Area concept is not only good for the region but needed in order to create a sustainable future. More influence for ABAG and MTC to establish standards for PDA development is key.
  - The efforts of MTC and ABAG on “Plan Bay Area” are truly inspiring. The information presented was great and depicts the concerns and interests of many people in the Bay Area. I feel that the strategies and initiatives fall in line with what the Bay Area needs and currently lacks. SJSU supports Plan Bay Area 100%!
**SOLANO COUNTY**

- **Dixon – March 7**
  - Informative meeting; well-presented information.
  - Please enroll me on any upcoming information meetings.

**SONOMA COUNTY**

- **Santa Rosa – March 12**
  o Interested in seeing more being done toward electrification of mass transit. Need to identify ways to shift budgets from capital improvements/expansion to ongoing maintenance – identify how that can happen – where pressure needs to be in the political process. Keep expanding part of budget for additional mass transit services.
  o - I would suggest the financial pie chart directly represent the investment strategies. It is not that I found it confusing or irrelevant, but I think it would help speed up this particular conversation.
    - Please share my contact information with SCTA.
  o One thing I didn’t mention in the meeting...I drive an electric vehicle and it is the Wild West out there in terms of EV charging station standardization, availability, signage, security, access, guidelines or rules for use, etc., etc. For example, some people “hog” the only station around by being there 5+ hours. Some stations are poorly designed where there might be three chargers but room to pull up for only 1.5 cars.
  o This was extremely informative and the presenters listened well.
    - I do have a concern about how we’re going to continue to ramp up transit over this time but perhaps the escalating fuel prices will motivate that.
    - I am encouraged by the direction this plan is going; the priorities seem sound to me.
    - Feel free to forward my contact info to SCTA.
  o Fund incentives for alternate methods of transportation such as ride shares, public transport, bike, etc.; especially in “rural” counties like Sonoma.
  o Thank you for this opportunity. Please provide my contact to SCTA.
  o Good process today. Consider doing this with Taxpayer’s Association. We should double transit service in this county.
  o Thank you. I appreciate this process, and the interest in improving transit and the environment in our community and Bay Area as a whole. Great presentations. Thanks!
  o A bicycle/pedestrian overpass over Highway 101 at Steele Lane is in need of funding. This is a huge priority for so many of us, as it will connect the east and west sides of town in a way that will make it much safer for pedestrians and cyclists.
  o - Community comment: Sustainable growth limiting sprawl. Stop seeing transit as a fee for service and more like a utility that delivers a public good. Transit oriented developers need to be a priority. We need more connectors between the
bike to buses to train. The 101 overcrossing in Santa Rosa is very important for pedestrians and cyclists; pedestrian safety is important. The impact on reducing traditional traffic while improving convenience to outlying areas. Connect stuff.
- I would really like that pricing program be installed in Santa Rosa.
- Please share my contact info w/SCTA.
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY-BASED WORKSHOP
POWER
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 2013
5:30 PM – 8:00 PM

AGENDA

5:30-6:00 CHECK IN, PICK UP REFRESHMENTS AND HANDOUTS

6:00-6:10 BRIEF INTRODUCTIONS

6:10-6:30 WHAT WE HAVE HEARD FROM YOUR COMMUNITY
(Pam Grove, MTC Staff)

6:30-7:15 DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA DISCUSSION
Background on Draft Plan Bay Area;
What to Expect When Plan Is Released
(Vikrant Sood, MTC Staff; JoAnna Bullock, ABAG Staff)
Facilitated Discussion/Q & A
(Zach Klos, Davis & Associates)

7:15-7:45 IMPLEMENTATION AND INVOLVEMENT
Ways to stay involved in local and regional planning issues
(Liz Brisson, San Francisco County Transportation Authority;
MTC and ABAG staff)

7:45-8:00 NEXT STEPS, FINAL QUESTIONS AND WRAP UP
(Zach Klos)

Thank you for your participation!
Agenda

- Welcome and introductions
- What we have heard from your community
- Draft Plan Bay Area discussion
- Implementation and Involvement
- Next steps, final questions
Why a Plan Bay Area?

- To manage growth in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area
- A blueprint to coordinate land use and transportation policies, projects and public investments
- Part of California’s approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles
- Updated regularly, every four years
- An ongoing conversation about the kind of Bay Area we want to leave for future generations
State Adopted Targets

- for cutting greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks in California’s metropolitan areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions from 2005 to Target Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Regional Task

- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from driving in the Bay Area by 15% per capita by 2035
- House the region’s population at all income levels
- Align transportation investments, housing growth, and land use planning
- Provide the necessary planning and capital supports for successful private investment in infill development
- Support a strong economy and quality of life
What We Have Heard From Your Community
Plan Bay Area Outreach

**Spring 2011 & Winter 2012**

- Two statistically valid telephone polls with nearly 1,700 residents
- Ten public workshops spring 2011 and 9 public workshops winter 2012
- Partnered with 14 community-based organizations to conduct outreach with communities that don’t readily participate in local and regional planning efforts *(1,600 surveys and 10 focus groups with 150 participants)*
- Ongoing meetings with our various advisory groups
- Extensive, ongoing outreach to local government and stakeholders; strong web presence
What we heard from POWER

- **Top transportation investment strategies:**
  - More frequent transit service on routes with high ridership
  - Increase transit service for transit dependent populations
  - Provide more frequent bus service
  - More transit service to connect housing and jobs
  - Expand commuter rail services (such as BART and Caltrain)
  - Add more bike paths/bike lanes
  - Provide financial incentives to cities to build more housing near transit
What we heard from POWER

- **Top policy initiatives:**
  - Develop economic strategies to protect existing jobs, create new jobs, preserve industrial sites
  - Reduce public transit fares
  - Tax corporate polluters to fund transit
  - Other pricing strategies, e.g., charge tolls on Express lanes, or charge fees for vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
  - Expand the Safe Routes to Schools network
  - Encourage smart driving
  - Develop commuter benefit ordinances
  - Change freeway speed limit to 55 mph
  - Increase vanpool incentives
What we heard from POWER

- **Key Comments from Spring 2011**
  - In favor of development in urban areas to bring more funding for the urban infrastructure
  - Invest in transit (new, existing and more effective), as well as fund commuter lines and bike lanes
  - Need affordable housing, and favor funding cities that build it
  - Increase job opportunities
  - Decrease violence and crime
  - Preserve cultural traditions in local communities
  - Maintain open space, parks, art and community centers
What we heard from POWER

- Key Comments from Winter 2012
  - Consider discounted or free transit for seniors and youth
  - Lower transit fares for low-income residents
  - Education (especially for seniors and students) on using public transit
  - Increase public transit for transit dependent residents
  - Need better enforcement of fares
  - Re-establish necessary transit routes that have been cut
  - Create late-night neighborhood shuttles
  - Provide tax rebates to those who don’t own a car
What we heard from POWER

Key Comments from Winter 2012 (continued)

- Provisions for teleconferencing and telecommuting (such as high-speed Internet access) would eliminate the commute for more workers.
- New housing attempts to attract new residents instead of providing places to live or jobs for current residents.
- Jobs should be generated for current, not new residents.
- High cost of housing means low-income individuals cannot live in San Francisco.
- Low-income families don’t have access to quality schools.
- Need to bring everyone’s income level up, not just incorporate rich people into poorer neighborhoods.
Discussion

Do these concerns/priorities still represent your community?
Draft Plan Bay Area

Expected release in late March 2013

The Bay Area in 2040:
Key Demographics Chapter
# Regional Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Growth 2010 - 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>3,385,000</td>
<td>4,505,000</td>
<td>1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>7,151,000</td>
<td>9,299,000</td>
<td>2,148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>2,786,000</td>
<td>3,446,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Regional Strategy for Growth

- Growth over the next several decades will be very different from the outward expansion over the last few decades.

- Primary strategies call for conserving resources and making better use of existing infrastructure, infill development with streamlined permitting and financial support.
Building on an Existing Framework

- The region already has a local-regional partnership to support growth in sustainable Priority Development Areas and to protect important natural resources identified as Priority Conservation Areas.

- No change to local authority over land use decisions.
Land Use Strategy

Jobs-Housing Connection

- Non-urbanized land
- Urbanized land
- PDAs
  - 3% of region’s land
  - 80% of new homes
  - 66% of new jobs

100 Planned PDAs
69 Potential PDAs

2007-2012: 52 Specific and Area plans funded by PDA program for $18.6 million
Draft Plan Bay Area

Performance Chapter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Protection</strong></td>
<td>Reduce per-capita greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequate Housing</strong></td>
<td>House all of the region’s projected housing growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Vitality</strong></td>
<td>Increase gross regional product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy and Safe Communities</strong></td>
<td>Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particulate emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space and Agricultural Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equitable Access</strong></td>
<td>Decrease housing and transportation costs as a share of low-income household budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation System Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Increase average daily time spent walking or biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase non-auto mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce VMT per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the transportation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance Targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Protection</td>
<td>Reduce per-capita greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Housing</td>
<td>House all of the region’s projected housing growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Voluntary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Performance Targets</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Increase gross regional product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space and Agricultural Preservation</td>
<td>Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Access</td>
<td>Decrease housing and transportation costs as a share of low-income household budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy and Safe Communities</td>
<td>Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particulate emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy and Safe Communities</td>
<td>Reduce injuries and fatalities from collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase average daily time spent walking or biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase non-auto mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce VMT per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the transportation system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Plan Bay Area

Investments Chapter
Overall Approach

**Six Strategies for Reaching Our Goals**

1. Maintain and Sustain the Existing Transportation System
2. Build Next-Generation Transit
3. Boost Freeway and Transit Efficiency
4. Support Focused Growth (OneBayArea Grant)
5. County Investment Priorities
6. Protect our Climate
Investment Strategy #1

Maintain/Sustain the Existing System

- Maintain local streets and roads to a satisfactory standard
- Replace buses and rail cars more frequently
- Fully fund operating needs for existing transit services
- Improve the condition of state freeways and bridges
Investment Strategy #2

**Build Next-Generation Transit**

- Develop a regional funding strategy to implement high-performing projects
- Position the region for federal transit investments in bus and rail projects
- High Speed Rail investment strategy on the Peninsula
Investment Strategy #3

Boost Freeway and Transit Efficiency

- **Regional Express Lanes Network**
  Improve reliability and reduce delay in congested corridors

- **San Francisco Pricing Program**
  Charge a fee to drive in specific, congested spots to fund transportation improvements, reduce traffic

- **Freeway Performance Initiative**
  Maximize efficiency and management of freeways and arterials

- **Reward agencies that achieve improvements in ridership and productivity**
Investment Strategy #4

Support Focused Growth (OneBayArea Grant)

- Reward jurisdictions that produce housing near transit
- Target investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs)
- Support Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)
Investment Strategy #5

**County Investment Priorities**

- Fund local transportation priorities identified by county congestion management agencies
- Majority (65%) of these funds dedicated to maintaining and sustaining current transportation systems
- Substantial bicycle and pedestrian investments
Investment Strategy #6

**Protect our Climate**

- Implement innovative initiatives to help the region achieve its greenhouse gas emission reduction targets
Total Transportation Investments

Total Funding — $289 billion

- Transit Operations and Maintenance: 54%
- Roads & Bridges Operations and Maintenance: 32%
- Roads & Bridges Expansion: 7%
- Transit Expansion: 6%
- Bike/Pedestrian: 1%
Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

- A short-term program of projects (6-year period) that implements the long-range Plan Bay Area
- Lists nearly 1,000 surface transportation projects
- Focuses on projects that receive federal funds, that require a federal action, or are regionally significant
- Updated every two years
- For more information, go to: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/)
2013 TIP Development Schedule

- March 29, 2013  Draft TIP Released for Public Review
- April 2013      Public Hearings on Draft TIP
- May 3, 2013     Close of Public Review Period
- June 26, 2013   Final 2013 TIP approved by Commission
- Sept. 2, 2013   Final 2013 TIP approved by U.S. Dept. of Transportation
Local Involvement
Plan Bay Area Relationship to Local San Francisco Planning

Liz Brisson (SFCTA)

Presentation to POWER

March 27, 2013
Outline

1. How does this relate to local land use planning?
   - San Francisco’s Priority Development Areas
   - Housing Element process

2. How does this relate to local transportation planning?
   - San Francisco Transportation Plan development process
   - How do these plans turn into projects in my neighborhood?

3. Key elements of Plan Bay Area for SF
The Challenge-92k households, 191k jobs in San Francisco in Plan Bay Area Preferred
## Recent Plans & Major Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Area or Project</th>
<th>Year Adopted</th>
<th>Projected Housing</th>
<th>Projected Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5M</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick/Hunters Point Shipyard</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Corridor</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>50,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown (C-3 &amp; other)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Park</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE SF (Sunnydale &amp; Potrero)</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market and Octavia</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Rock (SWL 337)</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkmerced</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 70</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Hill</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Redevelopment &amp; Transit Center</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion Valley</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warriors Arena (Pier 30/32 &amp; SWL 330)</td>
<td>Under development</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western SoMa</td>
<td>Expected 2013</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PLANNED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>77,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,050</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PlanBayArea - TOTAL PROJECTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>92,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSING PRODUCTION TARGETS, 2007-2014 and ACTUAL PRODUCTION, 2007 - Q2 2012

Including Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Units as Permitted by HCD Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>ABAG/HCD Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) Production Goals 2007-June 2014</th>
<th>Production Targets to Date, Q2 2012</th>
<th>Actual New Housing Production and Acquisition/Rehabilitation 2007 - Q2 2012**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Units</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>No. of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (&lt; 50% AMI)†</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>4,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (50-79% AMI)</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>4,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (80-120% AMI)</td>
<td>6,754</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market (over 120% AMI)</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>9,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,875</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual production based on 7.5 year reporting period (1 January 2007 - 30 June 2014)

### Draft Regional Housing Need Allocation (2014-2022) for San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Category</th>
<th>2012 Income for a 2 Person Household</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Difference from Previous Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income (≤50% of median)</td>
<td>≤ $41,200</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>.5% more (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income (51-80% of median)</td>
<td>$41,250 – $65,900</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>1.6% less (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income (81-120% of median)</td>
<td>$65,950 – $98,900</td>
<td>5,437</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>2.8% less (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate (&gt;120% of median)</td>
<td>&gt; $98,950</td>
<td>12,482</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>3.9% more (39.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RHNA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28,745</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How does this relate to local land use planning?
   ▶ San Francisco’s Priority Development Areas
   ▶ Housing Element process

2. How does this relate to local transportation?
   ▶ San Francisco Transportation Plan development process
   ▶ Local implementation of One Bay Area Block Grant
   ▶ How do these plans turn into projects in my neighborhood?

3. Key elements of Plan Bay Area for SF
What is the San Francisco Transportation Plan and how does it relate to Plan Bay

What is it?

- San Francisco’s transportation investment program for all modes, operators to year 2040
- Supporting policies and strategic initiatives
- Funding and implementation strategy

How will it be used?

- Informs local plans and investments (Transportation Element Update, SFMTA and DPW capital plans)
- Guides SF’s input to regional planning efforts (BART Strategic Plan, 2017 RTP)
- Positions SF for future funding opportunities and policy discussions at state, national level
Get involved in the SFTP!

- Tell us your investment priorities
  [www.sfbudgetczar.com](http://www.sfbudgetczar.com) (also available in Chinese and Spanish)
- Learn more: [www.movesmartsf.com](http://www.movesmartsf.com)
- Contact us: 415.593.1670
- Invite us to present to your group
- Stay tuned for public outreach in Late Spring/Early Summer
How do these plans turn into projects in my neighborhood?

- One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program - $35 million of funding to San Francisco for through 2016
- December 2012: Authority Board adopted initial OBAG Project List: 10 of 12 projects ~$54.6 million
- May/June: Authority Board to select final OBAG projects (other projects anticipated to be prioritized for Prop K and other funds)

Chinatown Broadway Phase IV Street Design is an Upper Tier OBAG Candidate project (project sponsor: DPW)
How do these plans turn into projects in my neighborhood?

- Prop K local transportation sales tax funds support transit/street improvement projects citywide, with 3-5x leveraging of other $.

- Priorities updated every 4-5 years (Strategic Plan, 5-Year Prioritization Programs, 5YPPs).

- Update process
  - April-June: Outreach Round 1 re: process
  - July-September: Outreach round 2 re: proposed prioritization
  - October/November: Adopt Strategic Plan/ 5YPP Update

**Prop K: 4 Major Categories of Projects**

- Streets & Traffic Safety 24.6%
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian
  - Street Resurfacing
  - Signals and Signs
  - Major Capital Projects

- Strategic Initiatives 1.3%
  - Parking Management
  - Transportation / Land Use Coordination

- Paratransit 8.6%

**Upcoming 5YPP updates will implement first phase of SFTP and Plan Bay Area priorities.**
1. How does this relate to local land use planning?
   - San Francisco’s Priority Development Areas
   - Housing Element process

2. How does this relate to local transportation planning?
   - San Francisco Transportation Plan development process
   - Local implementation of One Bay Area Block Grant
   - How do these plans turn into projects in my neighborhood?

3. Key elements of Plan Bay Area for SF
Key Elements of Plan Bay Area

- SF projects named 7 of 13 high-performers in region
- Downtown Extension of Caltrain, Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit named regional New and Small Starts priorities
- OBAG program links affordable housing plans and production with greater levels of transportation $ for first time
- Transit Performance Initiative created, $500 million in strategic investments to improve transit in urban core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Quantitative Benefit/Cost ratio</th>
<th>Qualitative (out of 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BART Metro Program</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Treasure Island Congestion Pricing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Congestion Pricing Cordon Pilot</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 AC Transit Grant—MacArthur BRT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Freeway Performance Initiative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ITS Improvements in San Mateo Co.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ITS Improvements in Santa Clara Co.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Irvington BART Station</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Caltrain Electrification and six trains per hour service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BART to San Jose, Phase 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Van Ness Avenue BRT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Better Market Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Thank you!

More information

Liz Brisson
liz@sfcta.org
415.522.4838

Sarah Dennis-Phillips
sarah.dennis-phillips@sfgov.org
415.558.6314
Local and Regional Involvement

- Stay involved in the planning process
- Attend local planning and/or city council meetings
- Sign up at [www.onebayarea.org](http://www.onebayarea.org) for updates on Plan Bay Area
- Make your voice heard
Remaining Plan Milestones

Draft Plan Bay Area released
Late March 2013

Public meetings in each county
April-May 2013

Comment period closes
Mid-May 2013

Comments presented to Commission
Late May 2013

Adoption of Plan Bay Area
June 2013
Questions?

Thank you!
A Guide to the San Francisco Bay Area’s Transportation Improvement Program, or TIP

Updated to reflect the Draft 2013 TIP

March 2013

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Introduction

This guide explains how the public and interested stakeholders can get involved in the San Francisco Bay Area’s transportation project development process. Specifically, the focus is on the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP, which is compiled and approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. A major milestone occurs when a highway, transit or other transportation project is added to the TIP. A project may not receive federal funds or receive other critical federal project approvals unless it is included in the TIP. This guide focuses on the TIP – what it is and how the public can use it to keep informed about projects in their communities.
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What is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission?

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was created by the California State Legislature in 1970 and is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC functions as both the region’s metropolitan planning organization (MPO) – a federal designation – and, for state purposes, as the regional transportation planning agency. As such, it is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, local streets and roads, rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The RTP includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates planning for transportation, land use and housing. The Commission screens requests from local agencies for regional, state and federal grants for transportation projects to determine their compatibility with the RTP, and coordinates the participation of governments and the general public in the planning process. MTC also functions as the Bay Area Toll Authority and the Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways.

The San Francisco Bay Area is served by seven primary public transit systems as well as over 20 other local transit operators, which together carry over 500 million passengers per year. There are nearly 20,000 miles of local streets and roads, 1,400 miles of highway, six public ports and three major commercial airports. The region includes nine counties and 101 municipalities; more than 7 million people reside within its 7,000 square miles.

The Commission is governed by a 21-member policy board. Sixteen commissioners are appointed directly by local elected officials. In addition, two members represent regional agencies – the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Finally, three nonvoting members represent the U.S. Department of Transportation, the State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
What is the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP?

The TIP lists the near-term transportation projects, programs and investment priorities of the region’s surface transportation system that have a federal interest – meaning projects or programs for which federal funds or actions by federal agencies are anticipated – along with locally and state-funded projects that are regionally significant. A regionally significant project, generally large scale, changes travel patterns over a relatively large geographic area. The TIP signifies the start of implementation of the programs and policies approved in the Bay Area’s long-range transportation plan. It does this by identifying specific projects over a six-year timeframe that will help move the region toward its transportation vision. Locally funded transit operations and pavement maintenance are generally not included in the TIP.

The TIP is multimodal.
The TIP lists highway, local roadway, bridge, public transit, bicycle, pedestrian and freight-related projects.

The TIP covers a six-year period.
The TIP lists projects for a period of six years. MTC is required by federal law to update the TIP at least one time every four years.
The TIP identifies future commitments of funding and signifies that a project may move ahead to implementation. A project's inclusion in the TIP is a critical step. It does NOT, however, represent an allocation of funds, an obligation to fund, or a grant of funds. For projects funded with federal dollars, this may occur only after the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and/or either the U.S. Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration review the design, financing, and environmental impacts of a project; consult with other transportation and resource agencies; and review public comment. Beyond this point, a project sponsor works with Caltrans or the federal agencies to guarantee the federal funding identified in the TIP. This federal guarantee is referred to as an “obligation.” To secure non-federal funds, projects are subject to final approval from state, regional or local agencies.

The TIP shows estimated project costs and schedules. The TIP lists specific projects and the anticipated schedule and cost for each phase of a project (preliminary engineering, final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction). Any project phase included in the TIP means implementation of that phase is expected to begin during the six-year timeframe of the TIP. Funding shown outside the TIP period is for informational purpose or to display total project cost. The TIP schedule of project implementation is NOT fixed. The timeframe shown in the TIP is the “best estimate” at the time it is first listed in the TIP. Sometimes projects cannot maintain that schedule and will be moved to a later year. Conversely, to accelerate implementation the project sponsor can request that the project be moved to an earlier year.

The TIP must reflect realistic revenues and costs. The list of projects in the TIP must be able to be funded within the amount of funds reasonably expected to be available over the six-year timeframe of the TIP. To add projects to the TIP, sufficient revenues must be available, other projects must be deferred, or new revenues must be identified. As a result, the TIP is not a “wish list” but a list of projects with funding commitments during the timeframe of the TIP.

The TIP may be changed after it is adopted. An approved TIP may be revised in order to add new projects, delete projects, advance projects into the first year, and accommodate changes in the scope, cost or phasing of a project. MTC encourages public comment on significant proposed changes to the TIP.

The TIP is NOT a guarantee that a project will move forward to construction. Unforeseen problems may arise, such as engineering obstacles, environmental permit conflicts, changes in priorities, or cost increases or declining revenues. These problems can slow a project, cause it to be postponed, change its scope, or have it dropped from consideration.
A summary of the Draft 2013 TIP

The Bay Area's Draft 2013 TIP includes approximately 880 transportation projects, and a total of approximately $16.9 billion in committed federal, state and local funding over the six-year TIP period through fiscal year 2018. See the next page for a map of projects with costs greater than $200 million.

Draft 2013 TIP Investment Analysis:
Focus on low-income and minority communities

To address the equity implications of the proposed 2013 TIP investments, MTC has conducted an investment analysis with a focus on minority and low-income residents. The key question addressed is: “Are low-income and minority populations sharing equitably in the TIP’s financial investments?” To answer this question, the investment analysis uses demographic criteria to calculate the shares of 2013 TIP investments that will flow to the identified communities, and compares those shares with the proportional size of this group's population and trip-making, relative to those of the general population.

Results of the Investment Analysis of the Draft 2013 TIP can be viewed on MTC’s web site at: www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/
# Projects in the Draft 2013 TIP

Over $200 Million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>County/Counties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Replacement</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$5.71 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BART – Berryessa to San Jose Extension</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$3.96 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension, Phase 2</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$2.60 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BART – Warm Springs to Berryessa Extension</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$2.52 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>US-101 Doyle Drive Replacement</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$1.97 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension, Phase 1</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$1.59 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SF Muni Third St LRT Phase 2 Central Subway</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$1.57 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caltrain Electrification</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$1.23 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transbay Transit Center – TIFIA Loan Debt Service</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$1.08 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>BART Railcar Replacement Program**</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$1.03 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BART – Warm Springs Extension</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$1.890 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-80/680/12 Interchange Project</td>
<td>Solano County</td>
<td>$718 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Toll Bridge Rehabilitation Program**</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$629 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>BART Car Exchange (Preventative Maintenance)**</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$603 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Valley Transportation Authority: Preventative Maintenance**</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$571 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sonoma Marin Area Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Sonoma/Marin Counties</td>
<td>$532 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>San Jose International Airport People Mover</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$508 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SR-1 Devils Slide Bypass Tunnel</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>$505 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>BART Oakland Airport Connector</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$484 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E-BART – East Contra Costa County Rail Extension</td>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>$460 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I-680/4R Interchange Reconstruction, Phases 1–5</td>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>$425 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>US-101 Express Lanes in Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$425 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SR-24 – Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore</td>
<td>Alameda/Contra Costa Counties</td>
<td>$420 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AC Transit: Preventative Maintenance Program**</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$392 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR-4 East Widening from Somersville Rd to SR-160</td>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>$385 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>US-101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (Sonoma)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>$373 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>US-101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (Marin)</td>
<td>Marin County</td>
<td>$341 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point Local Roads**</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$338 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)**</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$328 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Service (PE and ROW only)</td>
<td>Alameda/San Mateo Counties</td>
<td>$301 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway LRT Extension, Ph. 2</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$294 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>BART Transbay Tube Seismic Retrofit</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$276 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge Seismic Retrofit, Ph. 1-3A</td>
<td>Marin/San Francisco Counties</td>
<td>$274 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Southeast Waterfront Transportation Improvements**</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$254 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>El Camino Real Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$234 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yerba Buena Island (YBI) Ramp Improvements</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$233 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Caltrain Positive Train Control**</td>
<td>Multiple Counties</td>
<td>$231 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SF Muni Rail Replacement Program**</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$223 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>7th Street Grade Separation and Roadway Improvement</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$221 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Oakland Army Base Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$215 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SFMTA ADA Paratransit Operating Support**</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$207 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Better Market Street Transportation Elements</td>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>$206 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Enhanced Bus – Telegraph/International/ East 14th</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>$205 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** These projects not shown on map
Projects in the Draft 2013 TIP With Costs Greater Than $200 million
How does the TIP relate to the long-range regional transportation plan?

Regionally significant projects must be first identified in the region’s long-range transportation plan, and projects in the TIP must help implement the goals of the plan. The long-range plan is required by federal law and is a blueprint for transportation investment decisions over a 25- to 30-year horizon. The long-range plan establishes policies and priorities to address mobility, congestion, air quality and other transportation goals. The Draft 2013 TIP translates recommendations from the Draft Plan Bay Area into a short-term (six-year) program of improvements focused on projects that have a federal interest. Therefore, the earlier (and more effective) timeframe for public comment on the merits of a particular transportation project is during the development of the long-range plan.
How does the TIP relate to the Clean Air Act?

Transportation activities funded with federal dollars must be consistent with air quality standards called for in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. A TIP and Regional Transportation Plan are said to “conform” to those standards if they do not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay attainment of the air quality standards. Along with adoption of the TIP and RTP, MTC must make a conformity finding that the quality standards are met. To determine this, MTC conducts a transportation air quality conformity analysis. MTC encourages the public to review and comment on this analysis.

How is the TIP funded?

Funding for projects in the TIP comes from you – through taxes, tolls and fees, including local, regional, state and federal programs. Major fund sources are administered through the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, and by the State of California. Various county sales tax measures and regional bridge toll measures provide additional funds. The state of California, transit agencies and local jurisdictions provide dollars to match federal funding or to fully fund certain local projects.
Who develops the TIP?

MTC develops the TIP in cooperation with the Bay Area Partnership of federal, state and regional agencies; county congestion management agencies (CMAs); public transit providers; city and county public works representatives; and the public. The Bay Area Partnership subcommittees provide a forum for managers of the region’s transportation system to contribute to the policy-making and investment activities of MTC, and to improve coordination within the region.

Project sponsors must be a government agency (or other qualifying entity, such as certain non-profit organizations that are eligible for some transportation funds) and are responsible for initiating funding requests, applying for funds, and carrying their projects to completion. In the Bay Area, project sponsors include public transit operators, Caltrans, MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the congestion management agencies, the nine Bay Area counties, the individual cities within each county or other special districts.
How does a project get in the TIP?

Often years of planning and public input precede a project’s inclusion in the TIP. Although there are several ways in which a project can get in the TIP, the most typical course is described here. The chart on the next page shows where the TIP lies on the path to completion of a project.

First, a particular transportation need is identified. In many cases, planners and engineers generate lists of potential improvements based on their needs analyses and public inquiries. The local proposals are in turn reviewed by a city, county, transportation authority, transit operator, or state agency. If the public agency agrees that a particular idea has merit, it may decide to act as the project sponsor, work toward refining the initial idea, develop a clear project cost, scope and schedule, and subsequently seek funding for the project.

Once local agencies develop their list of projects and priorities, they are submitted to MTC for consideration to include in a regional transportation plan. Even if a project is fully funded with local funds, if it is a major project it must still align with the regional plan’s goals in order to be included in the plan. Many project sponsors will request funding for their projects that is subject to MTC approval. MTC must balance competing needs and assure that the most critical investment priorities are being addressed within the limits of available funds and that there is consistency among projects and with the region’s goals as embodied by the Regional Transportation Plan.

When federal and state discretionary funding becomes available to the region, MTC, guided by the long-range plan in consultation with transportation stakeholders, develops a transportation program for those funds. This involves deciding on criteria for project selection and setting funding levels per project. Depending on the program, either MTC, the county congestion management agency, transit operator, or county may propose projects.
Follow a Transportation Project From Idea to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Project Ideas and Local Review</th>
<th>MTC’s Long-Term Regional Transportation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idea</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An idea for a project starts when a transportation need is identified and a new idea is put forward. The idea can surface in any number of ways — from you, a private business, a community group or a government agency.</td>
<td>Every four years MTC updates the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), looking forward two to three decades. The plan identifies policies, programs and transportation investments to support the long-term vision for the Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Review</strong></td>
<td>The RTP also must identify anticipated funding sources. The RTP can include only those projects and programs that can be funded with revenues reasonably expected to be available during the plan’s timeframe. Projects identified in the RTP are generally drawn from the planning efforts of MTC, county congestion management agencies, transit agencies and local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project idea must be adopted by a formal sponsor — usually a public agency — that may refine the initial idea and develop details for the project. To move forward, the project must be approved by local authorities such as a city council, county board of supervisors or transit agency. To be eligible for certain regional, state and federal funds, projects must be cleared through the county congestion management agency (CMA), and become part of the Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
<td>State legislation now requires that regional transportation plans incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) — provisions for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks by integrating transportation, housing and land-use planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How You Can Make a Difference

**Get involved in your community!**

- Follow the work of your city council, county board of supervisors or local transit agency.
- Take notice of plans or improvement programs developed by your city, county or transit agency.
- Comment on projects proposed by your county CMA or on transportation

**The Regional Transportation Plan**

The Regional Transportation Plan is the earliest and best opportunity within the MTC process to comment on and influence projects.

- A project cannot move forward or receive any federal funds unless it is included in the Regional Transportation Plan. Participate in the RTP/SCS public meetings, surveys, etc.
- MTC support of large projects occurs in the RTP and not as part of the TIP.
Implementation

MTC’s Project Selection Process

Once long-term goals, policies and funding initiatives have been set in the RTP, MTC develops program criteria and funds specific projects.

Funding Levels Established for RTP Programs/Initiatives: Guided by the RTP and short-term revenue estimates, MTC decides how much funding to apply to programs over a two-to-four-year period at a time.

Project Selection Criteria Developed: For competitive programs under its control, MTC is guided by the RTP and develops and adopts minimum project requirements and criteria to evaluate and prioritize projects.

Project Selection: Depending on the program, projects may be selected using MTC’s criteria or by the county congestion management agency, the California Transportation Commission or a transit agency board. Some funding programs are non-competitive, meaning projects are funded according to a pre-determined formula or voter-enacted initiative.

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

The production of the Transportation Improvement Program or TIP is the culmination of MTC’s transportation planning and project selection process. The TIP identifies specific near-term projects over a six-year period to move the region toward its transportation vision.

The TIP lists all surface transportation projects for which federal funds or actions by federal agencies are anticipated, along with some of the larger locally and state-funded projects. A project cannot receive federal funds or receive other critical federal project approvals unless it is in the TIP. MTC must update the TIP at least once every four years. It is revised several times a year to add, delete or modify projects.

Environmental Review and Project Development Activities

The project sponsor conducts an environmental review, as required by either the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Final approval of the project design and right-of-way is required by the sponsoring agency and appropriate federal agency (Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration) if federal funds and/or actions are involved.

Funding is fully committed by grant approval (once the project meets all requirements and moves forward to phases such as preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, or construction.

Get involved in planning for the whole Bay Area at MTC!

- Comment at MTC committee-level and Commission-level meetings, special public hearings and workshops.
- Follow the work of MTC’s Policy Advisory Council which advises the Commission.

(www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved)

Comment on a project’s impacts

- Comment on the environmental impacts of the project before the environmental document and project receive final approval by the board of the sponsoring agency, or in advance of federal approval, if required.
Once a project is in the TIP, a considerable amount of work still remains to bring it to completion. The designated project sponsor is responsible for ensuring the project moves forward. Projects typically proceed in phases (preliminary engineering, final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Each phase is included in the TIP showing funding and the anticipated schedule. Ideally, a project will advance according to its listed schedule. However, tracking each project’s progress is important so that delays can be identified and remedied as soon as possible, and so that funding can be reallocated as necessary.

Once federal funds have been made available for a project’s final construction phase, they usually no longer appear in future TIP documents – even though the project may not yet be completed.
In what ways can the public participate?

Public participation occurs during all stages of a project’s development. Communicating support or concern to municipal and county officials and transit agency managers is one of the most effective starting points. As local review begins, public input may be provided at formal meetings or informal sessions with local planning boards and staff. Members of the public may also be asked to participate in special task forces to review transportation improvement concepts at the corridor, county and regional level. The MTC’s long-range transportation plan has an extensive public involvement program including but not limited to workshops, focus groups, surveys, public hearings and opportunities to comment at Commission meetings. Finally, once a project is in the TIP and it enters the preliminary engineering phase, the detailed environmental review process affords yet another opportunity for the public to offer input. An overview of opportunities to get involved during every stage of a project is provided on pages 12 and 13.

MTC’s public involvement process aims to give the public ample opportunities for early and continuing participation in transportation project planning, and to provide full public access to key decisions. The public has the opportunity to comment before the draft TIP is officially adopted by the Commission. MTC conducts a public comment period and holds public meetings to allow the public an opportunity to ask questions about the process and projects. Copies of the draft TIP are distributed to major libraries; notices are mailed out to an extensive mailing list of interested individuals and agencies along with instructions on how to access and comment on the TIP on the MTC website; and the TIP documents can be viewed on the MTC website at www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/.

MTC extends an open and continuing invitation to the Bay Area public to assist in developing transportation solutions for the region. A comprehensive Public Participation Plan details the many avenues available to groups and individuals who would like to get involved in MTC’s work. The plan can be found on MTC’s website at www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm.
Where to turn for more information

Visit the MTC website at www.mtc.ca.gov for more information about the transportation planning and funding process and to obtain schedules and agendas for MTC meetings. Below are direct links to key documents. Some publications mentioned are available at the MTC-ABAG Library.

Resources
The Transportation Improvement Program
www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/tip/
MTC Public Participation Plan
www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm
The ABCs of MTC
www.mtc.ca.gov/library/abcs_of_mtc/
Project Listing: MTC Fund Management System
www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/fms_intro.htm

MTC Staff Contacts
Program and Fund Management
Ross McKeown (510) 817-5842 rmckeown@mtc.ca.gov
Transportation Improvement Program
Sri Srinivasan (510) 817-5793 ssrinivasan@mtc.ca.gov
Adam Crenshaw (510) 817-5794 acrenshaw@mtc.ca.gov
Federal Highway Administration Programs
Craig Goldblatt (510) 817-5837 cgoldblatt@mtc.ca.gov
Federal Transit Administration Programs
Glen Tepke (510) 817-5781 gtepke@mtc.ca.gov
State Funding Programs
Kenneth Kao (510) 817-5768 kkao@mtc.ca.gov
MTC Public Information
(510) 817-5757 or info@mtc.ca.gov
MTC-ABAG Library
(510) 817-5836 or library@mtc.ca.gov
Request assistance

If you need a sign language interpreter, if English is your second language and you need translation services, or if you require any other type of assistance please contact us by calling 510.817.5757 or 510.817.5769 for TDD/TTY. We require at least three days' notice to provide reasonable accommodations.

Si necesita un intérprete del lenguaje de señas, si el inglés es su segundo idioma y necesita un intérprete, o si necesita cualquier otra ayuda por favor comuníquese con nosotros al número 510.817.5757 o al 510.817.5769 para TDD/TTY. Requerimos tres días de anticipación para proveer asistencia razonable.

如果您需要手語翻譯員，或如果英語是您的第二語言，您需要翻譯服務，或者您需要任何其他類型的協助，請致電510-817-5757或致電TDD/TTY電話510-817-5769。我們要求獲得至少三天提前通知才能提供合理的配合安排。
# Transportation agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area

## Major Transit Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express (ACE)</td>
<td>209.944.6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)</td>
<td>510.891.4777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)</td>
<td>510.464.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Water Emergency Transit Authority</td>
<td>415.291.3377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (County Connection)</td>
<td>925.676.1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority (Tri Delta)</td>
<td>925.754.6622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield/Suisun Transit (FAST)</td>
<td>707.422.2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District</td>
<td>415.921.5858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (WHEELS)</td>
<td>925.455.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (VINE)</td>
<td>707.259.8631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)</td>
<td>650.508.6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)</td>
<td>415.701.4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)</td>
<td>650.508.6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</td>
<td>408.321.2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Department of Transit and Parking</td>
<td>707.543.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano County Transit (SolTrans)</td>
<td>707.648.4666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>707.585.7516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>415.597.4620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Contra Costa Transit Authority (WestCAT)</td>
<td>510.724.3331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Major Airports and Seaports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port of Oakland</td>
<td>510.627.1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of San Francisco</td>
<td>415.274-0400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland International Airport</td>
<td>510.563.3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose International Airport</td>
<td>408.392.3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco International Airport</td>
<td>650.821.8211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Agencies

**Association of Bay Area Governments**  
510.464.7900

**Bay Area Air Quality Management District**  
415.771.6000

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission**  
510.817.5700

**San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission**  
415.352.3600

### Congestion Management Agencies

**Alameda County Transportation Commission**  
510.208.7400

**Contra Costa Transportation Authority**  
925.256.4700

**Transportation Authority of Marin**  
415.226.0815

**Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency**  
707.259.8631

**San Francisco County Transportation Authority**  
415.522.4800

**City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County**  
650.599.1406

**Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority**  
408.321.2300

**Solano Transportation Authority**  
707.424.6075

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority**  
707.565.5373

### State Agencies

**California Air Resources Board**  
916.322.2990

**California Highway Patrol, Golden Gate Division**  
707.551.4180

**California Transportation Commission**  
916.654.4245

**Caltrans, District 4**  
510.286.4444

### Federal Agencies

**Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9**  
415.947.8021

**Federal Highway Administration, California Division**  
916.498.5001

**Federal Transit Administration, Region 9**  
415.744.3133
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Comment Sheet
POWER
2013 CBO Workshop

Please use the space below and on reverse to offer any comments.

__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Name and contact information (optional):

Name: _____________________________________________________________
Address: ___________________________________________________________
E-Mail: _______________________________________________________________________

Check Here [ ] to be added to the Plan Bay Area email notification list.
1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The workshop and related materials were accessible</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adequate notice was provided</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. I had sufficient opportunity to provide comments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The information presented was clear with an appropriate level of detail</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. I understood what was established policy and what was open to public influence</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The handouts and presentation were educational</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. I felt like my comments were heard</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives and priorities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. A quality discussion took place</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please share any comments on the above in the space provided below or on the back of this handout. Comments may also be submitted using the separate comment form provided.