

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

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

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	The plan designates almost entirely "mixed use development" for the entire El Camino corridor. We need more diversity not all the same. More areas with individual character. We need 6-8 "City Centers" and also some rural "Town Centers." A mix of something for everyone — NOT the "same" for everyone.
SM	City Center - love it! Promotes/builds for community. Increased use of local business. Mixed Use Corridor — Boring, terrible for pedestrians.
SM	Need more diversity of place types. Like to see more City Center. Need employment near housing. Alternative transportation.
SM	Appears that little thought has been given to development other than on the traditional transit corridor. Thought must be given to development based on employment opportunities.
SM	City Center
SM	Based on examples of current growth in those areas, higher density projects need to be dealt with differently. Too little of real life taken into consideration. In high rise condo style areas: no place for families, not enough parking, leading to no business wanting to move in.
SM	It appears that some cities will NOT be growing: Pacifica, Half Moon Bay, Woodside, Portola Valley, Atherton, Foster City, Hillsborough. It seems inequitable that these cities will be exempt from having to deal with the challenges of accommodating additional growth.
SM	I live in #31 which is projected to be mixed use corridor; however it is labeled moderate-density and it is currently high-density in many areas of #31, so moderate-density would be an improvement.
SM	Mixed-use located closest to existing transit (Caltrain, BART, Samtrans) & major freeways (380, 280, 101)
SM	Live near SR 92 and Delaware. Should be more jobs planned to guide area planning.
SM	Live — Suburban neighborhood
SM	Unclear where employment centers are located and would make a difference to me.
SM	Transit Town Center (where I live). How are we going to grow population and the need for public transit while we are currently cutting the service of Caltrain and bus? Population growth must be planned, anticipated and public transit solutions have to be built in the mean time.
SM	My neighborhood (Sunnybrae) is very concerned about implementation of transit-oriented development and its impact on lives.
SM	San Mateo — downtown — supportive of city center concept. El Camino Real — supportive of it being more of a mixed-use corridor. Glad some affordable housing being built along El Camino (e.g. at Hillsdale).
SM	SAMTRANS needs to offer transfers for short E-W connections to El Camino. It's too far to walk but don't want to pay for 2nd bus, so drive.
SM	Suburban, I would like it to be more akin to suburban center.
SM	Belmont would work as a Transit Town Center with connection across the corridors. As presently identified for a mixed use corridor it will lose identity. The city is mostly housing, it needs a job mix to reduce travel, greenhouse gases. Land use change is necessary.
SM	Areas in mixed use corridor that are near train stations should be indicated as such — as potential TOD "nodes."
SM	Space type = mixed use corridor. Seems convenient to many amenities. Concerned somewhat about crowding, lack of privacy, noise, lack of yard space. Transportation needs to be coordinated and connected.
SM	Mixed-use corridor — wider sidewalks, tree lined streets, lower speed limits. Know high rise buildings (3 stories).
SM	More pedestrian (and safer) bike access across 101 and El Camino. A regional cultural center, maybe as an upgrade or incorporated into Expo Center.
SM	Be sure to have open spaces. Lots of greenery.
SM	Good idea. Projects within PDAs should compliment each other, emphasize linkages. Strive for "Complete Neighborhood." Need green space. Areas for community gathering. Walkability important.
SM	San Carlos = mixed use corridor. I support this use. Building densities up to 50-60 units/acre are okay. Heights up to a 4-story is okay. Development needs to be "complete" neighbor, not just "transit adjacent." Neighborhoods should include retail/services/city parks/housing/offices all in one area accessible by walking, biking and transit — less dependence on automobiles. Majority of new housing should be "affordable."

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

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

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	Foster City (Millbrae) I work in. Transit neighborhoods most appropriate but it blends into urban neighborhood easily. City has a #6 designation which I don't think is a good job. Millbrae has a multi-modal station which can support a stronger mix of commercial, higher density residential — crease a critical mass and level of synergy.
SM	San Mateo city — mixed use is a good choice especially on El Camino corridor. More "City Centers" in cities without them (e.g. Belmont).
SM	East Palo Alto: On the map it's designated as a transit town center which I do agree with, but I'd also like to see mixed-use as part of the place type. They're in the midst of their own re-development plan and have voted the desire for mixed-use.
SM	I agree that El Camino Real should be a mixed use corridor. I think that the Caltrain station area should include an urban neighborhood in it's redevelopment of the old racetrack.
SM	City Center
SM	Mixed-use transit corridor VERY appropriate with adjoining transit neighborhoods.
SM	Mixed-use corridor and Transit Town Center — call out improved walkability/bikeability. Mixed use corridor and Town Center — need public gathering places.
SM	Safer walking/biking infrastructure needed.
SM	Like to walk to downtown — rarely use my car on weekends.
SM	I live in Pacifica — and currently work in Pacifica, but plan on working in San Francisco again. Our biggest issues are lack of public transportation and need to plan for growth focusing on transit town centers or neighborhoods or mixed use corridors. We need clustered growth in several areas of Pacifica and are in the process of updating our General Plan and drafting a Climate Action Update.
SM	1. <u>Best feature Woodside</u> : Closeness to nature. Woodside allows horses, cows, chickens, goats, deer (too many!), bobcats, coyotes, rabbits, birds — plan for accents to NATURE. 2) <u>Roads Woodside</u> : are narrow, no bikes or pedestrians can dominate. Rural feeling could be saved if density is focused in town center. 3) <u>Redwood City</u> : Make it more pedestrian — slow traffic. It would be good to have CLEAR East-West connectors along which transit to reach out and land use can be upzoned.
SM	Suburban Center. Lacks proper transportation connections.
SM	I live in Pescadero, CA and would like to see a more rural mixed-use corridor.
SM	Adequate representation of current plan for city of Redwood City.
SM	City Center (downtown San Mateo) characteristics are great in that there are houses at all income levels, a good mix of restaurants, services entertainment and I can take the train or bike to work. Need to strengthen east-west connections across county to preserve/improve access from hillside single-family neighborhoods to the El Camino Corridor.
SM	Need clear definition of "in-fill." Mixed-use corridor for sure on veterans in Redwood City. No housing/retail development on bay lands or salt ponds (hard to see on the map if this was planned) on peninsula. Mixed-use corridor good along El Camino - but thoughtfulness about integration building height with local neighborhoods (i.e. evaluating loss of sunlight on existing neighborhoods off El Camino Real).
SM	I like the place types in the area where I work and live. Employment near transit I think is very important.
SM	The PDA closest looks reasonable for the area — close to the El Camino corridor in San Mateo.
SM	Mixed Use & City Center — these types are very appropriate for the area.
SM	Pacifica doesn't but YEAH
SM	North Fair Oaks designation as "Transit Neighborhood" is not close to what is or may be land use in the future. We are low-income, no transportation hub or transit opportunities. This scenario is not logical or feasible without totally tearing down existing neighborhoods and starting over.
SM	For San Carlos, mixed-use corridor seems right. Caltrain station stop. Bus service, but declining.
SM	Menlo Park — suggest high density, 10 stories plus, on El Camino. Don't need retail under housing. Suggest retail clusters.
SM	Many of the place types are too similar and/or overlap quite a bit — especially in the pictures. Also, I don't see an example of a mixed-high density residential area — one with a mix of townhomes, attached single family, and mid-to high single family. Very common — and may not necessarily have much transit.
SM	Downtown San Mateo RR Station — higher density (i.e. taller buildings) in DT retail area.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

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

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	The examples do not represent the proper density. City center density should be available in transit corridors.
SM	San Bruno, where I live, is coded as a mixed use corridor. Caltrain was considering closing the station in the city. The train would be needed for the city if it were to be truly mixed-use. Same goes for South City (closing of station and listed as a growth opportunity area). Same goes for the proposed closure of Hayward Park station in San Mateo (where mixed use is proposed).
SM	Suburban, but with shuttle to offices. Concerned about Redwood City: salt works vs. G.P., supply of water, traffic constraints/capacity. High Speed Rail: takes up TOD space San Mateo: TOD to save open space, not expand right of way for High Speed Rail Transit: shuttles (public/private partnership)
SM	I live on coast — need smart growth, "in-fill" development. More public transportation.
SM	For San Carlos, yes on Suburban Center, Transit Town Center, Transit Neighborhood, Mixed Use Corridor
SM	City Centers provide excellent opportunity for density access to public transportation and reduction of every commuter
SM	Redwood City's new General Plan had broad community support and implements the Plan Bay Area vision. This is threatened by the Salt works Project proposal. Growth should <u>not</u> occur on salt ponds which are <u>open space</u> or fill in the Bay. It's also threatened by <u>current</u> HSR plan for elevated track or expanded right-of-way.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

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

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	Improve access & efficiency of public transportation in San Mateo County. Check the metro in DC area. How efficient it is and user friendly.
SM	Education + public will + funding. Many areas in San Mateo County are transit-isolated. Many unincorporated areas do not have sidewalks, which discourages pedestrian activity. Bus/train affordable passes.
SM	Increase funding for better use of transportation. Expand commuter rail services. Bike/Pedestrian resources. Offer financial incentives. Employment. Safe routes to school.
SM	Parking, grocery stores, fire and police services, transit.
SM	Parking resources, transportation resources (e.g. to get seniors just a few blocks to mixed use area), planning from high-to moderate-density.
SM	More access to cross-town shuttles for residents in hill areas for commercial and medical services. Public transit more friendly to disabled & mothers with small children. Consideration of public services (post office, library, city hall) availability.
SM	An adequate transit <u>network</u> is needed.
SM	Enhanced transit opportunity/services. It is counterintuitive to have more TODs with less or reduced services.
SM	Focus in on creating complete neighborhoods intentionally, not just density. I think most would be sold on the idea of complete neighborhoods with homes, shops, services in a walkable/bikeable distance.
SM	<u>Connected</u> transportation links (like Caltrain, more light rail) is very important.
SM	Public transit (electrified Caltrain? BART extension around the bay?). The bay area is structured so that you as a professional is likely to have meetings/professional activities between San Francisco and San Jose almost on a daily basis. A network of transportation solutions is needed, especially an efficient light rail system around the Bay.
SM	Transit needs to be seamless so that it doesn't require thought or a high degree of pre-planning to use. Transit needs to run 24/7, clean (spotless) and safe!
SM	Better transit at local end — more frequent trains and busses. Instead we are cutting.
SM	Strategic Planning, Community Commitment, Resources/\$\$ Incentives.
SM	More support for public transit so that TOD can actually work and not simply denser development that requires people to use cars only.
SM	Better transit. Improved bike and walking paths.
SM	Thoughtful economic development strategy to revitalize El Camino Real.
SM	We will need schools, recreation space sufficient to address community needs. We need approval to use large infill sites such as are found in the industrial salt works to create complete communities which can connect with the transportation corridor of the El Camino Real and Caltrain.
SM	Transit, especially buses. Great schools, better neighborhoods. Jobs sustainable within a walking footprint. Creek corridor restored. Community gardens. Bikes and elder tricycles. Economic development strategy with gas at \$20/gallon by 2050 local economies.
SM	Incentives to cities to approve TOD housing. Financial disincentives for surface parking.
SM	Better coordination of transit systems.
SM	Save tax increment financing! Retain RDAs, but reform. Monetary incentives for good growth. Emphasize precise plans.
SM	Form-based planning codes. Economic incentives for developers. Specific plan/precise plans.
SM	Better integration of uses with the Millbrae station — commercial, residential, office. The station can be leveraged better. City needs more support and assistance for planning around the station.
SM	Schools (K-12), childcare access for working families (preschool - before/after schools care), green space/parks/community gardens.
SM	Infrastructure, sidewalks = wider, traffic calming devices (crosswalks, speed humps/bumps)
SM	We need more walkable/bikeable neighborhoods and El Camino Real requires a SIGNIFICANT investment in the infrastructure. Should include safe routes to transit and schools.
SM	High quality schools — p - college. Safe neighborhoods — bike paths, good lighting. Clean neighborhoods — dumping issues. Maintain open spaces — wild and planned. Provide excellent public transportation. Incentivize employers to provide shuttle service from Caltrain.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 1: County Growth and Place Types

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

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	We <u>must</u> think about joint planning for housing and schools. Housing won't work for families if the schools and day care aren't there — parks also. These are what makes higher density housing livable.
SM	More transit, east-west connectivity, walking & biking.
SM	As discussed, Pacifica needs more public transportation focused on Highway One and other transportation corridors. Mainly links to BART. Pacifica needs regional government subsidies/ assistance to invest in high-quality growth.
SM	It would be good to have CLEAR East-West connectors along which transit to reach out and land use can be upzoned. Transit connection on Woodside Rd (84) over to the ocean would allow public in high-density transit in downtown RWC and access to open space on the ocean. Allow schools to be built along transit with housing above. Allow rooftops to be used for recreation assembly (fire codes currently prevent aggregates of people using rooftops).
SM	Transportation funding for VMT & GHG reducing projects.
SM	More support from the outside world! Having more county input for the Pescadero Area!
SM	Some private sector risk-taking to develop housing to support retail growth/success. Jobs/income security for folks to be able to buy, rent, upgrade. Market toward young professionals, young families, empty-nesters.
SM	Policy guidance to encourage unbundling parking, eliminating minimums that don't make sense, and charging for parking to support other programs. Affordable housing supports/help with land acquisition, financing, etc. Intensive assistance from MTC/ABAG/BAAQMD to make sure infill is not prevented by CEQA air quality thresholds. Model policies and best practices.
SM	<u>Enough water!</u> Clean water and air, farmers markets, access to local, organic, affordable produce/food, walkable, access to affordable public transit, local parks.
SM	I live in rural suburban area. I think we really need transit feeders to the main trunk lines where transit is frequent. ECR & Caltrain. I am lucky that I can walk from a station to work but where employment centers are not as close there needs to be transit to the trunk as well.
SM	For my neighborhood (between El Camino & 101 in San Mateo close to Burlingame), we need more people and homes, so there are enough customers to keep our shopping center and businesses lively.
SM	Education for the public on creative envisioning. People are fearful of losing parking, as well as learning to travel without their cars.
SM	Better transit from coast to transit.
SM	Resources: 1) Infrastructure (water, sewer, drainage for <u>flood control</u> , water quality). 2) Money for appropriate neighborhood development, including parks & open space, child care services, health care services.
SM	More convenient links to different types of transportation. High 24/7 security for transit, meals, schools. Recognize that we are part of <u>global</u> world.
SM	Political courage.
SM	Changes in regulations — allowing lower parking requirements for high density residential and/or mixed use.
SM	More education on how high density reduces CO2, traffic, increases business.
SM	Higher density regulations.
SM	A sustainable funding stream for Caltrain. Possibly loans for businesses to be able to purchase/lease empty space in city, especially the down-town area.
SM	Station area planning to ensure TOD-compatible stations.
SM	Rail, grade separated with lowest possible impact on surrounding land use.
SM	Provide dedicated sources of funding for public transportation. Create public-private-partnerships and related policies.
SM	Transportation dollars.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 2: Transportation Investment Strategies

Comments about top transportation investment strategies

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	The San Mateo County has very poor East/West transit connections to Caltrain and Samtrans. 50% of residential areas have <u>no way</u> to take public transit to the train or shopping areas along El Camino; we <u>have</u> to drive. Samtrans needs smaller vans to serve the suburbs.
SM	School buses would eliminate 50% of our 8 am and 3 pm traffic; parents would gladly pay not to have to drive our kids both ways daily. Safe routes to school would help too.
SM	STOP subsidizing roads and put the funding into public transit. Allocate public transit funds based on carbon savings and per-mile cost.
SM	Each city/town should have a balance of jobs and housing. Penalize cities that create employment without creating housing to go with it. And penalize cities that develop housing where the residents will all have to commute away to jobs. Don't just require all cities to build more housing — require that each city provide it's own internal balance of jobs and housing.
SM	I would use Public Transportation if it were more efficient. It costs the same for me as driving and takes 2-3 times as long to commute.
SM	Need more bike trails along transit corridor and city streets. More electric car charging stations. Regional public transit tickets.
SM	Provide school busing!! We have too many parents driving around in the morning and afternoon dropping and picking up kids. Thanks.
SM	High-speed rail to San Jose — BART only (no peninsula). Make transit agencies coordinate with each other! Why aren't local bus shuttles used in a small region in cities to supplement the less than ideal public transit?
SM	Same as previous page. Funding to expand existing services for transit.
SM	We need to provide funding on both ends of the spectrum: 1) Funding for affordable mixed-use housing near transit; 2) Funding to preserve agriculture and open space.
SM	The transportation systems need to connect and be seamless. Lines need to work as well.
SM	Sidewalks improvement in all cities/neighborhoods. I live in Hillsborough 4 blocks from El Camino Real, but since my town have no sidewalks it's super risky to walk these 4 blocks. More tax on cars/parking/HOV use but these have to be invested in needed new public transit infrastructure.
SM	I'm not clear if/how BART could use Caltrain's tracks — is that an option?
SM	Locations where compact housing, schools, parks and goods transit access can be co-located are rare and valuable and should be fully exploited.
SM	A — presumes that some entity knows what these "most effective transit services," are. Full range of alternate energy options need to be incentivized and made available. Look at the whole picture — if train access is improved to work but no shuttle is available then the person is stymied. If children don't have childcare, before and after school care options that allow parent to stay at work, then road trips are increased. Plan childcare options to mitigate trips in vehicles.
SM	Debundle parking from units, charge separately so people realize the true cost of having a car.
SM	Grade separation of train tracks.
SM	Buy back of inefficient cars to assist low income to drive more efficient cars.
SM	Incentivize carpooling and ride share programs. Provide structure to organize and communicate options. Investigate public/private shuttle service options especially for coastal and suburban areas. Otherwise not adequately served. Make allowances for small businesses which require travel and/or delivery services, and also for lower income drivers. Penalize drivers of low mileage vehicles — meaning those drivers not requiring low mileage vehicles for work purposes.
SM	1. Create a SINGLE transit agency for whole Bay; 2. Area (e.g. BART circles Bay); 3. Predictable East-West connectors from rail (e.g. buses, zip cars); 4. Connection to local transportation — bikes, stands, shuttles. TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT: Make pedestrians TOP PRIORITY and bikes second. This will make transportation policy totally different investment.
SM	Link transportation funding to land uses that can demonstrate VMT and GHG reduction.
SM	Pretty varied/ok balance
SM	Strategies that account for comprehensive improvement acts (health, equity, etc). Our investments and policies should be based on the information that is now available to us.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 2: Transportation Investment Strategies

Comments about top transportation investment strategies

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	A (increase funding for most effective transit service) should include making rail service along the peninsula affordable.
SM	Instead of growing residence near jobs, should also consider bringing jobs to suburban areas.
SM	I was happy to see "effective transit" got so much support.
SM	We need more short line rail routes on the peninsula.
SM	Disagree with need for security that wild cards promoted. Keep most of development along El Camino/ 101 corridors away from coast. Need better transit now!
SM	I believe that H (improve bike and ped facilities) is one of the most cost effective strategies in terms of reducing auto usage and improving safety.
SM	Need better East-West transportation. Smart buses direct to San Francisco. Electrify Caltrain.
SM	Transit needs to be supported by building in the transit corridors.
SM	It's important to have <u>green spaces, parks and open spaces</u> in our higher density suburban & urban centers, not just in the hills or in the salt flats in the Bay.
SM	Promote funding initiatives for expanded Caltrain service.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 3: Policy Initiatives

Comments about top policy initiatives

MEETING	COMMENT
SM	School buses should be mandatory. Does not make sense having 200 cars in and out at the same time at every school. What can't school children use fixed route Samtrans buses to go to school? This was something new I learned.
SM	Improve cost benefits/incentives for public transportation. It can't be expensive to ride BART/Caltrain/buses
SM	Worried about equity-impact of #4 and #5 on low income workers in our county (and lots of self-employed folks who drive to sites for a living — landscapers, housecleaners, etc.)
SM	More incentives, connectivity and nexus between fees and programs.
SM	Collective effort. Increase the parking fee, but with the money we have to subsidize public transportation or make our cities more walkable.
SM	I voted for solutions that leave room for individual choice rather than imposing mandates. Pricing strategies do that. (But you should look out for unintended consequences).
SM	#1 — I don't know if you can require employers to allow employees to work at home, but it would help ease congestion. #2 — Slower speed limits would greatly help reduce fuel consumption (e.g. on 280) but we're all in such a hurry.
SM	Pricing strategies are like a regressive tax. It is elitist and economically discriminating.
SM	Priority should be on reducing VMT vs. air pollution (EVs, etc.)
SM	At some point need to re-visit utilizing Dumbarton Rail Project re: traffic on Dumbarton Bridge.
SM	I do not support imposing fees on people for driving when a system is not in place to allow travel by public transportation or other alternatives.
SM	Employees don't have incentives to push them to transit incentives
SM	Electric vehicles suck money out of infrastructure maintenance. No gas tax \$.
SM	Charging for parking for those who prefer to drive to work and use funds to pay for public transit passes.
SM	See So Francisco Land Use/Developer Fees (Nexus study) and ordinances that allowed for \$ millions of dollars for investment in build out of child care infrastructure. (Gene Mullin mayor when done).
SM	Social equity should've been a card.
SM	Policy should be implemented as options become available to consumers. Ex. charging for parking should not come before adequate transportation is available.
SM	Good additional ideas for subsidizing shuttles to employment sites.
SM	Incentivize/reward carpools & ride sharing programs both through employers and by investigating additional methods. Use solar panels over parking spaces to charge electric vehicles. Prioritize policy initiatives according to those that 1) reduce carbon emissions and 2) conserve resources.
SM	If we want to preserve the QUALITY & BEAUTY of the Bay Area we should concentrate growth into and along transportation corridor with nodes of the MOST URBAN type of development. MOST URBAN contrasts well with and preserves existing suburban development because it provides the opportunity for the EXCITEMENT & ACTIVITY that only a dense development can sustain, takes the least area, is GREENEST and least carbon footprint, provides places for youth to enjoy, place for seniors to live conveniently.
SM	Coordinate regional policy efforts that they do not conflict each other's goals. For example: 1) BAAQMD new guidelines, while hoping to result in better air quality, stall or kill infill affordable housing projects by requiring full CEQA review. 2) New BCDC Bay Plan may impede development of PDAs identified by SB 375.
SM	Ensure that pricing policies include exceptions/subsidies for low income.
SM	Free bikes? I think Electric Vehicles should only be linked with clean energy — solar, etc — not from coal.
SM	Try looking at County Polling results for various vehicle license fee studies. San Mateo polls showed very different priorities for transportation than poll at Plan Bay Area workshops.
SM	Incentives for cities to develop secondary transit routes north-south & east-west on the peninsula for people who have to drive but choose to do so off of the freeway (more slowly). When there was a gas shortage, people could only fill up on certain days according to their license plates. Is there a way to reward people or employees who do not use their cars on "x" days a month? i.e. voluntary designation days.
SM	Please look at wild cards!
SM	This seminar was good for input on transit-oriented development. However, this is a <u>limiting</u> scenario in that all options and solutions are defined within a "transportation" baseline structure. There are many other, equally as important, factors (affordability, social justice, environment).

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 2011

Plan Bay Area Participant Comment Sheet

Step 3: Policy Initiatives

Comments about top policy initiatives

MEETING COMMENT

SM	#6 (Economic Development) should improve jobs/housing balance and reduce long-distance commuting.
SM	Reduce height limit in transit corridor
SM	Transportation options need to keep in mind the current older population and the increase in the older population in the future that will no longer be able to drive or choose not to drive.
SM	Transit is the backbone of non-auto transport system and needs higher priority to biking, which is important as well.
SM	Jawbone employers rather than regulate them (#1 - New Requirements for Employers). Congestion pricing too. Make sure revenue from #4 (Pricing Parking) and #5 (Other Pricing Strategies) goes to better public transit. Create some variable tolls on San Mateo bridge as Bay Bridge. Subsidize solar panels on homes to encourage people to buy electric vehicles.
SM	Promote funding initiatives for expanding Caltrain service.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 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
SM	1) Use pavement to take road space from cars and give it to buses, bikes and boards.	1) POMM — Program on Management Mobility like sharing.
SM	2) Restore creek corridors for urban agriculture and reduce food miles and create sustainable jobs.	2) Unbundle the cost of driving and parking and benefit districts individually
SM		3) Raising gas prices
SM	1) www.suntrain.com 2) zip car	1) Create incentives to match residence location with job location.
SM		2) Add electricity production (by solar to shade parking areas) to #3 — Electric Vehicles.
SM	24/7 High Level Security	1) Incentives to control the profit incentive so that it's supports sustainability.
SM		2) Increase incentives to use mass transit and decrease the attractiveness of solo driving.
SM	Don't forget about families with children. Change buses to light rail — I would take light rail with a young child, but I won't take a bus.	Higher taxes for low fuel efficiency vehicles.
SM	Expand emphasis on employment related development.	
SM	Have lower parking requirements for mixed use & higher density development	
SM	Have more efficient and user friendly public transportation that meets the needs of San Mateo County.	Gas mileage gauge mandatory in all cars to show lower speeds and improve gas mileage.
SM	Incent, locate, permit — childcare. Near transit; home; work.	Commercial developer fees — fund childcare infrastructure (see City of So. San Francisco [Mullin] for landuse policies and fee ordinance.)
SM	Incentives for cities that will focus on infill.	1) None of the alternatives "speak" to me as realistic or achievable. I don't have alternatives to offer.
SM		2) Implement the "London" plan — allow or dis-allow cars in city-centers on alternative days.
SM	Make transit agencies work together.	Make transit easier to use and adopt for those who are not yet using it. Create new ways to access information about taking public transport. 511 kiosks @ stations, better signage, volunteers to help people find their way around and support adoption by those who know that transit could strand them.
SM	More carpool lanes	1) Unbundle parking
SM		2) Higher taxes for low fuel efficiency vehicles
SM	Personal rapid transit.	High gasoline charge.
SM	Similar to I (offer more transportation funds to cities that build new housing), but with employment.	Interjurisdictional cooperation
SM	Stable, dedicated transit funding.	Give employers 3 choices: Fund Parking OR Subsidize Transit Pass OR Allow Telecommuting
SM	Workplace shuttles to Caltrain. Offer more charging stations for alternative fuel vehicles.	Providing sustainable funding sources for efficient and convenient public transit.
SM	SRTS - Safe Routes to Schools	1) Need more express transit from coast to transit hubs; 2) Build housing on top of suburban 1-3 story high commercial-industrial parks.
SM	"Bullet" Train to San Jose — regular train to San Francisco.	Schools must accompany development — ensure that there are sufficient schools to support the population

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 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
SM	Stop high speed rail at San Jose & connect to BART.	All revenue from other pricing strategies should go to improve public transit; therefore create legislation to ensure this revenue.
SM	Extend BART down the peninsula. Replace Caltrain with BART.	Create and support infrastructure (especially on roof tops) solar energy that can be used to charge electric vehicles, etc. Require any new building with flat roofs have a certain percentage of solar panels on them.
SM	Force transit agencies to work together creating a seamless and simply solution that's fast and efficient.	Eco level along existing transit routes
SM	Capture the increased value from up-zoned real estate adjacent to commuter rail and intermodal nodes.	Extend transit to job areas and encourage density in such areas.
SM	Build into the gasoline tax fees that pay for insurance coverage for drivers and improvements to transportation structure.	Gas tax
SM	Street cars	Gas tax!
SM	Offer financial incentives. Offer more transportation funds to cities that build new housing & development. (e.g. improve jobs/housing balance)	In transit corridors designed for mixed-use, require developers to include housing above commercial or pay <u>large fees</u> .
SM	Invest in safe routes to school.	Incentives for employer transit programs or rider vanpools.
SM	Improve transit connectivity with trunk and local lines.	Incentives for employers to provide shuttle service from Caltrain to place of employment
SM	Schools are a center for community activity.	Incentives for TOD -- link transportation \$ to cities' approval of infill & TOD housing.
SM	Ferry Service.	Incentives to get out of cars
SM		Mandate system prohibiting SOVs on odd/even days, e.g. London city center type system of permits (forces people onto transit)
SM		More carrot (reward for employers) to promote "proper" behavior. Less sticks.
SM		New requirements for employers. Incentivize employers to pool transit \$ to
SM		Schools must accompany development — ensure that there are sufficient schools to support the population
SM		Unbundle parking from new developments/units so developers don't have the requirements and individuals are aware of the true cost of having a vehicle.
SM		Unbundled parking in residential developments so cost to park is separate from cost to rent or buy.
SM		Use the revenues from pricing to provide free or discounted transit passes along the same corridor/same area. Charge 101 commuters and use \$ to save Caltrain! Or charge for parking in San Mateo and use the \$ for a downtown shuttle.
SM		Support car sharing.
SM		We need a mix of otherwise PG&E has a stronghold on the market w/ only electric car incentives. Solar vehicles, biodiesel - subsidize the purchase/lease of solar/biodiesel vehicles in the Bay Area.
SM		15 mph networked streets for neighborhood Electric Vehicles and Bicycle Boulevards.

San Mateo County Workshop — April 27, 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
SM		Subsidize car maintenance.
SM		Limit State and Federal funding to transportation systems (esp fixed rail) that serve regional circulation (stop funding local road maintenance).
SM		Make employer-paid parking a taxable (income tax) benefit
SM		Require interjurisdictional cooperation/target for emissions reductions. E.g. Incentivize and reward cities/county areas that step up to the plate to take development.
SM		Economic Development but open to changing trends.
SM		Economic Development to promote housing in multiuse areas.
SM		Subsidize transit/shuttle connections to employment centers.