

From: [Jim Frame](#)
To: [California Transportation Commission@CATC](mailto:California.Transportation.Commission@CATC)
Subject: Equity Access / I-80 (Yolo County)
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 5:49:10 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

I write to object to the plan to implement toll lanes on I-80 in Yolo County. In the name general congestion relief, this plan imposes a burden on lower-income drivers who cannot afford to pay the hefty tolls (particularly at peak hours), and there are no funds allocated to underwrite a plan to provide some environmental justice/equity relief.

All California drives pay for our highways with their gas taxes, so providing faster through travel only to those with enough disposable income to afford tolls is contrary to good public policy. I urge you to reject this toll plan.

Thanks for your consideration.

--

Jim Frame jhframe@dcn.org 530.756.8584
Frame Surveying & Mapping 609 A Street Davis, CA 95616
-----< Davis Community Network >-----

From: [Fred Kindel](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Cc: ahersh@dcn.org
Subject: No Widening I-80
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 11:32:25 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Carl Guardino--Please, no more hwy lanes for autos/trucks. Put the funds to better more sustainable less-polluting PUBLIC TRANSIT. We're trying to restore our environment now, not degrade it further. Thank you.

Yours For A Better Environment, Fred Kindel, Folsom



May 10, 2024

Sent via email

California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
ctc@catc.ca.gov

Re: Comments on the Yolo 80 Corridor Improvements Project (Agenda Item # 17)

Dear Commissioners,

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (Center) regarding the Yolo 80 Corridor Improvements Project. The Center is very concerned that the project, as proposed, will irreparably harm community and environmental health without achieving the project's objectives of reducing congestion. Adding more lanes to roadways will not reduce vehicular travel nor meet the state's air quality goals. Doing so will only worsen traffic and emissions while harming sensitive wildlife and habitats. The Center strongly urges the Commission to not approve funding for this project.

The Center is a non-profit, public interest environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 1.7 million members and online activists throughout California and the United States. The Center has worked for many years to protect imperiled plants and wildlife, open space, air and water quality, and overall quality of life for people in California.

The Project Will Harm Sensitive Species and Degrade Important Habitat. The project area supports a wide variety of special-status species and sensitive habitats that will be significantly impacted by a larger road with more vehicles and traffic and therefore more noise, light, carbon emissions, and runoff pollution. Instead of worsening the road's impacts on the environment, Caltrans has an opportunity to restore degraded habitats and enhance wildlife connectivity at their existing infrastructure to make the landscape and its inhabitants more climate resilient.

The Project Would Increase Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Harming State Climate Goals. California is currently not on track to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets, primarily due to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the transportation sector.¹ Adding new lanes to the roadway would increase the number of single occupancy vehicles on the road. This will inevitably lead to more GHG emissions and widen the gap between where California needs to be to tackle the climate crisis and where it is headed.

¹ CARB. "2022 Progress Report." <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2023-05/2022-SB150-MainReport-FINAL-ADA.pdf>

The Project Would Harm Community Health and Wellbeing. Increasing a region's vehicle miles travelled (VMT) isn't just bad planning, it also undermines community health. Increased VMT increases emissions of air pollutants, which have been linked to premature mortality, compromised birth outcomes, heart disease and a host of respiratory illnesses.² Furthermore, increasing the number of cars on roads increases the likelihood of automobile crashes, which are the leading cause of death among young people in the United States.³

The Project Would Divest Public Funds From Sustainable Public Transportation Initiatives. Providing alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel is essential to building an efficient, sustainable and equitable transportation system. Currently, 76.4% of daily commuters are people driving alone.⁴ To change these trends, government agencies like Caltrans need to invest in alternative modes of transportation to not only make them cheaper to use, but more efficient than driving. Using public funds to widen freeways and lock us into a future of car dependency will steer us farther away from our climate goals.

The Project Would Not Achieve Its Stated Objective of Reducing Traffic Congestion. The central goal of the project is to reduce traffic congestion, however, conducting business-as-usual and simply adding more lanes to an already congested freeway ignores the science that clearly documents the concept of "induced travel demand." It is widely accepted that building more lanes only creates more traffic long term, despite short term reductions in congestion.⁵ Depending on the extent of induced demand, undesirable consequences of road use such as congestion, pollution, and accidents worsen.⁶

I. Conclusion

California needs to be investing in transportation projects that reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles on our roads and solve congestion through more efficient forms of public transportation rather than outdated and ineffective freeway widening projects. We therefore strongly urge the Commission to not approve funds for this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Reid-Wainscoat, Campaigner
Center for Biological Diversity
ereidwainscoat@biologicaldiversity.org

² Mujtaba, Ghulam, and Syed Jawad Hussain Shahzad. "Air pollutants, economic growth and public health: implications for sustainable development in OECD countries." *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 28 (2021): 12686-12698.

³ Center for Disease Control and Prevention. "Underlying Cause of Death, 2018-2021." <https://wonder.cdc.gov>

⁴ McKenzie, B. (2015). *Who drives to work?: Commuting by automobile in the United States: 2013*. US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.

⁵ Angarita-Zapata, J. S., Parra-Valencia, J. A., & Andrade-Sosa, H. H. (2016). Understanding the structural complexity of induced travel demand in decision-making: a system dynamics approach. *Organizacija*, 49(3), 129-143.

⁶ Hymel, K. (2019). If you build it, they will drive: Measuring induced demand for vehicle travel in urban areas. *Transport policy*, 76, 57-66.

From: [Jordan Kim](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Equity Access and I-80 Yolo Funding
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 8:23:28 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear CTC Equity Commission,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed addition of a new lane on Highway 80, particularly focusing on the lack of inclusivity, environmental justice considerations, and equitable representation in the decision-making process.

1.

No Inclusivity: It has come to my attention that Caltrans and Yolo County officials did not adequately engage important and knowledgeable stakeholder groups during the Environmental Review process for Yolo80. Shockingly, 9 out of the 10 Transportation and Climate Action Plan (CAP) commissions in Yolo County were never consulted at any stage. Their valuable input on EIR study alternatives, final alternative selection, and tolling policy was completely disregarded. Even transportation experts at UC Davis, whose insights could have significantly contributed to the process, were ignored, as their views contradicted the predetermined outcome.

2.

Lack of Public Outreach: The so-called "public hearing" on the Toll lane held on 4/8/24 failed to involve the public in a meaningful way. Despite over 70,000 individuals commuting through this section daily, only one member of the public participated in the hearing, either in person or via Zoom. This lack of engagement is concerning, especially considering that the majority of attendees and commentators were lobbyists, politicians, trade associations, or environmental group members.

3.

Environmental Justice Concerns: The chosen alternative in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), HOT3+, fails to allocate sufficient funds

for an Environmental Justice Component. The projected toll revenue falls short by \$2 million of what is required to fund the FEIR mitigation plan, potentially neglecting critical environmental justice initiatives.

4.

Inequitable Representation: The composition of the new Tolling Authority Board raises serious questions about equitable representation. A glaring imbalance exists whereby 50% of toll lane users, particularly those residing in Solano within the MTC region, have no representation on the board. Conversely, despite only 8% of toll lane users residing in Yolo County, the county will hold a majority on the tolling authority board due to geographical factors. This inequitable distribution of power may influence how toll revenue is allocated and whether an environmental justice program, if ever funded, adequately addresses the needs of all affected communities.

In light of these concerns, I urge the commission to reconsider the decision-making process surrounding the proposed lane addition on Highway 80. Meaningful engagement with stakeholders, including local commissions, transportation experts, and the wider public, is essential to ensure a transparent and equitable outcome that addresses the needs of all communities involved.

Thank you for considering my input on this matter.

Sincerely,

A concerned citizen

From: [Ben Matsubayashi](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Equity and I-80 Yolo Funding
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 11:17:52 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

I am concerned about Inclusivity of the process, remaining social equity and environmental Justice issues are still not resolved in the Yolo 80 toll lane project. Yolo and Caltrans officials decided on an alternative for the Yolo 80 three years ago and subsequent public process has not been used to surface, then deal with, real issues.

No Inclusivity: Caltrans and Yolo County officials did not engage important and knowledgeable stakeholder groups in the Environmental Review process for Yolo80 (e.g. 9 of the 10 Transportation and CAP climate commissions in Yolo County were never engaged at any point. None were engaged for input on EIR study alternatives, choice of final alternative, or tolling policy.). Even Input from transportation experts at UC Davis have been ignored as they contradict the predetermined outcome.

No inclusivity 2: No outreach was done of public at the so called “public hearing” on the Toll lane 4/8/24, i.e. it was not inclusive: Over 70,000 individuals drive this section a day and will be affected by toll, yet only 1 member of public attended or zoomed into the public hearing and commented orally or in writing: All other attendees and commentators at the so call “public” hearing were lobbyists: politicians, trade association, or members of environmental groups.

No Environmental Justice: The FEIR alternative chosen for I-80 (HOT3+) provides insufficient funds for an Environmental Justice Component as forecasted of toll revenue generated will fall \$2 Million short of what is called for to fund the FEIR mitigation plan.

Inequitable Representation: The new the new Tolling authority board is setup so 50% of the users of this toll lanes will have no representative on it board (i.e. they live in Solano- the MTC region), While less than 8% of toll lane users will live in Yolo county that county will have a majority of tolling authority board due to an accident of geography. This inequitable power will likely be reproduced in where and how toll revenue is spent and an environmental

justice program, if it is ever funded.

From: [Jim Frame](#)
To: [California Transportation Commission@CATC](mailto:California.Transportation.Commission@CATC)
Subject: I-80 (Yolo County) Widening
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 5:49:12 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

I wish to register my objection to the planned widening of I-80 through Yolo County. I believe this project was ill-conceived and has been put developed in contravention of Caltrans policy. If fully implemented, it will eventually achieve little or no increased throughput due to induced demand, and will certainly degrade air quality in the region. We have already learned this lesson in many areas throughout the state; it's ridiculous that Caltrans persists in advancing projects of this nature. Please scuttle it.

Thanks for your consideration.

--

Jim Frame jhframe@dcn.org 530.756.8584
Frame Surveying & Mapping 609 A Street Davis, CA 95616
-----< Davis Community Network >-----

From: [Alan Hirsch](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Cc: Guardino_Carl@CATC; william.walker@catc.ca.gov; darnell.Grisby@catc.ca.gov; nailliah.pope-harden@catc.ca.gov; clarissa.reyes.falcon@catc.ca.gov; evan.cragin@asm.ca.gov
Subject: CTC & the Culture of "Disagreeing Better"
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 7:05:26 PM
Attachments: [2023_06_08 CTC staff TCEP rejects I-80.docx](#)

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Chair Carl Guardino and Members, tab 1.4
California Transportation Commission

CC: Chair William Walker and members, CTC Equity Committee (mtg tab 7)

RE: Inclusivity as part of *Disagreeing Better* on Transportation Projects

Mr. Guardino:

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan used to say:

“You are entitled to your own opinions. But you are not entitled to your own facts.”

The California Public Records Act (and the Brown Act) were designed so we work from the same facts---that there is sharing of information - so in dialog agencies don't strategically withhold information to put electeds official as well as the public at an unfair disadvantage in reviewing projects.

Transparency is Inclusivity.

However, I want to bring to your attention a situation where Caltrans seems to be strategically withholding information from the public on a \$1/2 billion project.

In June 2023 the CTC staff report recommended NOT to fund Yolo80 toll lanes out of TCEP funds, rating it medium priority. In that staff report CTC staff rated Yolo80 31st out of 48 projects. Caltrans rated Yolo80 last in priority (24th) out of 24 of their projects. (extract from June 2023 staff report attached)

This of course raises question why it is now rated a priority for advance funding. In the CTC discussion on 5/16. Would not you and other commissions like to know?

If fact 11 month ago, I tried to find out.

I made a public records request of information from Caltrans 6/15/23 (attached) on why it was

rated last of 24- even before that June 28th, 2023, CTC meeting. I requested the rubric that was used. And I later ask the CTC staff for detail why it was rerated for funding at March now May 2024 meetings.

I have received no response from either.

I have gotten acknowledgement and notice of delays in writing, and even gotten calls suggesting I drop part of my request so I can get something.. I just said, "send me what you can now". I have also contracted my assemblyperson's Cecilia-Aguilar- Curry office for help. All to no avail.

It seems to me to be there is active resistance to disclosing public information.

I have also been told by lower-level agency staff that they feel their addressing my public record act is "on top of my regular job". Is this the 'message' they got from their bosses about public records? .

Everyone having the same facts is basic part of "**disagree better**" on the Yolo80 project,).

It is too late for me to get the information for this meeting: As you read this I am now traveling for my child's college graduation that is held in NYC.

So, the ball is in the CTC court on Thursday on pursuing this information.

I do hope you see this as an opportunity not a problem. CTC action on Yolo80 could send a message to the thousands of staff and managers in over hundred state transportation agencies about "disagreeing better" by being transparent and inclusive with the public. **That the CTC expect players in the transportation arena to follow at least the legal minimum of California Law on public records** if they want to apply for CTC funding.

I will be interested to watch the meeting tape to see what "rules of the road" the CTC enforce on the public process to help us disagree better at all levels of government.

Yours for a better California,

Alan Hirsch
Yolo Mobility.
916 717 9682

=====
From: CALTRANS <caltrans@mycusthelp.net>

Date: April 8, 2024 at 14:13:02 PDT

To: aaahirsch8@gmail.com

Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R023957-061523

--- Please respond above this line ---



RE: Public Records Request of **June 15, 2023**, Reference # R023957-061523

Dear Alan Hirsch,

On **June 15, 2023**, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) received your request for records under the Public Records Act (PRA) wherein you requested the following:

- 1) Submission to the CTC for processed at June 28th 2023 meeting of project application of Yolo80 Managed Lanes Project for funding by TCEP program- Likely drafted by District 3 but may be in possession of Caltrans HQ.**
- 2) All letters or email of support of Yolo 80 Managed Lanes project submitted to CTC, if not included in 1.**
- 3) Caltrans HQ 's final project scoping/priority setting/ranking for all 24(?) Caltrans TCEP projects submitted to CTC for June 28 meeting**
- 4) Description of Caltrans ranking/scoping priority setting process for TCEP funding**
- 5)) With any details note why the Yolo80 managed lanes project was prioritized/scoped the way it was by Caltrans HQ.**
- 6) Any email or communication to District 3 explaining the prioritization /ranking of the Yolo80 Managed Lanes project**

Caltrans is in the process of gathering and reviewing the requested records. Your request

will take extra time to fulfill because of the need for consultation, to be conducted with all practicable speed, with an agency having substantial interest in the determination of the request or among two or more components of the agency having substantial subject matter interest therein.

Consequently, Caltrans is exercising its authority under Government Code section 7922.535, to extend the time to reply to a Public Records Act request. You will receive a further, more **complete response no later than May 06, 2024.**

Thank you for your patience in awaiting this information.

Sincerely,

John O'Connell
Caltrans Public Information Officer
(530) 701-9459

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the [Public Records Center](#)



Begin forwarded message:

From: CALTRANS <caltrans@mycusthelp.net>

Date: April 19, 2024 at 11:01:07 PDT

To: aaahirsch8@gmail.com

Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R030062-031224

--- Please respond above this line ---



RE: Public Records Request of March 12, 2024, Reference # R030062-031224

Dear Alan Hirsch,

On *March 12, 2024*, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) received your request for records under the Public Records Act (PRA) wherein you requested the following:

All text and written communication between or within state agencies consisting of 1) CTC, 2) Caltrans District 3, 3) Caltrans HQ 4) CARB 5) STA regarding funding of Yolo 80 before the CTC of Yolo80 project.'

All communication between these 5 named agencies and Yolo Transportation District board member and staff.

Caltrans is in the process of gathering and reviewing the requested records. Your request will take extra time to fulfill because of the need to: search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request.

Consequently, Caltrans is exercising its authority under Government Code section 7922.535, to extend the time to reply to a Public Records Act request. You will receive a further, more complete response no later than May 24, 2024.

Thank you for your patience in awaiting this information.

John O'Connell
Caltrans Public Information Officer District 3

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the [Public Records Center](#)



Funding from Senate Bill (SB) 1 - Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017

2022 SENATE BILL 1 PROGRAMS – STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS from TCEP 6/28 item 17 (pdf)

Staff Report Link [022 TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM – STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS](https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/programs/tcep/2022-tcep-staff-recommendations.pdf) (pdf) <https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/programs/tcep/2022-tcep-staff-recommendations.pdf>

48 project listed. 23 OK'ed 25 rejected.

Note Caltrans has 24 project among the 48 projects rated in priority order on this this..and the Yolo I-80 is rated #24. Was this invisible to YoloTD?

This is list of Rejected projects under TCEP...CTC funding is biannual cycle.. Yolo have a chance under sb1 until 2025. Could be funded local match or another state only program. Hanna Walter is program manager at CTC. Scoring is available.

Item 17 on 6/28/23 DTC agenda. -below is staff report extract:

Below is I-80 Yolo section of full table with 48 projects of which 25 are funded.... listed in order. Note esp first column: "Caltrans priority". .

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION		2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program				STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS		Projects Not Recommended for Funding			June 8, 2023	
											(\$1,000s)	
Caltrans Priority	Project Title	Nominating Agency	County	Region	Regional	State	Total Request	Total Project	Score			
16	SB 101 Multimodal Corridor*	Santa Barbara County Association of Governments/Caltrans	Santa Barbara	Los Angeles/Inland	\$ 5,340	\$ 37,660	\$ 43,000	\$ 111,046	Low			
<i>*This project is being recommended in the 2022 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, therefore it no longer needs TCEP funding</i>												
17	SR 46 East Antelope Grade C	San Luis Obispo Council of Governments/Caltrans	San Luis Obispo	Central Coast	\$ -	\$ 34,700	\$ 34,700	\$ 54,030	Medium			
	Sacramento Hydrogen Fueling Stations	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District/Caltrans	Sacramento	Bay Area/Central Valley	\$ 30,870	\$ -	\$ 30,870	\$ 55,506	Medium			
9	The Desert Rail Infrastructure Improvement	Southern California Association of Governments/Caltrans	San Bernardino	Los Angeles/Inland	\$ -	\$ 28,386	\$ 28,386	\$ 40,551	Medium			
	Grant Line Road Safety Freight Mobility**	Sacramento Area Council of Governments/Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority	Sacramento	Bay Area/Central Valley	\$ 13,000	\$ -	\$ 13,000	\$ 47,859	Medium			
24	Yolo 80 U.S. 50 Managed Lanes	Sacramento Area Council of Governments/Caltrans	Sacramento/Yolo	Bay Area/Central Valley	\$ 52,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 103,000	\$ 206,980	Medium			
13	SR 47 Seaside Ave	Southern California Association of Governments/Port of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Los Angeles/Inland	\$ 16,718	\$ 25,074	\$ 41,790	\$ 62,980	Medium			
	HWY 1 State Park Drive to Freedom Boulevard	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments/Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz	Ccoast	\$ 5,340	\$ -	\$ 5,340	\$ 180,888	Medium			
	Port of Stockton Rail Bridge	San Joaquin Council of Governments	San Joaquin	Bay Area/	\$ -	\$ 50,523	\$ 50,523	\$ 78,508	Medium			
8	SR 58 Truck Climbing Lane	Kern Council of Governments/Caltrans	Kern	Bay Area/	\$ -	\$ 6,700	\$ 6,700	\$ 65,760	Medium			
	I-80 Music Industrial Interchanges Improvement Project	Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Alameda County	Alameda	Bay Area/	\$ 41,950	\$ -	\$ 41,950	\$ 220,000	Medium			

Contact: Hannah Walter

Associate Deputy Director Programming - Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

Planning - Road Charge Program

Email: Hannah.Walter@catc.ca.gov

Phone: (279) 203-1364

Text: extract from staff memo- format removed

SENATE BILL 1 PROGRAMS – STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS 2022 TRADE CORRIDOR ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Staff recommends Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds totaling \$1.081 billion for 26 projects with total project costs of nearly \$3.8 billion.

Recommendations for funding are contained on the attached list of projects.

The recommended projects were determined to be the projects that best address the criteria as outlined in the guidelines. All projects nominated for funding provide significant value to California residents, and the amount of funding requested reflects the significant need to address freight transportation improvements across the state.

The recommendations include a variety of projects that provide freight transportation improvements in localities across the state.

These projects support Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure principles as they will provide the program's first investments in zero-emission freight infrastructure resulting in an overall decline in harmful emissions.

The projects recommended will improve border crossings, increase freight rail storage and transport capacity, improve interchanges, and create highway improvements such as truck only lanes, auxiliary lanes, or managed lanes.

The recommended projects will facilitate the additional movement of trucks, rail, and cargo. Lastly, these projects will create nearly 50,000 jobs, encouraging economic development throughout the state.

Created by Senate Bill 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), the California Transportation Commission's (Commission) Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds infrastructure improvements on federally designated Trade Corridors of National and Regional Significance, on the Primary Freight Network, and along corridors that have a high volume of freight movement, as determined by the Commission.

In August of 2021, the Commission began development of the 2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program Guidelines. The Commission held seven workshops to solicit input on the development of the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program Guidelines. The guidelines were prepared by Commission staff and developed in consultation with Caltrans, the California State Transportation Agency, the California Air Resources Board, the Commission's Equity Advisory Roundtable, regional transportation planning agencies, local agencies, ports, transportation advocates, the freight industry, and other stakeholders.

In addition, new to this cycle, the Commission hosted 23 virtual office hour sessions from February 2022 to April 2022, where Commission staff provided technical assistance to applicants who wanted to discuss their project nominations for the 2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program. The Commission's guidelines, adopted at its August 17, 2022, meeting, describe the policies, standards, criteria and procedures for the development, adoption, and management of the 2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program. The Commission established the 2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Competitive Program as a two-year, \$1.051 billion program (fiscal years 2023-24 and 2024-25). Project nominations were due to the Commission on November 18, 2022.

The Commission received 48 project nominations seeking over \$1.8 billion in funding requests. Since Senate Bill 1 provides an on-going funding source for the Trade Corridor 1 of 4 CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION JUNE 8, 2023 Enhancement Program, agencies with projects not recommended for funding in this cycle will have the opportunity to apply for funding in subsequent cycles.

An evaluation team, consisting of Commission and Caltrans staff, reviewed all 48 project nominations based on the screening and evaluation criteria set forth in the Commission's adopted guidelines. In addition, California Air Resources Board staff reviewed applications to evaluate air quality benefits, and Interagency Equity Advisory Committee members evaluated the equity and community engagement sections.

Due to the competitive nature of this program, staff evaluations were limited to the documentation submitted with the application package. The total proposed programming exceeds the identified funding capacity and will be supported by Trade Corridor Improvement Fund savings and future Trade Corridor Enhancement Program project savings, consistent with the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund close-out policy and Trade Corridor Enhancement Program guidelines.

Projects not recommended for funding were found less competitive for a variety of reasons including goods movement benefits were unclear or minimal; required information was missing or unclear; components were deemed ineligible; and overall lower ratings in the evaluated criteria. The projects not recommended for funding demonstrated benefits but were determined to be less competitive for this program cycle. Nominating agency staff are encouraged to contact Commission staff for technical assistance to improve project nominations in future program funding cycles.

The Commission will consider these staff recommendations and program adoption at its June 28-29, 2023, Commission Meeting.

From: [Roberta L. Millstein](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Item 19, Funding of I-80/US-50 Managed Lanes Project with TCEP funds
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 3:45:38 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear California Transportation Commission,

I urge you to **deny - do not approve** - the advance programming request of \$105,000,000 from the 2024 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program for the right-of-way support and construction of the I-80/US 50 Managed Lanes Project in Yolo County (Item 19).

As a resident of Davis, I would be directly impacted by these changes to I-80. The added lanes purport to improve traffic flow, but as described in a June 2, 2023 article in the Davis Enterprise, such attempted improvements only help in the short term (and then only by a small amount). In the longer term, they induce traffic, with the result that we have the same traffic delays as before but with more cars and thus a greater contribution of greenhouse gases. Davis has committed to carbon neutrality by 2040 - this project would take us in the opposite direction.

As a Professor Emerit at the University of California, Davis who researches and publishes in environmental ethics, I believe that funding this project would violate California's, Yolo County's, and Davis's stated values, taking an action that would bring further harm to people, plants, animals, and planet at a time when we are already experiencing many negative effects of the climate crisis.

It is also worth noting that the tolling proposal, which stands to create inequitable "Lexus lanes" that working people cannot afford, has had insufficient (almost nonexistent) consultation from relevant stakeholder groups. For example, 9 of the 10 Transportation and CAP climate commissions in Yolo County were never engaged at any point. None were engaged for input on EIR study alternatives or the final choice of final alternatives. Furthermore, no outreach was done to engage the public at the so-called "public hearing" on the toll lane on 4/9/24, i.e. it was not inclusive: Over 70,000 individuals drive this section a day and would be affected by a toll, yet only 1 member of the public attended or zoomed into the public hearing and commented orally or in writing--all other attendees and commenters at the so-called "public" hearing were lobbyists, politicians, trade association, or members of environmental groups.

Thus, approval of the application submitted by the Capital Area Regional Toll Authority for a toll facility on Interstate 80 in Yolo County should be **denied**.

This project was rated last - 24 out of 24 - by Caltrans and 30 out of 49 by CTC staff in June 2023. This past June, the CTC wisely decided not to fund this project. It should make the same "do not fund" decision again.

Sincerely,

Roberta L. Millstein, PhD
Davis resident
Professor Emerit

Department of Philosophy
University of California, Davis

Book in production with the University of Chicago Press: *The Land Is Our Community: Aldo Leopold's Environmental Ethic for the New Millennium*

From: [Nick Bates](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Public comment on May 16/17 meeting item 17: Yolo Corridor Improvements Project
Date: Saturday, May 11, 2024 10:00:17 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear California Transportation Commission,

I am asking that you do NOT fund the Yolo 80 corridor improvements project. My reasoning is as follows:

1. This project claims to alleviate congestion by adding additional roadway capacity. However, there is ample evidence that highway expansions DO NOT alleviate congestion in the long run, and instead just attract more drivers. This is acknowledged by Caltrans in its CAPTI (p18) and I would like to see them live up to their own ideals.
2. Another reason given for why an additional lane is needed is that it will reduce instances of lane drops and merging lanes. In my DEIR comment letter to Caltrans, I pointed out that they did not adequately consider measures to eliminate these lane drops without widening the roadway (by removing many unnecessary/bottleneck contributing auxiliary lanes). I was not satisfied by their response to my comment and I think this issue needs further examination before the project is funded.
3. I am deeply concerned about the VMT mitigation funding plan. The majority of VMT mitigations involve funding local transit operations. However, explicitly defined funding only lasts for a few years (as few as 3 years). Instead, they say that future funding for these services will be supplemented by future toll revenue, however they do not provide any details on the feasibility of this plan. I do not think it's right for a project to be able to claim ongoing VMT mitigation for unfunded plans like this.
4. I am concerned about the impact to safety that will result from narrowing/eliminating road shoulders and narrowing lanes.

Overall, I share the desire to improve mobility of people and goods along this corridor. However, I think that the negatives outweigh the positives for this project and funding would be better spent on others with a larger emphasis placed on operational and environmental sustainability.

Thank you,
Nick Bates

Davis Resident, UC Davis Graduate Student, and City of Davis Bicycling, Transportation, and Street Safety Commissioner

From: [Scott Steward](#)
To: [California Transportation Commission@CATC](mailto:California.Transportation.Commission@CATC)
Subject: RE: CTC hearing on I80 toll policy - the current consideration does not charge through traffic enough.
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 8:06:16 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

TO: Chair William Walker, CTC Equity Advisory Committee & members
CC: Chair Carl Guardino and CTC members, Tab 17

I am a long time resident of Yolo County and I do not own property in Tahoe. I have an objection to the toll policies being presented to the California Transportation Commission.

The toll policy selected for the HOT3+ project by Caltrans creates social equity issues as it gives preference to groups heading to Tahoe over local use. Specifically, Alternative 4 (HOT3+) was chosen from the FEIR, which allows groups going on recreational trips to Tahoe to travel for free on the toll lane. This means the main source of congestion for local experience goes uncharged. Equity for HOT3+ should, at a minimum, be charging through traffic vehicles on their way to Tahoe some portion of the \$9 per vehicle (light or heavy duty) each way.

Thank you for your consideration on charging all through traffic destined for Tahoe; some amount of the toll, regardless, is discounted for 3+ persons in the vehicle.

Scott Steward

Davis CA,

From: [Gabriel Ehrlich](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: RE: Yolo 80 Corridor Improvements Project
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 9:58:36 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Chair Carl Guardino and members, CTC,

I am writing regarding the resolutions before the CTC about the Yolo 80 Corridor Improvements Project, Ref. 2.2c.(4), 2.5s.(8), 4.3, and 4.4 of the agenda for the meeting on May 16-17, 2024.

I am a Yolo County resident, a physicist by training, and an environmental professional specializing in data analysis.

I have serious concerns about the project in its current form. I hope you will consider the points below when you make your decision.

Thank you for your service,
Gabriel Ehrlich

- Decades of research have made it clear that **there is no traffic- or environment-related justification for adding non-transit freeway capacity**. Unambiguously, adding traffic capacity induces driving with an elasticity of 1 or more within at most ten years of project completion. Traffic delays stay the same or increase, and greenhouse gas emissions almost certainly increase.
- The Yolo County Transportation District and Caltrans propose a project that will increase non-transit freeway capacity. Inexplicably, they claim improvements to traffic delays and no significant environmental impact.
- **Significant irregularities remain in the final environmental document (FED) after revision.** The result, in my estimation, is to grossly understate the negative environmental impacts of alternatives that expand freeway capacity, and grossly overstate their transportation benefits. For example:
 - **It ignores induced travel for the greenhouse gas emissions calculation.** Long-term induced demand is more difficult to calculate, but even short-term induced demand is ignored. The authors are perfectly capable of calculating it, because they calculate the induced VMT. If induced travel were considered, the transportation benefits of expanding freeway capacity would be expected to be smaller or negative, and the greenhouse gas emissions would be greater.
 - **It includes fleet energy efficiency improvements in the project impact.** The transition to electric vehicles by the design year of 2049 creates an apparent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, but this reduction is not caused by the choice of project alternative. Alternatives need to be compared against the no-build baseline in the same year.
 - **It overstates idling emissions relative to high-speed emissions.** Using a 14-year-old emissions model, they argue that speeding up traffic will reduce low-

speed inefficiencies in combustion engines that cause greater emissions. Modern vehicles, especially the electric vehicles to which they acknowledge California is transitioning, have drastically reduced emissions at low velocities compared to combustion engines, making higher velocities a more significant contributor to energy consumption and consequent environmental impacts than they claim. Consequently, speeding up slow traffic may not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and may cause them to increase

- **Very different alternatives appear to have similarly negligible impacts.** With the above assumptions, no amount of capacity increase will appear to significantly increase greenhouse emissions, despite all research to the contrary. A toll lane increases capacity relative to a transit-only lane, and an HOT 3+ lane increases capacity relative to a toll lane; any model that doesn't show a corresponding trend for emissions is suspect.
 - Despite abundant official public feedback about these and other issues, they have not been addressed in the revision, and the overall finding remains "no significant impact."
 - There may be an opportunity to contest these irregularities in court, but the Yolo County Transportation District is attempting to begin construction under the approved Final Environmental Document **in August, before we will know the outcome of such proceedings.**
- **The mitigation plan is unrealistically optimistic, as well as unfunded.** The state resources recommended for items such as increasing Capitol Corridor frequency are far more cost-effective than the actual project at increasing person throughput, and indeed at reducing traffic delays by taking cars off the road. If we're capable of doing that, why do we need to add a lane at all?
 - The mitigation plan does not claim to mitigate the full amount of induced VMT.
 - **Transit alternatives, and alternatives that increase person throughput while reducing non-transit vehicular capacity, were not considered.** If the existing #3 lane were converted to a toll lane, the increased funding flow and transit reliability could potentially create the additional person throughput required, while at the same time taking cars off the road, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. With a long-term elasticity of 1, at worst, traffic delays might stay the same. However, alternatives like this were not considered.
 - **An HOT 3+ lane does not provide transit reliability.** A toll lane's toll can be adjusted to ensure the free flow of traffic required for buses to arrive on time. An HOT 3+ lane's toll provides no such guarantee: groups of 3 or more people, such as recreational groups traveling between the Bay Area and the Tahoe area, are exempt from the toll and can fill up the lane.
 - **A tolled lane would be more financially productive without the 3+ exemption.**
 - **The local political process at the City of Davis level, the Yolo County Transportation District board level, and the Caltrans EIR process level have failed to bring a perspective informed by scientific research into decision-making. I hope the CTC can play that role.**

From: [Kunzang R](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Widening I-80: danger/pollution/\$ will increase
Date: Saturday, May 11, 2024 7:42:54 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Widening I-80 ? Stop it, please.

1. No mitigation plan exists.
2. Current plan causes more congestion... NOT less.
3. TOLL LANES ?
 - A.-- To accommodate toll lanes, EACH regular lane shrinks by 1 ft ---increasing the dangers.
 - B. ...Rush hour toll? Estimated it'll be \$1 per mile, EVERY work day. -- Hard to pay \$10-15 every work day (approx \$200 month as a new debt) if working in a restaurant.. and/or supporting a family.
(NOTE: Will it be one-way or a round-trip charge?) ----Where's the impartial, scientifically researched plan (with start date) for dependable, low-cost, non-polluting MASS transit ?
4. Toxic air: Is there a proper environmental impact study ? Sadly, dirty/dangerous air will increase if this I-80 widening plan is completed.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Janet Roesler
205 full circle
Davis, CA 95618

From: [Ben Matsubayashi](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Yolo 80 widening and Toll lanes – Agenda items 17, 18,19 & 20.
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 11:27:00 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

1. **The alleged benefits of the project are grossly overstated** as the computerized traffic model used by Caltrans-SACOG ignores induced demand and thus overstates congestion relief. It is not a sustainable transportation fix and instead is a waste of money.
2. **The EIR ignores the safety impacts** of narrowing the lanes and eliminating a shoulder on the causeway. The project will increase the danger of driving on the causeway.
3. **The mitigation plan in the EIR only offset 55 million of the 158Mil VMT (including trucks) projected generated by the new lane.** The mitigation plan fails to comply with the State’s climate plan to reduce VMT.
4. In addition, the mitigation plan claims of 55 million VMT offset in the Final EIR mitigation plan is both **grossly over-optimistic to measure proposed, and highly underfunded** and is limited to Yolo County residents, even though 89% of the drivers are from outside Yolo County.
5. **Failure to share public information as required by law:** This project was rated last out of 24 projects to receive funding when it was before the CTC in June 2023. At that meeting, the CTC did not vote to provide additional funds. Now Caltrans/CTC staff are recommending the project be funded. There has been no response to an 11-month-old public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans did prior to the June 2023 meeting. In addition, there has been no response to an updated public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans has done more recently that now recommends the project be funded. How can we “disagree better” without shared facts: in Caltrans and the CTC is withhold public documents.
6. **A review of Final EIR shows it has bad calculations, bogus assumptions and is in gross violation of CEQA.** While it will be challenged in court- but the freeway will already be widened before the case is settled. Your body is the last hope to stop construction.
7. **This project violates Caltrans Climate plan (CAPTI)** and is contrary to Newsom’s climate plan. Far from being a benefit, the project creates an environmental debt that our children and grandchildren will have to pay.

From: [Jordan Kim](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Yolo 80 widening and Toll lanes
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 8:24:26 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear CTC,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed expansion of Highway 80. Despite the purported benefits put forth by Caltrans-SACOG, it is imperative to scrutinize the project more closely, as its potential negative impacts far outweigh any perceived advantages.

- The traffic model utilized in the project's evaluation fails to account for induced demand, thereby inflating the projected congestion relief.
- The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) neglects to adequately address safety concerns associated with the proposed narrowing of lanes and elimination of a shoulder on the causeway.
- The mitigation plan outlined in the EIR falls short of effectively offsetting the anticipated increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), thereby failing to align with the State's imperative to curtail VMT as part of its climate strategy.
- A comprehensive review of the Final EIR reveals glaring discrepancies, including flawed calculations, baseless assumptions, and a blatant disregard for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- The proposed expansion contradicts both Caltrans Climate Plan (CAPTI) and Governor Newsom's climate agenda, perpetuating a cycle of environmental degradation that future generations will be burdened with.

I implore you to carefully reconsider the approval of this project, as its

ramifications extend far beyond mere infrastructure development. Your decisive action is our last line of defense against the irreversible consequences of this ill-conceived endeavor.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
A concerned citizen

From: [Nick Shepard](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Yolo80 widening and Toll lanes- Agenda items 17, 18,19 & 20
Date: Sunday, May 12, 2024 9:47:44 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

A. The alleged benefits of the project are grossly overstated as the computerized traffic model used by Caltrans-SACOG ignores induced demand and thus overstates congestion relief. It is a not a sustainable transportation fix and instead is a waste of money.

B. The EIR ignores the safety impacts of narrowing the lanes and eliminating a shoulder on the causeway. The project will increase the danger of driving on the causeway.

C. But the mitigation plan in the EIR only offset only 55 million of the 158Mil VMT (including trucks) projected generated by the new lane. The mitigation plan fails to comply with the State's climate plan to reduce VMT.

D. Furthermore, the mitigation plan claims of 55 million VMT offset in the Final EIR mitigation plan is over-optimistic to measure proposed, highly underfunded, and limited to Yolo County residents, even though 89% of the drivers are from outside Yolo County.

E. Failure to share public information as required by law: This project was rated last out of 24 projects to receive funding when it was before the CTC in June 2023. At that meeting, the CTC did not vote to provide additional funds. Now Caltrans/CTC staff are recommending the project be funded. There has been no response to an 11-month-old public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans did prior to the June 2023 meeting. In addition, there has been no response to an updated public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans has done more recently that now recommends the project be funded. How can we "disagree better" without shared facts: Caltrans and the CTC are withholding public documents.

F. A review of Final EIR shows it has bad calculations, bogus assumptions and is in violation of CEQA. While it will be challenged in court, the freeway will already be widened before the case is settled. Your body is last hope to stop construction.

G. This project violates Caltrans Climate plan (CAPTI) and is contrary to the Governor's climate plan. Far from being a benefit, the project creates an environmental debt that our children and grandchildren will have to pay.

Thank you,

Nick Shepard
Sacramento

From: [Lynne Nittler](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Equity Access and I-80 Yolo Funding
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 3:59:29 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear Chair Carl Guardino and CTC members,

"I am concerned about the inclusivity of the process, social equity, and environmental justice issues that remain that have yet to be resolved in the Yolo80 toll lane project."

To summarize:

No Inclusivity: Caltrans and Yolo County officials did not engage important and knowledgeable stakeholder groups in the Environmental Review process for Yolo80 (e.g. 9 of the 10 Transportation and CAP climate commissions in Yolo County were never engaged at any point); not for input on EIR study alternatives, choice of final alternative, or tolling policy. Input from transportation experts at UC Davis has been ignored as they contradict the predetermined outcome. Non-interest group public was not present at public meetings.

No Environmental Justice: The FEIR alternative chosen for I-80 (HOT3+) provides insufficient funds for an Environmental Justice Component as forecast of toll revenue generated will falls \$2 Million short of what is called for to fund the FEIR mitigation plan. And the \$9-10 toll lane revenue will not impact pass-through drivers with 3 or more passengers. Tahoe drivers should not get a free pass for toll lane use.

Overall: the freeway widening is not going to solve traffic problems as study after study has shown that increasing individual auto/truck transportation capacity, simply invites drivers to fill that capacity. The I80 widening exacerbates traffic, diverts funds away from much more necessary rail solutions and undermines GHG reduction goals.

Thank you for reading and seriously considering my concerns.

Lynne Nittler, resident of Davis, CA

From: [Scott Steward](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Equity Access and I-80Yolo Funding , CTC Meeting
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 8:29:10 AM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

TO: Chair William Walker, CTC Equity Advisory Committee & members

CC: Chair Carl Guardino and CTC members

I am concerned about the inclusivity of the process, social equity, and environmental justice issues that remain that have yet to be resolved in the Yolo80 toll lane project.

To summarize:

No Inclusivity: Caltrans and Yolo County officials did not engage important and knowledgeable stakeholder groups in the Environmental Review process for Yolo80 (e.g. 9 of the 10 Transportation and CAP climate commissions in Yolo County were never engaged at any point); not for input on EIR study alternatives, choice of final alternative, or tolling policy. Input from transportation experts at UC Davis has been ignored as they contradict the predetermined outcome. Non-interest group public was not present at public meetings.

No Environmental Justice: The FEIR alternative chosen for I-80 (HOT3+) provides insufficient funds for an Environmental Justice Component as forecast of toll revenue generated will falls \$2 Million short of what is called for to fund the FEIR mitigation plan. And the \$9-10 toll lane revenue will not impact pass-through drivers with 3 or more passengers. Tahoe drivers should not get a free pass for toll lane use.

Overall: the freeway widening is not going to solve traffic problems as study after study has shown that increasing individual auto/truck transportation capacity, simply invites drivers to fill that capacity. The I80 widening exacerbates traffic, diverts funds away from much more necessary rail solutions and undermines GHG reduction goals.

Scott Steward,

Davis CA

From: [Juliette Beck](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Equity and 1-80 Yolo Funding
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 2:47:47 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

TO: Chair William Walker, CTC Equity Advisory Committee & members CTC@catc.ca.gov

CC: Chair Carl Guardino and CTC members, Tab 17

I am concerned about unresolved social equity and Environmental Justice issues related to the Yolo80 toll lane project.

Yolo and Caltrans officials decided on alternatives for the Yolo80 project three years ago and the subsequent public process has not been used to surface and address real issues.

Important and knowledgeable stakeholder groups that should have been properly and meaningfully engaged in the environmental review process were not included.

Yolo County's Climate Action Commission and their Equity and Engagement Technical Advisory Committee have not been meaningfully engaged, as required by the Yolo County general plan, CEQA and CTC policy.

Elected officials in West Sacramento that represent constituents deeply impacted by environmental injustice have not been meaningfully engaged.

The YoloTD Citizens Advisory Committee was not engaged in providing input on the DEIR, tolling or study of alternatives.

Please "press pause" on the Yolo80 project until an adequate and inclusive public engagement process is implemented.

Thank you for your service.

Respectfully,

Juliette Beck

Mother

Yolo County resident of 15 years

--

“California faces a water and climate crisis that will only be solved by foregrounding Indigenous management practices. Our restorative environmental management and tribal place-based knowledge are best practices for climate resiliency. If we teach the next generation how to better manage and live with the land, they will become the leaders that can solve our challenges.” --**Dr. Cutcha Risling Baldy**, Chair, Humboldt State Native American Studies Department

From: [Stephen M. Wheeler](mailto:Stephen.M.Wheeler@ucdavis.edu)
To: [California Transportation Commission@CATC](mailto:California.Transportation.Commission@CATC)
Subject: Public Comment: Please do not approve funding for Yolo 80 Project
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 8:58:56 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Dear Chair Guardino and Commissioners – I write to ask you to please not approve funding for Caltrans' Yolo 80 project.

We all care about California and the state's leadership on climate change. The largest single blemish on the state's climate record is transportation, specifically emissions caused by rising VMT. The main culprit for this is Caltrans. Despite many attempts to rein in the agency, Caltrans (particularly District 3) insists on widening freeways despite decades of evidence that doing so simply increases VMT and GHG emissions.

Twenty years ago such widening took place under the fig leaf of adding HOV lanes. Now widenings are taking place under the similarly greenwashed label of "managed lanes". The bottom line for both approaches is a capacity expansion of the freeway. Carpools move into the new lane, freeing up space for more single-occupant vehicles.

The EIR for the Yolo 80 project was highly inadequate. Virtually all of the alternatives studied widened the freeway; commonsense alternatives such as reducing congestion with all-lane tolls or congestion pricing weren't considered. The EIR analysis made little attempt to study induced demand. Caltrans has also illegally piecemealed the I-80 widening project, building its pieces as separate projects while also presenting the "managed lane" as a continuous improvement valuable precisely because it will go from Vallejo to Sacramento and assist bus service along the whole route. The agency should have studied alternative strategies for the entire corridor; instead it has pushed road widening in separate projects that are difficult for the public to track and contest.

Four major environmental organizations are planning to file lawsuits this month arguing that the Yolo 80 EIR is inadequate and the project should not move forward.

We need public officials such as yourselves to stand up to this powerful agency. Otherwise California will continue down the unfortunate path of rising traffic, VMT, and emissions. Please do the right thing and deny this funding request.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Wheeler, Ph.D., Professor
Department of Human Ecology
U.C. Davis
One Shields Ave.
Davis CA 95616
(530) 754-9332
smwheeler@ucdavis.edu
(he/him/his)

Chair, Community Development Graduate Group
2022 UC Davis Faculty Sustainability Champion

Books

Reimagining Sustainable Cities: Strategies for Designing Greener, Healthier, More Equitable Communities (w/ Christina Rosan; UC Press 2021; info at [https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520381216/reimagining-sustainable-cities.](https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520381216/reimagining-sustainable-cities))

The Sustainable Urban Development Reader (Fourth Edition 2023 from Routledge) Info at www.routledge.com/9781032331935

Planning for Sustainability: Creating Livable, Equitable, and Ecological Communities (Second Edition from Routledge, 2013)

Climate Change and Social Ecology: A New Perspective on the Climate Challenge (Routledge 2012)

Info about Fossil-Free UCD is at <https://fossilfreeucd.org>.

I would like to acknowledge the Patwin people who occupied the land that is now Davis for thousands of years, as well as other indigenous people worldwide and all those who work for peace, justice, equality, and sustainability.

From: [Juliette Beck](#)
To: California.Transportation.Commission@CATC
Subject: Yolo80 widening and Toll lanes – Agenda items 17, 18,19 & 20.
Date: Monday, May 13, 2024 3:01:29 PM

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

To: Chair Carl Guardino and CTC Members

As a mother raising a family in Yolo County and lifelong climate justice advocate, I urge you not to fund the 1-80 widening project. Here are some reasons why this project should not move forward at this time:

1. **The alleged benefits of the project are grossly overstated** as the computerized traffic model used by Caltrans-SACOG ignores induced demand and thus overstates congestion relief. It is not a sustainable transportation fix and instead is a waste of money.
2. **The EIR ignores the safety impacts** of narrowing the lanes and eliminating a shoulder on the causeway. The project will increase the danger of driving on the causeway.
3. **The mitigation plan in the EIR offsets only 55 million of the 158 million VMT (including trucks) projected to be generated by the new lane.** The mitigation plan fails to comply with the State’s climate plan to reduce VMT.
4. In addition, the mitigation plan claims of 55 million VMT offset in the Final EIR mitigation plan is both **grossly over-optimistic to the measure proposed, and highly underfunded** and is limited to Yolo County residents, even though 89% of the drivers are from outside Yolo County.
5. **The project lacks a FUNDED Environmental Justice plan** for the project to address the high toll level expected on the project—\$1/mile at rush hour. They expect the toll for the lane to fall \$2Million short of funding the VMT mitigation program—so there is clearly no money for an Environmental Justice program.
6. **Failure to share public information as required by law:** This project was rated last out of 24 projects to receive funding when it was before the CTC in June 2023. At that meeting, the CTC did not vote to provide additional funds. Now Caltrans/CTC staff are recommending the project be funded. There has been no response to an 11-month-old public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans did prior to the June 2023 meeting. In addition, there has been no response to an updated public records request to obtain the documents reflecting the analysis Caltrans has done more recently that now recommends the project be funded. How can we “disagree better” without shared facts: Caltrans and the CTC is withholding public documents.
7. **A review of Final EIR shows it has bad calculations, bogus assumptions** and is in gross violation of CEQA. While it will be challenged in court, the freeway will already be widened before the case is settled. Your body is the last hope to stop construction.
8. **This project violates Caltrans’ Climate plan (CAPTI)** and is contrary to Newsom’s climate plan. Far from being a benefit, the project creates an **environmental debt** that our children and grandchildren will have to pay.

Thank you for your public service.

Respectfully submitted,
Juliette Beck

--

Mother, eco-justice advocate, writer

“California faces a water and climate crisis that will only be solved by foregrounding Indigenous management practices. Our restorative environmental management and tribal place-based knowledge are best practices for climate resiliency. If we teach the next generation how to better manage and live with the land, they will become the leaders that can solve our challenges.” --**Dr. Cutcha Risling Baldy**, Chair, Humboldt State Native American Studies Department
