

## Appendix A – Small Group Trade-off Discussion Transcription

### Metro Bakersfield Workshop #1 – Trade-off Discussion

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7
<b>Scenario 1</b>	Perpetuates current infrastructure problems, no change/no gain, we have the opportunity to change this old practice	Causes travel over long distances, regional concerns are as important as Metro area, bus schedules would need to be improved, would need light rail outside of Metro area	Needs creative housing, protect existing farmland, investment in roadway infrastructure is positive, should invest in bike/walk strategies, not enough investment in trees, protect air quality, smarter building - not crowded but not on greenfields, energy and water efficient buildings, not enough transit options, requires too much walking, not enough funding, more 2-3 story building, safety is important and #1 does not improve safety		Multifamily housing units are dangerous because family members come home from prison, public transit is needed between schools and shopping, combine parks and bus stops, not enough money for development, increases air pollution and more energy used, takes away too much land from agriculture, travel takes too long now	Lack of maintenance, unfinished houses are just sitting there, creates dead zones, resources not spent where needed, more sedentary life, more roads, dangerous bike conditions	Costs too much, status quo hasn't worked, no South Beltway, possibly higher property values,
<b>Scenario 2</b>	Other than Scenario 4, this would be a good second option	Cohesive planning process, central parks and TOD, increase implementation, not much difference in scenarios, promote development near TOD, parks and shopping, promote clean air vehicles	#2 focuses more on maintenance, bike and transit, reuses old buildings, want more funding for Delano and other communities, more positives than negatives, but modest change is not enough, need to do more than the minimum	Safety, house the homeless, cameras, eyes on the street, fix run down buildings	Causes too much traffic, positive investment in transportation but creates too many large single family homes, good to have more education, central streets are too small, not enough parking space, distribute housing		Not enough

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6	Group 7
<b>Scenario 3</b>	Transportation needs are dependent upon family needs, distance from housing to bus stops, like the idea of mixed use housing, advancing Downtown revitalization would greatly enhance economic vitality	More investment in bike/ped, with better bus schedules the busses should also be environmentally friendly, clean air busses	Students need a good transit network, more opportunities come from better transit, also reduces expense, current conditions are difficult between metro outer communities, connect transit to schools and jobs, separate trucks from cars on highways, remove all cars and replace with trains, Delano is the 2nd largest city and also needs attention	Reduced parking, want sky rail/fast track, remove fees	Positive - more public transit, negative - we need space for schools and parks,	What exactly are the differences between the scenarios?	Not enough
<b>Scenario 4</b>	Reducing cars increases quality of life, resolved most current infrastructure issues, best scenario for air quality, household expenses, economic vitality, public safety, public health, time to realize we need to help fund our own problems, #4 would greatly impact chronic diseases, connectivity is a must, plant trees and time stop lights to decrease air pollution		Highways are dangerous, need alternative transit or back roads from main highways - they get blocked, create multiple transportation options to get to major destinations, pedestrian safety is key, wider sidewalks everywhere, #4 is major shift - all were in favor, balance projects across all communities, safer street crossings with connections to schools	Mixed use TOD near services and amenities, need incentives for revitalization, can't take someone's property, none of the scenarios have the mixed use scenario we need	More diverse types of living, more mixed uses, deal with vandalism, better retail in East Bakersfield, more transit bike and walk investment is good, less emissions, incentivize solar panels,	More walking and biking paths, more variation between scenarios, revitalize Metro and outside areas too, safe bike infrastructure, allows shift in market and lifestyle	Smaller urban footprint=fewer commuter miles, less healthcare costs from active transportation, cultural change - may require education, healthier, creative class brings employment, could increase traffic

**Metro Bakersfield Workshop #2 – Trade-off Discussion**

	<b>Group 1</b>	<b>Group 2</b>	<b>Group 3</b>	<b>Group 4</b>	<b>Group 5</b>	<b>Group 6</b>
<b>Scenario 1</b>	Costs more to live on the fringe, Bakersfield has many centers, many people want single-family homes, but can't afford it, spreads things out too much, less affordable housing, less walkable, encourages sprawl, creates more diverse housing due to multiple centers, bad to have single-family homes on the fringe, fringe development is very bad for water and air	Causes too much pollution, decreases safety due to fires in the foothills, fewer transit options if you have mobility issues, poor air quality, no services in fringe areas, debt funded, maintenance costs are over budget, limits services to those that live in mountains, large lots=lots of water use, bad for farmland, more carbon emissions, causes wider freeways/too expensive, loss of community center	Increases traffic and congestion, lacks major transit service improvements, best responds to historic housing demands, drop the South Beltway, it is unsustainable to do nothing	Less expensive property, building here is closer to oil and ag, fringe is not that far away, smaller lots,	May need to re-prioritize spending, sprawl is negative, need to infill before new development, no real change, more single-family homes = more water use/less water for farming, more single-family homes would balance more dense housing downtown, improving and maintaining roads is good, consumes resources and is unsustainable, fails to achieve air quality goals, funding would be easier to secure, Xeriscaping reduces water use, multi-family can increase heat island effect	Housing for low income families in Shafter, easier public transit for disabled, softer water, more transit stops, more sidewalks in Delano, not sustainable to do nothing, water is scarce but important to keep clean and for farming, bad to encourage use of roads, promote healthier lifestyles, traffic circles,
<b>Scenario 2</b>	Not going to get anywhere by only doing a little, Westside Parkway needs bike lanes	Preserve ag land, streets too wide causing too much heat, loss of downtown businesses, encourage free bus passes to the mall, does not help people to improve community, more security on busses, high speed roads and freeways destroy safe neighborhoods	More freight rail, not enough for future growth, not much change, conserves existing resources/roadway network, conserves under-utilized land resources, reduces investment in highways, doesn't meet traffic demands	Out of town buyers, carpooling incentives/vouchers, education jobs, no interest in multi-use buildings,	Condensed population = greater usage = more need for maintenance, good to invest in maintenance and bike/walk infrastructure, don't need to revitalize downtown, use private money to invest in downtown and use government money elsewhere, more rural development on greenfield areas,	Bigger hospital in Delano, better streets and maintenance, bike racks for Delano, more trees = better air quality

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5	Group 6
<b>Scenario 3</b>	Headed in the right direction	more transit=less air pollution, clean up image of using public transit, shuttles from parking areas to Rabobank, make it easier to get around in a car, require fewer parking places for businesses - force people to carpool or ride bus, more express routes - especially at holiday times, no high speed rail downtown, need to maintain neighborhoods, community gardens should be part of community centers, bring back parking meters at big box stores, shuttle busses for large events, bike paths around canals, riding the bus can be a social activity	Create identity and tourism downtown, not enough transit and bike choices, encourages infill development, more efficient use of infrastructure, require replacement of old infrastructure, expand capacity	Building codes should require less water use, toll roads far out of town for trucks, tradeoffs hurt trucking,	Too much emphasis on downtown, mass transportation is good, need to focus on protecting farmland for Kern economy, less investment in transit corridors = not enough ridership for any transit	
<b>Scenario 4</b>	North and south bus routes, need better coordination between transit lines, need to move more quickly than 2035, bus becoming light rail is good, park n ride needs to be safe, street trees = more walking, major changes always cost more, hard to get people out of cars, need rapid transit, offer a variety of transit choices, separate bike paths from roads, need to plan now for major growth, put transit near where employees live	Encourage development of city center, more housing downtown, put housing over businesses, educate high school kids on bike riding, improves sense of place/community, long term sustainability, put water in the river and create activity areas, provide connections between Downtown and Baker St., underfunded, more bus routes for seniors, more bike paths near canals, survey people at KC fair, more dense housing, more transit options	Want to see this in Delano, more housing per acre=higher revenue, poor air quality = poor bike use, get gov't grants, opposed to raising taxes/cut back on ambition, more change is best for environment	Pipe dream?, bike in summer is too hot, not enough infrastructure	Accelerated timeframe is critical, too much emphasis on Downtown, speedy timeline could cause mis-steps, some risk since we don't know if it will work, Kern doesn't want to be like LA, does the most to support housing and transit choices, requires new "out-of-the-box" thinking	Walk to transit, disabled people need better access, buffers to protect pedestrians, need bus access to LAX, bike and walk infrastructure is key to health and clean air, how will these policies impact rural communities like Delano, Shafter and Greenfield