

[Redacted]

From: Bill Mayben <[Redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, June 3, 2021 12:38 PM
To: Dave Vautin <DVautin@bayareametro.gov>
Subject: Today's webinar

External Email

Hi Dave,
Effective webinar this morning. You are encyclopedic!

My fears regarding the \$19 billion allocated to sea level rise protection, is based in hydrodynamics. Every area protected by a seawall displaces the unwanted effects onto all remaining bay shoreline, necessitating that action be taken sooner at the next weakest, or most valuable, point, etc. Another exponential curve for you. What we face is the progressive loss of an ecosystem, as one participant this morning stated; but aesthetically, the loss of the reason why we are all here. Our Bay. Mentioned in our place name. Bay Area 2050.

Once we start with seawalls, outside say the SF waterfront, when do we stop? Everyone will want to protect their existing property at some point; starting with three International airports; the ports, sewage and water treatment plants; and the proposed Santa Clara development. Oakland.

By "new development"; I meant ALL new built infrastructure; commercial, residential, civic, transportation, pipelines and transmission towers; everything. Everything has a life cycle, so in the next 30 years, will infrastructure get built that will immediately or eventually need to be protected by seawalls, based on its life cycle? Probably, if we allow it. At whose long-term cost? If this is the plan, I suggest we drag it out into the light of day. It is a significant aspect of the contemplated improvements to our lives. Over time, seawalls become institutionalized, raised periodically, and a part of our future visual reality. Walls not Bay. Walls not ecosystem. I think this is a serious, regional cost to our lives. It doesn't stop at \$19 billion.

Can you guarantee me, given our soils types and our propensity for earthquakes, that seawalls would endure a combination of water pressure and a seismic event? What would be the effects of such a breach; the combination of an earthquake and flooding? How does this fit with our goals of improving our resilience?

My alternative is not pretty; which contemplates an orderly retreat. If projections show that proposed development will be inundated or require a seawall within its projected life cycle, it would not be permitted. You can see where this leads. It affects our proposed open space set asides, as well as our stipulation that municipal

boundaries not change. We would be squeezed. It leads us to think more deeply about proposed growth. The rules have changed. This led my thinking to strike an elevation encircling the Bay, a datum line representing a future water level, allowing one to scale the projected life cycle of any proposed improvements in relation to that datum line. That line would be superseded over time. Decentralization can and should take a more strident role towards mitigating the pressures of development.

This thinking follows the principle of spending a development dollar one time rather than ten or twenty times or more. This especially holds true for public investments.

We didn't have time this morning to consider the back end of this Plan, the 2050 part; where we hand off our results to those following us. What opportunities are we leaving them? Where can they go from there? What mitigation and unfinished business are we deferring to the future? If we consider that point; it can help with the front end; that which we face now. What will the legacy of PBA 2050 be? I realize planning is a dynamic process, and that we will realize our screw-ups way before 2050. Why not today, for instance?

These are existential questions; AND if we accept all our real and present needs, assets, and restrictions; shedding our past; we are fully capable of providing transformational, and enduring solutions. All cards are face up on the table.

Thanks Again,

Bill Mayben