

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| Number | Section | Source | Comment | Response |
|--------|---------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | All | California Transportation Commission | <p>The draft Addendum provides significant detail on how rail, transit, and active transportation facilities can encourage mode shift, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and support economic vitality, air quality, and other goals. The Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan serves as the long-range plan for the interregional state highway system. The Addendum and the next Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan should better convey the long-range vision for these state highway facilities. For example, how do existing state highways fit into the overall multimodal transportation system and support state, regional, and local goals? How can state highway facilities be part of our multimodal mobility solutions? How is Caltrans developing visionary solutions for the interregional highway system that improve safety, address equity, support environmental goals, and bolster a vibrant economy?</p> | <p>The ITSP Addendum includes several examples of interregional highway facilities being part of multimodal mobility solutions. These include managed lanes, innovative safety improvements, and wildfire evacuation operations. As statewide plans like the Statewide Transit Strategic Plan, Freight Mobility Plan, and State Highway System Management Plan are updated, additional policies for innovative multimodal solutions on the highway system will be identified and incorporate in future updates to the ITSP.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 2 | All | California Transportation Commission | <p>Pursuant to the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines Section 34B, the assessment of system needs in the Addendum shall include potential improvements or strategies on priority interregional facilities.</p> <p>The discussion of potential improvements within each corridor should be expanded. While additional planning work is needed to identify specific projects, the document should identify proposed solutions to addressing system needs. These proposed solutions should be reflective of all relevant transportation modes within a corridor. Examples of solutions could include adding safety elements, development of solutions that reconnect communities, increasing transit service, pricing and tolling, improvements that increase freight throughput, or constructing new facilities. This information will make the Addendum more solutions-oriented and provide valuable counsel to the Commission, Caltrans, and partner agencies in the planning and development of multimodal projects for inclusion in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program.</p> | <p>The final ITSP Addendum adds a discussion of next-steps for each need identified. As the comment indicates, local planning work is needed in most cases to identify specific solutions for each need.</p> |
| 3 | Introduction | California Transportation Commission | <p>To better illustrate the robust stakeholder workshops that were conducted and the feedback which formed the basis for the document, add a summary of engagement efforts to the introduction section of the draft Addendum.</p> | <p>A section describing the development of the Addendum, including outreach, has been added to the introduction.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 4 | Implementation | California Transportation Commission | The Addendum should include information on progress made toward expanding this assessment to include all state highways that are specified in California Streets and Highways Code Sections 164.10 through 164.20, consistent with Section 34B of the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines. These assessments should consider all modes and establish a multi-modal vision to address state, regional, and local goals | A section has been added to the Implementation Chapter of the final ITSP Addendum that discusses progress made toward expanding the needs assessment to additional corridors. |
| 5 | All | California Transportation Commission | Coordinate with the Commission to align interregional corridor planning with the Senate Bill 671 (Gonzalez, 2021) Clean Freight Corridor Assessment efforts. The Clean Freight Corridor Assessment is being developed by the Commission in coordination with California Public Utilities Commission, California Energy Commission, and California Air Resources Board staff. The assessment will include information on electric and hydrogen fueling infrastructure needs and potential solutions for freight vehicles in corridors with high truck volumes. This is important given the unique fueling needs of freight vehicles and the fact that medium and heavy-duty freight trucks are anticipated to be 100% zero-emission where feasible by 2045, per Executive Order N-79-20 | The final ITSP Addendum adds sections on hydrogen and electric freight needs for the Southern California - Southern Nevada Arizona, San Francisco Bay Area - Reno, and Sacramento - Los Angeles Corridors. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|---|------------|--|---|--|
| 6 | All | California Transportation Commission | <p>The Commission recognizes the need for more data and planning work to identify and implement potential improvements and strategies on priority interregional facilities. The Commission supports Caltrans’ efforts to identify and commit appropriate resources toward the completion of comprehensive multimodal corridor plans in both urban and rural areas as these plans are foundational for the development of the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, Regional Transportation Plans, and funding of critical multimodal transportation projects.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 7 | All | California Transportation Commission | <p>The Commission requests Caltrans provide an update on the final Addendum at a future Commission Meeting. Specifically, we request Caltrans describe how feedback from Commissioners, Commission staff, partners, and stakeholders has been incorporated into the final Addendum. At the August 2022 Commission Meeting, the Commission received one stakeholder comment from Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Los Angeles Metro highlighted the importance of the connections between the strategic interregional corridors and California’s seaports</p> | Caltrans will present the final ITSP Addendum at the January CTC meeting. This table showing responses to each comment received will be posted publicly with the final Addendum. |
| 8 | I-80/US 50 | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | <p>McClellan Airpark should be elevated in the Plan to a “priority regional facility” supporting general aviation and goods movement along the I-80 corridor and throughout the Sacramento SMSA. As you also have US 50 on the map, the addition of Mather Field to this elevated status may also be prudent. These airports are mentioned later in the document as critical but not elevated to regionally significant facilities.</p> | McClellan and Mather Airports have been added to the map. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 9 | I-80/US 50 | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | <p>PCTPA and its member agencies support the provision of affordable housing along the corridor and are taking significant steps producing their fair share in accordance with the SACOG RHNA Plan. Our member agencies are working on a homeless housing plan for Placer County supporting each community providing their fair share of critical emergency shelter space needed to address homelessness. Language in the ITSP encouraging temporary housing on surplus Caltrans property where there is no immediate threat to individuals may have unintended consequences to the long-term health of individuals exposed to toxic substances created by highway emissions. We urge that a prioritization to support efforts of local communities' provision of emergency housing be the priority and only under dire circumstances would emergency housing be allowed in areas it was never intended to be located such as highway offramps, excess right-of-way or landscaped areas. This would also enable local agencies to better plan for access to services for persons using emergency shelters rather than in highway locations which lack any services.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 10 | I-80/US 50 | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | <p>PCTPA, NCTC and Caltrans District 3 recently adopted the Highway 49 Congested Corridor Plan Congested Management Plan of which emergency evacuation was a major component. This CCMP should be mentioned in this section.</p> | This change has been made. |
| 11 | I-80/US 50 | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | <p>Correct typo that should read "Given the high elevations and steep slopes....."</p> | This change has been made. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|--|---|
| 12 | I-80/US 50 | Placer County Transportation Planning Agency | Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transit, CCJPA, PCTPA, NCTC, TRPA, NDOT and Washoe County RTC are examining the feasibility of expanding CCJPA to Tahoe and Reno/Sparks. This project which is in the California and Nevada Rail Plans should be mentioned in this section. | The feasibility study is mentioned in this section. |
| 13 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | re:Map, does not have Land Ports/Port of Entry marked for San Ysidro or OME. Recommend adding these ports of entry/land ports to the map, since EJ communities surrounding them are disproportionately affected by resulting pollution burden. | Symbols for the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa Ports of Entry have been added to the map. |
| 14 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | re:Map, Housing Burden, they used the same color for housing cost burdened and priority interregional railway. Recommend that change color so that it is more accessible to readers/does not mask inequities. | This change has been made. |
| 15 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | "Cost Burden", I think that this section is tip-toeing around the equity issue and missing a component of how prioritization of highway infrastructure investments over rail and bike/pedestrian has created land use patterns that are characterized by sprawl, which is inequitable. Low-income households are pushed out of the urban periphery to seek lower-cost housing but are then burdened by higher transportation costs of a longer commute (higher fuel & vehicle maintenance costs, fortifies reliance on car ownership). | This text has been updated. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 16 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>“Frontline Communities” Sentence reads “The Southern California region’s air quality rates as among the worst...” maybe should be “The Southern California region’s air quality rates are among the worst in the nation...”. Also, maybe this section header should be “Pollution Burden” to match “Cost Burden” on the left. ‘Frontline Communities’ seems like ‘positive’ coded language that masks the inequities that exist in concentration of pollution burden near transportation infrastructure.</p> | This text has been updated. |
| 17 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>With many extremely low income communities concentrated near highway, seaport, and rail infrastructure, freight pollution disproportionately impacts these most vulnerable groups.” Another option could look like “Freight movement contributes to high levels of pollution vulnerability that disproportionately impacts People of Color in low-income communities who are concentrated near highway, seaport, and rail infrastructure due to the historic practice of redlining.”</p> | This text has been updated. |
| 18 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>“ITSP Strategies in Action, Balance Local Community and Interregional Travel Needs.” The comparison between balancing local community and travel needs seems surface-level. What about the local community would be balanced with travel needs? Is it their health? The connection of communities? Are we balancing statewide goals with the well-being of local communities?</p> | Thank you for your comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 19 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>“ITSP Strategies in Action, Improve Safety”, “This corridor’s priority interregional railway has more than 60 at grade rail crossings. These crossings can delay trains and make for uncomfortable crossings for cyclists and pedestrians”. I would switch uncomfortable with hazardous or dangerous, especially since the next section states that California has more rail fatalities than any other state.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 20 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>“ITSP Strategies in Action, Improve Safety” , “unhoused residents often seek shelter within the rail right-of-way, increasing risk of conflicts.” This sentence seems to put unhoused residents at the forefront of California’s issue of being the state with the highest rate of rail fatalities since it is built into the same sentence. Even if there is data to back up this claim I would reconsider putting the state’s most vulnerable residents at the forefront of the issue.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 21 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>ITSP discusses Caltrans’ North Coast Bike Trail (part of Build NCC). That’s consistent with the 2021 RP as we included their still outstanding segments as AT155 “North Coast Bike Trail: Gilman Dr to San Luis Rey River Trail (remaining segments)” in the 2050 phase year.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 22 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>Another project we included as being coordinated with the City of San Diego’s project is in Barrio Logan. Since Barrio Logan is listed as a “Frontline Community” in page 18, it would be helpful for them to include any relationship they have with the City of San Diego project CIP B17113 (see webmap) as we cited that project as a NB (City of SD-led) AT 153 Chollas Creek Bikeway to Bayshore Bikeway necessary to connect with AT152 Chollas Creek Bikeways: North Fork - Bayshore Bikeway to University Bikeway and South Fork (see RP2021 web viewer). The AT 153 / City CIP B17113 is within the I5 and SR15 footprint so I hope (but doubt) Caltrans is including it in their ITSP plans.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 23 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>On that note, for “consistency with the RP” just the same way we included their North Coast Bike Trail in our RP, I should hope anything in the Adopted Regional Bike Network that fits their definition for Interregional Transportation projects be included in their work. I should think AT068, the Camp Pendleton Trail, or AT085 the I-15 Bikeway – Country Club Ln to Rainbow Valley Blvd are the two best examples, presumably.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 24 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>Overarching comment - South Coast - Central Coast Corridor could include more information about climate resilience/adaptation needs and current efforts. Topics such as Sea Level Rise and Coastal Erosion are mention in other sections, but not for the San Diego region.</p> | <p>Sea Level Rise and Coastal erosion are discussed on page 20. Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 25 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Proposed change to: "Projects in high risk areas should prioritize resilient infrastructure such as renewable energy, battery storage, and microgrids to enable access to energy during power safety shutoffs. Projects in these areas should also include defensible space, fire resistant materials, and other elements to reduce fire fuel around interregional facilities." | While energy access is key to community wildfire resilience, Caltrans does not currently have a policy to develop energy infrastructure in wildfire prone areas. No change made. |
| 26 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | this corridor will be susceptible to sea level rise, may consider adding mention of SLR. Specific to SD region San Diego bay and surrounding state routes and also along PCH/Hwy1 going up the coast | Sea Level Rise and Coastal erosion are discussed on page 20. PCH/Highway 1 is not a designated priority interregional facility |
| 27 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Proposed change to: "The San Diego Association of Governments and Caltrans District 11 meet regularly with their federal partners at the US Navy to coordinate, including on multimodal corridor planning processes along the I-5 corridor and on military installation resilience efforts on corridors serving Navy facilities." | This change has been made. |
| 28 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | coastal community resilience will need to be addressed in San Diego county as well | Sea Level Rise and Coastal erosion are discussed on page 20. Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |
| 29 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | could also tie these issues back to san diego region | Thank you for your comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 30 | Implementation | San Diego Association of Governments | On page 117 it discusses the implementation of this plan and focusing on accumulating transportation project datasets into a "WebMap". It may make sense for SANDAG to provide our dataset of transportation projects in the 2021 RTP to supplement their data. | The final ITSP Addendum has adjusted this section to fold the work into Caltrans' existing Geospatial Information Network Analysis Tool (GIANT). As GIANT is developed, Caltrans will work with the regions to ensure relevant data is included. |
| 31 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | SANDAG's environmental projects and strategies within the KMY Corridor & SB2S CMCP align well with the Environmental Justice goals of the ITSP Addendum. The Addendum should look to SANDAGs environmental justice projects to for further guidance of local strategies. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 32 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | ITSP addendum discusses the need for increased bus, foot, and rail Border Crossing improvements. SANDAG currently is undergoing an request for innovative concepts which includes a transborder light rail line. We are also committed to developing the Otay Mesa East Border which should reduce border wait times for freight and multimodal transportation options. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 33 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | We are excited to see new MTS Blue Line Trolley highlighted as a critical transit service within the San Diego region. With an estimated annual ridership of over 17 million passengers, it is a crucial to the success of our border region. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 34 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | "Increasing rail's share of freight is key to reducing vehicle miles traveled."- Is this aligned with our RTP and Goods Movements strategies? | This text has been replaced in response to another comment. |
| 35 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Mention of the older proposed San Diego Mobility Hub do we want to ask them to change anything? | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 36 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | wanted to point out that the Managed Lanes phasing is not very clear in the ITSP exhibits. Some facilities are planned for 2035 and others for 2050 – I’m not sure if they want to capture that, but just a note. The attached conveys the different phasing from the Regional Plan, if it’s helpful. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 37 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | One minor comment from us, it looks like the existing expanded HOV lane for North Coast Corridor isn’t shown on page 22 that discusses Managed Lanes. I’m not exactly sure of the NCC status, maybe there needs to be a portion shown as “In Development” if there is still pending HOV construction. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 38 | All | San Diego Association of Governments | highway travel time/transit travel time/transit transfers is for which section of the corridor? | A footnote has been added for each corridor indicating the trip used for corridor travel information. |
| 39 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | CalEnviroScreen map hides almost all of the EJ communities in San Diego because of the big I-805 shield | The shield has been removed from this map. |
| 40 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | "designated" | This change has been made. |
| 41 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | "San Diego station" --> Santa Fe Depot station | This change has been made. |
| 42 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | highly congested | This change has been made. |
| 43 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Phase 2 HSR: "along I-15"... and I-5? not the specific alignment for HSR but picking up most of the same trips (to LA) | I-15 is referenced as it is the designated priority interregional facility for that corridor. Both I-15 and I-5 run parallel to future High Speed Rail lines. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 44 | All | San Diego Association of Governments | not sure how informative the "highest percent freight traffic" is since in both cases it's just low-volume highways that happen to have more freight traffic than other places (but still overall very small traffic volumes) | Thank you for your comment. |
| 45 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | "With limited reliable transit and comfortable biking and walking infrastructure," --> Without reliable transit or comfortable... | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 46 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | air quality rates as among --> are among | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 47 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Capitol Corridor --> Pacific Surfliner; also, the way grade crossings are shown is confusing and makes crossings adjacent to each other hard to pick apart, would recommend a simple dot or an X instead of big circles | The label typo has been fixed. |
| 48 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | "North Coast Bikeway" isn't this the Coastal Rail Trail? | Thank you for your comment. |
| 49 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Please update data to reflect more recent stats from 2019. Revised section could read, "With 77 million northbound crossings of people and over \$65 billion in bilateral trade occurring between California's seven Ports of Entry (POE), efficient movement along this corridor is critical to the national, state, and regional economies." (Data: US DOT Bureau of Transportation Statistics (2019)) | Data has been updated. |
| 50 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | The point for the seaport at Port of San Diego could be moved eastward into San Diego Bay to more accurately identify the port's marine cargo terminal: Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal and National City Marine Terminal. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 51 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Tecate POE is missing from the map. Otay Mesa East POE should be added as a future POE | A symbol for the Tecate POE has been added. The priority interregional facility maps only reflect existing infrastructure. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 52 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Union Pacific Railroad Sunset Line could be displayed on the map-- it runs from Riverside County southeast via Yuma, Arizona and carries freight. | The Sunset Line is not a designated priority interregional railway for this corridor. Priority Interregional Facilities were designated by the 2021 ITSP. |
| 53 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | In the narrative, note that there is a seventh POE in the corridor at Cross Border Xpress. An eighth at Otay Mesa East is planned to open in 2024. Please update the map to include at least Cross Border Xpress and Tecate, which are missing. | The text and map have been updated to reflect the seven POEs. As indicated above, the priority interregional facility maps only show existing infrastructure. |
| 54 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | I-805 shield on map obscures the EJ communities in central San Diego area. | This change has been made. |
| 55 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | "California Department of Public Health states that residents of Imperial County are twice as likely to get asthma, which increases risk for cardiovascular illness." Twice as likely as what-- the state average perhaps? | The text has been clarified. |
| 56 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Please update border crossing statistics to a more recent year, such as 2019. The bar graphs seem confusing in the sense that they group personal travel modes (trips made via personal vehicle or pedestrians) and commercial movements (trucks). Also, there is no "transit" service that crosses the border currently (private bus travelers must disembark and cross as pedestrians). Suggest replacing the bar graphs with pie charts showing breakdown of people, personal vehicle, and truck crossing by POE instead (copy images from Zach's email). | Data has been updated. |
| 57 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | "San Diego station" should probably reference Santa Fe Depot, as it is more commonly known in San Diego. | This change has been made. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 58 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Suggest replacing " the crosssings" with "International border crossings" or "border crossings" under the "Goods Movement" section. | This change has been made. |
| 59 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Secretaría de Infraestructura, Desarrollo Urbano y Reordenación Territorial del Estado de Baja California (SIDURT) should be replaced by "Secretaría de Infraestructura, Comunicaciones y Transportes (SICT) and Secretaría de la Defensa Nacional (SEDENA)" | This change has been made. |
| 60 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Suggest updating the last sentence in the blue box to "The POE includes significant investment in advanced technology to measure and report wait times, flexible lanes for commercial and private vehicles, variable tolling, advanced traveler warning signs, and a network of "smart" sensors that utilizes global positioning system (GPS) and radio frequency identification (RFID) technology. | This change has been made. |
| 61 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Green shield is missing the State Route number (74) in Orange County | This change has been made. |
| 62 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Map legend should be "Pacific Surfliner" or "LOSSAN Corridor" rather than "Capitol Corridor." Defer to SANDAG rail planning SMEs on this. | This change has been made. |
| 63 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | New San Diego Layover Facility will be south/east of new San Diego Convention Center Station. The points for the two facilities should be switched for accuracy. But again defer to SANDAG rail planning SMEs. | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 64 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>The inclusion of San Ysidro Port of Entry in the "Seaports and Ports of Entry" section is interesting since the section focuses on goods movement. Only a small amount of goods travel by rail through San Ysidro POE, while the majority of cross-border goods travel via truck through Otay Mesa POE. The ownership of rail and port infrastructure should be clarified by Caltrans checking with the Ports of LA, Long Beach, San Diego, and Hueneme. In most cases, public port authorities own waterfront infrastructure and lease terminals to private operators. Rail infrastructure can be privately owned, but there are areas, such as near the Port of San Diego's Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal and National City Marine Terminal, where the port owns the rail infrastructure on which BNSF Railway operates. In other areas, transit operators own rail infrastructure and allow limited freight service during specified windows (LOSSAN corridor between Oceanside and downtown San Diego, SDAE/SDIY short line rail between downtown San Diego and El Cajon and between downtown San Diego and San Ysidro).</p> | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 65 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>San Ysidro Port of Entry does not serve trucks, so truck parking facilities should be described as being near Otay Mesa Port of Entry. Truck parking capacity near Otay Mesa is also described very differently compared to Caltrans' California Statewide Truck Parking Study completed in 2022. That study found a surplus of truck parking availability.</p> | The map and text has been updated to reflect the final Truck Parking Study data. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|----------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 66 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | Addendum should mention Community Emissions Reduction Plans being developed through CARB's Community Air Protection Program to address noted air quality deficiencies. These efforts are community-driven and involve multiple public agencies in implementing improvements to address disproportionate air pollution burdens. | Information has been added to the Imperial County air quality needs section. |
| 67 | All | San Diego Association of Governments | Suggest adding a "Mexico" label, south of San Diego and Imperial Counties, on the maps for geographical reference | Country and county labels appear on the first map of each corridor section. |
| 68 | Implementation | San Diego Association of Governments | Multiple projects within our recently adopted 2021 Regional Plan are consistent with the goals of the 2022 ITSP Addendum. The Addendum should look to SANDAG's project list for further guidance of local strategies. Specifically the Addendum mentions the accumulation of transportation datasets into a "WebMap". Should it be requested, SANDAG is ready and willing to provide our dataset for transportation projects from the 2021 Regional Plan to supplement your data. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 69 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | On page 22, the recently opened Carlsbad to Oceanside Carpool/HOV Lane Extension should be shown in the Managed Lanes Status map. | This change has been made. |
| 70 | South Coast | San Diego Association of Governments | Sections of SANDAG's Adopted Regional Bike Network that align with your definition of Interregional Transportation projects include the Camp Pendleton Trail and the I-15 Bikeway. These can and should be included on page 23 map of Planned Intercity Trails. | The Camp Pendleton Trail has been added. The I-15 Bikeway belongs in the US/Mexico Border Corridor, which does not have a trails section in the Addendum. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|------------|---|--|---|
| 71 | Border | San Diego Association of Governments | <p>The 2022 ITSP addendum discusses the need for increased bus, foot, and rail Border Crossing improvements. SANDAG currently is undergoing a request for innovative concepts which includes a cross-border lightrail line. Please also include a reference to the future additional border crossing at Otay Mesa East which is currently under construction which should reduce border wait times for freight and multimodal transportation options. Additionally on page 17, the Priority Interregional Facilities map legend indicates a “Land Port/Port of Entry” indicator but the San Ysidro Port of Entry is missing. On page 25, we are requesting the edit of the mention of San Diego’s Mobility Hub as those models and plans are out of date. We can provide newer plans if necessary.</p> | <p>Otay Mesa East has its own section on page 15. The symbol for San Ysidro POE has been added to the map on page 17. The section on page 25 has been edited to remove the reference to San Diego's Mobility Hub.</p> |
| 72 | I-80/US 50 | Nevada County Transportation Commission | <p>On page 102, please correct the name of the adaption study referenced to read, “Ready Nevada County Extreme Climate Event Mobility and Adaptation Plan”</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |
| 73 | I-80/US 50 | Nevada County Transportation Commission | <p>On page 102, consider editing the plan description to read, “The plan identified potential climate related impacts and weaknesses of the transportation system. The adaptation strategies are intended to help to mitigate and reduce the duration and severity of climate related impacts, identify strategies to harden vulnerable infrastructure, and reduce risks and address mobility and safety of the transportation system. The plan outlines operational strategies to improve wildfire evacuation, including identifying potential improvements to the designated priority interregional facilities SR 20 and SR 49.”</p> | <p>The text has been updated with some of this information.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|------------|--|--|---|
| 74 | I-80/US 50 | Nevada County Transportation Commission | <p>On page 103 or appropriate location maybe as an ITSP Strategies in Action, I would like for the plan to acknowledge the critical role that SR 20 and SR 49 serve functioning as an I-80 emergency detour route. Please consider inclusion of the following information: “Also, important to the state and national economy, both SR 20 and SR 49 in Nevada County are the only routes that can be utilized as “Emergency Detour Routes” when I-80, between Emigrant Gap and Colfax, is closed due to major accidents, wildfires, maintenance, and construction; and both routes are designated to handle STAA oversize and CA Legal Trucks. These events significantly increase both passenger and the truck freight traffic on SR 20 and SR 49. Caltrans District 3 Traffic Management Center data indicates that between 2004 and 2022, there were 220 closures of I-80, where truck traffic and passenger vehicles were rerouted onto SR 20 and SR 49. The amount of commerce that travels over I-80 is immense with estimates that on average between \$4 to \$8 million worth of goods travels over the Donner Pass, every hour, throughout the year.”</p> | The text has been updated with some of this information. |
| 75 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Map addresses wildfire vulnerability. Recommend to specify that the I-15, I-8, and SR 111 overlap with CalFire State and Local Responsibility Areas. Additional recommendation to discuss and visually show that the I-15, I-8, and SR 111 also overlap with the FEMA 100 yr Floodplain.</p> | The information about responsibility areas has been added. The floodplain data has not been added due to space constraints. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|--------|--|---|--|
| 76 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>ITSP Strategies in Action Section: Recommend adding Calexico East to the currently identified crossings.</p> <p>While Calexico West had considerable pedestrian crossings, data indicates that Calexico East is the second largest commercial border crossing in California. Also, data is current through 2022, so 2015 usage should be reconsidered.</p> <p>(https://explore.dot.gov/views/BorderCrossingData/Annual?%3Aembed=y&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y).</p> | Data was updated to 2019 to avoid COVID-related reductions. The POE's shown are the three busiest with total border crossings. |
| 77 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>For the San Ysidro border crossing, mode share is given as 32.7% for pedestrian and 0.3% for transit. A significant majority of San Diego Trolley patrons who board and alight at the San Ysidro station cross the border. This effects these statistics and should be clarified. Also, the section discusses needed improvements to bus and rail services, however there is little chance a passenger rail service will be built crossing the border in the future. Same with local bus transit, but not necessarily intercity bus operated by private companies.</p> | This text has been clarified. |
| 78 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Managed lanes typically limit access by vehicle occupancy not vehicle type, and tolling or both.</p> | This language is consistent with Caltrans' under-development Director's Policy on Managed Lanes. |
| 79 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Mention Blue Line connections to MTS Green and Orange Lines in downtown San Diego.</p> | This change has been made. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|---|--|
| 80 | Border | Southern California Association of Governments | ITSP Strategies in Action Section: The substantial majority of rail moves for the Southern California region are east/west with origins/destinations along most of the areas north of this corridor's extent. Please explain more clearly how rail improvements will increase freight rail mode-share. | This text has been clarified. |
| 81 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | Map is missing Hollywood Burbank (BUR) and John Wayne airports. BUR is immediately adjacent to the I-5 and LOSSAN Corridor. Also missing Long Beach airport. | This change has been made. |
| 82 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | May want to mention Metrolink Orange County and Ventura County Lines, as they operate on the LOSSAN Corridor | Thank you for your comment. |
| 83 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | SR 74 text missing on the map SR sign. | This change has been made. |
| 84 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | There is currently no section that addresses the climate hazards that impact this area. Recommend to create a section on climate risks that discusses and visually shows the overlap between the priority interregional and other facilities with the CalFire State and Local Responsibility Areas, FEMA 100 yr Floodplain, and CoSMos 1 m Sea Level Rise data. | Sea Level Rise and Coastal erosion are discussed on page 20. Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|--|--|
| 85 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Frontline Communities Section: Recommend changing the first sentence to read - The Southern California region's air quality rates as among the worst in the nation - as the second sentence clearly illustrates freight impacts.</p> <p>Recommend adding a sentence after the second sentence to read - In addition to zero-emission technologies, working with communities regarding workforce development and economic opportunities to balance local community business and health concerns is equally critical.</p> | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 86 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>ITSP Strategies in Action: Recommend specifying that at-grade crossings are predominantly related to passenger rail service operations, including further service expansion plans</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 87 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Map says "Capitol Corridor" but should be LOSSAN Corridor. Suggest more emphasis on safety than delay and uncomfortable crossings for Active Transportation for at-grade rail crossings.</p> | This change has been made. |
| 88 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>ITSP Strategies in Action: Recommend specifying that LOSSAN is the second busiest passenger rail corridor in the country.</p> | This is included on page 20. |
| 89 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>The LOSSAN improvements mentioned here are not all initiated by the LOSSAN Agency. For example, the Simi Valley Double Track project is a Metrolink SCORE project. Also the San Bernardino upgrades are located incorrectly. In order to keep passenger rail improvements sponsor/operator neutral, suggest the language "planned/funded by passenger rail operators," or something similar.</p> | This change has been made. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|---|--|
| 90 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | Please update the World Shipping Council date for the SPBPs ranking 9th to 2020. | This change has been made. |
| 91 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | The statement that there are several priced managed lanes segments in Southern California but none along this corridor's priority interregional highways is misleading. Large sections of the corridor's priority interregional highways currently have operational managed lanes. The decision to convert these managed lanes to priced managed lanes is subject to many considerations including transit service and HOV degradation. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 92 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | While rail serves as a key mode of freight transport, it should be clarified that the substantial majority of freight flows, above 85%, are by truck for the region. This is due to the region's large population and consumption versus the portion that is taken eastbound to other consumers across the U.S. It is also equally important to continue to monitor the discretionary cargo that is being diverted to the Gulf and East coast ports. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 93 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | ITSP Strategies in Action Section: With Caltrans recent Truck Parking Study complete, is a core reason why truck parking is less on I-5 a result of shorter trips through the use of the corridor? e.g., a move from SPBPs to Otay Mesa is a shorter trip versus those coming from the Central Coast or from eastern longhaul routes, etc., connecting to industrial facilities. Suggesting clarifying why San Ysidro is discussed, as it does not have any commercial crossing facilities with respect for truck parking, and most of the border-related industrial development is further east at Otay Mesa/OME and at Calexico East. | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|--|---|---|
| 94 | South Coast | Southern California Association of Governments | ITSP Strategies in Action: The M-5 Marine Highway has continued to be mentioned. Has there been an economic feasibility assessment? Freight transport and supply chain decisions are based purely on unit economics, so it would be good to get more perspective on this. Also, more insight on what type of capital investments may be required. | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 95 | Central N/S | Southern California Association of Governments | The identified priority interregional and other facilities overlap with the CalFire State and Local Responsibility Areas and the FEMA 100 yr Floodplain. Recommend to include a section following the "Climate Change Adaptation" section that discusses and visually shows the overlap with these climate hazards. | Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |
| 96 | Central N/S | Southern California Association of Governments | San Joaquin Rail should be referred to as the Amtrak San Joaquin service. | This change has been made. |
| 97 | High Sierra | Southern California Association of Governments | Map addresses wildfire vulnerability. Recommend to specify that the US 395 and SR 14 overlap with CalFire State and Local Responsibility Areas. Also recommend to discuss and visually show that the US 395 and SR 14 also overlap with the FEMA 100 yr Floodplain. | Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |
| 98 | High Sierra | Southern California Association of Governments | Freight Volumes Section - Please provide the source for the over 70% of freight volumes over the corridor originating in the Central Valley. | This text has been updated. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|---|---|
| 99 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Opening paragraph mentions Amtrak Sunset Limited not being viable for interregional trips. This is currently true, but it does stop in Palm Springs, which is not mentioned. Service is now only three days a week, with arrival and departure times in Palm Springs in the middle of the night, making it not viable. If it was expanded to daily service and the schedule adjusted, interregional travel would be viable. Also, the planned Coachella Valley Rail service will operate with up to four to five round-trips a day from downtown L.A. to the Coachella Valley in the future (mentioned later in chapter). | Palm Springs was added to the text. |
| 100 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | The identified priority interregional and other facilities overlap with the CalFire State and Local Responsibility Areas, the FEMA 100 yr Floodplain, and the CoSMos 1 m Sea Level Rise data. Recommend to include a section following the "ITSP Strategies in Action" section that discusses and visually shows the overlap with these climate hazards. | Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum. |
| 101 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Air Cargo and Ground Access: With technology transitions for freight modes, container ships, cargo plans, locomotives, and trucks, the latter seemingly is poised to see the strongest growth in the short-, mid- and long-term. Container ships and cargo planes are least likely to see technological advancement in the short and mid-term. How does this factor into considering mode-shifts? | Although trucks will remain the dominant freight mode, supporting air cargo and other modes are part of the interregional freight strategy. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|--|---|
| 102 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | While the planned priced lane network is included in SCAG's RTP/SCS, it should be clarified that LA Metro and SBCTA are the lead implementing agencies for the corridors identified. Also, it is LA Metro, not SCAG, that provides credits for low-income users of the Express Lanes and who invests the toll revenue in public transit and active improvements. | This change has been made. |
| 103 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Text states that due to severe congestion and limited access in L.A. area, express buses on highways is impractical. Disagree with this statement, as many transit agencies run express bus services on highways, freeways, HOV and Express Lanes. While those facilities, including the HOV and Express Lanes are often congested, express bus service is still relatively competitive with SOV travel. | This change has been made. |
| 104 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Growth in the Inland Empire Section: Perhaps telework, hybrid work schedules should also be mentioned/considered as part of the context. | Thank you for your comment. |
| 105 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Map of future CA HSR should show the alternatives as presented in AA documents produced by CHSRA, which include both I-10 and SR-60, and I-15 and I-215 as current alternatives. This has been indicated earlier in the document. | The map is meant to provide a high level understanding of the future high speed rail network, not to illustrate exact alignments, and has been simplified for this purpose. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--|--|--|
| 106 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Comment - ITSP Strategies in Action: It would be good to clarify operational characteristics/strategies with respect to short haul railroads. For instance, there are many industrial locations where mainline rail lines spur to a specific industrial location, whether concrete, steel, lumber, etc. Is the intent here to either develop more spurs to existing industrial facilities, and/or to suggest new facility expansion have rail spurs? | This text has been changed in response to another comment. |
| 107 | SoCal E/W | Southern California Association of Governments | Section discusses BNSF and UP "mainline." Each company has its own mainlines. Suggest referring to in the plural. | This change has been made. |
| 108 | All | Southern California Association of Governments | Please ensure that each corridor includes a dedicated equity section. If a variety of indices are highlighted, please qualify at the outset of the report that a variety of statewide indices were consulted and briefly describe them (e.g., CalEnviroScreen 4.0, California Healthy Places Index, etc.) and why they were referenced instead of another. | This text has been clarified. |
| 109 | All | Southern California Association of Governments | Many routes within ITSP corridors overlap with routes identified in the State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP) such as the US/Mexico Border-Inland Empire Corridor, South Coast- Central Coast Corridor, San Jose/SF Bay Area - Central Valley- Los Angeles Corridor, High Desert -Eastern Sierra-Northern Nevada Corridor, and the Southern California - Southern Nevada/Arizona Corridor. Please consider including the system preservation needs identified through the SHOPP in the ITSP Addendum. | Strategies related to system preservation will be considered as part of the next update to the ITSP. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-----|--|--|--|
| 110 | All | Southern California Association of Governments | <p>Consider describing regional Reconnecting Communities efforts (e.g., in Southern California corridor sections, including the South Coast - Central Coast Corridor and Southern California - Southern Nevada / Arizona Corridor sections). SCAG recently secured \$480,000 in Community Project Funding (CPF) for a Highways to Boulevard Regional Study. The Study will offer a path for communities to reknit by replacing aging highways with city streets that better fit the context of their surroundings and serve all people, not just automobiles. Furthermore, the Study will provide a framework to identify and evaluate potential highway corridors for performance improvements to reduce congestion, provide more multi-modal travel options, and increase transportation system efficiency, particularly in areas which intersect with Environmental Justice areas, Disadvantaged Communities, and Communities of Concern.</p> | <p>A reference to this study has been added to the Southern California - Southern Nevada / Arizona Corridor section on Reconnecting Communities. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum.</p> |
|-----|-----|--|--|--|

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|---|--|
| 111 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>"ITSP Strategies and Strategic Interregional Corridors" table, "Southcoast - Central Coast Corridor" column - "Provide STAA Access, Truck Climbing and/or Passing Lanes in Locations with Steep Grades and Expand First/Last Mile Rail Station Access" strategies remain unchecked. It is unclear why these strategies remain unchecked?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Please consider including "Truck Climbing and/or Passing Lanes in Locations with Steep Grades" strategy options for State Route 74 (SR-74). o Please note, the San Juan Capistrano Metrolink Station is within proximity (less than .5 mile) to the SR-74, which can be considered for additional expansion of "First/Last Mile Rail Station Access" strategies. | <p>Strategies were designated in the 2021 ITSP. The 2022 ITSP Addendum does not make any changes to strategy designations. Changes will be considered as part of the next ITSP update.</p> |
| 112 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>Priority Interregional Facilities Map - blank icon - please denote SR-74 on the icon.</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |
| 113 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>"Highest Percent Freight Traffic (SR-74)" - please confirm the statistic with the California Department of Transportation District 12.</p> | <p>This statistic is correct.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--|---|--|
| 114 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>"Increase Intercity Passenger Rail Service Frequency Consistent with the California State Rail Plan" - This ITSP Strategy identifies "the need for substantial resilience infrastructure to protect against sea level rise and cliff erosion" specifically, at the Del Mar Bluffs. Please consider including the Los Angeles-San Luis Obispo-San Diego Rail Corridor, specifically in the Southern Orange County Costa! Area in the cities of San Clemente and Dana Point which need substantial resilience infrastructure improvements to protect against sea level rise and beach erosion.</p> | Thank you for your comment. |
| 115 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>"Increase Connectivity and Accessibility to Modal Options" - Please consider updating the associated map to reflect recent updates and expansions to the Orange County Bike Loops network. Please reference the "Orange County Bike Loops" map attachment.</p> | This change has been made. |
| 116 | South Coast | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>In response to natural disasters, specifically wildfires, climate resiliency strategies such as escape routes are listed throughout various sections of the addendum. Please consider including SR-7 4 as an escape route for wildfires in the South Coast - Central Coast Strategic Interregional Corridor.</p> | The ITSP Addendum does not designate wildfire evacuation routes. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|---|---|
| 117 | All | Orange County Transportation Authority | <p>What was the process for selecting specific strategies for the Needs Assessment section?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Are these strategies prioritized in a certain manner? o What are the implications of including/not including specific strategies amongst the corridors? | <p>Strategies were identified for each corridor in the 2021 ITSP. Strategies highlighted in the Addendum were chosen to create a high-level sense of needs for each corridor while reducing duplication of needs across corridors. Just because a strategy is not included for a corridor in the Addendum does not mean it is not a need for that corridor.</p> |
| 118 | North Coast | Golden Gate Bridge, Highway Transportation District | <p>The map has a typo; GGT connects with MTA in Santa Rosa, not Willits.</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |
| 119 | North Coast | Golden Gate Bridge, Highway Transportation District | <p>Ferry service is provided to Larkspur, Sausalito, and Tiburon – not Belvedere.</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |
| 120 | All | Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments | <p>On the data summary box, please specify a highway in parenthesis for the “Highway Travel Time at Peak” and “Transit Travel Time Peak” measures. If these travel time measures are an average for all highways, please specify. As this data summary box is present on all corridor summaries, this comment applies to all corridor sections.</p> | <p>A footnote has been added for each corridor indicating the trip used for corridor travel information.</p> |
| 121 | Central Coast | Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments | <p>Population for the megaregion is currently shown as “3.934,498,” the period should be replaced with a comma.</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 122 | Central Coast | Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments | <p>This section should read as follows: (Edits in underline) “For decades, the Central Coast has experienced heavy precipitation events followed by flash floods, landslides, and debris flows. With UPRR mainline tracks and SR 1 running along the steep coastlines of the Central Coast, these landslides pose a significant threat to multimodal transportation. The 2017 Mud Creek landslide closed SR 1 for over a year and necessitated \$54 million in reconstruction and adaptation costs. Because SR 1 runs parallel to US 101 through much of this corridor, US 101 became the lifeline access route for communities during the closure. As climate change increases the frequency of heavy precipitation, local trips will shift from SR 1 more often, exacerbating US 101’s already high demand. Investments in rail and road infrastructure along the Central Coast should include elements to improve resilience to flooding and mud slides.”</p> | This change has been made. |
| 123 | Central Coast | Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments | <p>Since the discussion addresses AMTRAK bus service with one-way service at \$50, it may make sense to mention Greyhound as well if appropriate. Prices range from \$35-50 for the same type of service as AMTRAK bus.</p> | This change has been made. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--|---|--|
| 124 | Central Coast | Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments | <p>This section should read as follows: (Edits in underline) <u>Salad Bowl of the World</u> The Central Coast is home to the Salinas Valley, the top vegetable-producing region in the nation. The region, known as the “Salad Bowl of the World” produces over \$6.5 billion worth of agricultural products every year, including lettuce, strawberries, artichokes, and broccoli (2021). In recent decades thousands more acres of land have been brought into production for the first time as vineyards for growing fine wine grapes. The Central Coast also hosts major food processing and manufacturing facilities near Hollister, around Santa Cruz Watsonville, along U.S. 101 in Monterey County Salinas, near Paso Robles, near San Luis Obispo, near Santa Maria, and near Santa Barbara. These critical industries need an efficient freight network, particularly for perishable products. UPRR owns and operates this corridor’s rail. Freight demand on UPRR is low and over 85% of freight moves by truck due to time sensitivity of most agricultural products. Ensuring efficient freight truck movement along US 101 is key to preserving this vital component of California’s food chain.</p> | This text has been updated with edits for space constraints. |
| 125 | Border | Imperial County Transportation Commission | references truck crossings at the Calexico West POE. Truck crossings at Imperial County’s POEs only occur at the Calexico East POE. | The POE's shown are the three busiest with total border crossings. |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|--|--|
| 126 | Border | Imperial County Transportation Commission | <p>Also, Broadband Access and Rural Broadband are sections discussed in other regions of the state; however, that sections appears to be missing from the US/Mexico Border – Inland Empire Strategic Interregional Corridor. Please include a broadband access section in the US/Mexico Border section of this addendum. Imperial County lacks broadband access and in order to help pursue the necessary infrastructure, it is important that documents such as this one highlight this need.</p> | <p>Interregional needs topics are intentionally different to reflect the diverse needs of interregional corridors. Interregional needs for each corridor are not limited to the examples included in the Addendum.</p> |
| 127 | Central Coast | Transportation Agency for Monterey County | <p>TAMC appreciates the incorporation of our comments submitted in the 2021 Draft ITSP. The 2022 draft includes the Pacific Coast Bike Route in Monterey County and the integration of interagency coordination in the ITSP's Goals/Objectives. While the 2022 draft does not specifically focus on the weighting of the scoring criteria, we look forward to providing comments once the scoring criteria is revisited.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comment.</p> |

Public Comments Received on Draft ITSP Addendum

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---|--|--|
| 128 | Central E/W | Transportation Agency for Monterey County | <p>List all of State Route 156 as a Priority Interregional Facility: The agency appreciates the inclusion of State Route 156 as a Priority Interregional Facility in the Central Coast - San Joaquin Valley Corridor chapter. The agency recommends that State Route 156 should be listed as a Priority Interregional Facility in the Central Coast - Bay Area Strategic Corridor chapter for its role in freight movement, travel, and tourism in the Central Coast. The western terminus of State Route 156 is at State Route 1 in Castroville. The eastern terminus is at State Route 152 near Hollister. The Central Coast – San Joaquin Valley chapter contains narrative of the eastern section of State Route 156. However, it is vital to include narrative on the western section of State Route 156 in the Central Coast – Bay Area chapter, since State Route 156 is one of the major thoroughfares used by residents, commuters, tourists, and commercial trucks traveling to and from the Monterey Peninsula. Travelers from the Central Valley and the San Francisco Bay Area rely on State Route 156 to access the Monterey Peninsula, which sees 4.6 million visitors per year, contributing almost \$2.98 billion into the local tourist economy.</p> | <p>Priority interregional facilities were designated as part of the 2021 ITSP. The 2022 ITSP Addendum does not designate any new facilities. New facility designations will be considered as part of the next ITSP update.</p> |
| 129 | Central Coast | Transportation Agency for Monterey County | <p>Intercity Bus Map: On page 34, a map is provided on the Intercity Bus network for the Central Coast – Bay Area Corridor that includes the Intercity Bus routes for Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST). MST will be implementing its “Better Bus Network” through 2023 which will change most routes in the MST service area, including intercity bus routes. As of today, Monterey-Salinas Transit is no longer operating bus service to Fort Hunter Liggett and has suspended service to San Jose. Please coordinate with MST on the modifications for the Intercity Bus Map on page 34.</p> | <p>This change has been made.</p> |