

Memorandum

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: May 12-13, 2021

From: MITCH WEISS, Executive Director

Reference Number: 4.3, Information - **REVISED**

Prepared By: Matthew Yosgott
Deputy Director, SB 1 Programming

Published Date: May 7, 2021

Subject: Update on Commission Workshops on the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure

Replacement Item Change:

The April 30, 2021 version of this item is being replaced to reflect the following:

1. A "Summary of Comments Received" section has been included below to provide a high-level summary of common themes heard during the two CTC-hosted CAPTI workshops.
2. Additional information has been added to the Background section.
3. Two new attachments have been added:
 - a. Attachment A – A list of comments received during the two CTC-hosted CAPTI workshops
 - b. Attachment B - Comment letters received following the CTC-hosted CAPTI workshops

Summary:

At the March 24, 2021 Commission Meeting, Commission staff were directed to hold two public workshops to discuss the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI). As a result of that direction, Commission staff held public workshops on April 20, 2021 and April 23, 2021 to cover the proposed implementation of the CAPTI and each of its seven draft strategies. The workshops served as a forum to collect comments on the draft CAPTI document and provide answers to specific questions. A summary of comments received during the workshops will be made available prior to the Commission meeting. The public comment period ends on May 19, 2021.

Summary of Comments Received:

The two workshops were attended by a diverse set of participants representing advocacy organizations, nonprofit organizations, private industry, labor organizations, public agencies, and members of the public from nearly every geographic region of the state. Approximately 225 people participated in the first workshop on April 20th and roughly 170 participated in the second workshop on April 23rd.

Approximately 40 individuals, representing a wide range of interests, provided comments during the workshops. Public comments were made verbally during each workshop, and each of the comments spanned between support and opposition of the CAPTI. Many commenters provided observations regarding the CAPTI development process as well as feedback on specific strategies within the CAPTI. The following items are a high-level summary of common themes among the comments received:

- The CAPTI should preserve the intent of SB 1 and its outline for funding initiatives.
- The CAPTI development did not sufficiently involve stakeholders representing labor and business.
- There is a desire for representation on CAPTI implementation workgroups to include more than just state agency representatives.
- CAPTI should further consider the differences between the needs of urban, rural, and suburban regions in the state and offer varied approaches.
- The CAPTI is a good starting point to address climate change in transportation funding, but it needs to go further and is the “bare minimum” action that should be taken.
- The CAPTI outlines equity well but equity needs to be further embedded in California’s transportation funding decisions.

The full list of comments received during the two Commission-hosted workshops is included in Attachment A.

Background:

Executive Order N-19-19 calls for CalSTA in coordination with the Department of Finance to:

- a) Align the state’s climate goals with transportation spending on planning, programming, and mitigation to achieve the objectives of the state’s Climate Change Scoping Plan, where feasible.
- b) Reduce vehicle miles traveled by statewide directing discretionary transportation investments in support of housing production near available jobs and in accordance with the state’s smart growth principles, as defined in Government Code Section 65041.1, and taking public health into account.
- c) Reduce congestion through innovative strategies designed to encourage people to shift from other modes of transportation

- d) Fund transportation options that contribute to the overall health of Californians and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as transit, walking, biking, and other active modes.
- e) Mitigate increases in transportation costs to lower income Californians.

Executive Order N-79-20 requires CalSTA, Caltrans, and the Commission to identify near term actions and investment strategies by July 15, 2021 to improve clean transportation, sustainable freight and transit options, while continuing a “fix-it-first” approach to our transportation system, including where feasible:

- a) Building towards an integrated, statewide rail and transit network, consistent with the California State Rail Plan, to provide seamless, affordable multimodal travel options for all.
- b) Supporting bicycle, pedestrian, and micro-mobility options, particularly in low-income and disadvantaged communities in the State, by incorporating safe and accessible infrastructure into projects where appropriate.
- c) Supporting light, medium, and heavy duty zero-emission vehicles and infrastructure as part of larger transportation projects, where appropriate.

Following the release of EO N-19-19 on September 20, 2019, CalSTA convened an Interagency Working Group to coordinate on EO implementation throughout the Administration. The Working Group collaborated to draft the guiding principles of the CAPTI Investment Framework aimed at reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector and mitigating the impacts of climate change on our transportation system. During the first half of 2020, CalSTA held individual meetings with more than 200 public and advocacy stakeholders to get their input on the draft Investment Framework. Stakeholders were asked for their feedback via an online survey, which yielded 79 direct responses and 14 formal comment letters. The survey responses and letters included more than 200 action item ideas and 150 additional comments and suggestions regarding the Investment Framework and approach.

Additionally, CalSTA presented the draft Investment Framework to the joint CARB-CTC-HCD meeting in November 2020 for review, feedback, and guidance on the direction of the CAPTI effort. In early 2021, CalSTA continued to meet with a range of transportation stakeholders—from local and regional government agencies to climate, health, and equity advocates—to solicit feedback to help further refine CAPTI’s strategies and actions. There continues to be an effort to engage with different partners in the transportation sector, as it was expressed through recent workshops that representatives from labor and business desire increased opportunities for input.

To meet the July 15, 2021 deadline, CalSTA released the Draft CAPTI on March 10, 2021 for public comment. CalSTA held one public workshop on March 18, 2021 attended by over 400 participants. At its March 24, 2021 meeting, the Commission directed staff to hold additional workshops to gather comments and answer questions from the public on the CAPTI. Commission staff hosted, with participation from CalSTA and Department of Transportation (Caltrans) staff, two public workshops on April 20, 2021 and April 23, 2021. These workshops

were sequential, and the first workshop covered the implementation of the CAPTI and the first three strategies, and the second workshop covered the latter four strategies. Each workshop reserved time for general comments.

CalSTA also presented the Draft CAPTI at the Joint CTC-CARB-HCD Meeting on April 8th, 2021 and held an additional workshop at the Climate Action Team (CAT) Public Health Working Group (PHWG) hosted by CARB and CDPH.

The Draft CAPTI can be found at this link: <https://calsta.ca.gov/subject-areas/climate-action-plan>. The public comment period closes on May 19, 2021, and the CAPTI is anticipated to be finalized by July 15, 2021.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Comments Received During CTC-hosted CAPTI Workshops
- Attachment B: Comment Letters received following CTC-hosted CAPTI Workshops

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Comments Received During CTC-hosted CAPTI Workshops

The following document contains a full list of comments received during the two Commission-hosted Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) workshops held on April 20, 2021 and April 23, 2021. Many comments have been condensed for brevity. Comments are included following each CAPTI Strategy in which the comment was made. For reference, each of the seven CAPTI Strategy presentation slides were pulled from the CAPTI Appendix found on page 29 at the following link: <https://calsta.ca.gov/-/media/calsta-media/documents/capti-2021-calsta.pdf>.

This document has been submitted to the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). The CAPTI public comment period closes on May 19, 2021. Video recordings of each workshop are available on the California Transportation Commission YouTube Channel. Session 1 can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pdCCo37CUBo>. Session 2 can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P1AHOEocJK4>.

Workshop 1 Summary - Implementation and Strategies 1 through 3

Strategy 1 – Cultivate and Accelerate Sustainable Transportation Innovation by Leading with State Investments

- Under Strategy 1.1, bullet two is a high bar for rural and suburban communities.
- Under Strategy 1.3, we are concerned with the recommendation for fast tracking CAPTI aligned projects in early planning stages into the ITIP. The state needs to fund existing projects, some of which have been in the works since 1998, before we talk about shifting priorities.
- Under Strategies 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, does the state plan to identify new revenues for SCCP and TCEP so we can continue to fund projects that are in the pipeline, while also funding these new priorities?
- Under Strategy 1.1, our county has many projects in the pipeline and is implementing its regional transportation plan, which is focused on greenhouse gas reduction initiatives. It is important to keep these projects moving forward as we implement our RTP and accomplish our GHG reduction goals. Express lanes improve transit times and can generate revenue. However, the CAPTI excludes these project types because they induce VMT and allow for additional capacity. There is a bit of goal conflict in this.
- Under Strategy 1.1, the state should take a context sensitive approach when determining eligibility for projects. Our county has a corridor that's been in the works for nearly 20 years and identified various multimodal options. Our agency wants to

ensure that high occupancy vehicle lanes and managed lanes are still eligible as this corridor has been a priority for a long time.

- Under Strategy 1, our agency has concern that the state is creating new project requirements that might interfere with local transportation sales taxes and obtaining matching funds. New requirements might exclude projects that are being funded through local sales taxes.
- Under Strategy 1.1, our agency has concern that the language in strategy 1.1 could be changing the intent of SB 1. In some areas with high congestion, people cannot shift to other modes and must drive long distances to their jobs. There is also a concern about the transition to heavier duty electric vehicles. These vehicles can carry less cargo, which may require more trucks for the same amount of goods and again additional capacity would be needed in that scenario.
- Under Strategy 1.1, has there been consideration of converting general purpose lanes to managed lanes?
- Under Strategy 1, would implementing these actions involve moving money from an SB 1 program to fund other projects?
- Under Strategy 1.1, is there a reason that priced managed lanes are not explicitly mentioned in 1.1?
- Under Strategy 1.1, I would suggest adding TDM solutions to strategy 1.1, Bullet 2. These are important and cost-effective investments for both urban and rural areas. This could also apply to other CAPTI strategies.
- Under Strategies 1.1 and 1.4, the CAPTI changes eligible uses of funds, so it will change the types of projects that were approved with the passage of SB 1 in 2017.
- Under Strategy 1.1, most managed lanes are built as new lanes, creating new capacity. Will CAPTI encourage the state to amend legislation to allow for converting general purpose lanes to managed lanes to achieve CAPTI goals?
- Under Strategy 1.4, we understand that Strategy 1.4 is not a wholesale shifting of funds, but it is a policy shift from the perspective of business and goods movement. It changes the original intent of the program, which aims to move goods throughout California.

Strategy 2 – Support a Robust Economic Recovery by Revitalizing Transit, Supporting ZEV Deployment, and Expanding Active Transportation Investments

- Under Strategy 2.2, moving freight to rail is a good way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles traveled, and congestion.
- Under Strategy 2.4, the transportation construction industry is very supportive of finding additional funding for the ATP program. We are adamantly opposed to redirecting existing funds from other programs, even small amounts. The industry worked very hard on SB 1 and to ensure there were a variety of programs. This

included nearly doubling the funding for ATP. Other SB 1 programs including LSR have large active transportation components.

- Under Strategy 2.4, we are supportive of increasing ATP funding. We want to support a holistic approach to active transportation, including urban forestry programs. We encourage aligning with local California Conservation Corps projects.
- Under Strategy 2.4, we are very supportive of increased funding to the ATP. While we are looking forward to seeing what funds can help fund the backlog of project, we are very concerned about a long-term funding solution for the program. While other programs do have ATP components, the ATP components aren't necessarily prioritized.
- Under Strategy 2.4, we are supportive of increasing funding to ATP but want to protect the original intent of SB 1. We do not want funds redirected from other programs.
- Under Strategy 2.4, my region supports the proposed one-time augmentation but does not support redirecting funding from other programs. Administration should consider Cap-and-Trade as a potential long-term funding source.
- Under Strategy 2.4, our Board is very supportive of the ATP and increased funding. They are opposed to redirecting funds from other programs. The State should add funding for bike and pedestrian projects in other programs, such as the SHOPP and HSIP. Currently, the active transportation funding in these programs is minimal.
- Under Strategy 2.3, please make the TIRCP scoring and allocation process more transparent.
- Under Strategy 2.3, can you better specify the intent behind TIRCP cycles strategy? I believe within other forums it has been stated there is an intent to bring funding availability online sooner. Are there other strategies contemplated?
- Under Strategy 2.4, in many places most trips are less than three miles in length. Shifting driving to walking and cycling can have a significant effect on health and reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Under Strategy 2, will the CAPTI framework change the amount of pass through money given to local agencies? Will it change what the money is used for?
- Under Strategies 1.4 and 2.4, we support of additional funding for the ATP. Also, we support Strategy 1.4 of developing a zero-emission freight transportation system through mainstreaming zero emission vehicle infrastructure within TCEP. We can follow the policies of SB 1 while implementing the CAPTI.
- Under Strategy 2.4, have you considered reserving funding for active transportation quick-build projects to achieve timely safety and mode shift results?
- Under Strategy 2.4, we strongly support more funding for active transportation. We support an aggressive program to transform local transportation, land use and public transit, along with more walkable, bikeable communities. Walking and biking has enormous health benefits by promoting physical activity and can help reduce chronic

disease related to sedentary transportation patterns. Please commit to maximizing ATP.

- Under Strategy 2.4, we suggest that stormwater management be included as part of ATP projects. This will encourage walking and biking and make holistic projects.
- Under Strategy 2.5, will the CAPTI offer an opportunity to amend the Transportation Development Act to get rid of the farebox penalty or replace the farebox ratio requirements with another metric? These are especially challenging metrics to meet in rural areas.
- Under Strategy 2.3, what does it mean to accelerate the TIRCP funding? Doesn't the annual revenue limit what can be spent?

Strategy 3 – Elevate Community Voices in How We Plan and Fund Transportation Projects

- Under Strategy 3.1, we need to ensure that there's a focus on geographic equity. Many rural areas in the state are economically disadvantaged and depend on interregional connections as well as multimodal options, and state policy and funding decisions need to acknowledge and address this issue to ensure meaningful engagement.
- Under Strategy 3.1, because transportation is linked to housing and jobs, representatives from those industries should be included in the conversation to ensure a robust and holistic discussion.
- Under Strategy 3.1, can you clarify the destination for input for the advisory committees – input to CalSTA, CTC, and Caltrans?
- Under Strategy 3.1, we appreciate CTC's work on equity. We support this strategy and encourage pushing further to give this committee power to enact change.
- Under Strategy 3.1, has any preliminary work been done to determine the cost of staff work/agency coordination? There has been legislation that looks like it takes money from SB 1 for this. If it's transportation-wide, it shouldn't be entirely on the shoulders of SB 1.
- Under Strategy 3.3, more direct engagement with business community should be incorporated into the CAPTI. We feel this was not done previously. The industry is responsible for housing and moving people and should be included in these discussions.
- Under Strategy 3, our agency is implementing its Regional Transportation Plan and sales tax measure through a multimodal program of projects, including express lanes and bikeway improvements. Many agencies are relying on SB 1 to fulfill these commitments. We ask that the state keep the legislative intent of SB 1 in mind as it's implementing these strategies. Also, the state needs to consider commuters from

low and middle-income areas who commute long distances to higher paying jobs. Transportation improvements to support those communities are very important.

- Under Strategy 3, the transportation construction industry recognizes what the state is trying to achieve with CAPTI and shares in its ultimate goal. However, the maintenance of SB 1 as passed in 2017 is important and the industry will continue to raise this issue. SB 1 was only a half solution and there is still a \$6 billion shortfall in maintaining the state highway system. We need to work collaboratively to bring in new resources. We also want to see how the CAPTI brings us closer to our climate goals. The draft CAPTI does not quantify greenhouse gas reduction estimates.
- Under Strategy 3, CAPTI is a critical opportunity to start the radical shift we need to make to reach climate goals. We see good goals but need robust action. Decision makers should keep in mind that decisions will impact future generations.
- Under Strategy 3, the majority of projects that increase capacity in rural regions are safety projects and do not induce demand. These projects reduce fatalities, help goods movement, allow for evacuations in emergencies, allow for interregional travel, and connect disadvantaged communities to job centers and multimodal transit. In many cases, the projects are reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Most rural projects are only a few miles in length. Many projects require a decade or more to plan and deliver. Without state funding, these regions cannot complete these projects. How will the state ensure these projects remain eligible for funding?
- Under Strategy 3, our City supports the goals and objectives of the CAPTI. The City requests that support and resources for local implementation of transportation demand strategies be included in the CAPTI. This would include investment in ZEV infrastructure and expansion of the high-speed rail system.
- Under Strategy 3, we share the underlying goal of addressing climate change. The business and industry sector should have been included in CAPTI development over the last 18 months. There isn't clarity on the data and modeling that went into the plan. We request an opportunity to look at that data. We want more discussion on the alignment of CAPTI with housing goals. We echo comments of others who have emphasized the need to focus on the intent of SB 1.
- Under Strategy 3, our organization supports the draft CAPTI recommendations. We are encouraged by expressed commitment for the CTC to include consideration of CAPTI during program guideline development. Projects, even if planned for decades, need to be considered in the light of new evidence. We urge the CTC to consider specific VMT reduction goals during guideline development process and measure progress. There's a lot of work to be done on equity.
- Under Strategy 3, we appreciate the Administration's focus on mode-shift, specifically to public transit and on accelerating the transition to zero emission vehicle technologies that the industry has identified. We have been looking at the recommendations within the CAPTI and can provide constructive feedback on how things can be better aligned with the industry's specific priorities.

- Under Strategy 3, shifting from gas tank to a battery does not reduce GHG by much. We request an ongoing inventory of reducing VMT. Moving freight onto trains is important to reducing GHG from trucks.
- Under Strategy 3, how will self-driving cars fit into CAPTI goals?
- Under Strategy 3.4, we request Caltrans and the state involve regional agencies in the development of the equity index. As it's written now, the strategy only involves input from state agencies.
- Under Strategy 3.2, we need to do much more to meet climate goals. We need decisions today to ensure that the situation doesn't get worse.
- Under Strategy 3, can you clarify how several of the recommendations to enhance engagement avoid duplication of efforts at the county and MPO level?

Workshop 2 Summary - Strategies 4 through 7

Strategy 4 – Advance State Transportation Leadership on Climate and Equity through Improved Planning & Project Partnerships

- Under Strategy 4, could infrastructure include the hardware, software, and sensors design and implementation of an environmentally-sound and economically fair car parking system?
- Under Strategy 4.1, will the Caltrans Strategic Investment Strategy inform the selection of projects under the SB 1 competitive programs? If so, how will regional and local agencies be able to engage in reviewing the new data and methodologies?
- Under Strategy 4.2, our agency asks that previously funded Interregional Corridors that were funded through SB1 and the STIP Interregional Program remain eligible and a priority for completion be part of CAPTI and the 2021 ITSP.
- Under Strategy 4.2, our agency agrees that previously funded Interregional Corridors that were funded through SB1 and the STIP Interregional Program remain eligible and a priority for completion be part of CAPTI and the 2021 ITSP. Will CalSTA clarify language in the CAPTI to acknowledge the need for investment in rural corridors that did not substantially increase VMT, given the documented safety and operational needs, as well as documented impacts of climate change? The need for these improvements in high fire risk areas even more critical.
- Under Strategy 4.2, our organization agrees that previously funded Interregional Corridors that were funded through SB1 and the STIP Interregional Program remain eligible and a priority for completion be part of CAPTI and the 2021 ITSP. Our organization is concerned that we're limiting types of projects needed to solve a variety of transportation problems and needs. CalSTA has stated that the CAPTI is focused on leveraging existing resources but it could be done more easily if we find additional resources.

- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our agency agrees that previously funded Interregional Corridors that were funded through SB1 and the STIP Interregional Program remain eligible and a priority for completion be part of CAPTI and the 2021 ITSP.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization supports strategies 4.1 and 4.2. The climate need is urgent. We need to fund projects that reduce VMT and pull back on projects that induce VMT.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization also supports strategies 4.1 and 4.2 and agrees that the climate need is urgent and that we need to fund projects that reduce VMT and pull back on projects that induce VMT. We need to apply the lens of climate change to projects that have already been scoped. We need to scrutinize all transportation projects. We need to prioritize projects that reverse the trends of climate change and sprawl. There's a lot that can be achieved with the resources we already have.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization also supports strategies 4.1 and 4.2 and agrees that the climate need is urgent and that we need to fund projects that reduce VMT and pull back on projects that induce VMT. New funding is great, but the status quo is funding our climate problem.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization agrees with prior comments in support of strategies 4.1 and 4.2, particularly regarding the critical importance of shifting investments from those that induce and incentivize VMT and toward those that truly align with the state's health and climate goals. We second the call for transparency in development of metrics, and strongly urge the incorporation of health metrics including a range of health pathways and outcomes.
- Under Strategy 4.1, our organization requests that the data and performance driven metrics be developed in a transparent way that includes feedback from the business, industry, and supply chain sectors.
- Under Strategy 4.1, our region agrees that the data and performance driven metrics be developed in a transparent way that includes feedback from the business, industry, and supply chain sectors. Metrics should be appropriate for the differing contexts of rural and urban areas.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, if the overall objective is to reduce VMT, how will you balance projects that increase VMT against those that reduce it?
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, how will alignment of HOV/express lanes capable of inducing demand and vehicle volume commit to reducing VMT on 2 lane state highways, such as State Route 84, Niles Canyon, a watershed for Alameda County. Strategies 4.1 and 4.2 are not aligned with connecting to existing state routes and highways already at capacity.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, I have been reading the new University of California ITS "Driving California's Transportation Emissions to Zero" report. I see a lot of

policy detail, especially chapter 8 on Vehicle-Miles Travelled -- toward 15% total per-capita VMT reduction by 2045, that would do well to be incorporated in the CAPTI.

- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, most people drive to destinations expecting a parking place. Parking is often very expensive to provide. Parking is as important to driving as are roads. Parking is required by the government, so government cannot claim to have no connection to parking. Our climate emergency requires that we work hard to do what we might have thought was out of bounds. "Free Parking" is never really free. The cost of parking generally increases rent and other costs. It lowers the wages that can be paid. This especially harms low income communities. When parking is priced (or people are paid to not drive, which is how a good car-parking system feels to employees) there is a double-digit decrease in driving. Please reconsider how you can help. Note that value-priced parking would result in less parking needed and that would save money.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization appreciates the comments about the need to leverage current resources to meet climate goals. However, there are tens of billions of dollars of unfunded maintenance, rehabilitation, and safety needs on the state highway and local streets and road systems. CAPTI goals are valuable but if we shift funding from existing programs, we dilute our ability to meet a variety of goals. My organization supports more revenue so we can address valuable climate needs while also continuing to maintain and build a safe and efficient multimodal transportation system.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization agrees that CAPTI goals are valuable but if we shift funding from existing programs, we dilute our ability to meet a variety of goals. Our organization also supports more revenue so we can address valuable climate needs while also continuing to maintain and build a safe and efficient multimodal transportation system.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, our organization understands that specific trades and businesses rely on the highway to fulfill functions. For the large bulk of ordinary public, a difference can be made in prioritizing mass transit and active transportation.
- Under Strategies 4.1 and 4.2, could you achieve a 1% reduction in project related VMT in the first year of activity?
- Under Strategy 4.3, what does climate smart decision-making mean/include? This language makes it sound like funds will be diverted from their intended use of critical maintenance and operations.
- Under Strategy 4.3, our agency is concerned about Caltrans' surplus lands. There is a farm in Union City that's next to a riparian habitat. The San Francisco Estuary Institute said that that could be rehabilitated. I'm wondering if Caltrans would consider properties that are unique like this as part of a nature-based solution to the expansion of the interstate system where we're increasing vehicle volume and vehicle miles traveled.

- Under Strategy 4.3, given the growing shortfall demonstrated in the SHSMP, it is important to balance new objectives with Fix-It-First. Important to maintain SB 1 intent.
- Under Strategy 4.3, how does 4.3 interact with asset management planning?
- Under Strategy 4.3, it is well known that we are behind in maintenance, bridges becoming more dangerous. Management means doing the maintenance in a timely manner to minimize the cost. I believe that managed lanes begin as soon as the car enters the system. The highway system is underpriced and needs to be priced in a means-based way. In favor of a road-use charge. Need a database of people who own cars that includes their net worth and income.
- Under Strategy 4.3, will maintenance projects that re-use pavement constituents be prioritized? What about E-maintenance equipment?
- Under Strategy 4.3, our region supports elevating the need for vegetation management within highway corridors in high wildfire risk areas.
- Under Strategy 4.3, our organization supports action 4.3. Incorporating climate smart decision-making will reduce the risk and costs of maintaining state transportation assets.
- Under Strategy 4.3, our agency thanks people for acknowledging the climate resilience of the interstate system and the SHS. Hopes there is a land management strategy related to wildfires as well.
- Under Strategy 4.5, many state agencies have so-called free parking, which is a terrible system. The state could develop a good car parking system and that would be done by a third-party vendor so you would issue an RFP to companies which are comfortable with technology. Parking system should be value priced and fully automated.
- Under Strategy 4, aren't most of Caltrans' investments funded by the gas tax and thus have limited ability to fund transit on highway corridors?
- Under Strategies 4.4 and 4.5, please consider adding language ensuring Caltrans' partnership with MPOs and county transportations commissions (especially in self-help counties) in these efforts.
- Under Strategy 4, will multi-modal freight movement systems be prioritized?
- Under Strategy 4, as a public health professional, I strongly support the proposed establishment of VMT reduction targets from all sources. Motor vehicle injuries disable and kill thousands of Californians every year, with rising rates of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities, and the development of innovative safety solutions is critical.
- Under Strategy 4, our organization agrees with the establishment of VMT reduction targets and the development of innovative safety solutions. comments align to the above comment. 98% of Californians live in areas with polluted air. Seven of the 10 most ozone polluted cities are in California. People of color are 61% more likely to live in an area with a poor air quality measured as a failing grade nationally. Climate change is making the job of cleaning our air much more difficult, and speaks to the

need for the CAPTI process and shifting our focus in our transportation investments, as the transportation sector is the leading source of air pollution and carbon pollution in our state. Broader screening of health and equity impacts should be integrated in the screening process for transportation projects.

- Under Strategy 4.4, we ask that previously identified corridors of statewide and regional significance remain a priority as part of CAPTI. These are corridors that have had multimodal corridor plans developed with Caltrans and the regions that provide a range of transportation options like managed lanes, transit, rail and bike/pedestrian improvements that address mobility, safety and freight movement.
- Under Strategy 4.4, our agency agrees that previously identified corridors of statewide and regional significance remain a priority as part of CAPTI.
- Under Strategy 4.5, regarding our desperate need to have good car parking systems, I am happy to see 4.5 does not have the word infrastructure. California has employees and employee car parking systems; the state could create a monster.
- Under Strategy 4.6, our agency has growing concerns with freight coordination with the ports. Planning for ZEV freight will be critical since Capital Corridor wants to increase service. Analyze port needs in conjunction with what Capital Corridor wants to do.
- Under Strategy 4.6, we're underpricing driving on the roadways.
- Under Strategy 4.6, our organization supports the overall direction of plan. We agree with comments regarding the importance of health analysis. With the expansion of trucking it's also important to think about rerouting strategies in neighborhoods that may not have proper active transportation facilities. Solutions must be developed with the community, using community-led priorities.
- Under Strategy 4.6, our organization is committed to addressing the challenges that climate change presents. However, the freight sector is so important to economy, and this plan should not negatively impact the ability to move people, goods and services. As zero emission strategies are incorporated, don't discount the role that increased capacity plays in congested areas. Those in the freight industry should be involved in the development of the plan.
- Under Strategy 4, Caltrans does not keep performance metrics on bike lanes now, at least not publicly, and past metrics show they were being primarily used by males for exercise. Please incorporate appropriate systems for women and performance metrics that show equity.
- Under Strategy 4, our organization supports Key Actions 4.4 and 4.5, but hopes that you would consider adding language to 4.4 that specifically elevates the role of dedicating lanes for transit, very high occupancy vehicles, and high occupancy vehicles to provide faster and more reliable travel times for sustainable road users.
- Under Strategy 4, consider multimodal systems such as installing Park and Ride lots along strategic Interstates that can cross county lines to allow for regional buses and

connections to BART and Capitol Corridor Stations linking interstates to regional busses and rail.

- Under Strategy 4, please be sure local funding and investment measures, approved years ago by voters and not consistent with the state's goals, are preserved in order to keep faith with local voters' needs and expectations to increase capacity and alleviate congestion.
- Under Strategy 4, it is important to recognize that different segments of the overall goods movement system can transition to zero-emission faster and cheaper than others. Important to not penalize those segments that might take more effort and time - as incentives to transition for those might be more critical in getting entire goods movement sector to zero emission.
- Under Strategy 4, our organization is encouraged to see a commitment for Caltrans to re-examine and revise its own processes, procedures and guidance that local agencies have sometimes identified as a barrier to advancing sustainable transportation. We would like to see this commitment elevated in the CAPTI to a Key Action under Strategy 4, with a particular focus on how Caltrans can reduce the time and cost of delivering both active transportation projects and projects that provide uncongested travel to transit and high or very-high occupancy vehicles on state-owned right of way. In the Bay Area, for instance, a project to convert a four-lane state-owned right of way into a two-lane road with a middle turning lane and two bike lanes has required over 13 separate Caltrans studies, assessments, and reports.
- Strategy 4.5 talks about establishing a baseline and reduction targets, but that seems duplicative of what the regional transportation plans that are approved by the state and federal government already do. In 4.5, there's language that says that Caltrans will set measurable and achievable targets for passenger travel that will be supported by VMT reduction strategies. Will that be funded through SHOPP? For 4.6, incentivizing zero emission freight and freight infrastructure will certainly go a long way to improving the air quality and inland areas of the state like Riverside County. However, zero emission freight and freight infrastructure are still being developed. So, there's just some concern from our agency's perspective that using the language that these types of projects will be prioritized. We are afraid funding would just end up being directed to a few very specific areas of the state and may lead to inequities in how freight funding will be distributed. Inland areas have a great deal of freight and we're worried we'll be left unable to compete for that funding.

Strategy 5 – Support Climate Resilience through Transportation System Improvements and Protections for Natural and Working Lands

- Under Strategy 5.2, how will recommendations stemming from AB 2800 (i.e., Climate Safe Infrastructure) be integrated into program guidelines (outside of

recommendations from the Interagency Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy)?

- Under Strategy 5.3, could CalSTA elaborate on what strategy 5.3 could entail?
- Under Strategy 5.2, the language around incentivizing climate adaptation is dangerous. We are clearly on a path to destabilizing the climate and heading toward population collapse. Climate adaptation is only possible if we achieve climate stabilization.
- Under Strategy 5.1, will the climate risk assessment consider and identify transportation improvements in high risk wildfire corridors that are needed in order to facilitate evacuation and emergency response?
- Under Strategy 5.1, as you improve roads that are high fire risks, you encourage people to go there and reside there. We shouldn't encourage people to be in high risk fire areas. When we electrify vehicles, these vehicles embody a lot of greenhouse gases. We need multimodal freight transportation.
- Under Strategy 5.1, SB1 is intended to fix and maintain the system we already have. The state must resist the temptation to distort the intent of SB 1.
- Under Strategies 5.1 and 5.3, our agency suggests 5.1 include language calling for collaboration with MPOs and county transportation commissions (especially in self-help counties) in periodic updates to Caltrans District Assessments/Reports. Suggest that 5.3 be developed in part through collaboration with MPOs and RTPAs.
- Under Strategy 5.3, our agency suggests revising 5.3 to promote land conservation as a short-term goal. Water quality, loss of habitat, wetland/riparian areas and farmlands are at risk now. We need the climate adaptation strategy and let's start now. Climate change is unlikely irreversible sadly and land is irreplaceable.
- Under Strategy 5.3, please clarify difference between 5.3 and the SB 1 advanced mitigation strategy.
- Under Strategy 5.3, our agency strongly supports 5.3. We would encourage the state to consider awarding extra points to projects in an area with a state approved NCCP tied to infrastructure.
- Under Strategies 5.1 and 5.2, rural Mendocino County is seeing climate-related impacts to transportation systems and sees the need for climate adaptation. It's hard to see how regular programs that are listed in this strategy would be appropriate for achieving those kinds of adaptations that would be meaningful. Additionally regarding 5.1, what we have seen locally is that those vulnerability assessment and adaptation priorities don't thoroughly capture a lot of the climate-related impacts to our transportation system that we're already seeing here locally. Encourage state to use other sources of information.

Strategy 6 – Support Local and Regional Innovation to Advance Sustainable Mobility

- Under Strategy 6.2, is the roadway pricing work group intended to provide guidance to MPOs? Who is the audience for the recommendations?
- Under Strategy 6.2, while we welcome CalSTA and Caltrans organizing a working group to discuss equitable roadway pricing implementation, ultimately the regional and local agencies must maintain autonomy as it currently exists in implementing congestion pricing, particularly on tolled facilities on which agencies like ours have incurred substantial loans to construct the multimodal facilities.
- Under Strategy 6.2, it is important to ensure this effort does not negatively impact the ability of RTP/SCSs to meet GHG emission reduction targets. If CARB assumes pricing is a state action for GHG reduction accounting purposes, the MPOs share of GHG emission reductions must be revised accordingly.
- Under Strategy 6.3, how would the project evaluation framework be applied?
- Under Strategy 6.2, can we bring in the perspectives from the business, industry, housing, and labor sectors on this working group that were left out of the CAPTI process early on?
- Under Strategy 6.3, please expand participation to include county transportation commissions (especially for self-help counties).
- Under Strategy 6.2, we strongly support this strategy, and in particular look forward to working with the state and other stakeholders on the future Roadway Pricing Working Group. We hope local jurisdictions already advancing ideas like congestion pricing will have seats at the table to bring our local experiences to bear, in particular our identification of funding and legislative challenges that may be preventing these types of projects from advancing.
- Under Strategy 6.2, why not include parking in the roadway pricing work group?
- Under Strategy 6.2, the road-pricing activities in other states, including Utah should be investigated. Ultimately, there will be need for national integration.
- Under Strategies 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, part of an approved RTP/SCS is the ability to prove attainment of air quality conformity using CARB-provided air quality models. An approved RTP/SCS allows for the advancement of critically needed transportation projects that may not particularly reduce GHG but do ensure the economic vitality of our residents and state while being offset by GHG-reducing projects. 6.3 feels unnecessary. For 6.1, our agency supports mitigation banks.
- Under Strategy 6.1, our organization is concerned with the concept of a mitigation bank in 6.1. Our organization is well aware of the different needs that rural communities, including many we work with, have for mobility, but this sounds like another problematic credit scheme that will exacerbate deep inequities that consistently burden the same low income communities that deal with public health and air quality. No strategy should be allowed to transfer of harm from one

community to another. Nor allow increases in rural communities that are offset by Urban communities.

- Under Strategy 6.1, the problem with mitigation banks is that is very hard to evaluate the impacts and benefits on various parts of the system.

Strategy 7 – Strengthen Transportation-Land Use Connections

- Under Strategy 7.3, I applaud this strategy. A lot of places we could convert to boulevards.
- Under Strategy 7, this whole strategy must incorporate jobs. California residents should be able to live in all different densities and be employed nearby, not just in dense, urban areas. The actions identified in strategy 7.1 are suited for urban areas. Suburban and rural areas are not served well by these policies. The suggestion is to make that distinction in the text.
- Under Strategy 7, our organization agrees this whole strategy must incorporate jobs. Infill development is just one strategy to focus on – should be focusing on state housing crisis. We request that business, industry, and housing voices be included in the working group defined in this strategy.
- Under Strategies 7.1 and 7.2, 7.1 has potential to disproportionately benefit agencies with land use authority over transportation agencies that need cooperation from other agencies. For 7.2, it's important to include local transportation and transit agencies that are implementing projects, not just state agencies.
- Under Strategies 7.1 and 7.3, our organization supports 7.1 and offers that these could be required and include stronger incentives for jurisdictions with strong affordability requirements; by right development of affordable housing in high opportunity areas; and reduced impact fees on infill affordable housing projects. On 7.3 - We support this and commend the agency for including a recognition and concrete action to start addressing the harm that racist planning and projects have had on communities that have been split by highways. As reminder, this pilot program must be truly co-designed with Black and Brown residents in neighborhoods that have been devastated by these past issues, and not simply a top-down project.
- Under Strategy 7, our organization agrees that cities and counties need strong involvement in these working groups.
- For Strategies 7.1 and 7.2, we need to think about minority homeownership as an added equity lens and look at transforming communities through land use and transportation investments to ensure generational wealth.

General Public Comments

- Our agency wants to reemphasize some points from the perspective of a planning and implementation agency. We are busy implementing our regional transportation plan, which is targeted towards major reductions in greenhouse gases. We need SB 1 for these projects and to meet these goals. The need to commute for lower wage workers should be acknowledged. Many of the corridors they travel on don't have good transit or active transportation options and aren't conducive to that. Sometimes they must look at a capacity project. Want to underscore the importance of including the RTPAs, MPOs, and businesses in the CAPTI planning process.
- Our organization has generally strong support for CAPTI recommendations. We call on CTC like other agencies to update guidelines to align with CAPTI. On 4.5, we think the CTC should work with other agencies to develop VMT reduction targets. For 6.2, there is a lot of opportunity in the way we employ VMT mitigation and we support the exploration of mitigation banks. There's so much opportunity to figure out how we can revitalize rural main streets and enhance rural communities generally.
- I am disappointed to see nothing about telecommuting, telemedicine, and remote learning in the CAPTI. Communications infrastructure should be seen as another form of transportation infrastructure.
- Telecommuting is no doubt reducing traffic but may be inducing travel demand. I am disappointed that other speakers haven't talked about car parking reform.
- Climate change is an emergency. CARB said we needed to reduce driving by 30% by 2030. We need to have metrics every six months. With big data it's easy to get that information.
- It is important from the public health and air quality perspective that the CAPTI process move forward. Counties with the highest levels of unhealthy air in the US are in California. Ozone pollution is driven by transportation emissions. For people in the Inland Empire it is critical that we address transportation pollution. We need to reverse negative health consequences.
- Climate change is irreversible. There is no real public transportation structure from San Joaquin to the Bay Area. We need to look at bus on shoulder options. We need to conserve the natural resources we have.
- Our agency strongly supports addressing climate change and appreciates the state's leadership on this issue. Success will require creative, flexible, pragmatic and collaborative solutions to address the unique challenges and opportunities of each region. Regional flexibility is key to developing a balanced multimodal transportation system that meets our mutual goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing safety, promoting a vibrant economy, and enhancing mobility while respecting the differing needs of urban and rural communities.
- My organization is supportive of CAPTI. The implementation of CAPTI can reduce the combined cost of housing and transportation for families struggling to make ends

meet. CAPTI will prioritize and maximize the creation of affordable infill housing near jobs and transit centers, saving families time on commuting, money on rent and personal vehicles. Commute time is the single strongest factor in the odds of escaping poverty. By improving transit and active transportation options and reducing traffic congestion, CAPTI will save commuters in every region valuable time and money.



April 28, 2021

The Honorable David S. Kim
Secretary, California State Transportation Agency
915 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95815

Re: Transportation Construction Industry Comments on the Draft Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure

Dear Secretary Kim,

The undersigned organizations, representing the transportation industry and workforce that builds, repairs, and maintains California's statewide multimodal transportation system, write to respectfully communicate our significant concerns with many aspects of the Draft Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI or Draft Plan) released by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) on March 10, 2021. While we are not at odds with the state's overarching climate, health, and equity goals, we are apprehensive about the proposed strategies for achieving said goals. As such, the comments below are offered in the spirit of collaboration and cooperation and, while critical, are intended to be constructive. The state must ensure that that implementation of the CAPTI does not impede progress on other key state goals including the creation of living-wage jobs, economic growth, and opportunity for upward mobility for all Californians.

Unfortunately, we find overall that the Draft CAPTI lacks significant detail that is necessary for meaningful analysis and without this information, it is difficult to understand the practical implications from enacting such a plan and its associated implementation strategies and actions. The Draft Plan also fails to demonstrate how, and by how much, the CAPTI will help the state achieve its climate change, health, and equity goals. The proposed structure and process for monitoring implementation of the CAPTI is not specific enough to hold the state accountable or to evaluate outcomes and understand trades-offs being made within the strategies and actions.

Moreover, the Draft Plan does not offer a true public process that provides stakeholders the ongoing opportunity to be meaningfully involved in revisions to the “living document” that CalSTA and its state agency partners envision for the CAPTI effort. Finally, the Draft Plan states it was developed in a collaborative fashion with stakeholders. While we appreciate the additional California Transportation Commission (CTC) workshops on the Draft CAPTI since its release, and the two CalSTA hosted CAPTI workshops, substantive new information and answers to our questions and concerns have not been provided to date. It is concerning that some stakeholder groups have touted the CAPTI public process as robust and meaningful while many other groups, including ours, have found it lacking. This leads us to question how equitable the public process has been.

It is imperative for CalSTA and its state agency partners to provide more information in support of the Draft CAPTI assumptions and engage in a true stakeholder driven process to vet the Draft CAPTI proposals, goals, and anticipated outcomes; develop quantifiable metrics to evaluate progress; and generally, take the time to build a baseline of mutual understanding, trust, and collaboration prior to acting on the final plan. In addition to these high-level takeaways, below please find more specific feedback on the Draft CAPTI goals, strategies, and actions:

Honor SB 1 by Identifying and Delivering New Revenues to Solve Transportation Related Climate Change, Health, and Equity Problems. Since Governor Newsom signed Executive Order N-19-19, which calls on multiple state agencies to take action to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change, including leveraging more than \$5 billion in discretionary transportation revenues, CalSTA has maintained its CAPTI efforts will preserve the fix-it-first approach in SB 1 – the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. While a fundamental tenet of SB 1 is indeed a fix-it-first approach to our multimodal surface transportation infrastructure, the legislation is so much more than an infrastructure strategy.

SB 1 is the product of years of detailed negotiations, weighing of various policy trade-offs, setting goals, and making extremely specific programmatic and funding decisions to achieve said goals. Unless CalSTA identifies and delivers new funding opportunities (such as the federal funding discussed in the Draft Plan), we are extremely concerned about the CAPTI, slowly, but surely altering the purpose and use of SB 1 funding. For instance, under “S2.4 Increase Funding to Active Transportation Program (ATP)” the state suggests first pursuing new federal funding for this purpose but also offers the concept of taking “small contributions from across several programs (e.g. SHOPP, TCEP, SCCP, TIRCP, etc.) to minimize impacts to any single funding source.” While this likely passes a constitutional test in that the strategy would use transportation revenues for transportation purposes, it will dilute existing funding from its original intended purpose and impede the ability of the state and locals to reach other critical transportation goals. The concept of repurposing existing revenues for the ATP also ignores the fact that SB 1 more than doubled funding for that program and Caltrans has also increased discretionary spending on complete streets projects on the state highway in recent years. Moreover, the ATP isn’t the sole funding source supporting active transportation—local governments have proposed and built over 1,700 projects with active transportation components using flexible SB 1 funding. Another CAPTI goal, which our organizations support, is the build out of an integrated, statewide rail and transit network, centering around the State Rail Plan (S2.2). The State Rail Plan is an ambitious plan that to date remains unfunded. Without new revenues, how does the Draft Plan propose to meet this goal while also preserving the integrity of existing transportation revenues?

Finally, we would be remiss if we did not raise the issue of SB 375 (Chapter No. 328, Statutes of 2008) implementation. CARB argues in both its SB 150 Report and the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy that SB 375 is not being implemented and that the state will fail to meet its GHG reductions goals from the transportation sector without more aggressive action. However, the state has failed to deliver on its fundamental role in SB 375 implementation which was to provide, “a sustainable source of funding to be able to accommodate patterns of

growth consistent with the state's climate, air quality, and energy conservation goals." A state revenue stream to support projects that accelerate implementation of sustainable communities strategies would surely have provided accelerated GHG emissions reductions over the intervening period since passage of SB 375. Moreover, it is unclear the extent to which cities and counties are making land use decisions that are inconsistent with SB 375. More analysis is needed to support the claim that SB 375 is not being implemented at the local level and that an ambitious vehicle mile traveled (VMT) strategy is called for.

Draft Plan Does Not Quantify Anticipated GHG Emissions Reductions. The Draft Plan does not quantify what GHG emissions reductions will be achieved from implementing the proposed CAPTI strategies and actions. As such, it is impossible to understand how much closer implementing the CAPTI will bring us to achieving our climate change goals. Without this information policymakers and stakeholders cannot adequately evaluate the proposed outcomes and the various policy trade-offs inherent in these decisions. If implementing the Draft Plan forecasts a 15-percent reduction in GHG emissions from the transportation sector, certain trade-offs might be worth it, whereas if the plan were to result in only a 3-percent reduction in GHG emissions those trade-offs might be less acceptable. The Draft Plan talks about policies and trades-offs needing to deliver outsized benefits to climate, health, and equity goals. We request CalSTA quantify the CAPTI's outsized benefits prior to moving forward with adoption and implementation.

Impacts to Living Wage-Jobs and Economy Growth Not Analyzed. The Draft Plan does not indicate whether the proposed strategies and associated actions were analyzed for impacts on living-wage jobs and economic activity. If an evaluation was conducted, the analysis and results were not detailed in the CAPTI. Our overarching concern is that an increase in VMT typically occurs in tandem with robust economic activity. What, if any, impact will a purposeful reduction in VMT have on economic growth and the creation of living-wage jobs? The CAPTI should not be adopted and implemented until this critical question is addressed.

Lacks Quantifiable Metrics to Measure Outcomes and Achievements. The Draft CAPTI includes a section dedicated to implementation, including a multipage chart of specific actions, the lead agency tasked with implementation, supporting agencies, and a timeframe. These metrics are a measure of whether the state has taken on and completed certain tasks like updating guidelines, convening working groups, and exploring funding opportunities. These metrics, while showing progress on implementing the plan, will not allow for evaluation of the effectiveness of the plan in achieving the state's climate change, health, and equity goals. It is one thing to update transportation competitive grant program guidelines, it is another to analyze how those guideline changes will alter project funding decisions and how those new funding decisions move the needle on the state's goals.

Analysis of Existing Governmental Constraints. The Draft CAPTI includes numerous proposed strategies and actions but does not elaborate on what can be achieved by CalSTA and its state partners with existing authority and what new authority or authorization it may need from the State Legislature. For some proposed strategies and actions, existing authorization is clear (updating CTC guidelines, creating working groups) but for others state authority is opaquer (e.g. an interagency framework for project evaluation around advancing sustainable communities). Without analysis, it is impossible to understand how successful the state will be in implementing the Draft CAPTI and therefore how the state can be held accountable for outcomes.

Erosion of Existing Transportation Funding. Recently, the Mineta Institute published a report that examined the potential impact of the state's zero emission vehicle (ZEV) and reduced VMT goals on the current transportation funding structure. The report found that in a scenario where the state goals are reasonably achieved, transportation funding would be reduced on an annual ongoing basis by \$4 billion by 2040. It is critical that the

state ensure a replacement funding mechanism to adequately maintain the state's "built" mobility infrastructure prior to implementing aggressive VMT strategies.

We want to reiterate our commitment to the state's climate change, health, and equity goals. That said, we urge CalSTA and its state partners to meaningfully involve stakeholders, including the transportation construction industry, in information sharing, development of policy issues, and forming solutions to solve these challenges. Without these critical pieces having occurred during the development the Draft Plan, we must request that CalSTA take no further action on the CAPTI until meaningful stakeholder engagement has occurred. Please contact Kiana Valentine, Executive Director, Transportation California should you want to discuss our request or if you need additional information (kiana@politicogroup.com or (916) 266-3892).

Respectfully,

/s/

Kiana Valentine
Transportation California

Bob Alvarado
Northern California Carpenters Regional Council

Tim Cremins
International Union of Operating Engineers

Joe Cruz
California State Council of Laborers

John Hakel
Rebuild SoCal Partnership

Michael Quigley
California Alliance for Jobs

Jon P. Preciado
Southern California District Council of Laborers

Bradley Kimball
Southern California Contractors Association

Emily Cohen
United Contractors

Peter Tateishi
Associated General Contractors, California
Chapter

Ernesto Ordonez
Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education
Trust

Brad Diede
American Council of Engineering Companies,
California

Robert Dugan
California Construction and Industrial Materials
Association

Eddie Sprecco
Associated General Contractors, San Diego
Chapter

cc: Toks Omishakin, Director, California Department of Transportation
Hilary Norton, Chair, California Transportation Commission
Mitch Weiss, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission
Ronda Paschal, Deputy Legislative Secretary, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom
Mark Tollefson, Deputy Cabinet Secretary, Office of Governor Gavin Newsom
James Barba, Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Atkins
Julius McIntyre, Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Rendon
Heather Wood, Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus
Daniel Ballon, Consultant, Assembly Republican Caucus



Secretary David Kim
California State Transportation Agency

April 28, 2022

RE: Letter in Strong Support of the State's Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI)

The State's Climate Action Plan for Transportation Investments (CAPTI) is a critical and necessary step towards helping California meet its climate and equity goals. SPUR is particularly supportive of aligning all the state's discretionary transportation funding decisions around achieving these essential goals, including funding programs controlled by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Given the potential influx of federal transportation funding over the coming months, with the hoped-for passage of the American Jobs Plan and Surface Transportation Reauthorization, there is a real urgency to not only finalize CAPTI but execute on its recommendations.

For too long, the state has funded transportation infrastructure investments that work at counterpurposes to the state's climate, equity and fiscal goals. These investments increased greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, disproportionately impacted low income and BIPOC communities, contributed to the high levels of deaths and serious injuries on our roads and poor public health outcomes, and generated unfunded long-run maintenance obligations.

The need for the state to line up its transportation infrastructure investments with its climate and equity goals has only become more urgent in recent years, as greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector have continued to grow and now represent over 40% of all emissions in the state. Although switching to zero-emissions vehicles is an essential strategy, deployment of zero-emissions vehicles alone is not sufficient to meet our state's climate goals. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has clearly documented, including in its most recent 2020 Mobile Source Strategy, that the state needs to reduce the vehicles miles travelled per capita to meet its climate goals even under the most aggressive zero-emission vehicle deployment scenarios.

CAPTI clearly lays out a framework, in seven strategies, under which the state can work to mobilize its discretionary transportation spending to reduce climate emissions and inequities caused by our transportation system. SPUR would also like to commend CalSTA and the inter-agency working group on its extensive, thoughtful and comprehensive public outreach process.

As CAPTI moves from draft to final, SPUR would encourage the state to fully align its discretionary transportation funding with its climate and equity goals -- the only “where feasible” standard is too loose a standard for such critical state policy goals. SPUR also makes the following additional and more specific comments:

Strategy 1

SPUR enthusiastically supports CTC updating its Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) guidelines and scoring criteria to prioritize projects that provide travelers with options other than driving alone and reduce vehicles miles travelled. Projects that include strategies that enable drivers to internalize the cost that driving impose on our communities, generate revenue to invest in sustainable transportation options, and disproportionately benefit disadvantaged communities, should be encouraged. SPUR is also supportive of prioritizing projects in the SCCP that help deliver walkable, transit-supportive, low-VMT and equitable communities.

SPUR would also like to see a similar commitment by the CTC to update its Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) guidelines and scoring criteria to prioritize projects that advance the state’s climate, air quality and equity goals. Too often, trade corridor projects are prioritized for funding that increase truck traffic through disadvantaged communities that are already disproportionately burdened with the air pollution, safety and public health burdens of diesel truck traffic.

The CAPTI framework largely focuses on actions that can be taken by state agencies under their existing authority. While that should be CAPTI’s primary focus, SPUR would like to see in the final CAPTI a sub-strategy that commits the state to inventorying the statutes that limit the ability of discretionary transportation funding helping meet the state’s climate and equity goals (eg statutes that limit the conversion of general purpose lanes to express lanes that prioritize buses and high occupancy vehicles), and force the money to be spent on projects that increase VMT, increase the state’s greenhouse gas emissions and exacerbate existing disparities.

Strategy 2

SPUR is particularly supportive of actions the state can take to support transit recovery.

SPUR is also particularly supportive of increasing funding to the Active Transportation Program (ATP). The ATP Program is the most over-subscribed discretionary transportation funding program; can be distributed broadly to communities and neighborhoods across the state; will generate immediate mobility, safety and air quality improvements; will create jobs immediately;

and will help support transit, VMT reductions and climate reductions. These investments can be specifically and easily targeted to disproportionately benefit disadvantaged communities, and have some of the strongest cost-benefits of any transportation improvement. SPUR would support prioritizing ATP funding from the state general fund given this year's surplus, from future flexible federal funding, from local contributions from existing programs with the state providing a match from the State Highway Account, and by taking contributions from other state transportation funding programs.

SPUR would like to see a clear commitment to prioritizing projects in state funding programs that get transit and very-high occupancy vehicles out of traffic, including in dedicated lanes and with signal priority. The evidence is clear that unless we get transit out of traffic it will continue to become more expensive to operate, less reliable, slower, and have fewer riders.

Strategy 3

SPUR is particularly supportive of elevating community voices, with a particular focus on incorporating the perspectives of disadvantaged communities. Further, we support ensuring community voices are incorporated into the planning, project delivery and maintenance processes throughout their development and delivery without relying on the public-input provisions provided as part of the environmental (CEQA) process. This work should build on the best practices in community-led transportation investment programs, such as the Transformative Climate Communities program developed by the Strategic Growth Council and the Community Based Transportation Plan program developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Strategy 4

SPUR is particularly supportive of Caltrans aligning its Strategic Investment Strategy, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, State Highway System Management Plan and Caltrans Corridor Planning around state climate and equity goals. However, SPUR would like to see in the final CAPTI a commitment by Caltrans to develop and implement a Climate Action Plan with targets that are not only measurable and achievable, but which are in line with the state's own climate targets.

SPUR would also encourage the state in the final CAPTI to prioritize public health, especially in disadvantaged communities, in its freight planning and trade corridors funding. This must include considerations for zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure and deployment, but should also include addressing pedestrian and bicyclist safety, brake and tire wear emissions, emissions from the non-zero-emissions fleet, and the potential to re-routing freight traffic away from disadvantaged communities. The state should also prioritize community-led planning to reduce the impacts of

freight traffic and freight infrastructure on disadvantaged communities. The state should also explicitly prioritize investments in the freight network that directly benefit California's passenger rail system, especially where freight traffic can be moved off right of way shared with passenger trains.

SPUR would like to see in the final CAPTI, a clear commitment as part of Caltrans corridor planning efforts to plan for prioritizing transit, high and very-high occupancy vehicles on state-owned right of way. To build fast, reliable and efficient express bus networks quickly and cost-effectively, the state needs to be incorporating transit priority in as many of its highway improvement projects as possible -- from direct access ramps for HOV or HOT lanes allowing transit and very high-occupancy vehicle to enter without having to shuffle across congested traffic lanes, to queue-jump lanes on highway on-ramps and off-ramps, to bus-on-shoulder treatments and more.

SPUR is encouraged to see a commitment for Caltrain to re-examine and revise its own processes, procedures and guidance that local agencies have sometimes identified as a barrier to advancing sustainable transportation. However, SPUR would like to see in the final CAPTI this commitment elevated to a Key Action under Strategy 4, with a particular focus on how Caltrans can reduce the time and cost of delivering both active transportation projects and projects that provide uncongested travel to transit and high or very-high occupancy vehicles on state-owned right of way. In the Bay Area, for instance, a project to convert a 4 lane state-owned right of way into a 2 lane road with a middle turning lane and 2 bike lanes has required over 13 separate Caltrans studies, assessments and reports.

Strategy 5

SPUR enthusiastically supports incorporating climate risk assessment as a standard practice in the transportation project development process.

Strategy 6

SPUR particularly supports convening a roadway pricing work group, focused on equitable roadway pricing, that will hopefully also include non-government stakeholders. Various form of roadway pricing have been identified in both the California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2050, and in numerous Sustainable Community Strategies around the State, as one of the central greenhouse gas and VMT reduction strategies, as well as a key way to generate revenue to provide more sustainable mobility options whose benefits should be targeted at the most disadvantaged communities. This is particularly true in the Bay Area, where the current draft of Plan Bay Area 2050 envisions congestion pricing in downtown San Francisco, completing a

regional network of express lanes with a focus on general-purpose lane conversion, and ultimately implementing all-road tolling on the region's most congested highways with robust transit alternatives. It is critical that any roadway pricing strategy is focused on delivering equitable outcomes, in its pricing strategy, in its fines and enforcement strategy, and in how the revenues from the project are spent.

SPUR also supports the development of a framework to evaluate whether a particular project or set of projects aligns with the goals of SB375, achieves the objectives of the Scoping Plan or helps deliver on the climate and equity goals of a regions' sustainable community strategy. Just because a project is included in a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or SCS does not mean that the project itself advances the RTP or SCS's climate or equity goals. Given the complex interaction between projects in the RTPs and SCS in the same corridor or in the same community, SPUR encourages the state to explore the option of having willing MPOs be able to extend and deepen this evaluative framework under state guidance or approval. SPUR hopes that non-governmental stakeholders will be included in the development of this framework, and that the framework will ultimately be used to prioritize projects for federal, state and local funding.

On the other hand, SPUR would be cautious about implementing VMT mitigation banks and urges the state to learn from the mistakes made in implementing similar project-based offset programs in cap-and-trade programs around the world. Many of these programs ultimately failed given the challenges of ensuring equitable outcomes and proving additionality (that a particular environmentally-beneficial project would not have gone forward in the absence of the funding provided by its sale of environmental-credits). It would not help to meet the state's climate or equity goals, if highway expansion projects that disproportionately burdened disadvantaged communities were allowed to move forward because they took credit for VMT mitigation actions already underway in wealthier communities who suffered less from environmental burdens.

Strategy 7

SPUR applauds CAPTI's focus on strengthening transportation-land use connections. SPUR is particularly enthusiastic about using transportation funding programs to reduce VMT by incentivizing infill development, and prioritizing transportation projects for funding that incorporate robust anti-displacement strategies. However, it is important that transportation investments prioritize the production of affordable housing in infill locations in addition to market rate housing. In addition, it is important the transportation investment prioritize not just the development of transit-adjacent housing, but prioritize the walkable, amenity-rich, low-parking, affordable transit-oriented communities that truly reduce VMT. Adopting a 15-minute neighborhood framework, for instance, as well as other urban design and transportation demand

(TDM) best practices would be an important addition to a prioritization framework centered on the number of new infill units built.

SPUR encourages the state leverage transportation investments in existing transit systems, not just for new transit systems or transit systems extensions, to incentivize affordable infill housing production and the creation of low-VMT transit-oriented communities. SPUR also encourages the state to explore both prioritizing projects based on infill housing and adoption of low-VMT best practices, and setting a minimum standard of infill housing and low-VMT best practices that have to be met to be eligible for funding. Setting minimum standards has been particularly successful both in MTC's TOD Policy (Resolution 3434) as well as in numerous transit agency TOD Policies at BART, WMATA and elsewhere.

SPUR also enthusiastically supports a Highways to Boulevards pilot program. SPUR would encourage the prioritization of new state and federal funding for this program, as well as the repurposing of portions of existing transportation funding programs that have had the most damaging impact on low income and BIPOC communities to be deployed reparatively to tear down the highways that have torn up too many of these communities. It is essential that any Highways to Boulevards program centers equity by being community-led, putting in place and funding robust anti-displacement strategies in surrounding communities, and prioritizing the reclaimed land for community-serving uses such as affordable housing. This program should also create boulevards that prioritize buses, bicycles and pedestrians and active uses.

Tracking Progress

SPUR supports the clear commitment in CAPTI to regular evaluations, and for annual updates to CAPTI's recommendations. However, SPUR would like to see in the final CAPTI a clear commitment to detailed annual tracking and reporting of the extent to which each of the state's discretionary transportation investments, including investments for which the CTC is responsible, support the state's climate and equity goals as well as the RTP and SCS's goals. It is not enough to track the progress on implementing the strategies, the state should be tracking progress on how discretionary transportation funds are actually being spent.

We look forward to further opportunities to engage in and support the important work you are doing to align the state's transportation funding with its climate and equity goals.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Nicholas Josefowitz". The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined with a single horizontal stroke.

Nick Josefowitz
Chief Of Policy, SPUR

cc:

California State Transportation Agency (Darwin Moosavi, Avital Barnea, Lori Pepper, Natalie Fowler, Elissa Konove)

California Transportation Commission (Laura Pennebaker, Matthew Yosgott, Mitch Weiss, Tanisha Taylor)

California Department of Transportation (Jeanie Ward-Waller, Tony Dang)

California Air Resources Board (Jennifer Gress, Monique Davis)

California Department Housing and Community Development (Josh Rosa, Kevan Rolfness, Jess Negrete)

California Strategic Growth Council (Egon Terplan)

Governor's Office of Planning and Research (Nuin-Tara Key, Natalie Kuffel)

Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (Tyson Eckerle)

California Department of Finance (Mark Monroe, Steve Wells, Benjamin Pollack)



April 29, 2021

California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-4245

California State Transportation Agency
915 Capitol Mall, Suite 350B
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-5400

Dear CTC Commissioners and Secretary Kim,

The Bay Area Council is pleased to support the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure and applaud the myriad strategies that leverage funds to solve the twin crises of climate change and congestion with the same dollars.

We've been focused on transportation and climate change throughout our 76-year-old history: By the 1940's the Council was a regional environment watchdog for We started BART to take cars off the road, sponsored legislation to start BCDC and MTC, brought back public ferries to address congestion, and have supported many measures to transition away from fossil fuel.

The CAPTI presents ten guiding principles and a set of seven strategies that we believe will address the major issues that the transportation infrastructure is facing in conjunction with the climate crisis. The framework presented in the CAPTI will allow for an investment in zero-emission vehicle infrastructure, to improve social and racial equity by reducing public health and economic burdens and promoting projects that lead towards protecting our natural and working lands.

We support the plan and proposed projects that will improve transportation infrastructure and address the climate crisis which include: (1) increasing funding to the active transportation program, (2) prioritizing solutions for the congested corridors program and supporting projects that enable travelers to opt out of congestion, and (3) the exploration of new mechanisms to mitigate increases in vehicle miles traveled from transportation projects. It is imperative that transportation agencies consider the implications of not pursuing these project goals.

Thank you for continuing the mission to combat and adapt to climate change while supporting public health, safety, and equity as it pertains to transportation infrastructure. We look forward to working together to implement these projects, policies, and programs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gwen Litvak', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gwen Litvak
Senior Vice President, Public Policy



May 6, 2021

Hilary Norton, Chair
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

via email

Subject: CTC Agenda Tab 24 (Ref. No: 4.3.) CAPTI Workshops

Dear Chair Norton and Commissioners:

On behalf of the American Lung Association, I am writing to comment on the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) item on the California Transportation Commission (CTC) May 12-13 agenda. We appreciated the opportunity to participate in the CTC workshops on the CAPTI in April, and the CTC's ongoing attention to this important process.

Because attainment of health-protective clean air and climate standards depends on major reductions in transportation pollution, the American Lung Association supports the CAPTI framework as an important starting point for developing investment strategies to achieve healthier communities. Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-19-19 of September 2019 called for "funding transportation options that contribute to the overall health of Californians." The American Lung Association has participated throughout the CAPTI development to ensure the process advances the goals of reducing public health impacts and disparities associated with transportation in California.

On April 21, 2021, the American Lung Association issued our 22nd annual [State of the Air](#) report to highlight the progress and challenges facing local communities across the United States in terms of ozone and particle pollution. In California, over 38 million residents – 98 percent – live in a county that received a failing grade in *State of the Air 2021*. Our report features lists of the [most polluted cities](#) in the United States which found that seven of the nation's ten most ozone-polluted cities are in California, as are six of the most particle-polluted. Among all counties in the United States, counties in the Inland Empire and San Joaquin Valley rank highest for unhealthy ozone days and annual particle pollution levels, respectively. Because the transportation sector is the leading source of ozone- and particle-forming NOx emissions in California, implementing the CAPTI framework is especially important to improving health in these regions. In addition, eight California cities (Bakersfield, Chico, El Centro, Fresno, Los Angeles, Redding-Red Bluff, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Sacramento) appear on all three lists of most polluted cities in the United States.

The respiratory and cardiovascular health impacts of ozone and particle pollution are well documented,¹ and range from impacts to lung function and development, asthma attacks, heart attacks and strokes, to premature death. In addition, breathing particle pollution can cause lung cancer. Further, research has shown that people of color are more likely to be exposed to air pollution and more likely to suffer harm to their health as a result. People living in poverty,

¹ American Lung Association. Health Impacts of Air Pollution. April 2021. <https://www.lung.org/research/sota/health-risks>

children, older adults and people living with existing health issues are also more vulnerable. In California, particle pollution alone contributes to an estimated 5,000 deaths annually, including 2,500 deaths attributed to transportation sources.² Given that the transportation sector is the dominant source of California's air and climate pollution, the CAPTI framework represents a pivotal opportunity to reduce the pollution burdens facing too many Californians while also expanding opportunities for healthier mobility options.

We urge the CTC to continue to partner with sister agencies throughout the CAPTI adoption and implementation process and to begin reviewing proposed and future projects for alignment with the framework. The CTC should also move to quickly update all funding guidelines to align with the CAPTI framework, develop health and equity assessment tools and metrics to track investment performance, and to evaluate additional opportunities with to expand the reach of the framework. We believe these near-term actions are needed to ensure California's transportation investments support clean air, reduce disparities in pollution exposures and burdens, and accelerate healthier transportation options for all Californians.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments, and please don't hesitate to reach out to me at William.Barrett@Lung.org with any questions of for more information.

Sincerely,



Will Barrett
Director, Clean Air Advocacy

² California Air Resources Board. Draft Mobile Source Strategy at p. 18. April 2021. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-04/Revised_Draft_2020_Mobile_Source_Strategy.pdf



May 6, 2021

Ms. Hilary Norton
Chair
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Central Coast Considerations on Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure Plan (CAPTI)

Dear Chair Norton:

We understand and appreciate Governor Newsom's goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and encourage additional investments in public transportation and active transportation projects. The Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure Plan (CAPTI) serves as an important document to work collectively on those efforts. While the Central Coast Coalition is in strong support of addressing climate change and appreciates your leadership on this issue, success will require creative, flexible, and pragmatic solutions to account for the unique opportunities and challenges that face each region.

The CAPTI strategy to prioritize certain projects will benefit the Central Coast region to the extent that we have been working for many years to increase rail service along the Central Coast and are currently working on several bus-rapid transit corridors. However, we are concerned that this strategy will neglect critical highway safety and congestion relief improvements that support goods movement, tourist travel, transit travel times, and employees who are traveling to jobs in major urbanized areas. These improvements are delivered in partnership between the state, regional and local partners and oftentimes rely upon state competitive grants for delivery. Given the region's unique geography, vast agricultural farmland, heavy goods movement, tourism traffic and the jobs-housing imbalance we must continue to accommodate all modes of travel in the Central Coast. With a population collectively near 1.5 million, the Coast does not experience the same travel patterns as high-density urban areas. As such, our region requires continued state investment along several key highway routes, including Highways 1, 17, 25, 46, 152, 156, 166, and U.S. 101 to maximize safety, goods movement and mobility within the region.

Regional flexibility and regulatory relief for rail, bus and active transportation is key to supporting a balanced multimodal transportation system that will meet our mutual goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing fatalities and injuries, and enhancing mobility. Our key suggestions are as follows:



1. **Allow Regional Flexibility to Address Safety, Goods Movement and Mobility Needs**

State funding programs should provide flexibility to regions so that they can address all modes efficiently as possible to maximize safety, mobility, goods movement, and throughput in order to expedite the response to climate change. We request that CAPTI adopt a geographically sensitive approach in recognition that many parts of the state are more rural than the large, urbanized areas.

The Central Coast has an equitable, sustainable and multimodal approach to improving the transportation network. Our multimodal regional transportation plans detail the substantial need for investments to expand rail service on the LOSSAN corridor and the rail line to Monterey County. In fact, we strongly urge CalSTA to support making Coast Rail service a reality by filling the 153-mile gap in rail service between Gilroy and San Luis Obispo. Our regional plans also include bus-on-shoulder in Santa Cruz County and the SURF! Busway along the Monterey Branch Line. In addition, there are substantial plans to expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities and networks, such as the Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway in Monterey County and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail/Rail Trail in Santa Cruz County. We submitted many of these projects in the last Active Transportation Program funding round and strongly support the CTC's request for a \$2 billion investment of general funds in this oversubscribed program. Finally, in Santa Barbara County, the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments and Caltrans have been partnering for over twenty years to deliver on multimodal improvements between Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. These improvements include completing the remaining gap on Highway 101 with implementation of a Highway Occupancy Vehicle lane to promote carpooling and transit use, continuation of interregional transit from Ventura County, peak hour passenger rail service, and completion of gaps on the California Coastal Trail to increase biking and walking. Once these improvements are completed in partnership with the State, users of the corridor will have many options to travel through the corridor.

One of the strategies identified by CAPTI, however, is to 'promote projects that do not increase passenger vehicle travel'. We request that CalSTA take a geographically sensitive approach to this strategy as there are small urban/rural areas that still need to plan, fund and deliver projects that address safety and support goods movement. Note that improving roadway safety by reducing injuries and fatalities on our state highways is a key priority for both regional and state agencies. These projects will include proven safety countermeasures, such as roundabouts or new interchanges connected by a network of new frontage roads. It is important to not exclude such safety improvements from SB 1 funding programs if our Vision Zero goals are to be met.

Further, our counties represent one of the most productive agricultural regions in the state, if not the world. Fresh produce, berries and wine grapes cannot be delayed when going to processing or to market. Investment in regional goods movement transportation corridors will remain a priority for our region.



Finally, the state must also consider areas where capacity expansion is necessary to address climate adaptation and resiliency or to close gaps on evacuation routes to prepare for natural disasters or other climate events. Examples of recent climate resiliency gaps include the closure of U.S. 101 in Santa Barbara County as a result of the Thomas Fire and Montecito debris flow event, mudslides near Big Sur severing access to Highway 1, and when Interstate 5 closed during inclement weather events over the Grapevine, making US 101 the only north-south alternative. These safety improvements rely upon state investments that are not just critical for regional needs but also meet state and national priorities

2. Support Additional Strategies & Augment Programs to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As noted above, our region fully supports investments into public transportation, but transit is not the universal answer to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Expanded electric vehicle use and charging facilities and enhanced broadband capacity should be a key part of our climate action strategy.

The pandemic's crash course in teleworking has proven it to be effective at reducing travel while maintaining the productivity needs of employers and employees in many industries. We request that CalSTA include in its strategies expanded investment in broadband, particularly in rural areas, to support enhanced telecommuting, and state support for local implementation of transportation demand management strategies, vanpools and park-and-ride lots, and VMT-mitigation credits.

In addition, we appreciate the Governor's direction through N-79-20 to invest more into zero-emission infrastructure and ask that the Central Coast be considered a priority for rebates for zero-emission vehicle purchases as a critical opportunity to help the region realize its air quality and mobility goals. The Central Coast is working collectively with Caltrans on installing charging stations within the region and has applied for a Caltrans planning grant to enhance our efforts.

The influx of \$15 billion in surplus General Fund revenue, plus the enactment of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, which will provide California with \$26 billion, including \$16 billion to local governments (\$8.4 billion for cities, \$7.7 billion for counties) for COVID-related expenditures (broadband is a qualified use), provides a unique opportunity to accelerate addressing climate resiliency and project delivery to enhance mobility for all. Cycle 5 of the Active Transportation Program (ATP) received nearly \$2.3 billion worth of applications, but only \$445 million was able to be allocated. The Central Coast Coalition respectfully requests that additional resources be dedicated to ATP and other SB 1 competitive programs such as Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, and Local Partnership Program, as well as traditional flexible, formulaic grant programs, such as the STIP, to expedite delivery of multi-modal options. The Coalition also proposes that resources be made available to local transportation



planning agencies in order to comply with SB 375 and assist with infill development. These investments would collectively allow for a wholistic approach to address all modes in order to enhance mobility and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled, where feasible.

These strategies should be a key part of the Climate Action Plan whose ultimate goal is not just to reduce vehicle miles travel but also to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

3. Support the Will of the Voters and Maintain State and Local Partnerships

Four of the five Central Coast counties have enacted local sales tax measures that make multimodal improvements on and near the state highway system. These measures required comprehensive public engagement, contain diverse investments in multi-modal options, and required a 2/3 vote for passage. San Luis Obispo has also engaged in broad-based public outreach to prioritize state grant investments towards state-owned assets. Our agencies have made a commitment to the voters and our public to deliver the investments that our expenditure plans promised. A key part of keeping our promises is to secure state matching funds, since each county does not generate enough in local sales tax revenues to make up for the disproportionate cost of delivering projects. This funding gap makes continued access to state funding for a multimodal range of projects imperative.

In 2017, the legislature enacted SB1 to address mobility, safety and congestion, in addition to maintaining infrastructure. The Central Coast advocated for the bill to include: the creation of the vehicle registration fee as a carbon-neutral funding source to address congestion and multi-modal options; the creation of the State Rail Assistance Program, dedicating operations funding for passenger rail service; and augmentation of the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. In 2018 voters rejected Proposition 6 (the repeal of SB 1) and supported Proposition 69 (protecting SB 1). It is important to support the intent of the voters in order to maintain the public trust, by preserving all of the modes supported in the original SB 1 legislation.

4. Align All State Agencies in Support of CAPTI Goals

Finally, in order to maximize the impact of CAPTI, all state agencies should be aligned in streamlining the process to make it easier to deliver multi-modal options by providing flexibility on addressing habitat mitigation and local land use decisions when system or service expansion is pursued to provide a carbon-neutral benefit and to expedite project delivery.

In conclusion, the Central Coast Coalition agencies want to be part of the plan to take action to limit climate change, but we ask that state investments be responsive to the unique needs and characteristics of each region: urban and rural, valley and coastal. We look forward to partnering with you and the appropriate state agencies to develop pragmatic solutions to meet the objectives articulated in the Executive Orders and providing additional input on the development of CAPTI.



Central Coast Coalition
Moving California's Economy

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Marjie Kirn, Chair, Central Coast Coalition, at (209) 261-6425 or mkirn@sbcag.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Marjie Kirn".

Marjie Kirn, Executive Director
Santa Barbara County Association of
Governments

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pete Rodgers".

Pete Rodgers, Executive Director
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Debra L. Hale".

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Transportation Agency for Monterey County

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Guy Preston".

Guy Preston, Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
Commission

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mary Gilbert".

Mary Gilbert, Executive Director
San Benito Council of Governments

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Maura Twomey".

Maura Twomey, Executive Director
Association of Monterey Bay Area Government

cc: Members of the California Transportation Commission
Mitch Weiss, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission
Ronda Paschal, Deputy Secretary, Governor Newsom
Mark Tollefson, Deputy Secretary, Governor Newsom
Kate Gordon, Director, Governor's Office of Planning and Research
David Kim, Secretary, California State Transportation Agency



Central Coast Coalition
Moving California's Economy

Darwin Moosavi, Deputy Secretary, California State Transportation Agency
Toks Omishakin, Director, Caltrans
Tim Gubbins, District Director, Caltrans District 5
Sarkes Khachek, Director of Programming, SBCAG