

**TA**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**as of 12-07-2023**

**From:** [Giuliano](#)  
**To:** [Board \(@smcta.com\)](#)  
**Subject:** 14.b Programming and allocation of Measure A and W funds for 11 projects  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 6, 2023 10:45:11 PM

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

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

Hi all,

### **Please reject project US 101/SR 92 project.**

I met with staff on Monday (Peter, Patrick, and Jessica Manzi). After some discussion we agreed that the engineering consensus and published studies agreed that 1) in general, increasing capacity leads to induced demand leads to the return of congestion and 2) there were no studies suggesting otherwise for on/off ramps and interchanges, or for local streets feeding onto them, and so one must assume they behave the same. The return of congestion means the return of the unsafe conditions this project is meant to fix. We also discussed the states mandate that California State requires that projects do not increase VMT. Increased capacity leads to increased VMT. And increased VMT leads to increased GHG emissions. And CA State has mandated that we substantially reduce GHG emissions by 2030, not embark on projects that will increase GHG emissions.

Therefore, as this project increases capacity and will therefore increase VMT, as increased VMT will increase GHG, as its congestion relief will be temporary, and therefore its safety improvements will be temporary, this project will fail to meet its goals, and is in violation of California States requirement that projects must not increase VMT, you should reject this project. Anything else makes no sense. The project fails to meet its goals, increases GHG, and is contrary to CA State policy.

### **Please put 101 managed lane project sponsors on notice**

101 project has 3 alternatives: add a lane to be used as managed lane, convert a lane to a managed lane, do nothing. Adding a lane adds capacity which means adding VMT and therefore adding GHG emissions. It is therefore contrary to California State policy. Please either as a board or as individuals that if this project returns having selected the lane addition option you will be force to reject the project at that time, and require the sponsors to return selecting one of the other options. They will save time and make progress more quickly by returning to the board choosing one of the other two options from the outset.

### **Please figure out how to require project sponsors to include bicycle infrastructure into highway and local streets projects**

Staff informs me that the highway and local streets buckets can include cycling infrastructure. It just can't be solely or primarily cycling infrastructure.

Two weeks ago I was hit by a car. I am okay. The person who hit me was a doofus. But we all make mistakes, we're human, it's bound to happen. The problem is badly designed roadways and a lack of infrastructure makes it vastly more likely that a dumb boo-boo results in a crash

and great injury or death. I was fantastically lucky to have escaped with a sore elbow. I should not have been hit. No one should be hit like this. I was hit where there was no bike lane, just a picture of a bike on the roadway. Which was not visible at night.

If we are to reduce GHG emissions, if we are to reduce motor vehicle VMT, people simply must make fewer trips by car and make them instead by bike. But they won't do so if they rightly fear being hit by a car as I was. We simply must have a lot more good bike infrastructure, and that means lot more protected bike lanes, Please, I beg you, direct staff to do all they can to ensure all projects include them.

giuliano

--

Drive a bike a bit more often and cars a bit less.  
You'll be healthier and happier, and so will our world.

<https://bikesiliconvalley.org>

<https://www.peopleforbikes.org/news/your-bike-advocacy-playbook>