

TA

CORRESPONDENCE

as of 11-03-2023

From: [Giuliano](#)
To: [Board \(@smcta.com\)](mailto:Board (@smcta.com))
Subject: My comments from tonight
Date: Thursday, November 2, 2023 7:47:20 PM

You don't often get email from giuliano@carlini.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

So, it's got to be pretty clear that I don't feel comfy with public speaking. I missed a few of the important points from my written notes. I've appended them in their entirety, but include below the most important bits I sure wish I had said. These are not public comments or anything like that. Just my comments that I hope will mean something to y'all.

My single most important comment on the 101 managed lane project. And I forgot to say it! Argh!!!

I hope that each of you individually, at some point soon, make clear to C/CAG and staff that if this project returns recommending an additional lane that you will oppose the project. And, if it does return with an extra lane that you do reject it. This will not kill the project. You can give guidance at that time for which option(s) you will support, and the project can be brought back.

The *US 101/SR 92 INTERCHANGE BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS* asserts that these lane additions will add no VMT. Nowhere does the BCA describe why adding these lanes will not add VMT. It simply asserts they will not. But that makes no sense. Like the movie said, "If you build it they will come".

More lanes is more space for cars. More cars means more VMT. We know this with utter certainty, we have 60 years experience doing so. That traffic comes from streets before getting on the interchange is ... the same as every other freeway project before it. Insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results. Please, when this project comes back, direct staff to rework the project to keep the beneficial elements but remove the lane additions.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7028813/#:~:text=In%20fact%2C%20many%20features%20of,the%20city%20of%20Manchester%2C%20England.>

<https://www.gov.ca.gov/2022/11/16/california-releases-worlds-first-plan-to-achieve-net-zero-carbon-pollution/>

<https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10315>

101 managed lane

While the current tolling model is not perfect, that can be fixed. But an extra lane should be a poison pill. An extra lane would induce up to 25% more VMT. We need to be reducing VMT, not increasing it. Starting now.

giuliano

My written comments in their entirety ...

Unagendized Comments

Hi All,

Firstly, Thank you! I'm very pleased to have heard that you added an additional step for TA Board review of the 101 managed lane project.

On the flip side, I'm disappointed that you accepted the 92/101 widening project as is. It has a lot of safety improvements to recommend. Unfortunately, 3 of this project's 4 elements add lanes.

The *US 101/SR 92 INTERCHANGE BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS* asserts that these lane additions will add no VMT. Nowhere does the BCA describe why adding these lanes will not add VMT. It simply asserts they will not. But that makes no sense. Like the movie said, "If you build it they will come".

More lanes is more space for cars. More cars means more VMT. We know this with utter certainty, we have 60 years experience doing so. Insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results. Please, when this project comes back, direct staff to rework the project to keep the beneficial elements but remove the lane additions.

Okay, so why is it necessary to reduce VMT and therefore the lane additions? There are many reasons. Climate change, public health, DEI, and a host of others. But tonight I'll focus on just climate change.

I hope we all agree that climate change is real, that it is caused primarily by GHGs, that traffic is a major source of GHG emissions, and that we must make changes to stop it. And that we must do so now. Not doing so will create a hellscape for our children, grandchildren, and their children and grandchildren. The State of California's Air Resources Board has said that as a start we must reduce VMT by 25% below 1990 levels by 2030. That's below 1990 levels which are 30% below current levels. [2.12T miles in 1990 vs 3.26T miles today]. There's no way we can reach these targets in 2030 unless we start now. Right now. With this project and every one following.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7028813/#:~:text=In%20fact%2C%20many%20features%20of,the%20city%20of%20Manchester%2C%20England.>

<https://www.gov.ca.gov/2022/11/16/california-releases-worlds-first-plan-to-achieve-net-zero-carbon-pollution/>

<https://afdc.energy.gov/data/10315>

101 managed lane

Hi all, again I'm speaking only for myself.

I'm so happy to hear that newer projects are moving to better cycling infrastructure, protected lanes, rather than painted lines or pictures of bikes.

With the additional review step, I now support moving forward on 101 managed lane project now. Putting in place the elements needed to reduce demand through tolls is great. While the current tolling model is not perfect, that can be fixed. But an extra lane should be a poison pill. An extra lane would induce up to 25% more VMT. We need to be reducing VMT, not increasing it. Starting now.

I hope that each of you individually, at some point soon, make clear to C/CAG and staff that if this project returns recommending an additional lane that you will oppose the project. And, if it does return with an extra lane that you do reject it. This will not kill the project. You can give guidance at that time for which option(s) you will support, and the project can be brought back.

We must reduce GHGs. Starting now! And, we can do it. We have reduced the release of harmful chemicals into the environment before. Back in the 1980s and 90s the world suffered other significant threats: acid rain and the destruction of the ozone layer. Acid rain would acidify lakes, oceans and the soil, killing trees that generate oxygen and the micro flora and fauna that are needed to sustain all larger life forms. The ozone layer protects all life on earth from radiation. Vested interests denied this was happening, denied they were caused by people, denied we could do anything about it, or denied that we could fix these economically. They were wrong. We did something about these. We fixed them. These threats have been substantially mitigated.

We can, we must do the same with GHGs. To do that we have to reduce VMT. And we have to start now. With this project and every project that follows.