

This is comment for the California Transportation Plan 2040      date 3/18/15

The major concern here is I-5, major inland interstate artery up the coastal states.

We think less effort should be made to block and close off the old highway 99 up the Sacramento Canyon. In doing so, you eliminated fishing access to many parts of the river, and confined it to given camp and bridge areas. This may have been by design due to landowners, but also cut off floating the river safety options. Are big bridges on I-5 subject to terrorism/quakes (Gibson Curve)? You need to keep alternatives just in case.

As local USFS biologist 35 years, I recommended no dump-up-the-hill for excess, but to fill in canyons above the freeway, provide a creek channel to and under the freeway and plant to forage due to lack of deer nutrition. Since then, I was proved correct and the spoilage remains a mess. The deer are obviously into roadside grass, but nothing on the spoilage, which is just a heap out of sight. This was silly and stupid. Fill uphill canyons and plant, don't just haul off and dump. The ideas that these were deer refuges were very stupid and have been shown to be false sophistry. It's the forage for deer and birds.

The landscape architects and beautifiers are not worth the pay. You should plant to local forage species (deer, birds) when engineers are done doing erosion prevention finishes and stop insane antics with non-native bushes (some were poisonous, invasive, and stupid ideas). Naturalized forage grass is still good, provided it is adaptable to soil type and exposure. Decorative rocks were pretty silly, too, as drivers need to watch the road.

You did well providing intermittent holes in center concrete walls so fawns could find a way off the road. You need to accommodate the wildlife, its still deer winter range.

To reduce single occupant vehicle use, simple provide essential services in remote areas. The public would not drive to the next town if the price was right locally for gas, groceries, and other goods. I suggest a UNIFORM gas price (by taxes?) in the state, UNIFORM food price, perhaps no sales tax in remote counties to encourage local shopping and less incentive for driving away to a deal or music show in the big city.

The ad industry says you get more sex, money, and power if you drive a big SUV. I don't understand why, but the TV and radio ad industry is against economy cars, public buses, and railroads. Rich guys set bad examples with muscle cars for girl wagons.

I also see public buses are local failures in remote areas like Siskiyou County. Stop subsidizing these things and downsize them. I have seen only ONE that had over 25% of the seats filled since they started doing it. Provide an "on-call service" van, or shrink these subsidized oil-wasting hulks to service vans. They are likely still not practical.

I practice what I preach driving an old 28 mpg Ford about 3000 miles per year.

Sincerely, from a retired USDA USFS R&WL bioscientist,  
Francis Mangels, 736 pine Ridge, Mt Shasta, CA 96067 ph. 530-926-0311 in PM.