



SFCTA Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Comment for 6/26/24 Community Advisory Committee Meeting

1 message

Zafarali Ahmed <zafarali.ahmed@gmail.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Sun, Jun 23, 2024 at 11:20 AM

To the SFCTA CAC,

I am writing to express my concern regarding Item 8 on the agenda for 6/26/24, specifically the use of Prop L funds for freeway projects in San Francisco. I urge the CAC to recommend that the SFCTA Board prohibit any Prop L funds from being used to widen highways or increase auto capacity thereby increasing VMT.

The Northbound Interstate 280 Carpool and Transit Lane Study, as outlined on p. 23 of Item 8, presents two options for adding HOV lanes. While Option 2, which involves eliminating much of the shoulder, is described as not "widening" the highway, it is effectively increasing auto capacity on 280. This will worsen air pollution in nearby neighborhoods, increase traffic violence for pedestrians and cyclists, and exacerbate greenhouse gas emissions.

Highway widening is unpopular and counterproductive. The primary concern raised in community meetings was not highway queuing, but the negative impacts of increased auto traffic. Both the Dogpatch and Potrero neighborhood associations oppose Option 2 due to its potential to worsen air pollution and traffic violence.

It is concerning that an SFCTA engineer expressed a preference for Option 2 before an environmental review. Widening highways does not alleviate congestion in the long term, as wider roads induce more traffic. It is 2024 and this effect has been empirically multiple times in the Bay Area and across our country.

I urge the SFCTA CAC to follow the example of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee, which voted against a similar widening proposal for Highway 101. Instead of encouraging more driving, we should prioritize investments in public transportation like Caltrain which has recently been electrified

Sincerely,

Zafarali Ahmed



SFCTA Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Don't Expand Highways

1 message

Allison MacQueen Felder <allison.macqueen.felder@gmail.com>
To: clerk@sfcta.org

Sat, Jun 22, 2024 at 9:18 AM

Thank you for your service to the transportation needs and safety concerns of the community.

I am writing regarding Item 8 on the agenda for 6/26/24, which provides funding for various freeway projects in San Francisco. I ask the CAC to recommend to the SFCTA Board that conditions be placed on the use of this taxpayer money. Specifically, SFCTA should prohibit any of these or other Prop L funds be used for highway widening (i.e., any project that increases auto capacity).

On [p. 23 of the Item 8 Memo](#), there is discussion of the Northbound Interstate 280 Carpool and Transit Lane Study. This study included two options for adding HOV lanes on 280 in order to increase transit and carpool use: Option 1 - to convert the lane #1 from a General Purpose Lane to a HOV lane, OR Option 2 - to add a lane by eliminating much of the shoulder. While the Memo says that Option 2 doesn't "widen" the highway, it should be clear that this is indeed a highway widening in that it increases auto capacity on 280. This incremental auto traffic will worsen air pollution in the adjacent Mission Bay, Potrero, and Dogpatch neighborhoods. Widening 280 will also increase the number of cars driving to and from the highway in these neighborhoods, increasing traffic violence for residents who walk and bike. Finally, it will increase greenhouse gas emissions, with transportation (i.e., cars) the #1 source of GHG pollution in our area.

Widening the highway is unpopular. The major concern raised in [community meetings](#) wasn't highway queuing (which is misleadingly listed first in the memo). When the Dogpatch and Potrero neighborhood associations opposed Option 2, they cited the air pollution and traffic violence created by widening 280. It was disappointing that in one of these meetings an SFCTA engineer said that Option 2 was "preferred" due to congestion concerns. SFCTA engineers should not be leaning toward any option prior to an environmental review occurring. Also, traffic engineers should be aware that [widening highways does not improve congestion](#). Wider highways induce more auto traffic and delays quickly return to previous levels, with more cars on the road.

I urge the SFCTA CAC to follow the lead of the [San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee](#), which voted against a similar widening option under consideration for Highway 101 in South San Francisco. San Francisco should not be spending taxpayer dollars to encourage non-residents to drive into the city instead of taking Caltrain, which was just electrified at a cost of over \$2 billion.

Sincerely,

Allison MacQueen

Move San Mateo and Safe Routes to School San Mateo Advisory Committee



SFCTA Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Comment for 6/26/24 Community Advisory Committee Meeting

1 message

Mike Swire <mswire91@gmail.com>
To: SFCTA Clerk <clerk@sfcta.org>

Fri, Jun 21, 2024 at 5:28 PM

Dear SFCTA CAC,

Thank you for your service to the transportation needs and safety concerns of the community.

I am writing regarding Item 8 on the agenda for 6/26/24, which provides funding for various freeway projects in San Francisco. I ask the CAC to recommend to the SFCTA Board that conditions be placed on the use of this taxpayer money. Specifically, SFCTA should prohibit any of these or other Prop L funds be used for highway widening (i.e., any project that increases auto capacity).

On [p. 23 of the Item 8 Memo](#), there is discussion of the Northbound Interstate 280 Carpool and Transit Lane Study. This study included two options for adding HOV lanes on 280 in order to increase transit and carpool use: Option 1 - to convert the lane #1 from a General Purpose Lane to a HOV lane, OR Option 2 - to add a lane by eliminating much of the shoulder. While the Memo says that Option 2 doesn't "widen" the highway, it should be clear that this is indeed a highway widening in that it increases auto capacity on 280. This incremental auto traffic will worsen air pollution in the adjacent Mission Bay, Potrero, and Dogpatch neighborhoods. Widening 280 will also increase the number of cars driving to and from the highway in these neighborhoods, increasing traffic violence for residents who walk and bike. Finally, it will increase greenhouse gas emissions, with transportation (i.e., cars) the #1 source of GHG pollution in our area.

Widening the highway is unpopular. The major concern raised in [community meetings](#) wasn't highway queuing (which is misleadingly listed first in the memo). When the Dogpatch and Potrero neighborhood associations opposed Option 2, they cited the air pollution and traffic violence created by widening 280. It was disappointing that in one of these meetings an SFCTA engineer said that Option 2 was "preferred" due to congestion concerns. SFCTA engineers should not be leaning toward any option prior to an environmental review occurring. Also, traffic engineers should be aware that [widening highways does not improve congestion](#). Wider highways induce more auto traffic and delays quickly return to previous levels, with more cars on the road.

I urge the SFCTA CAC to follow the lead of the [San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee, which voted against a similar widening option](#) under consideration for Highway 101 in South San Francisco. San Francisco should not be spending taxpayer dollars to encourage non-residents to drive into the city instead of taking Caltrain, which was just electrified at a cost of over \$2 billion.

Sincerely,

Mike Swire
Appointee, San Mateo County Citizen Advisory Committee
Chair, C/CAG of San Mateo County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee
(writing as an individual)