From: **Dustin Foster**
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 12:40 PM
To: ctp2040@DOT
Subject: CTP2040 30-day Public Review Period 02/29/16 - 03/29/16 Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dustin Foster on March 21st, 2016 at 12:39PM (PDT).

firstname: Dustin
lastname: Foster
city: Redlands
state: CA
comments: Overall, I support the multi-modal direction that the State must embark upon to ensure we meet legislative mandates and environmental, safety and health goals in the future. Along these lines, the construction and maintenance of bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks will be pivotal in helping us meet these goals. The traditional response of Caltrans, to widen freeways, should now be scrutinized more heavily, given Susan Handy's recent publication, Increasing Highway Capacity Unlikely to Relieve Traffic Congestion (http://www.dot.ca.gov/research/researchreports/reports/2015/10-12-2015-NCST_Brief_InducedTravel_CS6_v3.pdf). Jeff Tumlin's recent lecture on Lessons from LOS Reform (found here: http://svgcstream01.dot.ca.gov/webcast/vod/training/vod_training.asp) also provides a critical analysis of the infrastructure we have built to mitigate level of service. These two critiques taken together, the best way for our state the make more effective use of our transpor!
tation investments is to create the most space and energy efficient use of our state highway system facilities. AN acknowledgement of these two expert analyses should be included in the document, perhaps in CHapter 2's section on the State Highway System.

This plan should therefore suggest utilizing freeway and highway right of way for such transportation modes as light rail transit, bus rapid transit, and bike paths (on freeways)/protected bike lanes (on highways) as methods to reduce greenhouse gases, mitigate congestion, and provide modal choice. Perhaps most importantly, in conjunction with providing complete multi-modal transportation facilities, this plan should strongly promote Goal 5: Foster Livable and Healthy Communities and Promote Social Equity". Communities oriented around cycling, walking and transit have higher densities, which reduces VMT trips, our per capita emissions, and often include public green space and affordable housing. These are the communities we should be building in the future, and they follow state policy- namely, SB 375 and SB 743.

I wish to critique language within both the Preface and Chapter 2 which suggests that "the state's shift to using public transit has been too sluggish". The author should provide data to support these claims, as they sound like a normative, rather than positive, analysis of our situation. I couldn't disagree more with this language, as it fails to acknowledge the integration between land use and public transportation that has been disregarded given suburban sprawl development and LOS metrics. It also fails to acknowledge that Los Angeles has the second highest-patronized bus and light rail systems in the nation; and the San Francisco BART is the fifth highest patronized heavy rail system in the nation.

Comparing national transit ridership over the past 30 years, it is apparent that although ridership was highest in the mid-1980's, it increased nearly every year between 1990 and 2014, a year which had the highest transit ridership in 58 years (http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2015/pages/150309_ridership.aspx). Los Angeles Metro also had a banner year in 2014 (https://www.metrotransit.org/metro-transit-2014-ridership-is-highest-in-more-than-three-

decades). Interestingly, 2015 did see a decrease in ridership, although it is difficult to understand the trends looking from one year out. One explanation for this dip may indeed be explained by low gas prices and a strong economy, but it is apparent that in the future, gas prices will continue to rise due to global demand. Inevitably, public transportation will one day be the only option for a higher proportion of Americans than the current transit-dependent population- and the State of California must lead the nation!
in developing a high quality integrated system to make this a reality. Los Angeles Metro is currently handling the largest capital rail expansion in the nation, a long-term investment that will greatly impact the modal choices of future Angelenos. Pairing these investments with high density, mixed-use, walkable and bikable communities would be the smartest way to make the best use of these investments, stimulate development and reduce our impact on climate change.

Due to this, the language surrounding public transportation in the CTP 2040 should be more aspirational and forward-looking than normative and dismissive. Our funding of public transportation should be much higher as well. In the executive summary, the goal to "Improve Transit" should not solely focus on the California High Speed Rail Authority, but rather the local and regional transit options that will support it and feature a much higher proportion of trips.

I will now move to a discussion of our State's roads and streets. In page 51, the text states "these sustainable, integrated corridors serve not only for conveyance of people, goods and services, but also as livable public spaces". It is unclear to me whether you are discussing an existing condition or a vision of future roads and streets. To be frank, a majority of major roads in Southern California fail to provide sustainable and integrated options for cyclists, pedestrians and transit riders. Most major roads are designed to a highway standard that is clearly unsafe for all road users, as they permit automobile drivers to drive at dangerous speeds with minimal separation between them and our road's most vulnerable road users- pedestrians and cyclists. Many of the roads in the Inland Empire, the goods movement and logistic hub for the nation, are designed to cater to our roads least vulnerable user- trucks- further exacerbating and sacrificing the safety needs of pedestria!
ns and cyclists. Further, many folks within Caltrans fail to acknowledge a street's or community's aspiration to create a street that is a livable public space due to the LOS standard. An internal, mental evolution needs to occur where we look at roads not just as a conveyance for automobiles, but as a public space that aids a community in meeting a number of transportation, livability and economic goals.

In order to accomplish a goal of providing such corridors, we need to seriously address Complete Streets within every single major roadway in the State. This could be done most cost-effectively by implementing road diets that provide additional space for sidewalk extensions, protected bike lanes, bus rapid transit, or light rail transit, based upon the context of the roadway in question. As a lifestyle cyclist, I also must state the importance of protected/separated bike lane implementation across the state, as a necessary component of making our streets safer for all road users. The fact that this innovation was not mentioned once within the CTP 2040 text shows that this solution is not being given the level of attention it deserves. Studies on separated bike lanes have proven success in reducing collision rates, increasing bicycling greatly, improving LOS, and stimulating economic activity. Due to our Strategic Management Plan goals of tripling bicycling by 2020, CTP 2040 !
must include a section on separated bike lanes. Here are some links for further information: 1.
http://m.motherjones.com/environment/2014/09/adding-bike-lanes-reduces-traffic-delays-new-york-city
2. http://www.streetsblog.net/2016/02/08/new-evidence-that-protected-bike-lanes-get-people-cycling-more/
3.
https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/separated_bikelane_pdg/separatedbikelane_pdg_appendix.pdf

ALl of these critiques are perhaps most glaringly apparent in Chapter 3: Modeling Theoretical Transportation Scenarios. It is apparent that an aggressive vehicle fuels efficiency approach (Scenario 3) was analyzed and showed some promising results. However, a more aggressive transit-oriented, sustainable communities approach was not analyzed. Scenario 3 appears to be a status-quo approach, as it would therefore allow cities to continue to develop sprawling, automobile-oriented communities that increase significantly impacted habitats and fail to help us to meet our goals. It is

disappointing that the State would not at least analyze a sustainable communities approach to compare and contrast the results of this analysis with those found in Scenario 3.

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to comment on the CTP 2040. It does appear to be a clear upgrade to the way transportation planning has been done in the past- so Caltrans deserves a deal of credit for moving in the right direction. However, the glaring missteps highlighted above show that it is still a work in progress and could use stronger language, policies, and enforcement in order to impact the true implementation of a state-wide multi-modal transportation system.

submit: Submit Comments