

CAP Meeting Notes: Community Meeting Feedback
December 2, 2009, Hayward, CA

I. Transportation

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

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

- Bike connections to transit/safe modes (in addition to community and commercial areas)
- Support these measures because currently not enough bike lanes or safe sidewalks
- Emulate Davis (got award for bike friendly roads) – Ask re: process.
- Lack culture of biking / need change in norms / cool to do (could outreach to schools with campaign)
- Safe, locked bike storage
- BART not allowing bikes during commute hours
- BART station valet parking (like Fruitvale)
- Walking to stores (moving stores closer, etc.)
- Mostly urban centers and then suburbs separate (can county change zoning; increase density)
- Two lane bike lanes?
- Concrete blockade between lanes and roads? (usually based on safety/need) as well as increased impact/cost effectiveness
- “Safety rodeos” by sheriff? (why don’t we have those anymore?)
- Start with young people to increase positive response to using bikes, walking, etc. (Education and outreach should be part of plan)
- Bike programs good for flat areas but some areas are too mountainous (or secure bike locks at base of hills)
- Bike racks/storage important piece (like parking lots)
- Nurturing bike culture with starting with schools (i.e. elementary students biking and maintaining bikes)
- Bike manufacturers involved?
- Berkeley BART bike park
- Good step to have bike racks on buses
- Increase bus services in hills (but some hill streets are too small)
- Need more racks on buses (and more frequent services)
- Connecting routes like bay train
- Need sustainable transit (AC cuts with recession but doesn’t increase with better economy)
- Upkeep of bike lanes so bikes use them (sweep, etc.)
- Mission Blvd (Hayward) need to get Caltrans and county together to increase bike lanes and racks
- Not safe to bike on Mission Blvd (cars cut off)
- Could have a white/concrete dividers between cars and bikes
- Sewer grates are dangerous too
- Red light running is increasing
- Flashing lights at cross walks are good
- Secure locking stations for bikes
- Bike racks on buses (even more capacity)

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

- Wider roads are less safe for pedestrian crossing
- Castro Valley Library near BART (need improved safety for crossing) Maybe building elevated structures in these “hot zones” (or Mission and Harder)
- Pedestrian accidents with lack of traffic law enforcement (i.e. running red lights)

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

- Speed bumps make me frustrated (harder for bikes)
- Plant trees in center circles
- Keep bike and pedestrian areas separate
- Intersections are not big enough here for center circles
- No protection for bikes for commuting to CAL State East Bay and other hill areas (Castro Valley) maybe a shuttle
- Section off/close a street on Sundays for bikes
- Make streets for cars one way and bikes other direction
- Limited street parking near businesses (bike lanes compete for street parking)
- Diagonal (vs. parallel) parking causes more accidents

T-10:

- Should add police protection for bus stops

T-15: Develop commercial area parking fee.

- Q re: evidence that increasing parking fee actually decreases driving
- How about using the money from parking fee hike for pedestrian, public transit, parks and other green interventions (vs. general funds)
- Big push back from commercial owners for increased parking fee (fear of reduction in business)
- How much? (concerned about how fees like this keep going up)
- Another concern is fees may drive people away to other stores, etc.
- Encourage local people to shop local (biking/walking), but then there are people who either live far from stores or can't physically bike/walk.
- Where would fees go? (should go back to green infrastructure in local area)
- See what Seattle has done with smaller buses/shuttles to help with shopping centers (San Jose and Walnut Creek too)
- Some alternatives: neighborhood parking restrictions (pass for residents)
- Fee for multiple cars per home (3=\$50/mo, 4=\$60, etc escalating fee)
- Consumers would go away to Walmart (work with adjacent communities to also increase fees for parking)
- Buses need to run late enough, etc.
- CA state \$1 gas tax (decrease driving)

Other

- Challenge of working with AC transit due to budget cuts
- SB375 – incentive to tie green changes with transportation

II. Energy and Buildings

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

- Follow Marin County's model
- Look at other cities within the County – for their models
- Should not just depend on PGE → County/City can do a better job.
- Based on Alameda County being a leader – government use of energy (solar)
- Should pursue in CCA → look at other models.
- County can lobby the state to change the law re: current CAP levels.
- Take advantage of small wind energy areas → a lot of windy areas → take advantage of this.
- Would require zoning to put wind turbines in place. Building permits (wiring. . . County permits could get in the way)
- Makes sense to pursue – easy to do relative to some other measures.
- Government run power → can they run and maintain it?
- Will be difficult to plan out and see the cost savings
- Without having larger infrastructure in place → shouldn't be getting into this
- Green jobs economic impact and analysis??
- We've got to do it.
- Can meet greenhouse gas emission reductions through CCA
- More # recycled in the County
- Energy security because it's in-county production
- Would County be able to increase their rates?
- What are the rates in surrounding cities that do this? Are their rates lower than PGE's?
- The County could do it if they wanted to
- There is \$ to do this – it's a matter of priorities

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.

- Unless you have a big area to do this. . .
- Absolutely, needs to be done! We should be looking at all collective measures.
- Capacity of the County – they have total control
- Distributed projects going on in Portland now
- Would take a lot of coordination on the part of the County.
- Should consider the color of paint used

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

- A lot of problems with how government rates energy efficiency. e.g. Energy star rated appliances
- How do you get correct info to consumer with proper ratings so consumers can make right choices?
- In general, government ratings are not so far off
- Rising Sun Energy Center (Berkeley Based) outreach prop.
- Has to be done – tie in with AB 811 Prop.
- Why doesn't this apply to commercial property?
- Outreach is needed – not everyone knows rules and regulations about energy efficiency.
- If this is implemented, use interns to conduct the outreach (volunteers, interns, AmeriCorps type structure)
- Information and outreach also to children -- Behavior change education/outreach

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

- Lower income housing sales? How does Berkeley handle this?
- Has to be a cap in place
- Could be expensive to make changes on older homes
- Have an education program
- Cap should be determined by sale price of home → more expensive home, higher cap
- Existing residential-commercial areas is where measures need to happen (compared to new construction)
- Seems punitive to seller – can this be reversed whereby incentive to buyers → through loan (reduce pts, etc) i.e. give them a period of time to make the changes (i.e. 5 years)
- Like flexibility of applying to buyer or seller
- How does incentive/measure apply to buying foreclosed homes?
- Finance concern over making upgrades
- Regardless of who is paying for it (buyer or seller) we will have energy efficient homes
- Good idea

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

- Why isn't this a no brainer?
- County needs to equal or surpass Hayward
- How does this affect purchase of commercial property with significant renovation of 50% or more of the structure (if it applies → may be cost prohibitive)
- Is there any integration of landscaping with new construction measures?
- Good idea!

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.

- Why CV specific?
- CV BART station, already has an early 90s plan for mixed-use etc..
- There will be much opposition toward it - just went through a 5-year planning process.
- CV residents voted against being incorporated -will resent it.
- What about other options? East 14th Street?
- Landscape preservation improves with density – better than the opposite (urban sprawl)
- Much transit oriented planning in Hayward, for example, is poorly planned- needs to be well planned beautiful communities (e.g. Amsterdam) that people want to live in, and that have green space near by.
- Need to create beautiful dense spaces- not just increase density.
- Housing Element meetings are not paying attention to waste/water/green issue
- Re-orienting growth will create savings (e.g. one-stop causes less driving, etc..), the consumer-savings need to be identified for people to support the measure before it goes to voters.

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.

- Busses to hill areas Need shuttle to park n ride and BART
- Need small bus units traveling on frequented routes
- Seniors in area need transit
- New housing in Cherryland areas impact determined to be less than significant - perhaps it should be less than significant with mitigation
- Is there a requirement for new developments to have commercial centers attached to it

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

- Why would development be good? (If the assumption is growth, than better in denser areas than in sprawl)
- 238 CalTrans property - could this be developed instead of in-fill?
- What about taking under-utilized areas such as failing car-dealerships and developing those?
- There are rental properties being torn down - eye-sores, shouldn't they be used?
- Should be looking at the Detroit model of farms being put into foreclosed lands.
- Are you looking at minimum levels of landscaping for urban areas?

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

- Waste generation is not as routed by just landfill but by all
- Waste diversion rate – increase to 90% - is about recycling and compost
- Why 2030? (2020 = 83% of goal)
- Improving recycling isn't the answer
- What is the current waste- policy for medicines? We only have two places in Unincorporated. This creates driving and GHG emissions. We're putting medicinal waste-in our water supply. (*California-Federal legislation may impact this with new take-back regulations.*)
- Is this all just landfill avoidance? (CAP does not address life cycle issues)
- Take-back requirements need to be in place and should be encouraged
- “The story of stuff” is good outreach about it and should be part of community education
- What is the 90%? – is it the percentage of total generated annually? (And so it's necessary to have reduced it annually for the 90% to actually be a reduction)
- Diversion to compost can create methane – if compost is put in the landfill it can break down; need to specify methodology for composting to ensure that it's not contributing more GHG
- Will county create policies for construction to reduce waste?
- What kind of enforcement mechanisms will be in place?

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

- Trees - Are they climate appropriate?
- Currently, they have a preferred species list to ensure that appropriate -
- Also, need to ensure that we are not limiting solar access with trees
- If tree planted before Solar Access rules - then might still be there blocking solar access?
- What about encouragement of gardening?
- Tree and vegetable garden incentives and care-guidelines.

Other

Greywater policies for new construction - this is the opportunity to develop it.