

7-28-2020

**Public Comments on Draft PBA 2050 Blueprint Strategies and Equity and Performance Projections**

Bill Mayben

*“The difference between problems and predicaments is that problems have solutions, and predicaments have only managed outcomes.” John Michael Greer*

Dear PBA Staff;

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments and suggestions to the long and thoughtful work you have done on Plan Bay Area 2050.

Despite a Progressive and Comprehensive Agenda, most Bay Area residents are concerned whether The Plan can deliver on its promises. Many of the Blueprint and Equity and Performance focus areas propose very thin margins. Many also lack secure, identified sources of funding despite relatively constrained objectives. There is clear evidence that certain features of the Blueprint are functionally unattainable. The numbers simply do not work. Continuing as though they do at this point in the analysis could be construed as misleading. Describing The Plan as transformative is inaccurate. I prefer to reassert the principles of substantially increasing sustainability and resilience; and with each element; we either have it or we don't.

The Plan, even in its draft form, does not have buy-in from a majority of our citizens or their representatives. There are many stakeholders, but no identified, empowered, project management entity. These are red flags. Below I point out recent huge, but less ambitious projects than PBA2050, which have gone over budget by billions and over schedule by a decade or more, essentially due to diffuse leadership structure and ideology, undependable cost projections, and uncoordinated project management. It appears to have become a fixture of our large public projects

I am concerned that if we go about public works in our usual way, we can expect many of our usual outcomes. Our usual way of going about things got us into this mess; so if we don't change our process first and foremost, we can reasonably

expect the same results we have gotten in the past three decades for the next three decades. We need the eyes of outside neutral expertise on our Blueprint and projected outcomes in regular external peer reviews.

Is this Transformation or Business as Usual? The Plan ostensibly intends to go beyond simply meeting the inevitable Bay Area Growth needs in the coming 30 years, and tangibly improve how we live. In analyzing the preliminary budget, if we remove everything we would have to accomplish anyway, what remains that is transformational in substance? While the improvements projected under Affordable, Connected, Diverse, and Healthy show business improving significantly; for 30 years of progress, they fall short of transformational. They depict an economy that continues to be highly centralized, and continues to suffer the effects in transportation, housing, inclusion, and egalitarian culture.

We all watched the slow motion train wreck of our Bay Bridge seismic replacement. The original projected cost was \$1 billion, and construction was to take 7 years. By the time the funds were allocated it was up to \$1.3 billion. The final cost was \$6.4 billion, and it took 17 years; that was \$5.1 billion over budget and 10 years behind schedule. Much of the additional cost was based on delay; quibbling about design, adding complexity, poor purchasing protocol, and “normal corruption”. In a nutshell, poor project management. There are many other recent examples such as The Transbay Terminal, The High Speed Rail Project, The Hunter’s Point conversion, and the Treasure Island conversion.

I am amazed that the recent MTC video on the Blueprint, does not mention our traffic jams! It is as though the automobile doesn’t exist. The Plan perpetuates the domination of the automobile commute, and yet downplays this fact at every turn. Auto commuting has not worked since the 50’s, and represents its own dysfunctional economy. The Plan states right away, its full intent to Maintain Existing System. In fact, this is the only commitment The Plan makes in clear and concrete terms. The implications are enormous, overriding all else.

This would be easier to swallow if it said “Adapt and reemploy existing roadway system”, but it is the existing system that is stuck sideways in our throats. It is

excruciatingly painful; the reason I seldom go to SF. Vast sums have been spent over the past six decades, leading closer and closer to absolute gridlock.

The new outcomes we seek would include changes to our traditional economy. Without a commitment to this reality, it seems there would not be the wherewithal to pursue change. The challenges this represents shouldn't be underestimated.

In the maps on sheet 2 of Equity and Performance, sea level rise directly affects several identified Superdistricts. Major 2015-2050 household growth is also projected to occur in several flood- vulnerable areas. The same is true of key areas projected to sponsor 2015-2050 job growth. The 2050 major projected population density areas appear to overlap with flood prone areas. This issue also appears on the map of some of the highest 2050 jobs/housing ratio parcels.

Occasional flooding always precedes inundation. If not anticipated based on the best available information, this issue alone has the potential to upend several major plan areas. In this instance we need to look at the life cycle of new development, not the 30 year Plan timeline. My fear is The Plan under-represents the existential financial risks sea level rise represents; continually affecting the planning cycle, and construction of improvements, its costs and schedule.

The Plan assumes sea level rise during the plan period at 2'. I do not see this as a conservative estimate, which in this case would be a higher water level, and believe it our obligation to err on the side of caution. That would be 4' minimum. Conflicts are showing up on the Blueprint maps even with a modest 2' projected rise in sea level. This is coupled with projected major commercial and residential growth in the South Bay.

There is also a fundamental rolling disconnect between the life of public, commercial and residential development, including buildings and infrastructure; and the duration of The Plan to 2050. Just because we do not project flooding of proposed development during the plan period, does not mean development should proceed in the identified areas. While it is understood that The Plan will be updated over time, this exception is especially concerning in the early stages of

The Plan. We can misconstrue The Plan constrained study to mean that all development will be acceptable, when, in fact, that development may not endure for its natural useful life after the thirty year plan interval.

There has been alarm in the scientific community already this year. Despite the economic slowdown caused by the pandemic, 2020 is still projected to be the hottest global temperature on record. They are also concerned about exponential increases in methane levels. Both of these facts do not bode well for sea level rise staying within previously predicted rates. It is relentless, and we should consider a progressive, ongoing, modular strategic infrastructure and building retreat from the bay, rather than a series of expensive attempts to stand against the inevitable. This is clearly a long-range planning function.

Sea level rise will not stop in 2050. Inevitably we will continue moving to higher ground. If we plan for that, we can budget for it, and do the mapping, zoning, infrastructure, and entitlements in a timely fashion. Anything built at bayside will have to be demolished and removed eventually, if our commitment to the environment is true to form.

How many times should we spend money to hold the same ground, verses spending one time to build safely in accordance with the useful life of our improvements? To act economically, we need to use effective sea level rise estimates, and they need to be updated regularly through the plan period. All areas of The Plan will be affected by sea level rise, which will have to be anticipated beyond 2050, as we will be constructing improvements with lifespans of 100 years or more.

Broadly, to present true totals, all projected Plan costs should consolidate all transactional costs (financing), and lawsuit contingency funds; instead of being limited to depicting direct capital improvement costs.

### **Transportation:**

Blueprint transportation projections begin with “Operating and maintaining our Existing infrastructure”; which includes 75% of transportation revenues. This ostensibly takes what has been a one of our most significant problems for 50

years, and moves it forward in time another 30 years. Operating and maintaining, if it means to you what it means to me, is a catchphrase for meeting and extending the ongoing financial needs and practices of existing interrelated economic entities, both public and private; guaranteeing continuity of past practices, by default, in every other Plan area. By committing to these economics, both the incomes and expenditures, it predetermines our capacity for change.

It seems impossible that we can continue doing what we have been doing, and expect different results. I am suggesting that auto commuting be placed on an attenuation schedule. This will involve major economic changes which need to be faced squarely. The fact is we can't have it both ways. The economic momentum of single auto commuting is powerful, and can continue to thwart evolutionary transportation progress from benefitting all of us.

Automobile commuting has not worked since the 50's, despite extraordinary financial contributions. We continue to believe, somehow, after 60 years, that we can "fix" the auto commute, which is restrained by the holding capability of the destinations. Our commute can only be fixed by removing cars and a commitment to fully funding viable alternatives. There are too many of us in cars now, imagine 10.5 million of us in cars. Why does The Plan not only fail to recognize; but in fact empowers the continuity of this core issue?

This is at the core of our double-bind; are we attempting to pull enough funds and usability from a broken system to create an alternative? In doing so do we fund and perpetuate the broken system?

Elon Musk for example is close to demonstrating his Hyperloop system; so we should be circumspect in our declaration that we will "Operate and Maintain" a transportation system that is already obsolete, as a prominent feature of a 30 year Regional plan.

In the "Connected" section of "Equity and Performance Outcomes"; the net costs of maintaining this system as is where is, show little improvement for auto transportation by 2050. If that is true, then public transportation should offer a more compelling alternative, however busing also fails to improve for CoC

residents under the Blueprint. I suggest that existing transportation, public or private, be held to the same criteria as all other 2050 Plan goals. If it doesn't work, we need to change it.

A thoughtful review of California State Law, in SB100; brings to question what collaboration The Plan is providing. There is no room for neutrality. There are five oil refineries in our midst, going as far back to the late 1800's. They use our Bay as a port for crude oil, and our air to carry their effluent away. It is time to make the tough decision, and over the next 30 years, to decertify, decommission, disassemble, and remove them. We will have a number of positive uses for the dirt under them.

The public has no inherent obligation to subsidize the ongoing financial needs of private facilities, oil refineries, car and truck manufacturers, and financial institutions making auto loans, the auto insurance industry, auto and truck maintenance facilities, parts manufacturers; as well as taxes and fees supporting the Federal, State, and Local governments. It is an economy that is, by your own admission, preying on our population.

I believe we are obligated to portray solutions. The unsustainable dream of the single automobile commute has long been swallowed whole by the financial and societal costs. Successful cultures are now reclaiming their streets, their neighborhoods, and their cities. Truth is, the one single way to create the "healthier and safer streets" mentioned in the MTC video, is by reducing automobile traffic on them.

With the projected number of people in motion each day, I suggest we refocus on fast, efficient, and convenient, multi-modal Bay Area wide mass transportation for everyone. We recognized this in the 60's, yet we have never adequately funded our realization. Resolving this can include enabling BART; providing wheeled trains using dedicated freeway lanes, added ferries, decentralization of jobs, a major reduction in private vehicles, and other intermodal transit alternatives. New York used off-hour subway cars for freight transportation, for example, to remove trucks from their daytime freeways.

Under the “Affordable” Section of Equity and Outcomes; calculations are presented regarding auto transportation for low income households. It is previously established that H+T cost for low income households is already unsustainable. Thirty years from now the Plan proposes that these households will still pay very nearly twice the percentage of their income as All Households. Why is this? These are extraordinary costs for everyone. The cost of maintaining our present transportation system is not justifiable, and certainly not considering all hidden societal costs.

My margin notes on page 3 of the Equity and Performance Outcomes; for the “Connected” and “Diverse” goals; essentially repeat the phrase “Let’s fix this.” This is supposed to be a Blueprint. This is especially true of the projected Peak-Hour Travel Times. We can do better than this. True of the overcrowding of transit vehicles; let’s not accept this outcome! Let’s Blueprint a plan that requires us to overcome these conditions. Our lives will be no better than the transportation we plan and build for ourselves.

It is also hard to accept that the “Daily PM2.5 emissions will continue as projected. California State SB100 represents a commitment to end fossil fuel use by 2050. We need to consider this commitment in our assumptions. There has been tremendous legislative progress since 2015, which we cannot ignore in projecting the next 30 years.

The redevelopment of some office buildings to residential use based on remote work due to the pandemic, could permanently affect traffic, and help recover cities from dominance by business and the automobile. If this situation goes deep, it could impel us to revisit our freeway system costs verses usage. Municipal governments will need to prepare to move decisively and rezone and entitle appropriate buildings from commercial to residential use.

We need the opinions of world-class experts in several applicable fields to regularly look at The Plan objectively.

## **Housing:**

The Bay area is constrained by water, mountains, and two major peninsulas. Added to that, sea levels are rising. Additionally, we are stating that we intend to protect conservation lands while increasing population, affordable housing and commerce. These factors compound our present land constraints. Essentially; our land area is shrinking by a combination of sea level rise, environmental preservation, and our growth. Something has to give.

Given these factors, it is nearly impossible for many municipalities to grow solely within existing jurisdictional limits. With less land and more people some counties and cities will experience the limitations and hard costs of sea level rise more than others. It should be noted that The Plan, though involving nine counties, focuses almost entirely on the portions of those counties closest to the Bay.

Some of the best solutions to our most pressing problems over the coming 30 years may include the outer reaches of these counties with a combination of remote workers, decentralization of jobs and housing, and ultra-high speed fiber optic networks. We have the potential of uncoupling the seemingly inescapable local housing and transportation issues by decentralizing. If we don't do it purposefully; traffic jams, crowding, sea level rise and the shear economic difficulties of life in the Bay Area may force unplanned change upon us. This would not be pretty.

In addition to decentralization, one affordable housing possibility would be to establish a number of houseboat marinas strategically around the bay. Since these communities are floating, their location can be easily adjusted with sea level rise. They are unlikely to flood. They can provide proven long term affordable housing by avoiding the cost of the land. We could provide a significant number of residences with this model. Sausalito and Oakland have proven that this works; establishing attractive houseboat communities adjacent to commercial and industrial transition areas.

In terms of conventional construction, would it be better to accept the reality of sea level rise and build at a higher elevation over the next hundred years; rather



than rebuild every 25 years? Each successive wave of inundated development will have to be demolished and remediated, in addition to the loss of a portion of its useful life.

The Plan needs to incorporate other positive lessons we are experiencing from Coronavirus. Our skies became clear, traffic snarls went away, noise levels reduced, our wildlife expanded, and we had more time for ourselves and our families. What has the Coronavirus taught us about our potentials in addition to its limitations?

Most governing entities have such stringent requirements for new residential development, that proposed affordable housing ends up being full custom projects; the most expensive, and therefore exclusive, type of new construction. These are in turn subsidized with our taxes, since there is no affordable housing in actuality, only subsidized housing. Without collaborative regional affordable housing efforts between major industries and municipalities; all three may suffer.

The Plan proposes funding affordable housing. We do not have affordable housing. Not in its construction, in the cost of its land, in its municipal fees, in its infrastructure, in its financing. We have subsidized housing. To make the best use of the proposed funding; I encourage looking at what our codes, regulations, ordinances, and entitlements require of housing construction. This is the core of its expense. Planning Departments set up competition for land between the highest bidders. This never includes affordable projects, so we must subsidize them. This process is the equivalent of redlining; which was the systematic exclusion of certain citizens from certain areas by lenders.

The most obvious solution would be for each commercial development to include specific and equivalent residential solutions. Cities should not approve corporate development without physically accommodating equivalent housing. This forebodes a collision with the environmental protections envisioned in the Blueprint. With rising sea levels on the one side, and a combination of protected land and steeper hillsides on the other; we are on our way toward looking like Hong Kong, a vertical city. We require thirty to 50 years of planning under the circumstances, not five; otherwise provisional decisions are likely to be made.

We are in earthquake country. Previously I recalled emphasis on sustainability and resilience as guiding principles for The Plan. Residential towers can be a problem in a major earthquake. Structural damage; broken windows; failed elevators and utility systems can make them uninhabitable. It is a feature of almost every dystopian novel.

The pandemic, and resulting remote work force, may offer opportunities such as changing the profile of commercial office uses. There may well be some office space coming on the market, since some corporations are realizing they have no need to sponsor extensive on site offices. There may be some shuffling in the commercial real estate market, potentially allowing for selective residential conversion beyond aged shopping malls.

Without egalitarian planning and zoning, there can be no affordable housing. This obviously includes transportation planning. No affordable housing should be built anywhere around the Bay Area in a location that is projected to be inundated by rising sea levels and storm surge at any time during its natural projected useful life. We do not fulfill our affordable housing responsibilities by building in the path of rising floodwaters and storm surge. The same should hold true of any public improvements. We should decide flatly to pay for development only one time during the projected life of any public improvement.

This certainly colors our responsibilities regarding growth. I previously suggested establishing an agreed elevation encircling the Bay, representing the projected future water line on a year certain. The life cycle of any improvements having public impacts should site the useful life of those improvements in relation to the datum line; assuring the public, finance, insurance, and real estate markets, buyers and sellers, that they are getting their money's worth, and that their investment will not likely be flooded before its time is up.

### **Economy:**

Coronavirus will be with us for some years yet. It has the potential of infecting half of our population, and killing 5 million of us nationally. We should make provisions for the economic downside at least in the first phases of The Plan. I

agree that most infrastructure plans expect economic vicissitudes during the project schedule. This is different. Federal, State, County, and municipal budgets and businesses will be struggling for some time; not to mention workers and their families. Economic growth will be severely impacted for an extended period of time. This means tax revenues will most likely not provide the wherewithal to support many of the early Plan projections. Our societal fabric is disrupted. Post-pandemic we may struggle to find workers with specific skillsets. All areas of human interaction are affected. We cannot continue “as though” this were not a factor. We now need to develop an unfolding grounded, comprehensive Plan B startup based on our real situation.

The MTC video on the Blueprint appears to have very few concrete steps under the category of the economy. It is obvious in the Transportation and Housing categories that there are profound economic barriers for the majority of Bay Area residents; so our primary need is to remove barriers to economic vitality. The solutions offered in the Blueprint do not appear substantial enough to make a difference. We have the “local economy”, and the “global economy”. The local economy requires the participation of all of us to create vitality. We engage the global economy with unique products and services that attract high levels of compensation.

The tissue and sinew between jobs, transportation, housing and “diverse, healthy and vibrant” communities in the coming years; as well as sustainability and resiliency; is founded in a living wage. Without the ability to function as an economic unit, family integrity cannot survive the coming 30 years. Without family integrity, there cannot be community and cultural integrity. The connection that must be made is a shared understanding of economics between businesses and the lives of their employees. There is a formula to living in the Bay Area that cannot be pressed down below a certain point, where the basic costs of functioning collapse; and the only solution is to leave a game that does not work. When enough key pieces go missing, the cultural thread is lost; and the knowledge resting in our workers. The local economy requires workers to be compensated at a rate to allow them to participate; in the housing market, in commerce, in entertainment, in our cultural life. Land and houses cannot just be

for those directly associated with the global economy. That will create a divided society that will cease to work together. Obviously, these issues need to be corrected to have a vital local economy.

We should take a hard look at the areas in The Plan, where in fact government is required to compensate for the lack of a living wage not being paid by employers. When I speak of decentralizing the Bay Area from the core areas of its nine counties, I am addressing functionality which already exists and is necessary for the Bay Area to continue to function as it does now.

Exurban communities in the outer reaches of counties create opportunities for a Bay Area that cannot presently house and transport the people it desperately needs to operate. Investment in our outlying communities with physical and virtual connections to the Metropolitan Bay Area will solve problems only to the extent that they don't require overwhelmed commute options to do so.

Outlying communities share a number of advantages. They can provide housing that is more affordable and attainable. Local driving and parking is easier, or even unnecessary. The natural world is close at hand. There are copious sources for fresh foods. They are safer. There is a sense of community with ones neighbors and agencies. They are healthier for families. We should not allow corporate development to dominate Bay Area quality of life.

Remote work can also enable a transition that lowers employee costs, removes vehicles from the commute, lowers business fixed real estate costs, clears the air, and supports healthier families that participate more in their communities. This change can help solve a lot of societal conflicts.

The Coronavirus is showing us how rapidly we can change positively and effectively; so cities can embrace and benefit from the participation of a remote workforce without having to accommodate the real estate, traffic and transportation costs. There are compelling exchanges. It appears that a growing Bay Area population facing rising sea levels will inevitably need to expand horizontally to function as the vibrant, healthy, and diverse web of communities

described in The Plan. Decentralization can help free urban Bay Area impediments to that.

Periodic flooding will precede inundation; eventually leaving properties uninsurable and uninhabitable. The question emerges as to whether The Plan accounts for the potential net outmigration of residents from the Bay Area, who have been displaced by sea level rise primarily affecting low income residents. How, when and where will these losses be replaced? Where can seawater be pumped to clear flooding? What would be the timing for replacement, when entitlements for new construction can commonly take two to three years before the first shovel of dirt is turned.

Progressively, as in Florida; insurance for floodwater damage in low lying neighborhoods and commercial properties will vanish. Without insurance there are no mortgages available; so it appears that many affected properties will become derelict before actual inundation. How does the Blueprint account for the effects of losing property tax revenues from areas blighted by sea level rise? Who will be contractually responsible for the demolition, removal and remediation associated with abandoned flooded improvements? Ideally these will not be the public; although they will shoulder the costs for remediation of public improvements. Should we abandon in place underground improvements to flooded commercial and residential properties, or remove and remediate them?

Dikes will be proposed and built. There is the potential for the Bay shore to begin to resemble a series of medieval forts, but even they will endure only temporarily in the face of sea level rise. We are discussing areas with soils subject to liquefaction and earthquakes. This raises the question, if sea level rise is relentless, should we build dikes that will eventually be overrun; create an unsightly shoreline, wall us off from the Bay and each other, and damage the ecosystem; or should we spend less money on a planned, long range strategic retreat instead? How many dollars should we spend, over time, fighting the inevitable? Is this topic about housing, the economy, or the environment? These begin to converge when we speak of sea level rise. Dikes represent a vainglorious

effort to transfer the impending costs of sea level rise on a particular property or project, to others, in the future. How can these ill effects be prevented?

Given the length of our Bay shoreline; shouldn't we consider a comprehensive plan, so that decisions by some properties do not affect the value of their neighbors? Let's have environmental planners from the Netherlands review and comment on The Plan. They have a 200 year plan for sea level rise, verses our 30 year plan. In some areas, much of the commercial development is adjacent to the Bay. Where do these go when they can no longer function behind dikes? The same is true for many sewage treatment facilities. What is the effect of depending on a system of dikes in earthquake prone areas, where soils are subject to liquefaction? Our primary goal is to creatively "break the box" we are in. Each dollar will have to be spent in a way that assures its effects endure. This is a whole new ball game.

A child born today will be 30 years old in 2050. We need to think about the Bay Area he or she will be living in. What essential responsibilities fulfill the promises of The Plan in substance rather than form for these future families?

### **Environment:**

In the coming decades, the environment has the potential to take more from Bay Area residents than it provides. The Plan projects only 2' of sea level rise. Most entities studying this use an increase in mean sea level, MSL, to identify increases in average water level. Most knowledgeable studies clarify their MSL calculation by adding storm surge, averaging one foot additional, and king tides, which can add another foot or more to that. This would put the extremely conservative 2' sea level rise between now and 2050 at 4' minimum. In this area, it is important to err on the side of caution. The costs of getting it wrong are very high.

Our commitment to the environment should include the health of our Bay. As mentioned above, extensive sea walls to preserve infrastructure, housing or commercial development will progressively change the nature of the Bay because estuaries and shallow waters will be progressively sacrificed. Sea walls have the same effect as bay fill did; turning shallow water into deeper water.

One valid strategy suggested by SFEI and SPUR is to “let Bay waters reclaim undeveloped areas”. This seems a logical initial step. Since the Plan only covers 30 years, nothing now built Bayside will reach its complete lifecycle before even periodic flooding starts. Periodic flooding precedes actual inundation. I agree with their statement that “the BCDC needs to make the tough political calls now.”

Generally efforts to preserve our environment could parallel improving air quality; reduced auto traffic; converting commercial office buildings to residential rather than building on new land, and more landscaping. I believe integrating housing and open space makes it more accessible than getting in a car and “driving to the environment”. Ideally, our natural environment is integrated more into our daily lives. If provisions are not made to specifically preserve or integrate these areas in development, as policy, they are likely to be swallowed up by the future “built environment”.

The Bay Area will become hotter, drier as well as more populated. Reducing the shear area of pavement and adding trees can in and of itself positively transform our environment. It can also reduce the projected need for air conditioning, which further heats the environment.

## **Summary of Potential Solutions for PBA 2050 Blueprint**

### **Transportation:**

1. Outline specific commitments to parallel State of California efforts under SB100, to eliminate fossil fuels by 2050.
2. Commit to progressively eliminate auto commute in favor of multi-modal public transportation. We have to choose which is to be primary.
3. Consider the addition of “wheeled trains” in dedicated freeway lanes as automobile use diminishes.
4. Eliminate unnecessary roadways to uncover useable ground and reduce atmospheric heating.
5. Re-allocate transportation funds from roadways to public transportation.
6. Incentivize Neighborhood Electric Vehicles; allowed under California for local streets, 25 mph maximum. Long distance cars can be rented on an as

needed basis for trips. Fees should progressively discourage auto commuting.

7. Adjust projected Sea Level used in PBA 2050 to minimum of 4', preferably more; based on increased global heating, runaway methane gas emissions, polar ice melting, and resultant increase in sea level rise. Note that some claim 6' is the proper number.
8. Reconsider, review, and confirm that features to make Bay Area more resilient and sustainable are ubiquitous throughout The Plan.
9. Seriously consider sponsorship of extended nine County Ultra High Speed optical cable network to promote Decentralization.
10. Make active decentralization of businesses a key feature of The Plan, to reduce traffic loads, improve family life, community strength, sustainability and resilience.
11. Consider alternate times, modes of freight hauling on public roadways.
12. Incentivize removal of internal combustion transportation; public, private, and commercial.
13. The weekday BART parking lots are full by 6:30, preventing convenient daytime use. This also prevents business from choosing different hours, including BART to relieve traffic.

### **Economy:**

1. Consider effects on business taxation of remote work, potential reduction in commercial use of office towers.
2. Consider the economic effects of reduced real estate costs to businesses.
3. Consider the economic effects of reducing employee uncompensated costs of employment; commute, parking, auto expenses, etc.
4. Consider encouraging decentralization of R&D operations.
5. Consider the effects of incentivizing fisheries.
6. Consider incentivizing urban agriculture to increase resilience.
7. Consider the effects of rezoning and renovating excess office building use to residential use, to encourage resilience and sustainability, culture and reclamation of the Cities for residents.



8. Consider the progressive decommissioning of oil refineries and oceangoing oil docking facilities, including mitigation of the sites for residential, commercial, or open space, as a function of California commitment to end fossil fuel use within the timeframe of The Plan.
9. Continue and promote a Bay Area initiative to progressively halt the use of natural gas in favor of resilience and sustainability.
10. Promote a living wage floor in the Bay Area that effectively meets the cost of living here.

### **Housing:**

1. Consider potential availability of unused commercial office building to convert into residential use.
2. Encourage establishment new towns well outside the primary Bay Area metroplex, to encourage decentralization of housing and jobs; lower housing costs, reduced traffic, and increase resilience and sustainability.
3. Support and encourage the conversion of appropriate commercial buildings into residential uses, to eliminate traffic, reclaim our cities for residential uses, reduce pollution, and create affordable housing alternatives near work.
4. Design and encourage some houseboat marinas around bay, as an alternative to affordable housing on land; and resilience against sea level.
5. Consider coexistence of farming and housing communities.
6. Reclaim abandoned freeway right-of-way for housing, parks, food production, bikeways, etc.
7. Promote the recovery of cities and their streets for people, over traffic, parking congestion.
8. Maintain focus on sustainability and resilience in communities, transportation, fire, police and medical services, utilities, and alternate transportation modalities.
9. Press for actual affordable housing in the codes, planning, zoning, and entitlements; in addition to subsidized housing.
10. Solve housing needs as regional, rather than a local, concerns; formulating regional solutions.

## **Environment:**

1. The progressive reduction and elimination of internal combustion engines will be seen as the healthiest single improvement to our environment.
2. Consider the importance of effective project management as a key integral aspect of The Plan. This should involve integrity in adherence to the budget and schedule, the design perimeters, specifications and scopes of work.
3. Any open space we now take for granted will be used for residential or commercial uses going forward unless designated otherwise. Encourage the planning and designation of open space now.
4. We should progressively cease refining oil in the Bay Area. It is a 120 year old vestigial industrial artifact that is incompatible with an extended metropolitan area of 8.5 million people. We should not refine gasoline here for shipment elsewhere. As fossil fuels use is diminished, Bay Area refineries should be closed, dismantled, and remediated.
5. We should progressively tax commuting automobiles and trucks at the real societal impacts of their use, and forward the proceeds for public transportation, with a plan for attenuating their use on highways. For example, the reason internal combustions cars, trucks and commercial airlines are profitable to operate, is they are not responsible for cleaning up the atmospheric pollution they create.
6. We are told we cannot regulate the pollution that aircraft create at ground level in the Bay Area “because they operate under Federal law.” Automobiles that created smog in California also used to operate exclusively under Federal law. We changed that. Consider changing the laws that allow aircraft to pollute our immediate surroundings? The greatest aircraft pollution occurs on takeoff.