

CAP Meeting Notes: Community Meeting Feedback
December 1, 2009, Livermore, CA

1. Transportation

T-1: Improve bicycle infrastructure near community activity areas.

- East County Residents don't have as much need for this item. More relevant to urban areas.
- East County residents also have horse trailer width concerns
- Safety issues involved with widening lanes
- North Livermore – bike lane creates hazard for those needing to stop
- East County residents commute outside unincorporated areas for goods
(Rural roads meeting forum discussion)
- Many cyclists are recreational.
- Access to transit doesn't appear to be a priority item
- Of 15 transportation measures listed, not one is about access to transit for bicycles. One item is relevant about getting bikes on transit.
- Feel like access to transit should be equal to bicycles on transit, as it compounds value.
- Tesla Road to Miner Road has a very narrow bike lane.
- Is the intention of these measures that bicycling will be the panacea?
- I believe the problem is transit organization.
- A significant amount of traffic is Tri-Valley, etc....
- Congestion issues are not from the East County residents but commuter traffic.
- Is there any part of your plan going to address the transitory traffic?
- What could be done on Tesla/Vasco?
- Are you considering reducing parking requirements for businesses for bike storage? (This is a land use issue)
- My vote would be to not do that on parking restrictions, because with bad weather/daylight issues some people still need to drive.

T-2: Develop appropriate bicycle infrastructure for high traffic intersections and corridors.

- This should be written in more user-friendly language to explain it (e.g. closing gaps, pipeline)
- Vasco Road is more like a freeway, but it has bike-lanes
- Not very applicable as most cycling here is recreational, not commuter. In Livermore/Pleasanton some bike-commute issues.
- Hundreds of people come to Del Valle Lake- Regional Park. Many more people would use bicycles to go to the lake if there were paths.
- Need to create bike lanes on the flat routes
- City of Livermore does a good job improving bike lanes
- Need longer bike paths that are longer, high use routes.
- Some routes good but not yet complete
- Need sufficient facilities for bike storage, like they have in downtown Livermore has some bicycle storage. Are there bike storage facilities for Altamont carpool and train stop on Greenville?
- This doesn't discuss bicycle trails. A lot of bicycle trails will provide and encourage bicyclists
- The East County has superior design already for developing/improving trails – Trail paths in development now will get across County.

T-4: Enhance pedestrian infrastructure within easy walking distance from community activity areas.

- Not relevant to East county – have paths by library, etc.
- With adoption of CAP– hopefully not build places like Marginally Center away from others.
- Pathway along routes (Mines Road) could be improved and maybe made more scenic for people to prefer traveling by bike-walk.
- In town –we already have some paths
- Grocery cart exchange/rent could create more walk-to-town if pushing a cart.
- Taking the cart home with you and back.
- People go to business to shop and buy things that they need to take home. The car serves as a mechanism for carrying goods.
- Nob Hill Shopping center could be revitalized

T-5: Expand Traffic Calming Program to improve pedestrian safety.

- Need to discourage speeding
- Speeding on rural roads – speeding causes more use of fuel-
- What about creating a local additional fine for speeding for waste of fuel – on Vasco Road, 45 mph speed limit, but people go above this.
- Can you lower speeds on roads in East County.(State law: If 85% of people on the road exceed the speed limit, they can't enforce it, so they have increased the limit by 5 mph)
- Single commuters create GHG emissions. Why don't you find a way to create a single commuter fee to really reduce the number of single-passenger vehicles?
- Many people going through County to somewhere else: How are you addressing pass-through traffic?
- Very different traffic conditions during commute hours than the weekend.
- Reducing speed limits on South Livermore and Tesla.
- (What are traffic-calming devices are physical devices –slow down to go over or around it?)
- People who live on streets – for example Buena Vista – have 10 bumps. People who drive on it don't like it.
- There are traffic calming measures devices on Marina Avenue, which we don't like, it says slow to 15 mph, but before it says 25 mpg.
- Discussion of whether it would be good/bad to have traffic-calming measures on other routes being used as highways
- Balance out – recognize if cars have to stop/start will have to use more gas,
- Try to look at routes being used by commuters and develop more efficient rural roads to decrease emissions.

T-15: Develop commercial area parking fee.

- What about individuals who don't have a choice, and must drive miles to town?
- Will it be uniform (Yes) But some people have no choice.
- Will it cause people to carpool? Probably not, but it may cause some people to reduce the number of trips, but others may not have a choice and need to go to town for business
- Already a long way away from services – Won't you be penalizing those who MUST go to town and wouldn't really cut down as people need to go?
- Question: Could we put a local tax on gasoline? State already does – could you have a county gas tax? The Money from the County gas tax could go to climate measures.
- Disadvantage on traffic calming for Emergency vehicles. Livermore, can go through center of road
- Most city areas want to encourage business climate- this will discourage people from shopping..
- Night parking fee in Oakland showed a negative impact on business.
- If you take a downtown area and increase costs, people won't stop driving to the shops, they will just go somewhere else without a parking fee, causing more driving and less business.
- The nuisance factor may discourage travel by car.
- In many places there's no option for transit/pedestrian/cycling so you will only discourage business in the area.
- Only increased gas costs decreased traffic
- What can Alameda County do to create incentives to purchase clean vehicles
- Need to really think through measures. For example, the most commonly purchased car in the cash for clunkers program was not a clean vehicle.

II. Energy and Buildings

E-1: Research the potential for community choice aggregation.

- (What does this mean?) The County acts as the utility – utility “distributor”
- Is this politically acceptable?? Already a network involved. Is the political will there?
- How efficient will the county be by creating another agency?
- Resources aren't there yet. Renewable energy sources haven't been identified or put into place yet.
- May not be prepared for quite some time
- Not sure how much green energy there is out there – may be all bought up already.
- Does community choice aggregation require density? Is this a viable option for unincorporated areas?
- Don't have enough information to give feedback
- Is there that amount of renewable energy available?
- Opposed to this – not subject to PUC
- Should be subject to same rules as PUC

E-2: Evaluate the potential for district energy systems in mixed-use and higher density areas of the community and develop implementation plan for cost-effective systems.

- Less applicable impact on East County versus West County
- Doesn't affect us out here, with Measure D

E-4: Develop comprehensive outreach program to educate residents about the availability of free home energy audit programs and benefits of home energy improvements.

- Who would conduct outreach? (County staff in collaboration with other agencies)
- Seems like this will already happen through other programs and measures (stimulus, etc)
- Outreach should include how to get rid of CFL bulbs and other energy-saving measures
- Would like to concentrate on renewable energy rather than fossil fuels (i.e. solar panels)
- Great that it is captured by the CAP

E-5: Develop and implement a point-of-sale residential energy conservation ordinance (RECO).

- This seems more punitive than incentive driven
- Have voluntary aspect along with mandatory (i.e. what Berkeley is doing)
- Detriment to housing market recovery
- Would get too much resistance without having incentives
- Need to be careful about implementing this one
- When you start mandating personal residences – more resistance
- Provide incentives to encourage behavior change
- Alternative: with existing homes – when a certain amount of work is done – (retrofit) – can require certain measures are put in place, green point rated.
- Like the idea of a „step“ increase
- This could be tens of thousands of dollars.
- Is there a way to put an age restriction for homes on this? (i.e. older homes are exempt, such as 100 year old houses) What about exceptions for historic homes?
- Some houses built in such a way that they can't be insulated (built with 2 x 4s, no insulation)
- If we do this, seller may not be able to (afford to) sell it
- This should be on the buyer, not the seller.
- Some antique fixtures in homes → devalued by low flow devices required
- Needs to be very specific and detailed. Needs to include everything that would be required
- Needs to be reasonable in what it is required
- If tearing down a house and building a new one → will this apply?
- Needs to cover ALL exceptions
- Not enough information presented.
- Big reduction but high cost
- Needs to be spelled out if it is a measure that is passed.
- Need to have some allowable exceptions in place
- Don't see any objections to this
- Can't do with homes built with 2 x 4s.
- Include these measures as part of the outreach

E-11: Require all new construction to achieve California Green Building Code Tier II Energy Efficient Standards (Section 503.1.1)

- Like the idea of walking into Home Depot, and only seeing renewable materials and resources
- Why hasn't this already been done? With new construction, don't have any limitations
- Look at different plans and be open to the innovation and different ways people have planned to reduce building energy use → not just reviewed on a pro-forma basis (or a pre-existing template)

III. Land Use, Water, Green Infrastructure

L-1: Facilitate the transformation of the Castro Valley Central Business District into a higher density, mixed-use, pedestrian- and transit-oriented community.

- Neighborhood shopping centers so people can walk or bike to shops have been unsuccessful in Livermore in the past.
- East county could not build centers because lack of sewers
- What is the cost to the County? (County gets taxes from development centers)
- More mixed use centers: residential, commercial near BART stations.
- Need education on how increasing density decreases emissions?
- People may not want to live in higher density areas
- (The new areas will need to be well designed density. Must be desirable living places)

L-2: Reduce restrictions on second units in single-family residential districts near transit stations, major bus route corridors, neighborhood commercial centers, and central business districts.

- L-2 Requires re-doing the zoning code and building codes
- Will allowing more density conflict with solar access laws? (*Currently, two floors or 25 feet are allowed. More density often means an in-law unit or making a duplex. This will not conflict with solar access, especially since most houses are too far to be affected by a neighbor*)
- Single family homes have higher values than duplexes. Asking people to convert to duplexes may reduce home value (*An in-law unit could increase value.*)
- Livermore there is not much transit oriented development.
- Do we have measures to decrease urban sprawl (development not near transit)?
- We may need disincentives in addition to incentives
- L-2 Does not apply to East County. If not near transit, this simply means more cars!
- Sunol may be able to use L-2

L-3: Increase the vitality of mixed-use neighborhood-serving commercial centers through increased density allowance and enhanced design.

WS-1: Increase solid waste reduction and diversion to 90% by 2030.

- What are the main waste reduction measures?
- Waste reduction is expensive, and this is discouraging
- Expensive to sort waste (AECOM: Residents can sort, at no cost)
- Where does composting fit in? (County: Altamont has new center, which is not yet in EIR stage)
- I need recycling pickup! I have to take my things to the dump, and pay for it.
- Some communities do not use large truck hauling for landfills. ... they need a central waste facility and transfer station, like Pleasanton.
- Folks should spend time at the dump – this would motivate them to divert waste

G-1: Expand Urban forest (e.g. street trees, and trees on private lots) in order to sequester carbon and reduce building energy consumption.

- An urban forest must be alive to do its job! When they die, carbon comes back
- Urban forest is small reduction compared with others
- Trees do damage. Also, cleaning up after them takes energy (County: We know which trees are easy to manage)
- Trees grow slow, are a long term investment
- Will the County give out trees?

Other:

- Will we have enough water? Recycling water – rain gutter
- Graywater systems for landscapes, these are no longer outlawed
- Unincorporated areas impacted by county – hard to quantify
- Give copies of CAP to Livermore library reference desk
- What about agriculture? Water and carbon emitted by agriculture are not addressed here.
- Vineyards should do cover crops rather than tilling. This releases less carbon.
- We need BART to go to Tracy!
- Unused tracks in Altamont can be used for BART
- Need large gray water barrels – multiple gallons. Can we get grants or money for this? This would be a great carrot. Australia has a great system for this
- Give people options for how to decrease emissions
- Let people choose their reductions.