
From: info@planbayarea.org <info@planbayarea.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 4:07 PM
To: info@planbayarea.org
Subject: Draft PBA 2050 Comment Form submission

External Email

Submitted on July 14, 2021 Submitted values are: *Name* Auros Harman *Email* [REDACTED] [1] *Zip Code* [REDACTED] *Affiliation* Vice-Chair, San Bruno Planning Commission (but speaking only for myself) *Topic* Other *Comment* I am making a general comment on the overall performance of the official Plan, as compared to the Alternatives that were considered (Alternative 1, the "Transit Rich Area Focus", and Alternative 2 "High Resource Area Focus" Both Alternatives do slightly better than the Plan on climate and transportation goals. Both have reduced VMT, emissions, congestion, and better access to jobs. However, Alternative 1 does much better in terms of producing housing in urban areas close to jobs, which in the long run is the biggest lever for reducing emissions associated with individual choices and behavior. In SF the jobs/housing ratio is 1.6 with the Plan, 1.4 with Alternative 1, and 1.9 with Alternative 2. Any person who is able to both work and live in SF will have a radically more environmentally-friendly lifestyle. Alternative 2 actually increases displacement risk for Equity Priority Communities, from 40% with the Plan to 44% with Alternative 2, because of the lack of development in low-income communities to guard against displacement. The official Plan also inappropriately includes things like adding lanes to 280 inside SF. The experience with removing the 101 from Embarcadero suggests this has things exactly backwards. We ought to be talking about getting rid of freeway lanes, and pushing more trips onto transit. I hope that elements of Alternative 1 will be adopted into the final Plan, to improve environmental performance and enable more people to gain the physical and mental health benefits of living in a walkable community with a short commute. [1] [REDACTED]