

From: [Chris Guenther](#)
To: [Montoya, Michelle](#)
Cc: [Alexa Forrester](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on GHG Reduction Strategy
Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 5:02:01 PM
Attachments: [BikableSR – GHG Reduction Strategy - Jun 2024 DRAFT.pdf](#)

Please accept the attached letter commenting on the Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (Item 5.1 on the agenda for the June 5th meeting of the Climate Action Subcommittee).

Thank you,



Chris Guenther

Co-Lead, Bikeable Santa Rosa
m. 415-265-9378
bikeablesantarosa.org



June 4, 2024

Climate Action Subcommittee
City of Santa Rosa
100 Santa Rosa Ave, Room 10
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Dear Mayor Rogers and Subcommittee Members,

Thank you for this opportunity to share our input on the Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Due to time constraints, we are limiting our feedback below to those areas where we would like to see improvement or where we have questions. However, overall we are very supportive of this document. We especially appreciate Measure 1 (Locate and design new development to minimize vehicle dependence and Measure 2 (Improve the frequency, coverage, and effectiveness of local and regional transit and rail networks).

Please see the chart below for our feedback. Most of these are small wording changes that we believe will better capture what is needed. Our main area of concern is with how the City proposes to measure its performance in building out the active transportation network, and its overall goals for doing so.

Reference	Existing Content/Language	Feedback
Pages 28, 31: Comments on Overall Objective	Decrease community-wide vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase the use of zero-emission vehicles and equipment.	Current wording does not make a clear enough link between the first and second halves of the objective. Requested change(s): "Decrease community-wide vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase the proportion of zero-emission vehicles and equipment used."
Page 28: Comments on wording of Measure 4	Measure 4: Enhance active transportation and micromobility systems.	"Enhance" is too vague and piecemeal improvements will not be sufficient to encourage mode shift. Requested change(s): "Implement a complete, low-stress active transportation network and micromobility system supports."
Page 41: Item 4.5	Implement traffic-calming techniques on local streets that experience high-speed or	We recognize that added parking can have a traffic-calming effect, but it has side-effects that the other members of this list do not: heat island

	<p>cut-through traffic to improve neighborhood livability by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Narrow streets. b. Add on-street parking. c. Add chicanes, chokers, or diverters. d. Rough-pave crosswalks. e. Add rumble strips. f. Add planted islands. 	<p>effects, inducing car use, increasing conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists, increasing road repair costs.</p> <p>Since traffic calming can be achieved by other means, it would be unwise to choose a method that imposes these externalities. However, we do support reconfiguring existing parking (changing the cross-section of the street or the orientation of parked cars) if the City's engineers believe it will create better safety and mobility outcomes for all road users.</p> <p>Requested change(s): Remove “add on-street parking” or perhaps replace with “reconfigure on-street parking.”</p>
Page 41: Item 4.6	<p>Improve connections in the active transportation network to ensure that all who choose to walk, roll, or ride have adequate access to public transportation amenities, especially in Equity Priority Areas and Areas of Change.</p>	<p>Current wording implies that some will have adequate access and others will not. We support prioritizing EPAs and Areas of Change in implementation but believe the underlying goal should be citywide.</p> <p>Requested change(s): “Improve connections in the active transportation network to ensure that all who choose to walk, roll, or ride have adequate access to public transportation amenities, prioritizing Equity Priority Areas and Areas of Change in the implementation schedule.”</p>
Page 41: Item 4.11 & 4.21	<p>4.11. Ensure that the needs of seniors, children, people with disabilities, and those using strollers are addressed through sufficient and continuous sidewalks, crosswalks, and reasonable crossing distances.</p> <p>4.21. Ensure that the needs of seniors, children, people with disabilities, and those using strollers are addressed through sufficient and continuous sidewalks, crosswalks, and reasonable crossing distances. Continue to upgrade curb ramps and other pedestrian infrastructure in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.</p>	<p>Maybe a cut-and-paste error? The first part of 4.21 is identical to 4.11.</p> <p>Requested change(s): Remove the first (redundant) sentence of 4.21.</p>
Page 44: Measure 4	<p>Total sidewalk network length (miles) – City Limits and External Planning Area 2030: 650 (15% increase from 2019)</p>	<p>We have serious concerns that these numbers reflect a failure to properly integrate all the work done in the 2023 City Thread report, and a failure</p>

Performance Standards	<p>2045: 730 (30% increase from 2019) 2050: 760 (35% increase from 2019)</p> <p>Total bike network length (miles) – City Limits (cumulative) 2030: 130 (20% increase from 2019) 2045: 148 (35% increase from 2019) 2050: 154 (40% increase from 2019)</p>	<p>to understand the current road conditions and how they relate to mode shift. This plan as articulated will not yield the GHG savings that could be netted if a more realistic and ambitious plan was adopted.</p> <p>First: The City of Santa Rosa currently has NO bicycle network. Our most recent Bike Network Analysis score is 26 and the map clearly shows that large parts of the city are not meaningfully connected by safe routes (Level of Traffic Stress 2 or below). (For comparison, Davis's network score is 77/100, Napa's is 39/100, Emeryville's is 43/100.)</p> <p>We believe the City is misrepresenting the state of affairs in the above baseline numbers by counting Class 2, 3, and 4 facilities as part of the network when those facilities (a) have significant gaps and (b) are too high-stress for the majority of residents to seriously consider as options.</p> <p>We also believe the stated goals of increasing the network by less than 50 miles by 2050 is woefully inadequate. We simply cannot develop a robust culture of biking for transportation in Santa Rosa if the City fails to build connected, protected routes. Culture change follows infrastructure change.</p> <p>Requested change(s): We suggest that the City recalculate its baseline numbers as follows: For any stretch of road to count as part of the network, it must be possible to reach City Hall from that location without having to use a facility with a Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) higher than 2. (This represents genuine connectivity.) And we suggest that the facility itself must be LTS 1 or 2.</p>
Page 45: Measure 5	Measure 5: Accelerate the adoption of zero-emission light-duty and heavy-duty vehicles.	<p>We generally support this. However, we have the same issue with this as the overall objective, raised above. This wording suggests that merely by adopting ZEVs we will have an impact on GHGs. We will not, unless these ZEVs are being used to replace existing gas-powered vehicles. The following edit makes this clear.</p> <p>Requested change(s): "Accelerate the replacement of gas-powered vehicles with zero-emission light-duty and heavy-duty vehicles."</p>

Should you have any questions about the above comments, please contact us at bikeablesr@gmail.com. We would also welcome the opportunity to meet with you to further discuss our feedback and collaboratively develop ideas to further enhance the Strategy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Alexa Forrester

Co-Lead, Bikeable Santa Rosa

Chris Guenther

Co-Lead, Bikeable Santa Rosa