

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*

Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

The following public comments, and staff actions on those comments are in this order:

Commenter	Date Received	Summary of comments and Staff action
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager, City of Capitola	11/12/2010	1
Gary A. Patton, Santa Cruz	11/28/2010	5
Scott Fuller, General Manager, San Juan Oaks Golf Club	11/29/2010	6
Amy L. White, Executive Director, LandWatch	11/29/2010	6
Mayor Pauline Valdivia, City of Hollister	12/7/2010	7
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	12/14/2010	7
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County	12/14/2010	9
Jack Nelson, Santa Cruz	12/15/2010	11

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Agency	Comment	Response
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	1. Beginning on page 4 the light blue and white makes it hard to read. Maybe some of the problem will go away when heavier paper is used. Printed on regular paper has the back page printing almost as clear as the white wording.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: The contrast was increased to make the text more legible.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	2. On Page 7 it seems like there should be some comment on what percentage of our total GHG emissions problem is being created by our housing and transportation decisions. Industrial and residential consumption are clearly issues as well. The blue print is only talking about housing and transportation choices. Is this 2/3rds of the problem? Maybe a chart isn't needed but the narrative should at least mention the relative importance of housing and transportation.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Blueprint is not AB 32 and not focused on greenhouse gases, consequently there is no 2/3rds apportionment of transportation-land use to a 'problem' no change.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	3. On page 13 the top chart is not clear. Is the 200,000 number the actual total regional population?	No. Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: it's commuters. Fixed.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	6. On page 21 the second chart needs a one sentence narrative such as: This chart shows a reduction in farmland in San Benito and Santa Cruz counties and an actual increase in farmland under production in Monterey County (maybe I'm not reading this correctly since it seems to contradict what is said in the narrative on ag land on page 23).	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: . The narrative has been amended to better reflect what the graphics depict.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	8. On page 23 the second paragraph under Agricultural Land the word simply is repeated. This discussion of agricultural land needs to have a few sentences making a direct connection between the loss of farm land and the long-standing residential development pattern that concentrates on developing new neighborhoods rather than updating existing residential neighborhoods. Yes LAFCO and the Williamson Act are important but local jurisdictions can also stop sprawl development into agricultural areas simply by refusing to allow residential zoning in those areas.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: text changed

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	9. On Page 24 the quote about “Under current growth patterns” doesn’t seem to make a clear point. I like the statements in the Conclusion section and I like the Current Growth Pattern: Key Characteristics chart. However, the conclusion section should be summarizing the main points that have been made in this section of the report. I’m not sure that commercial strip development, leapfrog development, isolated smart growth efforts and lack of coordination between market rate, workforce and affordable housing provisions have really even been discussed. You might need to go back and make sure that these items really have been mentioned. Otherwise they should be removed from the conclusion section.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: edits clarifying the point were added in red. Comments on your other points were added to the Getting There chapter.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	10. On Page 26 only part of the Title “Presenting the Alternative” is shown. “Sustainable Growth Patterns” should be added as is done for the heading on Page 10.	Revised. Staff Action: fixed.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	11. On Page 27 you mention Priority areas as being within one half mile of proposed transit stop but then the illustration mentions an 8 minute walk. Is an 8 minute walk equal to a one half mile walk? If so, make that clear. If they are different then pick one or the other so that you don’t confuse people. I would try to clarify the definition of transit stop a little more clearly. A bus stop down a rural road is not a transit stop and pending approval is not clear enough. I would add a sidebar in an earlier section of the report to explain what sustainable means. It’s kind of the theme here and shouldn’t be lost as a small footnote.	Staff will make revisions Staff Action: Yes, but it can vary of course. Transit stops as they are envisioned in Blueprint are defined in the text. No change.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	12. On Page 33 in the second paragraph the word live should be changed to living. Also, is the word raiteros spelled correctly?	Staff will revise the “live/living” typo. “Raiteros” is spelled correctly. Staff Action: typo fixed.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	14. On Page 40 I strongly disagree with the short discussion on Improved Commercial area design. This report needs a separate section that talks about parking policies both in terms of residential parking and commercial parking. The provision of low cost and convenient parking is a direct contributor to increase automobile use, reduced public transit ridership and increased VMT. The Blueprint needs a section that makes a clear that reduced parking requirements for residential development, shared parking arrangements and clustered parking arrangements can help reduce land use, increase public transit ridership and increase pedestrian orientation of our commercial area designs. I see that this issue is discussed on Page 43 but it should also be mentioned here under housing choices as well.	The intention of this section is to articulate the point that you have made here regarding parking (among other issues). Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: additional comments supporting your statement were added to the Getting There chapter.

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	15. On Page 40 in the housing section I would suggest that you add Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) to the list of housing choices. The City of Santa Cruz has received a major APA award for its ADU program which helped add density to its existing single-family residential neighborhoods. I would also add here that local Inclusionary Housing Ordinances has been instrumental in integrating affordable housing and greater income mix to our neighborhoods. Finally, a couple of sentences should be added to this section on housing to discuss the importance of providing housing that is specifically targeted to the income range of the local workforce. For the City of Santa Cruz, for example, the hospitality industry workforce currently cannot afford to live in Santa Cruz and is forced to commute in from Watsonville or Salinas in order to find affordable housing. Policies should be considered that will encourage the development of employer assisted housing. The Local Housing Element RHNA numbers for the provision of affordable housing should be mentioned as an important minimum guideline for the development of affordable housing.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Added.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	16. Page 41 talks about school centered development and locating schools in denser areas. These are great ideas but it should be mentioned here that the school development policies are not regulated at the local or regional level but are state mandated regulation that need to be challenged. Aptos High and Pajaro Valley High are two of the worst examples of State mandated requirements that forced leapfrog, auto-dependent and non-neighborhood oriented school development. These policies need to be challenged and but at the state level.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: State law is revisiting the matter of school footprints to support more intense development and less leapfrog development. No change.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	18. On Page 42 the discussion on “fix it first” seems like a sly way of avoiding the issue of freeway widening and intersection widening. In my mind maybe this report doesn’t need to take a stand on this issue but it does need to say whether highway widening contributes to increased VMT and whether intersection widenings often contribute to reduced safety and access for pedestrians and bicycles.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: We are not trying to avoid the issue of widening nor is simply ‘more VMT’ the only relevant characteristic. No change.
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	19. On Page 43 there needs to be a section added that discusses policies on public transit. There is nothing even mentioned here about long-range planning for such things as the Rail-Trail program in Santa Cruz County or the Personal Rapid Transit system being considered for Santa Cruz, or local shuttle programs and and pedicab programs. Earlier in the report there was mention of the doubling of our senior population but there is no mention of the need for public transit improvements to serve this population (Para transit, covered bus stops, improved headways, etc.)	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: We are not sure who is actually considering PRT nor can we refer to all of the good work going on in this region. Elderly needs are addressed on Page 73.

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	20. On page 45 I agree with the idea that long range planning may require that we place housing in areas that are more difficult to provide with water. However, I would take out the conclusion that the investment in desalination is the water infrastructure that makes the most sense. Investment in water infrastructure can take many different approaches and there are other alternatives to desalination that may offer a solution with lower GHG emissions impacts.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. It is much more important to emphasize the need for a more diverse water portfolio. The focus on desalination may be unfortunate although useful in terms of comparing the impacts of various scenarios. Staff Action: No change, as there is no conclusion that desalination “makes the most sense.”
David Foster, Housing and Redevelopment Project Manager City of Capitola	21. The illustration on page 45 doesn’t really show clearly the consumption levels and how they differ. Maybe showing the open spaces in green would help or you could add a little note that shows the consumption levels for each housing type	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: But the table on page 44 does. Some housing types are much more efficient than is represented in the table, however, either because of local conditions as in Santa Cruz or Monterey/PG or because of housing type.

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Gary A. Patton	<p>This brief letter is to comment on Envisioning The Monterey Bay Area, AMBAG’s recently circulated “Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure.”</p> <p>I would like to suggest that AMBAG consider an alternative set of policies that would direct almost all future growth and development to areas already committed to “urban” development. This would mean, essentially, that developments requiring a subdivision would be limited to lands that have both sewer and water services available to them at this time.</p> <p>The policy I am suggesting would permit the “development” of lands not currently served by water and sewer by allowing construction of various kinds on existing parcels, but it would preclude the further subdivision of lands that do not now have urban services immediately available.</p> <p>The result of directing most new development to lands that already have access to water and sewer service would be exactly the kind of “sustainable” future that the current draft of the “Blueprint” advocates. However, I am certain that this policy would result in a lot less sprawl than would be permitted under the current “Blueprint” draft.</p> <p>Cutting sprawl from 40,000+ acres (under current growth patterns) to 20,000 acres (as would be achieved by the current draft of the “Blueprint”) is not ambitious enough. Our global warming crisis poses a mammoth challenge to human civilization, and to the natural environment. We need to respond in a manner commensurate with the danger. Furthermore, the agricultural economy of the Monterey Bay Area demands that we stop subdividing commercially viable farmlands.</p> <p>I do not believe that a growth pattern like the one I am advocating here has actually been analyzed as a part of the development of the current “Blueprint” proposal. As a first step, I urge the AMBAG Board of Directors to do such an analysis, prior to making a commitment to the current draft.</p> <p>Finally, the policy direction I am suggesting is essentially what Santa Cruz County voters did, in 1978, when they adopted Measure J. There is no reason that other parts of the AMBAG Region cannot similarly succeed in accommodating new growth by encouraging development where a commitment to urban levels of growth has already been made, and by discouraging further subdivision of rural and agricultural lands.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my suggestion seriously. The current “Blueprint” is pointed in the right direction, but I think we need to do better.</p>	<p>Comments are appreciated. As you might expect, AMBAG must tread carefully between the need for more compact development on one hand, and local control of land use and private property rights on the other.</p> <p>As such, Blueprint does highlight the need to emphasize infill development consistent with your vision.</p> <p>Your comments on Measure J have been noted – staff will consider referencing this policy in the “Getting There from Here” section.</p> <p>Staff Action: A reference has been added to Measure J in the Getting There section.</p>

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Scott Fuller, General Manager San Juan Oaks Golf Club	1. The regional maps on pages 22, 28, 51, 55, and 59 consistently fail to depict or label State Route 156 between Highway 101 and San Juan Bautista, and between San Juan Bautista and Hollister, and as well fail to depict or label State Route 156 as it continues as the Hollister by-pass and ultimately past Hollister to its connection with Highway 152. While the map on page 14 provides a "156" label between San Juan Bautista and Hollister, it does not depict or label State Route 156 at all past Hollister. Other than the singular label on page 14, there is not one instance in the various maps in either the draft Envisioning Document or the Technical Appendix that depicts and labels State Route 156 for the segments I mention. This is no small omission. According to CalTrans' official statistics, the segment of this road between San Juan Bautista and Hollister alone carried 14,820 eastbound vehicles and 9,880 westbound vehicles per day in 2005. CalTrans projects that by 2011 this segment will carry 15,908 eastbound vehicles and 10,605 westbound vehicles per day and by 2030 these numbers jump to 19,355 eastbound and 12,903 westbound. This segment of State Route 156 is the only link between Hollister and San Juan Bautista (other than a disconnected series of local "back roads") and serves local commuter traffic, commercial trucks and agricultural equipment associated with the farms in the San Juan Valley, and tourists and other commuters traveling between the San Joaquin Valley and Highway 101 and coastal destinations to the west. The final Envisioning document and technical appendix should depict and label this important State Route, just as the other main roads are depicted and labeled on the various maps.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: No change, as 156 is already labeled and there is no need to create duplicate labels for one road. Correction: map elements representing SR 156 have edited to highlight this road with additional labeling.
Amy L. White, Executive Director, LandWatch	In addition to percentage changes, GHG emissions for the base year and the target should be state numerically (i.e., tons/day or tons/year).	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: no change as the document already specifies daily pounds as the metric.
Amy L. White, Executive Director, LandWatch	Page 17. Per capita savings would be about \$2,178 with compact land use patterns. The time period for the savings should be identified, e.g., annual or other.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Over 25 years, and now noted in the document.
Amy L. White, Executive Director, LandWatch	Page 21. Substituting "lower levels of GHG emissions" for "more efficient rates of GHG emissions" would be clearer.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: no change.

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Mayor Pauline Valdivia, City of Hollister	<p>Comment 2: The City of Hollister supports draft blue print tools that encourage compact and infill development. Given the fact that the target horizon is 2035, the City of Hollister also recommends inclusion of tools for development of larger tracts of land that would be infill development of an adopted sphere of influence.</p>	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: we are not clear what that would mean aside from developing compactly, which is a theme supported throughout the Blueprint. No change.</p>
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document provides good emphasis on schools as possible community centers. In addition to recommending the implementation of Safe Routes to Schools, please consider discussing the challenges associated with the current methods of siting schools and potential policy solutions. The Safe Routes to Schools program (noted on p.42) includes both state and federal components, more information regarding the Safe Routes to Schools Program is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: Please see Implement school centered development or locate schools in denser areas.</p>
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the Blueprint forms a good framework for initiating a sustainable communities strategy, there is still a significant gap (6.1%) between the expected greenhouse gas emissions savings in the Blueprint and the target set by the California Air Resources Board for the AMBAG region. Including a frank discussion of this gap and the need to identify additional strategies to close it could be useful for framing future discussions. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration. Please note that Blueprint modeling was completed well ahead of the target set by CARB.</p> <p>Staff Action: no change.</p>
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of policies to improve housing and neighborhood choices on p. 40 is very informative. Given the large existing single-family detached housing stock in the region, local efforts to increase density and housing options could also include policies to promote construction of secondary dwelling units. This practice could address the need for additional rental housing in the region, allow for densification of existing housing stock, as well as provide housing options to accommodate the needs of an aging population. Please consider including discussion of policies to promote secondary dwelling units on p. 40 and in Appendix E. As an informational resource, San Luis Obispo County has a program in place which makes stock plans and streamlined permitting available for secondary dwelling units: http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/planning/Property_Uses_and_Development/Secondary_Dwelling_Stock_Plans.htm 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration. Thank you for the reference.</p> <p>Staff Action: comments on ADUs were added to the Getting There chapter.</p>

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 42 – Consider including discussion of additional alternative transit modes, such as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and looking at policies such as corridor planning and management that increase the viability of transit. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: a Support TOD section has been added to the Getting There section.
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Comment – Recently, the Department of Finance reported that the state's population grew less than 1 percent in the last fiscal year, one of the lowest rates on record. Consider including some discussion of potential impacts from this slowing and the possibility that future growth could occur at lower levels than have occurred in the past. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: No change. Blueprint is a long range planning document, not a document covering one extended recession. There is already discussion on the short term impacts of the recession and long term considerations. See pages 37-38.
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 16, third paragraph that starts, “In the results from . . .” -- This statement needs clarification. We suggest replacing the language with: “AMBAG’s Blueprint workshop surveys indicate that if a transit trip takes twice as long as driving, it is only attractive if: driving would require an extra 15 minutes to find parking, and, it were possible to get everything one needed in a single transit trip. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Changed.
Brandy Rider, Branch Chief, CalTrans District 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible text for page 35 – Barriers and incentives for development. Developers are critical to successful implementation of Blueprint growth patterns. Identifying existing barriers and disincentives for developers to build mixed use, compact, and infill development, and pursuing strategies to eliminate barriers and provide incentives is essential. Consider including a brief section addressing this issue, possibly on page 35. Strategies used in other areas include supporting catalytic projects (examples are SCAG’s Compass Blueprint Awards and the Department of Housing and Community Development’s Catalyst Projects for California Sustainable Strategies), providing design guidelines or templates for compact and mixed use developments, and identifying and redressing specific local barriers for developers. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Please see page 72 of the Appendices “If you plan it, will they come?”

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Introduction	And finally, since many people will only read the Executive Summary of the Plan, we would like to see a more complete summary of the contents of the Plan. It is important that a member of the public be able to understand the Plan, in at least a general way, by reading the Executive Summary.	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: comments were added to the end of the Executive Summary identifying the following chapters and their contents.
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Overall/General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The spiral bound copies that were distributed are too small to comfortably read. The page size should be 8.5"x11" minimum. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: with Board direction, staff will make this change. However, doubling the print size will double printing costs.
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Overall/General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive Summary needs to briefly summarize purpose of document, its conclusions, how they were reached, and the next steps. The Executive Summary as currently written does none of these but instead is more of an "Introduction" chapter. A Table summarizing and highlighting the attributes of, and differences between, the Current Growth Patterns and Sustainable Growth Patterns scenarios would be helpful here for those who do not want to (or have time to) read the whole document. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Actually, the Executive Summary does do these things except for how conclusions were reached as that is too expansive for a Summary. Key characteristics of both scenarios are presented on Page 7.
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Overall/General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Executive Summary and document in general, should also make clear that, in addition to accommodating future land use development and investing in transportation improvements in a manner that fosters reduction of greenhouse gases, it will also be extremely important to address the very difficult matters of funding Transit operations, and supplying water to serve new development. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: Now noted in the Executive Summary (pg 6)
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Overall/General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain/define terms such as "Blueprint" , "smart growth", "smart infra structure", "SB 375", etc. which may not be familiar, or only partially familiar, to a lay audience. Consider use of text boxes or sidebars for this purpose. 	Staff will take this comment into consideration. Staff Action: a glossary will be added to the appendices.

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Overall/General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cite all sources, perhaps in footnotes. 	<p>Staff Action: Notes are provided in the Appendix. An expanded version of the Notes will be more useful in identifying Sources.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Graphics/Maps:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The graphics are mostly good, but sometimes hard to read, and often include key information that is not in the narrative. The graphics should support the narrative, not the other way around (see Pg. 7 for an example of this). 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: we have removed the graphics on page 7. As discussed with the Policy Group, the Blueprint document was intended to be lean; invariably in the interest of space we had to compress text.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document needs to more explicitly state that a principle that is key to the Sustainable Growth Patterns scenario is the idea that the use of public transit is greatly enhanced by increasing the number of people who live and work within easy walking distance of convenient (Le., frequent) transit service. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: See Page 27—“By focusing development...”</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Resource Land Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient discussion of the amounts of other types of resource land (e.g., undeveloped open space, etc.) conserved in each scenario, and how such resource lands could be protected from development. It may be appropriate to mention efforts such as the Santa Cruz County Blueprint for Conservation and other similar efforts in Monterey and San Benito Counties. 	<p>Staff Action: No change. It is not feasible to estimate how much resource land may be impacted under each scenario as that depends on exact information on where future growth goes which we do not have.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Inter-Regional Connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a discussion of the out-of-region commute, what expectations may exist regarding the SF Bay Area and Silicon Valley and their planning efforts as they pertain to our region's jobs/housing balance and VMT/GHG emissions. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: addressed in the Getting There chapter.</p>

Public Release Draft of *Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure*
 Public Comments & AMBAG Staff responses

Agency	Comment	Response
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Policy "Toolbox" Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a policy suggestion to encourage Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), along transit corridors or around transit nodes, through the creation of a zoning district or zoning overlay that could provide more flexibility in allowing higher densities, mix of uses, reduced parking requirements, etc., perhaps including design criteria to ensure aesthetic development that respects the surrounding urban fabric and promotes walking and bicycling. 	<p>While this topic is discussed throughout the document, staff will consider calling it out specifically in the policies section.</p> <p>Staff Action: addressed in the Getting There chapter.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Policy "Toolbox" Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a policy suggestion to encourage infill and limit urban sprawl through adoption of Urban Growth Boundaries. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: addressed in the Getting There chapter.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Policy "Toolbox" Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a policy suggestion for improving bike safety though adding more bike lanes and dedicated bike-only paths and removal of dangerous conditions (e.g., parking lanes too close to bike lanes, etc.) 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: addressed in the Getting There chapter.</p>
Tony Campos, Santa Cruz County; Policy "Toolbox" Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding website addresses of appropriate informational websites to each of the policy idea descriptions, so that readers can get more details if they are interested. 	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: addressed in the Sources appendix.</p>
Jack Nelson	<p>The costs-of-sprawl discussion on pages 17-18 does well on including some little-recognized connections. You could add, the connection of sprawl to the financial costs of corresponding long commutes, the personal toll on workers and family, and the loss to communities when people don't have time to walk around or be involved in the life of their community.</p>	<p>Staff will take this comment into consideration.</p> <p>Staff Action: information is provided on costs of congestion in the Defining the Issues section. It is not feasible to identify or quantify the "personal toll" on people but it is there. No change.</p>