

## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

(A.) Additional comments to population distribution in your county

#### MEETING COMMENT

|    |  |
|----|--|
| SF | I wish discussion was regional, not just San Francisco   |
| SF | San Francisco is dense enough. ABAG assigns housing goals with little regard for the current residents. San Francisco is the bedroom community for Google and other Santa Clara/San Mateo county firms. Santa Clara County employment centers should be responsible for their housing quota. Encourage "company town" housing near the work site to reduce/eliminate the daily commute.  |
| SF | We need better transportation connection between the most dense areas (e.g. Park Merced & downtown) to the less dense areas to encourage people to spread out (residence)  |
| SF | It looks reasonable  |
| SF | There should be more increase in density around heavy rail stations (esp. Glen park, Balboa BART; 22nd Street Caltrain) and along outer light rail (N + L trains)  |
| SF | Map lacks central subway — why?  |
| SF | Chinatown density increased by Central Subway. Central Subway is awful project and should be killed.   |
| SF | I think the growth of density should be more along the rail/transit routes than it is represented on the map. Some of the dense purple areas are far from the indicated routes — unless these are mixed use developments with high walkability it appears there will still be traffic issues from people commuting to jobs and driving to other places they need to reach but can't by transit   |
| SF | I don't see how it would be appropriate for the Bayview Hunters point neighborhood to have high density development, unless water-based transit is available in this area  |
| SF | More density on rail; more density on BRT (bus rapid transit) (Van Ness, Geary, Geneva)  |
| SF | Less density on waterfront (global warming = high water)   |
| SF | Can be slightly more dense   |
| SF | Need to make West side of San Francisco more dense, not fair to make East side of San Francisco 'take'/handle all of the density, especially around the bus rapid transit on Geary Blvd., or Van Ness corridor, but I can see that being more difficult because it's also Highway 101  |
| SF | Seems appropriate  |
| SF | Look at ways to incentivize additional units on single lots  |
| SF | Burden of the Southeast neighborhoods to absorb all of the urban growth in San Francisco   |
| SF | Strategies for diversifying mix use throughout the city  |
| SF | More housing that is actually affordable to the average person   |
| SF | Locate more population close to major west side transit lines including future Geary BRT with more mixed use and less parking  |
| SF | The area I live in cannot accommodate more growth. It is already built up to capacity.   |
| SF | How about revitalizing areas in the Sunset, surround N and K light rail lines, and 19th Avenue? These are some of the lowest density areas of the city which could become thriving mixed use TODs surrounding transit centers that <b>already exist</b> . Just because these areas have historically had negative responses to the idea of densifying, I think there is an opportunity for creative zoning reform to accommodate lower income residents (like students commuting to SFSU). |
| SF | The growth does not seem to be accompanied with new transit  |
| SF | Density correlates with PDAs   |
| SF | High density growth is already planned for East side of town, which is a good match for transit infrastructure   |
| SF | Higher density on West side light rail lines e.g. N-Judah, L-Taraval would be good planning (albeit politically challenging)   |
| SF | Note: map does not reflect Geary and Van Ness BART projects  |
| SF | There is definitely more opportunities for infill growth which is not represented in the map   |
| SF | Surprise that there is no diversification along L and N lines, no indication of any transit improvements required in PDAs  |
| SF | I am curious about proposed density that appears to be centered along Monterey Blvd. It is a wide Blvd., but neighborhood serving retail is limited and I'm not aware of transit or planning proposals that would foster change  |
| SF | We need a seawall or some plan for sea level rise to protect downtown, SOMA, eastern neighborhoods   |

**San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011**

**Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet**

*Step 1: County Growth and Place Types*

(A.) Additional comments to population distribution in your county

**MEETING COMMENT**

|    |  |
|----|--|
| SF | Population distribution: more evenly distributed along rail lines  |
| SF | There should be a dark purple circle (high density) around every BART station and not high density where transit does not currently exist. |
| SF | Put all density around current transit. You have not done this on current map; all density is focused on the East.                         |
| SF | There are big projects planned in areas without transit; place types don't have much wiggle room.  |

## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

(B.) Thoughts and comments about **place types** in area closest to where you live or work

| MEETING | COMMENT  |
|---------|--|
| SF      | Muni transit investment necessary into eastern neighborhoods along 16th/3rd street area  |
| SF      | The M line seems popular; lots of students & seniors rely on it, yet it is one of the worst, least frequent, shortest trains, least reliable. Schedule-wise.   |
| SF      | Instructions were incorrect. The original scenario was supposed to be region wide analysis, not county specific.   |
| SF      | Work — San Francisco Regional — expand the regional to the urban area  |
| SF      | Place types are hard to distinguish from one another! (bad print job on maps) I mean in color but also in concept. Names & pictures look too similar.  |
| SF      | For the Castro and Downtown areas I think development that's proposed is fair.   |
| SF      | Fast-track approval for in-fill TOD  |
| SF      | Modify CEQA to encourage expand downtown San Francisco Regional Center   |
| SF      | Transit Town center all along Geary & Geneva BRT   |
| SF      | Hunter's Point & Candlestick have unrealistic density  |
| SF      | Outer Richmond appointments  |
| SF      | (not legible) neighborhoods. Mixed use (not legible) major corridors.  |
| SF      | Noe Valley (my neighborhood) is already kind of mixed use, but affordability is an issue.  |
| SF      | Noe Valley could use a better variety of retail (lots of nail shops and women's clothing stores)   |
| SF      | Van Ness Avenue should be as shown City Center like as your envision. California Street should also be more urban neighborhood, as envisioned  |
| SF      | Work in downtown San Francisco — I can see further densification but I also think special attention should be paid to pedestrian environment.  |
| SF      | Mission District - Bay View Hunters Point  |
| SF      | *Main concern is gentrification. Need to problem solve the barriers for AA families and existing residents to access even "affordable" and "senior" housing - important work of Jane Jacobs.   |
| SF      | Transit is the main plus of this area  |
| SF      | Urban neighborhoods good but, if too dense people will react as caged rats!  |
| SF      | West Portal can be more dense with mixed use and less parking  |
| SF      | Regarding place types close to where live/work: this scenario does not relate to where I live  |
| SF      | I live in the Sunset and work in the Richmond. I will soon be moving to Ocean Avenue/Balboa Park area. All three of these are currently designated as 'transit neighborhoods' in the One Bay Area vision scenario. I think all of these areas are opportunities to become mixed use corridors. These areas are thirsty for greater commercial activity and already are served by light rail (though could use more effective bus service). |
| SF      | Colors are difficult to decipher   |
| SF      | Urban neighborhood — no mention of diversity of housing types  |
| SF      | Mode share not mentioned   |
| SF      | The 'urban neighborhood' vs. 'regional centers' distinction in Northeast quadrant seems odd (e.g. Geary Blvd. and Masonic doesn't strike me as a "regional center", but more just mixed use corridor).   |
| SF      | Why is Tenderloin/Nob Hill "regional center" vs. "urban neighborhood"? They are neighborhoods, not "primary centers of economic and cultural activity".  |
| SF      | Place type distinctions are a little confusing for San Francisco. I am fine with designation of my neighborhood (upper Castro/Market)  |
| SF      | Higher density housing along transit lines   |
| SF      | Increased density — Transit Town Center should be considered, if not prioritized on Geary and West Portal. Urban Neighborhood should cross 101 to encompass San Bruno Avenue   |
| SF      | Potrero Hill generally accurate; will grow even more as Mission Bay and Pier 70 area expands   |
| SF      | Assigned place type for Northeast quadrant of SF = regional center   |
| SF      | The assigned Regional Center place type is unclear. If the Russian Hill neighborhood is considered a regional center, then its fine, but it's really a mixed use, transit oriented urban neighborhood within the Regional Center. More mixed use would be better.  |
| SF      | I live in the Mission. The area is rapidly gentrifying. If development continues, the City/region needs to be concerned about gentrification and displacement. MTC needs to seriously consider mechanisms to reduce or prevent displacement.   |

**San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011**

**Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet**

*Step 1: County Growth and Place Types*

(B.) Thoughts and comments about **place types** in area closest to where you live or work

**MEETING COMMENT**

SF | I live in Hayes Valley, please develop as a regional center.

SF | I live in a central SF mixed-use neighborhood. It's close to shopping, transit; it's 3 blocks to 2 parks; has yard space.  
Great!

## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

(C.) What resources do you think would be needed to support growth and high-quality development in your community?

| MEETING | COMMENT  |
|---------|--|
| SF      | The country is broke and financing restricted. High quality development? Why not second or third best that is affordable?  |
| SF      | Job projection   |
| SF      | Demographics (can residents afford to live there?)   |
| SF      | Develop housing that are affordable, or rental units   |
| SF      | Closer transportation to work areas  |
| SF      | Maintaining plus if possible improving transit (more frequency)  |
| SF      | Stop destruction of Chinatown. Kill the Central Subway.  |
| SF      | Space and support for local businesses to thrive   |
| SF      | More affordable housing throughout the city to create diverse neighborhoods.   |
| SF      | More outreach to each community would be needed.   |
| SF      | TOD neighborhood on rail & BRT   |
| SF      | Need superagency to fast track in-fill development   |
| SF      | Low interest loans for in-fill development   |
| SF      | Mixed use corridors → need stronger Planning Commission to stand up to local opposition  |
| SF      | City and community will & better transit (no Muni rail in Richmond District)   |
| SF      | More reliable transit (the J. Church street car, #24 bus, and #4 bus all have reliability problems)  |
| SF      | Better controls on private shuttles (Google, etc.). They get in the way of public transit, and are dangerous for bikes and pedestrians.  |
| SF      | More affordable housing options (not sure how to do that)  |
| SF      | Affordable housing   |
| SF      | Changed zoning   |
| SF      | Downtown SF: improve BART stations (modernize), street cleaning, more sidewalk usage, more truly affordable housing across housing types.  |
| SF      | Less mega development; more smaller non-profit developments  |
| SF      | Difficult to find one area where there has been a massive increase in high-density development. Need to find more examples and lift up   |
| SF      | More public housing; deeper subsidies for affordable housing   |
| SF      | More recreation and community activities. Staff Cayoga Rec Center. Open community center at old Muni office building & powerhouse  |
| SF      | More funding for BRT and transit priority streets, bus bulbs, low-floor buses; autos second, less stop signs on Muni routes  |
| SF      | We need bus bulbs and stoplights at transit stops; traffic calming must be taken seriously.  |
| SF      | Increased bus service (28 line! 29!)   |
| SF      | Make 19th Ave safe for bicyclists and pedestrians (bike lanes!)  |
| SF      | Increase mixed use development (and commercial development) surrounding N and L lines and 19th Avenue  |
| SF      | Increase parking cost, do away with parking space/unit of housing zoning requirements  |
| SF      | Financially support urban agriculture as one aspect of a "mixed use" neighborhood  |
| SF      | Coordination of transport/construction is imperative   |
| SF      | Bus bulbs, pedestrian bulbs, <i>real</i> bus only lanes East of Van Ness (e.g. Geary BRT gets 'diluted' to not-true BRT East of Gough, according to current plans, but this is insufficient)   |
| SF      | Affordable housing funding   |
| SF      | Wider side walks   |
| SF      | There are multiple resources that already exist but are not focused on and not effectively utilized. Therefore, I feel like the most important resource for high-quality development is the ability for planning agencies to think about infrastructure and how it can be put to better use. |
| SF      | San Francisco cannot support the additional PDA densities (thou I support doing so!) in absence of greatly improved transit within SF. \$1 spent on transit in SF is much more effective than \$1 spent in Marin for example.  |
| SF      | We need to keep a diverse mix of housing, grocery stores, jobs, entertainment in regional transportation centers   |
| SF      | By nature of geography and history, SF is focused on smart growth. What is needed is funding for execution.  |

**San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011**

**Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet**

*Step 1: County Growth and Place Types*

(C.) What resources do you think would be needed to support growth and high-quality development in your community?

**MEETING COMMENT**

|    |  |
|----|--|
| SF | Increase density-housing in NCD's along existing transit lines; keep jobs, homes, shops, parks all within walking distance   |
| SF | See B — Lots more affordable housing options. MTC needs to develop a <b>community equity/regional equity workgroup</b> to discuss how SCS can limit the amount of negative impacts on low income or communities of color |
| SF | Strong planning/design/zoning — public education.  |
| SF | Lift zoning RH1 to RH3 and help people add units/density   |
| SF | Senior housing close to services   |

## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### Step 2: Transportation Investment Strategies

Comments about top transportation investment strategies

| MEETING | COMMENT  |
|---------|--|
| SF      | Fix what we currently have.  |
| SF      | The U.S. is very behind compared to other countries in terms of transit infrastructure. We need fast train, subway, and clean intratransport like Singapore. Too much policy and environmental stoppers. We need to move on as we are way behind!  |
| SF      | These are all good options. Given a 5th card, I'd select (F) Expand express bus and local bus.   |
| SF      | Stop stupid transportation funding. Stop funding Central Subway. Central Subway increases Muni deficit plus reduces Muni service.  |
| SF      | Do the right thing; Don't choose federal dollars to ...  |
| SF      | VMT peaked before the recession — MTC needs to change its assumptions  |
| SF      | 15% reduction in GHG by 2035 is embarrassing. CAFÉ will lead to more.  |
| SF      | Not sure what "most effective" meant in A above; still voted for it but needs better explanation   |
| SF      | Concern that more funding may not mean better service  |
| SF      | Local transit agencies should be regionalized to improve planning. Maintaining local input is helpful if we create a regional transit agency so that local issues are not overlooked   |
| SF      | Consolidate regional transit agencies or at least have an oversight agency that can look at regional needs and have the power to move funds.   |
| SF      | ABAG and MTC need more control over land use, cannot separate from transit. Local control doesn't work. Low density areas export their problems to Bay Area.   |
| SF      | Transportation should have been one of the topics covered in the different scenarios   |
| SF      | Much investment is aimed at expansion of transit network at the deficit of existing infrastructure. This attitude should be put to rest, and more innovative uses of existing resources should be encouraged.  |
| SF      | Freeway expansion and capacity increases should be discouraged   |
| SF      | Current investment strategies reward past bad behavior (like funding related to highway miles). Eliminate those. Eliminate "past commitments" which is the main MTC excuse for inaction.   |
| SF      | Concerns about workers transportation options are reflected in these priorities. Workers need affordable and efficient transit   |
| SF      | After voting, changed commuter rail expansion to synergistic commuter rail investment with high speed rail   |
| SF      | More efficient to increase existing services along current train routes  |
| SF      | Need to improve core services of public transit, with some expanded capacity to areas with planned growth.   |
|         | Future development should encourage pedestrian orientation/public transportation around existing transit   |
| SF      | Maps of San Francisco do not reflect realistic growth/infrastructure opportunities/challenges  |
| SF      | I think the entire range of top transp. investment strategies misses the mark. The real solutions lie outside the frame. The real issue is creating and funding a total transportation that minimizes trips via land use/place making, and creates a pattern to make transit work best, and provides access to best transportation mode, including carshare, private vehicles, etc., for the type of trip that's run entirely on renewable energy not GHG emissions. How close will the pre-packaged policies within the given frame get us to meeting this ultimate need? Would it ever get us there? |
| SF      | Supporting the development of HSR in regional investment   |
| SF      | Three priorities: 1) consider the job creation impacts of all investments. In other words, highway construction creates lots of good basic crafts jobs. But rehabilitating and expanding transit also creates jobs; 2) consider the development and maintenance of public transit systems. Invest in operations; 3) consider the affordability and efficiency of workers' transportation options. Don't increase tolls and commute hours unless these are effective regional transportation options that will get workers to their jobs.   |

## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### Step 3: Policy Initiatives

Comments about top policy initiatives

| MEETING | COMMENT   |
|---------|---|
| SF      | Don't punish — incentivize changes you want; all 1,(2,4,5) are intended to cost commuters more.   |
| SF      | These policies are too steered to modify people/employers through higher fees   |
| SF      | Incentives — carrots may be more productive than sticks (punishing behaviors)   |
| SF      | Missing are the policies to promote/create economic development and to encourage our employers/businesses to remain in the area   |
| SF      | #6 Eco Development — Don't understand the preservation of warehouse & industrial sites if you can improve them  |
| SF      | #3 Electric vehicles — if it is cheaper   |
| SF      | I support new requirements for employers, but would prefer incentives to requirements   |
| SF      | MTC is an obstacle to intelligent decision-making. Reconstitute MTC so that it reflects an appreciation for transit (instead of politics).  |
| SF      | Incentives are preferable to disincentives/punishment   |
| SF      | Current vehicle in Bay Area 430 gCO <sub>2</sub> /mi; Prius 178 gCO <sub>2</sub> /mi. By 2040 vehicles will have 1/2 of emissions (even with 15-year turnover).   |
| SF      | 50% of people work for employers with multi-locations   |
| SF      | More frequent buses; BRT and TOD  |
| SF      | #3 — needs something added re pollution generated by power plants that generate electricity for the cars.   |
| SF      | Expecting employers to force employees to make behavior change has not and will not likely lead to change   |
| SF      | Policy/zoning changes will be necessary in SF to accomplish most of the regional plan. This must somehow be incentivized if Nimbi's is not to prevail.  |
| SF      | Building types should include units/acre to be more clear   |
| SF      | No <b>new</b> HOT lanes (convert existing lanes)  |
| SF      | Regional congestion pricing/tolls and SF-focused cordon   |
| SF      | Get rid of bad projects i.e. Central subway, BART to San Jose BART to Oakland airport connector   |
| SF      | Biggest problem in Bay Area is communist-style pricing policy for road users. Without dealing with social costs (economic/environmental externalities) & internalizing those costs, all other measures are entirely useless   |
| SF      | 5 — equalize price of driving   |
| SF      | Regional gas tax — was suggested after voted! But, would have gotten my vote above all others   |
| SF      | I also like carbon tax or cap + dividend strategies. We need economic incentives to encourage public transit over passenger car use = increase tolls, increase parking costs. We also need to make car shares, public transit, walking/biking the easiest and cheapest transportation option.   |
| SF      | Price all highway lanes except HOV lanes invest in place making by educating people about place making.   |
| SF      | Regional Gas Tax!   |
| SF      | In the end, the problem with these exercises is the total disconnect between the public input and MTC's output. MTC collects much public input, yet its decisions are entirely political and unscientific. MTC complains about lack of flexibility and transit funding, yet somehow Europe does more with less. The reason is that European cities simply make better choices in how they spend the funds they have. I see no evidence that MTC will choose better in the future. |
| SF      | Employer supports for worker transportation is necessary.   |



## San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011

### Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

#### WILD CARDS

Step 2: Transportation Investment Strategies

Step 3: Policy Initiatives

| MEETING | WILD CARD — Investment Strategies  | WILD CARD — Policy Initiatives  |
|---------|--|---|
| SF      | Align transit spending with current job centers/ employer decisions  | Economic incentives   |
| SF      | Work with local planners and citizens to change zoning   | Reduce transit fares  |
| SF      | Prioritize buses over rail and freeways  | Tax corporate polluters to pay for public transit   |
| SF      | Regional transit czar agency   | Not sure but don't really like the others — Gas tax, I guess, but don't like that it's a regressive tax   |
| SF      | Prioritize bus ops. re rail-building projects  | Financial incentives for TOD  |
| SF      | Use funds to engage community regarding zoning   |   |
| SF      | Eliminate central subway from planned transit  | Gasoline tax should be put back in public transit and bike lane development   |
| SF      | Distribute funding increase to number of existing and new parking  | Reduce minimum number of required parking spaces/unit to zero   |
| SF      | ADA consideration in very plan use   | Incentivize the construction and affordable housing (housing density) and the diversity of mode share   |
| SF      | Smaller buses for neighborhoods  | Creative initiatives/regulations for parking i.e. MTC leadership on local incentives for good parking policy and BAAQMD oversight/fees or parking |
| SF      | Expand urban rail transit (Geary subway)   | Incentivize transportation agencies to more effectively use existing resources, and infrastructure that are under-used, without reducing service  |
| SF      | Make regional investments that support the development & implementation of high speed rail i.e.. Caltrain electrification        | Region wide cap & trade system on parking! Eliminate transfer charges for transit   |
|         |  | Promote car sharing & car pooling, particularly with electronic vehicles  |
|         | Align transportation funds/spending with current job centers/employer decisions  | Economic incentives - economic development  |
|         | No cost coordinate regional connections schedules. Avoid just missed connection  | Implement a high gas tax with revenue going towards maintaining/improving public transit.   |
|         | Require one non-mechanical off-street parking space for each new residential unit in the project to maintain reasonable density. | More mixed use development that places both jobs and housing in same neighborhood   |
|         | Synchronize schedules between transit agencies   | Promote economic development and new housing using environmentally sustainable methods and practices  |
|         | Bus funds prioritized over rail and freeway  | Provide financial incentives for development of mixed use projects at transit centers   |
|         | Fund citizen process to give input to build support for zoning changes   | Reduce transit fare   |
|         | Expand urban rail transit (as opposed to commuter/intercity)   | Tax corporate polluters to pay for public transit   |
|         | Eliminate funding for central subway and bad transit   | Gas tax, I guess, but I don't like that it's a regressive tax. Especially because many times the lower cost housing is further from good transit. |
|         | Distribute funding inversely with existing and new parking   | Change zoning law in neighborhoods - reduce the minimum required number of parking spaces unit of housing to zero!                                |

**San Francisco Workshop — April 25, 2011**

**Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet**

*WILD CARDS*

Step 2: Transportation Investment Strategies

Step 3: Policy Initiatives

| MEETING | WILD CARD — Investment Strategies   | WILD CARD — Policy Initiatives   |
|---------|---|--|
|         | Allocate extra funding to cities that rezones to minimize motorized trip generation, provide 5-min ped access to daily needs, and served by multi-modal transportation system...and that create a 100% jobs/housing balance within commute shed for its jobs at houses affordable to local workers. | Eliminate all parking minimums and replace with low maximums   |
|         | Road diets and removal of urban freeways  | Convert at least one lane on every freeway and thoroughfare to a HOT lane  |
|         | Funding for <u>place making</u> - road diets, sidewalk, streetscapes  | As for tolls, use hours as needed - like rush hours only to be more than regular tolls during the rest of the day  |
|         | Ensure no displacement of existing residents  | Creative policy initiatives/regulations for parking: e.g., MTC regional leadership on local incentives for good parking policy; increase BAAQMD oversight/fees of parking    |
|         | Smaller vehicles for neighborhood transportation - use less gas, emissions, better able to use narrow streets!  | Gasoline tax to be put back into public transit and bike lane development  |
|         |   | Toll <u>all</u> highway lanes except HOV lanes - (3+ per vehicle). Build enough HOV capacity so that express buses can go 55+. Funds pay for BRT/express bus infrastructure. |
|         |   | Regional gasoline/carbon tax to pay for sustainable trans., housing, community facilities.   |
|         |   | Limit/eliminate minimum parking requirements in transit-rich areas.  |
|         |   | Implement transportation strategies discussed in exercise 3 to ensure that there are real alternatives for driving   |
|         |   | Prohibit employers from paying for employee parking. Reduced transit cost for employers who stay in city (SF).   |
|         |   | Electric vehicles: subsidize <u>and</u> increase charging stations <u>and</u> discourage other types of fuel.  |