

Draft PBA 2050 Comment Form submission

Plan Bay Area <info@planbayarea.org>

Fri 7/9/2021 7:09 PM

To: info@planbayarea.org <info@planbayarea.org>

External Email

Submitted on July 9, 2021 Submitted values are: *Topic* Other *Comment* -MTC should move back to Oakland to save money and be more in touch with the diverse population it claims to support (in a central location) -Not enough outreach was done on planning sessions before this draft, wasting a lot of time by not getting enough input before drafting -Plan team has weaknesses such as Carroll Fife who pretends to support affordable housing but is ignorant of how to build it, and is absent from neighborhood meetings in her district so can't speak for Oakland -Plan written more like an academic paper than a user friendly actionable document (should be more concise and bulleted than long paragraphs with lots of jargon) -While having a land acknowledgement is trendy, Plan doesn't include specifics on protecting Ohlone sacred sites from illegal dumping and development (I find it offensive as a Native American) -Plan doesn't fully acknowledge pandemic impact (What about converting unwanted downtown offices to housing?, Pre-2019 transit levels? Maybe less transit frequency / taxpayer cost is needed now that more people work from home and nobody liked the unsafe, dirty and crowded BART before the pandemic anyway! - this is what I mean that MTC needs to be more in touch) -Plan ignores law enforcement role - how do we convert ineffective / destructive "justice system" to stop profiling and abuse, enforce rent control, enforce traffic and illegal dumping laws, and prevent theft and murder? It doesn't make sense to make new laws when you don't enforce existing ones! I've seen many homeless people in camps don't want permanent housing so just building housing won't address that. How are you going to deal with that? -Since the rich can avoid taxes and the poor don't have money, middle class people would have to pay for this so you need to give us something too for our tax dollars. Support internet and pave roads for everyone, not just poor people. And I am NOT supporting more welfare (basic income) when I have to work hard to survive! -Housing part has gaps. Too much money going to buy existing housing (which will drive up housing cost) than preserving existing affordable housing and building new affordable housing (which will actually make more affordable housing). Also too much focus on an ideology of mixed income housing when you can build more affordable housing by not doing mixed income housing. Lastly, inclusionary housing DOES have a cost to the developer unlike what you state in your report.