



# CITY OF VACAVILLE

650 MERCHANT STREET  
VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95688-6908  
www.cityofvacaville.com  
707-449-5100

RON ROWLETT  
Mayor

RAYMOND BEATY  
Vice Mayor

DILENNA HARRIS  
Councilmember

MITCH MASHBURN  
Councilmember

NOLAN SULLIVAN  
Councilmember

ESTABLISHED 1850

## Community Development Department

August 11, 2020

MTC Public Information  
375 Beale Street, Suite 800  
San Francisco, CA, 94105

[eircomments@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:eircomments@mtc.ca.gov)

### RE: Plan Bay Area 2050 Comments

To Whom It May Concern:

The City of Vacaville would like to express appreciation for the opportunity to comment on the Plan Bay Area 2040 Blueprint. The Cities of Vacaville, Fairfield and Suisun City will be accommodating the majority of future residential growth within Solano County, and we expect many of the new residents of our communities to commute to jobs in the Bay Area. As such, the Blueprint objectives and outcomes affect us differently. Please consider the following comments:

1. If focus of growth and investment is on areas that are already considered "resource-rich" won't disadvantaged communities suffer even more?
2. How does the Blueprint account for the needs of Solano County, or any County in the North Bay for that matter? It is centered around BART access and high-revenue employment centers and ignores a huge part of the Bay Area where many people live.
3. Objective 1: Consider extending public transit to the outlying counties (ie – Solano County) where majority of the employees in the greater bay area live. Especially is parking is removed from BART stations. "Transit Alternatives" on highly-congested freeway corridors should not include BART if there is not ability to park to use BART to get into the cities.

If the cost of driving goes up, and BART is not extended to low income communities where people commute from, like Stockton, Vallejo, Fairfield, working class people will bear the brunt of the transportation cost increase while white collar workers will enjoy faster and less expensive commutes.

Why are there not strategies for increasing bicycle and pedestrian access to resources?

4. Objective 4: To support and improve economic mobility, consider providing cities and counties with monies to use as grants to help local businesses in disadvantaged communities. Also, allow cities with lower-income/disadvantaged areas of town to be eligible for the monies (ie – Vacaville is not a disadvantaged community, but has areas in

town that would benefit from the help of grant funding such as this). Perhaps, permit the request to be based it on census data within a specified radius.

5. Objective 5: The “jobs-housing imbalance fee” seems very punitive. Suggest offering benefits for when communities work towards correcting that imbalance.
6. Objective 6: In reducing parking around BART stations, the Plan increases commute vehicles and commute times because – as shown in the maps in the Outcomes sheet – most people that work in the San Francisco area and nearby “resource-rich” areas have more jobs than homes; while the outlying counties have the reverse. To support the employees that have already been priced out of the area and their ridership on BART, parking should be addressed.
7. Objective 7: The requirement for 10-20% of new development to be permanently deed-restricted is a good idea. Please provide clear incentives to help the cities support this. Please clearly define the “thresholds” mentioned in the summary.

Sincerely,

Christina Love,  
Senior Planner