
From: mbitner@fresnocog.org
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 8:50 AM
To: ctp2040@DOT
Subject: CTP2040 45-day Public Review Period Comments

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Mike Bitner (mbitner@fresnocog.org) on April 8th, 2015 at 08:49AM (PDT).

firstname: Mike
lastname: Bitner
org: Fresno Council of Governments
email: mbitner@fresnocog.org
address_1: 2035 Tulare Street
address_2: Suite 201
city: Fresno
state: CA
zip: 93721
phone: 559 233-4148 216

comments: Fresno Council of Governments thanks you for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the California Transportation Plan (CTP2040).

The following are our comments:

FCOG is referred to as the Council of Fresno County Governments in several locations. Our name was recently officially changed to the Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG).

Overall the plan provides a good overview of how AB 32 is doing some great things to reduce GHG s. The plan also does a good job of simplifying the funding mechanisms and identifying the challenges currently being faced between the implementation of advanced technologies (coming out of AB 32 efforts) and the continued impacts on road usage.

There are significant references to Northern and Southern California but none that stick out about the San Joaquin Valley. In particular in the High Speed Rail section (page 11) there is no mention of the project being under construction in Fresno or the San Joaquin Valley. In addition on page 27 there is no discussion about the San Joaquin Valley s efforts to increase bicycle and walking investments, transit funding (with five new BRT lines in Fresno), and less investment in roadway capacity expansion.

Page 47-48: Discussion on gas tax revenues--Caltrans should consider updating the information or at least mentioning that the Board of Equalization reduced the per-gallon tax by 6 cents per gallon, from the current 36-cent excise tax to 30 cents. This takes effect July 1st; however, the plan should at least mention this upcoming change and briefly identify the expected impacts to the overall funding.

Page 54-Caltrans should consider using most recent Fiscal Year budget information.

Chapter 4 discusses Native American Transportation. Engaging with California s Tribal governments through four listening sessions was a very good idea.

However, we agree with the comment from some of the tribes that regional agencies should have been informed of the listening sessions. It would have been very beneficial for the MPOs to engage with the tribal participants and hear their concerns, challenges, and suggestions in person. Please consider inviting MPO staff to future listening sessions.

Chapter 8 of the CTP has Recommendations and Next Steps. Page 113 has a Short-Range recommendation of Avoid projects with high health and environmental costs, such as general land uses. This recommendation is so extremely vague that it is meaningless. Could you please be more specific? Also concerning Chapter 8, the footnotes are in complete disarray. All should be checked for accuracy and applicability.

The CTP 2040 does not include the SCS land uses and transportation projects in the San Joaquin Valley. We understand that the Valley MPOs did not have adopted SCSes while the CTP 2040 was being developed. However, the impact of not having the Valley SCSes could be very significant given that the pre-SCS social economic projections in the Valley were mostly pre-recession. Recommendation: include all the first SCSes from the 18 MPOs so that there is consistency in the Plan.

Many strategies assumed in the Alternative 2 & 3 are very hypothetical and aggressive and there was no cost analysis conducted for such assumptions. For example, it was assumed in Alternative 2 and 3 that by 2040 transit service and transit speed in the entire state will be doubled, transit fares for all the service will be free and 20% of all local bus services will be converted to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The cost for such statewide transit improvement could be so astronomical that the feasibility of such strategies is highly questionable.

Although CTP 2040 analyzed three scenarios, there was no clear indication that any of the scenarios was selected for implementation. The Plan could have provided a better picture for the State s future transportation system if preferred projects or scenarios were presented in the Plan.

Many of the strategies proposed statewide are not practical in the San Joaquin valley.

submit: Submit Comments