

Gerald P. Cauthen & Associates
Transportation Consultant
900 Paramount Road
Oakland CA 94610

May 10, 2008

To Honorable Members, Commission on the
Environment:

It has come to my attention that on Monday your commission will be considering how best to apply congestion pricing to San Francisco's traffic congestion problems. This is appropriate.

As you know congestion pricing has been applied in London, Stockholm, Rome, Singapore, Munich and elsewhere. In these cities the approach has been to define a cordon around the congested parts of the city and then assess motorists driving within the cordon during the hours of peak congestion. This has worked well. Congestion pricing applied in this manner has generally resulted in reduced congestion, fewer parking agonies, increased transit patronage and a higher level of commercial activity.

Congestion pricing applied to the Doyle Drive situation on the other hand would be congestion pricing misapplied. There are several reasons for this.

- 1.) In the first place San Francisco suffers from congestion during off peak as well as on-peak hours. For this reason it is highly counterproductive to introduce incentives that would have the effect of stretching out the peak commute period on Highway 101. By encouraging drivers to drive into San Francisco during more hours of the day, congestion pricing applied in this manner could actually make conditions in San Francisco worse. In San Francisco the congestion agonies are downtown, not on Doyle Drive, and downtown is where the congestion pricing should be applied.
- 2.) Congestion pricing revenues are normally used to upgrade the non-automotive alternatives to driving. In the case of the "Doyle Drive Corridor" this would mean allocating the proceeds to the Golden Gate Bridge District's well-run but cash-starved bus and ferry boat operations.

Diverting congestion pricing proceeds to pay for a freeway through the Presidio over twice as wide as the current roadway would be a uniquely inappropriate use of funds that should go to improving public transit.

- 3.) And finally, the sponsors of the Doyle Drive Project do not actually need additional funds. There are already over \$700 million in the Doyle Drive Project Budget. For \$700 million, the existing roadway could be upgraded to conform to modern seismic safety standards and meet appropriate highway functional requirements. And the upgrade could be arranged to reduce the environmental impact on the Presidio of San Francisco significantly below what would occur with the San Francisco Transportation Authority's \$1.1 billion freeway.

The most likely result of this tortured application of congestion pricing would be to discredit congestion pricing as a viable means of alleviating traffic congestion. For these reasons you should delete all reference to Doyle Drive from your proposed congestion pricing resolution.

Should you have questions or wish to discuss any aspect of this situation please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

Gerald Cauthen, PE
Principal, Gerald P. Cauthen & Associates

510 208 5441
cautn1@aol.com