

Summary of Public Comments Received on Alameda County Community Climate Action Plan

CCAP Measure	Comment	Meeting where comment was made
T-1 & T-2 Bicycle Infrastructure	More emphasis should be put on bicycles – more capacity for bikes on racks on buses, programs to bring bikes into schools.	USC, 4/28/10
T-3 Bike Parking Facilities	Bike facilities and paths should be funded through a bike license fee.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Requirement that employers with more than 50 employees provide showers is too onerous.	USC, 4/28/10
T-11 Transit facility improvements	The County should not put money into transit improvements like bus shelters. The transit agency should pay for this.	PC, 4/19/10
T-14 Comm'l Parking Fee T-15 Reduced Minimum Parking Requirement	The parking fee and reduced minimum parking requirements will have a negative impact on commercial areas.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10 USC, 4/28/10
	Need to clarify where the parking fee would apply.	PC, 4/19/10
L-1 Low Carbon Development Program	Charging a fee on residential development in agricultural areas will not help to perpetuate agriculture.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	There should be an exemption for residences built for people who will work for the agricultural operation on the property.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10 Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
	Maybe the fee could apply to developments over a certain number of units.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	There should be incentives for developing in the urban area rather than a penalty for developing in the rural area.	Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
L-2 Transit Oriented Development	There is a lack of infrastructure to support TOD.	PC, 4/19/10
L-4 Increase the diversity of uses in neighborhood commercial centers	Neighborhood shopping centers can't be expanded without taking housing.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	There is enough residential development to support neighborhood commercial. There is no need to add more density.	PC, 4/19/10
E-4 RECO	Need to clarify how program would work – What would 35% efficiency improvement be based on? How would property owner get credit for improvements that were already made? Etc.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10 CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10 Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
	The RECO would hurt the already depressed housing market.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10 USC, 4/28/10
	How would RECO program apply to foreclosed properties and short sales?	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10

		USC, 4/28/10
	Point-of-sale requirements don't work. Inefficient houses won't sell.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10 Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
	The RECO would give property owners in the unincorporated county an unfair disadvantage over those in other jurisdictions.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10
	The CAP should focus on incentives to retrofit older homes rather than a point of sale program.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 PC, 4/19/10 Sunol CAC, 4/21/10 USC, 4/28/10
	RECO should be kept in the toolkit for the CAP.	PC, 4/19/10
	The \$30,000 cap in the RECO is too high.	USC, 4/28/10
	The percentage target of RECO-improved residential units of 29% by 2020 is too high.	USC, 4/28/10
E-4 RECO, E-9 CECO	Measures should include reducing outdoor "over-lighting" that wastes energy.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
E-7 Improve Efficiency of Rental Units	Requiring landlords to provide utility bill information is not feasible.	USC, 4/28/10
E-8 Energy Efficiency in existing Comm'l Buildings	Need to define "commercial" – does that include ag. buildings?	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
E-10 Energy Performance in New Construction	Should provide values for increase in building costs under higher building code requirements.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	Need to clarify what "all new construction" applies to. Would it apply to ag buildings?	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	Need to keep in mind increasing local costs above those in neighboring jurisdictions.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
E-14 Submetering	There are many issues connected with submetering .	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Submetering is too costly.	PC, 4/19/10
E-17 Residential Renewable Energy Program	There was general opposition to the County developing a PACE program to provide financing for residential renewable energy.	PC, 4/19/10
	Solar power should be encouraged in residential areas.	Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
WT-1 Conserve Water in Existing Buildings and Landscapes	Opposed to the county adopting an ordinance that would prohibit home owners associations from preventing the use of water-conserving landscaping techniques.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
WS-1 Waste Reduction and Diversion	As landfill fees go up, more illegal dumping occurs in the East County.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
G-1 Expand Urban Forest	Could be expanded to include planting tree breaks in agricultural areas.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	Should include statements against v-cutting trees and for undergrounding utilities.	PC, 4/19/10
	Planting trees near houses is a fire hazard.	PC, 4/19/10

G-3 Community Gardens	Who will provide the water for community gardens?	CVMAC, 4/12/10
G-4 Agricultural Parks	Ag park concept could be expanded to urban parks.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
G-5 Farmers Markets	Agree with supporting more farmers markets. Some should be freeway accessible.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
Miscellaneous	More measures should be included that support agriculture.	Agricultural Advisory Committee, 2/23/10
	The illustrations on Pages 30 and 74 show street lighting pointing upward which wastes energy.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Concerned about use of county staff time.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Nothing can be done about global warming.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Happy to see county is working on the CAP, but it's late. Hayward already adopted theirs.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	A measure should be added to prohibit new gas-fired power plants in the county.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 USC, 4/28/10
	There should be stricter enforcement of vehicle emissions requirements.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	There should be restrictions on wasteful packaging.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	The cost of the CAP measures should be considered in light of the current economy.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	With the bad economy, the timing is bad for the CAP.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	The plan doesn't include any specific savings.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	There needs to be more stakeholder involvement.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	The bulk of the measures should be transportation related, not housing related.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	The sentence at the bottom of page 12 that says that not all of the measures apply to East County should be deleted.	CVMAC, 4/12/10 USC, 4/28/10
	We need to protect existing commercial uses.	CVMAC, 4/12/10
	Traffic signal timing should be fixed to reduce delays.	PC, 4/19/10
	Regarding solar power, information should be provided about what PG&E will pay for excess power that is put back on the grid.	PC, 4/19/10
	The burden of the plan shouldn't be placed on homeowners.	PC, 4/19/10
	Parts of Castro Valley are too hilly to walk.	PC, 4/19/10
	Growth shouldn't be directed to the West County.	PC, 4/19/10
	Pass-through traffic is a big concern. There should be a way to address.	Sunol CAC, 4/21/10
	Adding population won't reduce carbon footprint.	USC, 4/28/10
	Where will funding come from?	USC, 4/28/10
	Energy efficiency will lower revenue from the utility users' tax.	USC, 4/28/10
	The county is heading down the right road. Many wineries in South Livermore are working toward sustainability and the proposed measures do things that the wineries can't do on their own.	USC, 4/28/10
	More emphasis should be put on green jobs.	USC, 4/28/10

Miscellaneous (from letters and emails)	Comment	Comment Date
	Cost implications to property owners of certain measures (ie. RECO) are unreasonable and should be reduced or removed.	Letter (May 2010)
	Recycling should be required for all businesses; including requiring separated recycling bins, curbside service.	Email (December 2009)
	New residential development should be transit and pedestrian friendly and reduce the dependency on the automobile.	Email (December 2009)
	All new construction should have gray water systems.	Email (December 2009)
	Pass through traffic from out of town commuters is a significant GHG source. The County should enact a commuter tax on single occupancy vehicles to pay for renewables (solar) and support composting. There is only so much you can do with energy efficiency and water conservation in buildings. Will community members get credit for efficiency measures implemented in the past?	Email (November 2009)
	Not everyone lives in a neighborhood conducive to walking and biking. People should not be penalized for water usage. Adopt a permanent daylight savings time (people turn on lights later in the day).	Email (November 2009)
	Concerned about air quality, particularly from the crematory recently approved by the County that emits toxics.	Email (September 2009)
	Consider and support nuclear power.	Letter (September 2009)
	City & County government should do more to reduce GHG emissions before placing extra burden on community members.	Letter (September 2009)
	Support 1) public education regarding water conservation, 2) waste diversion services in East County, 3) Renewables- aggregate solar cost share program, 4) Save rural land, 5) safe bicycle routes	Email (September 2009)
	Cal State East Bay interested in student involvement in the Climate Action Plan process.	Email (September 2009)
	Concern about the Russell City, Calpine project.	Letter (September 2009)
	Support regional plans and programs including: MTCs Regional Transportation Climate Action Campaign, Safe Routes to Schools, Safe Routes to Transit, MTCs Routine Accommodation policy, and prioritize access and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians.	Letter (September 2009)
	Consider water conservation measures	Email (August 2009)
	Develop a Xeriscape Ordinance (i.e. Bay-Friendly Landscaping, Water Conservation, etc.)	Email (September 2009)
	Expand Feeder Service to BART stations, presumably AC Transit buses and expand BART Capacity	Email (September 2009)
	Questions regarding Quantification methods and consideration of projects in future years.	Email (April 2010)
	Include "Special Districts" in Roles/ Responsibilities/ Collaboratives, include trails as part of walking/bicycling improvements/amenities.	Email (April 2010)

	Concern for lack of broad community representation, general support for the effort to address climate change and AB32, cited positive net economic impact in support of climate change planning.	Email (April 2010)
	Proposed CAP language revisions and clarifications	Email (March 2010)
	Email from the consultant regarding modeling for GHG waste emissions calculations.	Email (April 2010)
	Proposed CAP language revisions and clarifications as it relates to the Government Operations and Services Climate Action Plan	Email (April 2010)
	Letter regarding negative cost implications of the CAP, cost burden on the community, need for conservation, and questions regarding the “science”, the GHG inventory, and GHG calculations, applicability of the CAP to all of Unincorporated County, specific questions and concerns regarding cited measures.	Letter (April 2010)
	Letter regarding negative cost impacts to local residents and business owners, a need to support local commerce and business development, the CAP is anti-business, certain measures will negatively impact community welfare, a need for more details, and other specific questions and concerns regarding cited measures.	Letter (April 2010).