Solano County Workshop
May 7, 2008, 6 p.m. – 8 p.m.
County Government Center
Fairfield, CA

Some 25 people were in attendance. Commissioner Jim Spering offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

NOTE: *At the Solano County workshop, there was a malfunction with the e-voting equipment. As a result, only percentages were recorded. All tables below show the percentages for each vote, but not individual counts. In addition, some tables may not add up to 100% due to rounding.*

The Three E's

How would you rank these three goals?	Percentage
Economy	35%
Environment	34%
Equity	31%
Totals	**100%**

Maintenance

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	Percentage
Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region	65%
Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region	35%
Totals	**100%**

Comments:

- Seems logical to maintain what you have before expansion
- Cost of maintenance is lower if done on preventative basis
- Maintenance on roads is essential if done early; good investment with limited budget
- If not maintain existing system then it will fail
- Not comfortable with these choices; I don't think one would choose Option B without first maintaining the existing system; I would favor new investments in the public transportation side;
- Option B is a wise long-term choice because voters will never vote for a bond to acquire a ROW; if you have the cash, acquire the ROW and let the roads deteriorate; let the voters to pass bonds to fix pavement

- We need investment in bike facilities at transit hubs in keeping high quality standards of BART and GGBHTD; need investment in California cross-state bike route; (implementation agreement) needs to be signed from Bay Trail to Tahoe Trail
- If you don't do Option A, then won't be able to do Option B in the long run
- I chose Option B on a philosophical basis; encourages folks to think long term
- Recognize that if you invest in existing system, then you are really encouraging smart growth (e.g., BART stations)
- Although Option A is reasonable, there are very limited opportunities in the existing public transit system – that's why I favored Option B for system expansion
- If you build a road from Gold Hill Road over the swamp, you could divert a lot of traffic from the I-80/680 interchange; also, double the size of Route 13 (2 lanes in each direction, divided)
- I chose Option A for safety reasons; as roads and transit deteriorate, we are decreasing the safety of users
- 75% should go towards maintenance and the rest to road expansion

How much of our $30M should be spent on maintenance?	**Percentage**
Up to 25% ($7.5 billion)	27%
Up to 50% ($15 billion)	60%
Up to 75% ($22.5 billion)	13%
100% ($30 billion)	0%
Totals	

Congestion Relief

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?	**Percentage**
Option A: Investing in highway system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.)	36%
Option B: Investing in public transit options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving.	56%
Option C: Investing in walking paths and bicycle lanes to provide alternatives to driving.	8%
Totals	**100%**

Comments:

- Need to be proactive with alternatives if not widening freeways
- Need to provide alternatives otherwise won't get folks out of cars
- Extension of SMART to Solano
- Need more investment in bicycle facilities near transit hubs, especially trails (also benefits pedestrians)
- Many welfare recipients need public transit options to get to job opportunities
- New highways are going on top of bike paths

- You can have multimodal facilities to stretch the dollars
- Solano's freeway system still has room to grow
- Highways are not exclusive to changing behavior; if you have HOV lanes, then you encourage public transit and carpools; need core HOV system
- More emissions from traffic jams
- Some nitwit painted out a lane causing more traffic jams
- HOV lanes are a scam
- Some areas are difficult to access by public transportation, such as San Mateo

What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?	**Percentage**
Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours	45%
Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee	9%
Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries	18%
Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees	27%
Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas	0%
Totals	**99%**

Focused Growth

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?	**Percentage**
Option A: Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines	68%
Option B: Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes	32%
Totals	**100%**

Comments:

- Option A just makes good sense
- Option A makes sense, but shortchanges communities like in Solano County that don't have the transportation funds
- Marin may get a more 50/50 vote; to penalize them for not wanting to grow near public transit is not good
- Put money to communities that want to do the right things
- We are in desperate need for transport funds; I fear that we will lose out in the smaller towns and communities
- Option B is better for communities that do not have rail lines
- Building housing along transportation corridors would not require public funds if it were really attractive to developers
- How does the region retrieve the gain in property values from proximity to rail?
- What is dense in Solano County may not be dense in Oakland or San Francisco; there should not be one size fits all criterion

Access

Transit Subsidy Based on Income: Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

There should be a subsidy for low-income riders.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	30%
Agree	35%
Neutral	20%
Disagree	15%
Strongly Disagree	0%
Totals	**100%**

Comments:

- Would benefit low-income families
- Cities frequently offer subsidies for water and sewers for low-income folks; this is consistent
- Senior discounts may not be good in the future with more seniors in the region

I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	25%
Agree	33%
Neutral	25%
Disagree	8%
Strongly Disagree	8%
Totals	**99%**

Comments:

- Assuming disabled people have access, income is a good basis
- Administrative challenges based on income
- Also privacy issues

Emissions Reduction

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?	Percentage
Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving.	80%
Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area.	20%
Totals	**100%**

Comments:

- Option A is really a compound questions; you can reduce emissions with technology only as shown in past 20 years
- Need stricter regulations on auto manufacturers
- Put housing near transit
- Anybody doing anything on ferry emissions?
- Option B is counterproductive; short-term solution par excellence; build a new freeway and they will come
- Regional agencies should continue to advocate for improved tailpipe emissions reductions

Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?	**Percentage**
Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles	17%
Provide more/cheaper public transit	22%
Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use	11%
Build more bike paths and sidewalks	11%
Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit	17%
Support local traffic signal timing coordination	22%
Totals	**100%**

Investment Tradeoffs

You have $10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend.	**Totals**
Maintenance	520
Congestion Relief	248
Focus Growth	136
Access	45
Emissions Reduction	116
Totals	**N/A**

Comments:

- Two main reasons choosing maintenance: reduce safety incidents and driving time

New Revenues

Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK)	**Percentage**
Regional gas fee	30%
Higher bridge toll	30%
Road tolls	30%

Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK)	Percentage
Vehicle registration fees	40%
County transportation sales taxes	70%
Other new revenues	30%
No new fees or increases	10%
Totals	**N/A**

Comments:

- Sales taxes: good way to collect a lot of money without a lot of pain
- Sales taxes conflict with Access goal
- Other revenue sources: City of Benicia has a local traffic impact fee

Open Comments:

Category	County	Comment
Misc.	Solano	Solano Transportation Authority Board has approved priority project list; this has been forwarded to MTC as part of the RTP Call for Projects
Maintenance	Solano	The project list does not include maintenance for I-80
Bike/Ped	Solano	Bicycles are zero emission vehicles and do not create congestion
No freeway expansion	Solano	Why can't we retrofit an existing freeway rather than replace/reconstruct it (e.g., Cypress Freeway…???)

Written Comments Submitted at Workshop:

Category	County	Comment
Congestion Relief	Solano	1500 Hrs – 3pm 92 East approaching 880 after passing under Hesperian Blvd, 3 lanes cross over 880 there was 2 lanes on the right off ramp to 88 South to San Jose. No problem until some nitwit removed one lane with no drive strips. Now as #3 lane backs up there is reduced access to off ramp to San Jose. 13 South to 580 South: 13 is two lane down to one lane entering 580 South was built to have 2 lane. Remove the striped area.
Meeting/ Maintenance	Solano	Good Meeting! All needs are important, but preserving the existing system is key.
Emissions	Solano	Public information campaign and regulations and ordinances to keep idling of car and truck engines to a minimum. (European idea—said to reduce a lot of emissions.)
Transit	Solano	GIVE PRIORITY TO IMPROVING PUBLIC TRANSIT, especially rail and ferries and SUPPORT BICYCLING—routes, safety, transit connections

Category	County	Comment
Maintenance	Solano	DISCOURAGE widening/expansion of freeways and discourage automobile use: gas tax higher YES/high tax on vehicle registration (on 2nd vehicles for household only?)
Transit	Solano	Priority: 1. Improved transit system and access to transit 2. Support and incentivize smart growth/wise land use 3. Maintain existing system 4. Evaluate projects based on emissions and environmental impacts (GHG, climate change, energy use, air quality)
Maintenance	Solano	It is unlikely that I will speak tonight so here is my basic input. Self-introduction: I'm a 34 yr old commuting and recreational cyclist. Unlike most citizens, I'll not ask you to build anything. I suggest something should not be built. Please do not spend our $ millions to build massive automobile-oriented "improvements" that will block free passage by cyclists and pedestrians. Specifically, do not construct bridges or an I-80/680 interchange that will inhibit or present a barrier to bike-ped users. Bicycles pre-dated the automobile and we'll be here (like cockroaches) after motor vehicles are extinct. Plan for us please. P.S. I favor an increase in the state gas tax to generate funds for transportation projects
Bikes	Solano	Need bike lockers and racks at al transit hubs and bike carriers on all buses, ferries, in standards with BART and Golden Gate Transit, Baylink is poor! Need to implement the California Cross State Bike Route from the SF Bay Trail to the Tahoe Rim Trail. There is NO SAFE or legal bikeway in the I-80/I-680/SR 12 corridor. Fees for Park and Ride Lots. Carbon Offset credits for bike paths.
Maintenance	Solano	Maintain existing "old" system as [it's] much cheaper than building new. However, shifting of money to public transportation encourages walking and bicycle options at transit hubs' reduce tailpipe emissions. Support regional, statewide and federal regulations to reduce emissions. Support smart growth, smart trains, regional ferries, and interconnections to existing and new transportation facilities. Identify realistic milestones.

Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:

1.) How did you get here this evening?	Percentage
Drove	78%
BART/Muni/Bus	0
Carpool	0
Bike	4%
Walked	17%
Totals	**99%**
2.) How long did it take you to get here?	**Percentage**
Less than five minutes	24%
Five to 10 minutes	43%
Ten to 30 minutes	19%
More than 30 minutes	14%
Totals	**100%**
3.) How would you describe yourself?	**Percentage**
Business Advocate	0
Environmental Advocate	13%
Community Advocate	17%
Government/Agency Staff	61%
Concerned Individual	35%
Social Justice Advocate	9%
Elected Official	13%
Totals	**N/A**
4.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting?	**Percentage**
Flyer	22%
Website	4%
Email	43%
Other	30%
Totals	**99%**
5.) Do you use public transportation regularly? (one to two times a week)	**Percentage**
Yes	20%
No	80%
Totals	**100%**
6.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past?	**Percentage**
Yes	95%
No	5%
Totals	**100%**

7.) What county do you live in?	Percentage
Alameda	0
Contra Costa	4%
Marin	0
Napa	4%
San Francisco	4%
San Mateo	0
Santa Clara	0
Solano	88%
Sonoma	0
Totals	**100%**
8.) What is your gender?	**Percentage**
Male	70%
Female	30%
Totals	**100%**
9.) Are you Hispanic/Latino?	**Percentage**
Yes	8%
No	92%
Totals	**100%**
10.) How do you identify yourself? (click all that apply)	**Percentage**
White	87%
Chinese	0
Vietnamese	0
Asian/Indian	0
Black/African American	9%
Japanese	0
Filipino	0
American Indian/Alaskan	0
Other Asian	0
Other Race	4%
Totals	**100%**
11.) What is your age?	**Percentage**
24 years and under	4%
Between 25 and 59	67%
Over 60	29%
Totals	**100%**

Workshop Evaluation Survey:

31.) I had the opportunity to provide comments.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	74%
Agree	26%
Neutral	0
Disagree	0
Strongly Disagree	0
Totals	**100%**

32.) I found the meeting useful and informative.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	28%
Agree	44%
Neutral	28%
Disagree	0
Strongly Disagree	0
Totals	**100%**

33.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21%
Agree	42%
Neutral	32%
Disagree	0
Strongly Disagree	5%
Totals	**100%**

34.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	11%
Agree	50%
Neutral	11%
Disagree	22%
Strongly Disagree	6%
Totals	**100%**

35.) A quality discussion of key issues took place.	Percentage
Strongly Agree	16%
Agree	47%
Neutral	21%
Disagree	11%
Strongly Disagree	5%
Totals	**100%**

36.) I learned more about transportation planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.	**Percentage**
Strongly Agree	6%
Agree	44%
Neutral	33%
Disagree	17%
Strongly Disagree	0
Totals	**100%**

37.) There were no barriers (language or other) that prevented me from participating.	**Percentage**
Strongly Agree	75%
Agree	25%
Neutral	0
Disagree	0
Strongly Disagree	0
Totals	**100%**