

From: [Giuliano](#)
To: [cacsecretary \[@smcta.com\]](mailto:cacsecretary [@smcta.com]); [Board \(@smcta.com\)](mailto:Board (@smcta.com))
Subject: Re: Correspondence for CAC and Board
Date: Thursday, October 3, 2024 9:29:11 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 unknown senders.

I'm a member of the CAC speaking only for myself.

Another [article](#) on highway widening. This one on I-80, but the facts and conclusions are similar to widening 101 north of 380. Professor Handy from Davis is quoted and is pretty definitive:

When more capacity is added to a road, "the faster-flowing conditions encourage more people to use the freeway. "So that increase in speeds is a very short-term effect. ... If the problem they're trying to solve is congestion, this is not the right project to solve that problem."

This inspired me to do both a Google search and a Google Scholar search. I could find literally zero sources that said that an increase in capacity led to a long term decrease in congestion. Every single one said that in a few months or years, speeds decreased to the same or lower levels, the number of cars below free flow conditions increased, VMT increased, GHG increased, pollution increased. Congestion and its assorted ills always return. These are boondoggles that waste money without producing their claimed benefits. If the goal is congestion relief, the solutions are well known and straight forward. We just have to have the will to take that path.

Thank you

giuliano

--

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