From:
To:
Subject: Fwd: RE: Plan Bay Area 2040
Date: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 2:44:46 PM
Attachments: my slide to ABAG - cost comparisons for 2040.pdf

---

>>> On 9/15/2016 at 6:52 PM, "Albert, Peter (ECN)" <peter.albert@sfgov.org> wrote:
Thanks, Ken and Miriam. It was great to hear the presentation yesterday (and to be able to see how much progress Laura Thompson has made on the Bay Trail, a project I'd supported for decades in many of my projects).

Connect SF:
As you may know, I'm the new Manager of Connect SF, and will work closely with Josh Switzky, Darton Ito and Amber Crabbe. I'd like to correlate as correctly as possible our descriptions of a future San Francisco with this work from ABAG.

I echo these issues I heard Josh raise (hope I'm capturing them correctly!):

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->our ability in general within San Francisco to accept a robust increase in jobs and housing as a smart-growth response on behalf of a more livable, sustainable region, premised on the planning resources we might need to assist in accommodating an ambitious inventory of housing and workplace production, and

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->a pragmatic sensibility toward the preparatory and lead time challenges of transforming large-scale development sites in SF and the region that might currently lack the functional infrastructure and ground readiness for development (think Hunters Point Shipyard: one of my biggest projects, entitled in 2010 and only now in full sway of development for its first phase, due to extraordinary clean-up and infrastructure prep).

I'm also interested in knowing if and how we would get down to assignments and distributions at a PDA level, so I can better understand the implications from a corridor and network level.

-

Cost Comparison Slide:
This is not a critical concern for me, but I think the diagram from your presentation showing a 2040 where % of HH costs for housing and transportation goes up could be confusing, maybe provocative.

I understood that the % of HH costs for transportation costs would have risen much more cataclysmically in a No Project 2040 scenario, and the Preferred Scenario brings those costs down substantially.

However, that message might get lost: and a reaction from a typical observer might be: " OK –

things are already expensive, so we need to stop any more growth from happening at all."

That's not the point you wanted to make. I'd suggest pitting the two 2040 scenarios together since they really are the only two practical futures we're considering. See my attached slide for notes….perhaps you agree it's worth reframing this slide?

Thanks again for all your work on all this. I'd be happy to elaborate more on what I hope to accomplish between now and May 2017 with Connect SF.

Peter Albert, Manager
Connect SF
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
415.575.8735

From: Ken Kirkey [mailto:KKirkey@mtc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2016 5:39 PM
To: Megan Espiritu; Ken Kirkey
Cc: Steve Heminger; Alix Bockelman; Brad Paul; Miriam Chion; Matt Maloney; Adam Noelting; Michael Reilly; Gillian Adams; Cynthia Kroll; Ezra Rapport; David Ory; Julie Teglovic; Sarina Seaton
Subject:

Dear Colleagues,

We greatly appreciate your involvement and input in the development of Plan Bay Area 2040. As many of you're aware Regional Agency Staff are in the midst of providing staff-level presentations of the *Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario* in each county. The dialogue thus far has been very good and we look forward to the remaining meetings over the next few weeks.

Some of you have requested a link to the PBA2040 Draft Preferred Scenario powerpoint presentation and related materials. Here it is: http://mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/meetings/meetings-archive/joint-mtc-planning-committee-abag-administrative-13

We encourage you to share the materials with your Elected Officials and City Managers.

The attached document is a brief memo intended to provide additional background on the development of the PBA2040 Draft Preferred Scenario and guidance for providing input to inform the Final Preferred Scenario slated for adoption on November 17, 2016.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Miriam Chion miriamc@abag.ca.gov with any questions or comments.

Best Regards,

Ken

Ken Kirkey
Director, Planning
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105
Main phone number: 415-778-6700
www.mtc.ca.gov

My direct phone number:
415-778-6790 (office)

Compared to the No Project, the Preferred Scenario is a "Good News" story, but this graphic doesn't convey those relative savings. It highlights how relative percentages of household income are spent, not the gross income values, but some people may lose that. Spending 1% more of overall income on transportation in 2040 won't necessarily mean spending 1% more in actual value -- an easy point to confuse.

This one slide won't clarify that No Growth At All is not an option. Showing comparisons between 2040 Preferred Scenario and 2040 No Project would offer a clearer picture of the true choices, and avoids the risk of provoking a pointless visceral reaction against ANY change in these charged times, or misinterpreting these comparisons of % of household income.