

Plan Bay Area		
January 2012 Public Workshops		
Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops		
Station A: Transportation Trade-Offs		
A number of potential transportation investments will be considered as part of Plan Bay Area. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. At the workshop, participants who visited this station used tokens to "vote" on transportation trade-offs in three areas, or to provide their own idea:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transportation Investment Priorities ■ Policies to Reduce Driving and Emissions ■ Policies Regarding Public Transit 	
See the PDF titled "STATION A TOKEN COUNT" for how participants ranked the transportation investment categories in those three areas, and what "Other" ideas they offered.		
Below are comments provided in the Comment Booklets related to these topics.		
Transportation Investment Priorities		
<i>Participants commented on investment categories important to them.</i>		
	County	Comment
1	Sonoma	Expand bus service. Increase public transit to everyone not just low income.
Policies to Reduce Driving and Emissions		
<i>Participants commented on a variety of strategies being considered to encourage the reduction of driving and associated vehicle emissions.</i>		
	County	Comment
2	Sonoma	Land use planning. Congestion pricing.
3	Sonoma	Complete the Regional Bike Network: focus on connecting communities in rural/suburban areas. Retain funding at, at least, current levels.
4	Sonoma	Encourage smart driving: what can reduce emissions, driving skills. Develop Commuter Benefit Ordinances: local, state, regional. Large employers should give transit benefits.
5	Sonoma	Define smart driving and Commuter Benefit Ordinances.

6	Sonoma	Encourage land use planning to match location of jobs (employers) and workers (employees).
7	Sonoma	Add another deck to Golden Gate Bridge for public transportation (train or bus).
Policies Regarding Public Transit		
<i>Participants considered and commented on a variety of strategies being considered to improve the customer experience on public transit and to operate our existing public transit system more efficiently.</i>		
County Comment		
8	Sonoma	Cut the funds. People that work taking care of those that won't.
9	Sonoma	Fund the SMART train and pathway.

Plan Bay Area		
January 2012 Public Workshops		
Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops		
Station B: Quality of Complete Communities		
<i>Complete communities are places where transit, jobs, schools, recreation and stores are located within walking distance and help bring the community together. New development (housing) and transportation investments need to be carefully designed to maximize benefits for residents. Of the following benefits select your top two priorities:</i>		
County	Count	Comment
Sonoma	8	Safer neighborhoods from lighting, infrastructure improvements and more eyes on the street.
Sonoma	14	Improved health through better infrastructure for walking and biking.
Sonoma	7	More retail and access to food due to larger population and pedestrian support for retail.
Sonoma	4	Increased open space and parks through planning and development impact fees.
Sonoma	10	Better schools through communities that attract residents with a mix of incomes; school impact fees; and shared use of city/school facilities.
Indicate here if you disagree or have other suggestions.		
1	Sonoma	Options won't work or we already have them.
2	Sonoma	Where are the jobs that sustain employment that makes this all possible through business inclusion?
3	Sonoma	Would like to see support for form-based coding as a tool for creating complete communities, especially block perimeter maximums to support a network of streets.
4	Sonoma	Complete communities should not be too "planned". Don't attempt to plan everything. You are not prognosticators! You don't know what the future holds or how many people will live here.
<i>Are jobs and housing converging in the right places in your county? Can this convergence support greater access to jobs and housing, particularly for low-income and moderate-income populations?</i>		
County		Comment
5	Sonoma	Leave this up to each community. MTC and ABAG out.
6	Sonoma	Long commutes are the norm in this county. More jobs needed in Cloverdale.
7	Sonoma	Yes, leave well enough alone.
8	Sonoma	The mass transit system covers most of this city and is available at least part of the time, it could be somewhat better.
9	Sonoma	Business parks are hard to work in without a car. Not helpful.
10	Sonoma	I would like ABAG and MTC to help Roseland in Santa Rosa become a proto-type Priority Development Area.
11	Sonoma	It really isn't your business where housing converges. That is up to the people through their locally elected officials.

12	Sonoma		To some extent, yes, as all communities in Sonoma counts have UGBs. However, in most communities, jobs and housing remain isolated from one and other. This convergence is going to require significant financial support/incentives in the current market, near to mid-term.
13	Sonoma		<i>It has gotten slightly better in the last decade or two, but we must dramatically increase the pace of smart growth and transit living.</i>
14	Sonoma		Transit oriented development in Santa Rosa is moving in the right direction.
15	Sonoma		<i>On the books it is, but actual development is not.</i>

Plan Bay Area		
January 2012 Public Workshops		
Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops		
Station C: The San Francisco Bay Area -- 2040		
How should the region accommodate projected growth? (Indicate your level of support for each potential option.)		
A. Allow new housing, offices and shops to be built in the centers of cities and town near public transit.	B. Build more affordable housing near public transit for residents without cars who depend on public transit, while preserving the character of single-family residential neighborhoods.	C. Build more affordable housing in existing communities that already have a strong job base.
1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion	1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion	1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion
Sonoma County -- Count		
1) seventeen	1) sixteen	1) fifteen
2)	2) two	2) one
3) two	3) three	3) four
4) one	4)	4)
5) three	5) three	5) three
0)	0)	0) two
If you opposed the three growth patterns above, offer your suggestions on how the region can accommodate projected growth.		
Comment		
1	Doesn't work. Isn't affordable.	
2	Let the locals decide. I do not approve of a "one size fits all" mentality. Thru is no funding for this to be diverted to a regional planning mandate.	
3	Why are you only focused on affordable housing? That is myopic.	
4	Build up, not out, but with generous set-backs to provide open space.	

Plan Bay Area		
January 2012 Public Workshops		
Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops		
Do you support development of Plan Bay Area?		
<p><i>Plan Bay Area is along-term strategy for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area that is currently being developed. The idea is to accommodate the region's housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years and reduce the region's auto dependence. Plan Bay Area is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it.</i></p>		
1. In general, do you support the establishment of this type of a regional plan?		3. Changes will be needed in my community and in my lifestyle to improve the quality of life in the Bay Area in the future.
1. Support Strongly 2 3 4 5. Oppose Strongly 0. No Opinion		1. Agree Strongly 2 3 4 5. Disagree Strongly 0. No Opinion
Sonoma County: Count		Sonoma County: Count
1) nine		1) seven
2)		2) two
3) two		3) one
4)		4) one
5) two		5) two
0)		0)
2. Why it that?		
1	Oppose Strongly: No regional consolidated plan. Our local governments do just fine and the corruption level is too high in MTC/ABAG and other NGOs.	

2	<p><i>Support Strongly: It is important to have a coordinated plan if you are trying to solve something like congestion and air quality/greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area region. Pollution does not stop at the border of whatever jurisdiction it is generated in and therefore, it is very important to cooperate and plan for the future.</i></p>	
3	<p>Support Strongly: Yes. However, I request that MTC remember the diverse and sometimes conflicting needs of the region. One size does not fit all. If MTC's funding priority over-focuses on PDAs, it will leave suburban-rural counties like Sonoma. It is important for PBA to allow local CMAs to choose how to distribute funds to meet the local needs. In Sonoma, our focus is on connecting our communities and reducing carbon emissions and increasing bike/ped safety.</p>	
4	<p><i>Support Strongly: As a society we are putting our head in the sand if we don't plan/prepare. Emergencies are caused by a lack of planning.</i></p>	
5	<p>Support Strongly: Because advance planning is smart.</p>	
6	<p><i>Oppose: Yes, but concerned the individual areas will lose their uniqueness. I want to maintain the openness of Sonoma county.</i></p>	
7	<p>Oppose Strongly: This developing plan is a top-down, too-far ranging plan that is attempting to "herd" the public toward a set outcome. This is too authoritarian and contains too many "suppositions" and estimates that don't agree with city and county estimates, especially regarding future population. This process should stop.</p>	
8	<p><i>Support Strongly: Yes, but the plan needs to provide resources and incentives for communities to move in this direction. There is some concern as to how equitable funding will be distributed to outer counties.</i></p>	
9	<p>Support Strongly: This region has slid backward towards typical U.S. auto dependent in recent years. Los Angeles is now easier to live the transit lifestyle than almost all parts of the Bay Area, except the City of San Francisco.</p>	
10	<p><i>Support Strongly: Because the issue cuts across many communities. Because people do not generally live where they work.</i></p>	

	Plan Bay Area	
	January 2012 Public Workshops	
	Participant Comments from Comment Booklets, as submitted at the workshops	
	Other Comments	
	<i>Participants were asked to provide any other comments related to Plan Bay Area:</i>	
	County	Comment
1	Sonoma	The community I reside in is just fine, as is. None of your non-help based on scare theories on climate models that are corrupt also. Also use 8-1/2 x 11 on the website documents you put on web. No 11 x 17. We citizens don't have the computer/printer systems to print it for reading off screen or the software to manipulate to smaller 8-1/2 x 11 size. Thank you.
2	Sonoma	<i>Make the next workshop a "no-heckle" zone.</i>
3	Sonoma	Sonoma county is car-centric. We need to increase our transit/bike/ped capacity significantly while retaining our rural/suburban culture.
4	Sonoma	<i>I enjoy a good quality of life, but not everyone does. I'd like to be able to share some of my good fortune with others around the area. Things that increase my quality of life: good food, fun places to walk, bike paths, friendly neighbors, good weather. Is there any way the hecklers can be quieted to make the work shop more civilized?</i>
5	Sonoma	I'm not sure what you are going to do with this question or how you are going to score it.
6	Sonoma	<i>Define the criteria to create a Priority Development Area. Consider requiring form-based codes in Priority Development Areas.</i>
7	Sonoma	I would use light rail to get into the city but I don't want to see the openness lost here in Sonoma county. I want to see land use preserve open space, family oriented, affordable housing and living.
8	Sonoma	<i>My community (Windsor) is already doing a good job with TODs so it won't be such a big change for us.</i>
9	Sonoma	Of course there will be progress, but it should be mainly done through private enterprise, not through regional non-accountable government agencies. Cities and counties at least have elected officials - One Bay Area, ABAG, etc. does not. We must organically develop, not have a forced top-down plan.
10	Sonoma	<i>Many of the changes that will be required are behavioral and these choices can not be legislated but will require education and infrastructure investments.</i>
11	Sonoma	We need some type of regional incentive towards driving. I suggest a VMT fee collected by the DMV in the nine county region. Would be very cheap and doesn't require much implementation or develop costs. Funds should go for transit operations.
12	Sonoma	<i>Next time you do this, please have a police officer in the room.</i>
13	Sonoma	No to this plan.
14	Sonoma	Due to audience disruptions the 1/9/12 workshop was unworkable and unproductive. Recommend re-configuring or canceling other workshops or at minimum more order via police presence and more formal structure.