

From: [Mick Klasson](#)
To: CAPTI@CalSta
Subject: Comments on public draft CAPTI
Date: Friday, April 30, 2021 5:35:21 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure. My comments follow:

Action S2.4 - increasing funding for the Active Transportation Program – I applaud this action.

Action S3.1 – establishing a transportation equity and environmental justice advisory committee in itself does not assure an increase in equity or justice. There should be specific targets in terms of how many low income and BIPOC communities are reached, how many get assistance in promoting their needs in state transportation activities, and how many projects of importance to them get funded and built. Then progress towards the targets needs to be measured and reported until the targets are actually met.

Action S3.2 should include helping low income and BIPOC communities create project concepts in advance of grant solicitations so that they are sufficiently developed to compete. They should get assistance in completing the application process.

Action S3.3 – As with Action S3.1, there should be more concrete measures of success in terms of adoption and implementation of the best practices, not just identifying them.

Actions S3.3 -- there should be easily found links on state transportation agency websites for individuals to sign up for e-notification of transportation projects of interest to them (in their area, related to travel modes of interest to them, etc.). For example, the Caltrans Active Transportation Program website should be kept current. At present, the last meeting that it lists was from February 13, 2020. Not only should the results of recent past meeting be posted, but there should also be information for upcoming meetings, including the date, which should be known as of the close of the previous meeting, agenda items and staff reports, and location and video streaming links for participation. The website still lists that the ATP-TAC Org chart is currently being updated, even though the meeting minutes from 2/13/2020 state that the org chart was already updated. The updated chart should be immediately available on the web site.

Action S4.3 – 3rd bullet “[SHSMP} update will include following approaches or considerations, at a minimum...” – these sound nice, but it’s unclear how “considerations” will translate into actual improvements on the ground.

Action S4.4 – this is a good action, especially the second bullet requiring corridor planning to prioritize sustainable multimodal investments. This should go further and state that:

- No state projects should be permitted creating barriers to transit and active transportation modes. Substantial work on existing state infrastructure that does create barriers should include eliminating or reducing those barriers, and address barriers on adjoining or impacted local roads. Examples are freeway overpasses in Sacramento creating deadly challenges for cyclists. Ped/bike alternatives should be inviting and safe. Where ADA requirements create long ramps, stairway alternatives should be created as well if they can reduce travel distances to obvious roads/destinations/origin points.
- Protecting the lives of people engaging in active transportation should be more important than maintaining or improving vehicle speeds on state infrastructure.
- State transportation projects should include ways to avoid diversion of drivers off state routes and onto local routes to avoid freeway congestion, thus creating hazards for active transportation on the local routes.

- State transportation projects should analyze and address how additional lanes induce traffic rather than reducing congestion.
- Every time a major vehicle transportation project is undertaken, a portion of the investment should be committed to creating or improving alternative travel modes along the same reach of the transportation system.

Action S6.2 – the equity impacts roadway pricing schemes should be evaluated, and if possible, mitigated (for example, a statewide tax credit for transportation that phases out in middle incomes).

Action S6.2 – roadway maintenance fees charged per vehicle mile, if not based on gas consumption, should reflect the weight of the vehicle. Since road damage is related to the fourth power of vehicle weight, a pickup that weighs 50% more than my car should be paying 5 times as much for road maintenance.

Cordially,

Mick Klasson