



K

Draft 2040 MTP/SCS Comments
and Responses

Introduction

The 2040 MTP/SCS is the blueprint for a regional transportation system that further enhances our quality of life, promotes sustainability, and offers more mobility options for people and goods. The 2040 MTP/SCS is built on an integrated set of public policies, strategies and investments to maintain, manage and improve the transportation system so it meets the diverse needs of our changing region through 2040.

On December 4, 2017, AMBAG released the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review and comment. Four public workshops and five public hearings were held in January 2018 to facilitate public comment on the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR.

Generally, the comments received to date on the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS covered the following broad issues:

- Comments on the SCS, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), and Greenhouse Gases
- Support for/Opposition to Transportation Modes and Specific Projects
- Comments on the Project List
- Comments on the MTP/SCS Document and Figures
- Comments on Sustainability and Greenhouse Gases

The close of the public comment period for the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR was February 5, 2018. Staff has compiled the comments received on the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS and prepared written responses, which are included as an attachment to this Appendix.

K

Attachments

Draft 2040 MTP/SCS Public Comments and Draft Responses Received During the Public Comment Period

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
1	Land Watch	DeLapa	Michael	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Thank you for the opportunity to review AMBAG’s Draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS, which is intended to reduce GHG emissions from travel by local transportation sources, is based on existing general plans and population and employment forecasts. Since implementation of the SCS is voluntary, it is important for decision-makers and the public to be informed about consistency of their land use decisions with the adopted SCS. Recently, the City of Salinas approved an Economic Development Element (EDE) as a new element to the City’s general plan. The EDE requires amendments to the existing General Plan and LAFCO approval of annexations to the City. In our review of the EDE, we found it inconsistent with AMBAG’s employment forecasts and with policies intended to provide for compact urban development and prevention of urban sprawl. Based on discussions with AMBAG staff, we understand AMBAG did not submit comments on the DEIR for the EDE. We urge the AMBAG Board of Directors to direct AMBAG staff to review and comment during the environmental review process on all general plan, general plan amendments, and annexation requests for consistency with the 2040 Sustainable Community Strategy. These very important government actions take place relatively infrequently, but when they do they offer a critical opportunity to influence public policy and inform the public and decision makers about reductions (or increases) in greenhouse gas emissions.	AMBAG was designated the regional agency responsible for clearinghouse operations in Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz Counties. The purpose of the Clearinghouse is to provide all interested parties within the tri-county area notification of projects for federal financial assistance, direct federal development activities, local plans and development projects and state plans that are proposed within the region. AMBAG does review local planning documents such as general plans or specific plans as part of the Clearinghouse process. However, AMBAG does not always submit comments on all of these plans.	Letter	12/28/2017
2	Public	Coile	Jennifer	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I’m a resident of Hollister for 17 and a half years. And I have three things I would like to speak about. One is bicycle facilities. Number two is ridesharing carpooling information coordination. And thirdly commuter rail and connections to it. So, I wrote the bike plans for the City of Burbank and the City of Glendale, back in the day, and it wasn’t just matter of bikeways but the supportive facilities. And I know that this is a macro plan, but just to make sure that we have bicycle parking and when we are encouraging bicycle commuting in an area of intense employment that there are showers for bike commuters and appropriate storage lockers. So, any example ordinances or promotion of bicycle facilities parking and showers and lockers, I would respectfully request that there be more emphasis on that. Secondly, carpooling. So, since I’ve lived here. We moved to Hollister so that my husband could walk to work. And then meanwhile I was the lucky one that got to go elsewhere for work. I have been lucky to carpool at times, but it has been a bit serendipitous. And when we have had the kind of rideshare matching the “511?” I don’t remember what it was. Something about the way the technology was set up then it was “okay, I live here and I’m going to be going to here” and then it’s okay so who is exactly very close to where you live and where you are going to arrive but it wasn’t. There wasn’t this somehow kind of the upstream sort of thing of, so I'm going to Sunnyvale but then if we’re or say I was going to Sunnyvale. Let's say if someone was going to Palo Alto, and they were about to pass my office in Sunnyvale there is no way that the computer could kind of or the matching program could kind of figure that out. But that was a while ago and I would like to think that our technology is better now and so again I would just like to make sure that there is funding allocated for really making a robust ridesharing thing, cause I think there is more that can be done. And we have seen it with vanpools but it can be hard to coordinate and you have just got to have a ride a guaranteed ride home program for people for parents because you can’t be carpooling with someone 45 miles away and then get the call that your kid has a fever at school and how do you get back your rideshare partner can’t leave till 5 et cetera. So, I think those guaranteed ride home programs are really important and maybe now they are even easier to do because of Uber and Lyft, than they were back in the day. And then the third thing is the commuter rail connections. So, here in Hollister, I went to the County Express park-and-ride, jumped on the bus, got up to Gilroy, jumped on CalTrain and got to work in Sunnyvale and Palo Alto. So, I have been looking at both the plan and the Draft EIR and maybe it is not just leaping out to me but I just don’t see enough documentation of the services we already have of the County Express bus to get us to Gilroy, which becomes even more important in Hollister when we are building 500 houses a year in Hollister and 500 in the county, and those are not local jobs, because I don’t know of any local jobs that pay the money for those people to buy those houses. So, lets pretty much presume they are commuting and get them onto the rail if they can. You know they know about it they are informed about and there is an easy way to get there. So that County Express bus service was critical for me. And also I'm not sure that the 55, the MST 55, that goes to Gilroy and the San Jose Airport was really documented in the existing conditions, that is a very service. So, we have some good regional services now and I would really pray that they will continue in the future and even expand so we can capture some of these new residents and commuters who are going to jobs elsewhere. So I would love to see by 2040 that there is an extension of rail track to Hollister, but there is just so many funding Gods and Goddesses that you probably can't promote that but at least lets continue the connections to get us to what I think CalTrain will still be there.	Additional information regarding bicycle supportive facilities will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS. Ridesharing services are discussed in Chapter 2.	Public Hearing	1/11/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
3	City of Gonzales	Mendez	Rene	General	Hello, Rene Mendez City Manager of Gonzales. First of all I want to thank everyone for being here. I think it is important to understand how these processes work moving forward. A lot of things that shape policies that the city responds to or that other agencies respond to, including regional agencies and state, key off a lot on these plans. So it is really important, and I encourage you to submit your comments in to AMBAG, because they take this role seriously. And I think one of the things that I am proud to say that AMBAG is trying really to understand our communities and what drives them. “Drives,” is maybe a poor choice of words, but transportation and so forth. And our workforce, and how our workforce goes all over the county. People come to work in Gonzales. People from Gonzales go to work in other parts of the county or outside the county. So, I think that it is very important and I encourage everybody to get your suggestions and ideas or thoughts questions or comments to AMBAG. There is absolutely nothing that is inappropriate that reasonable legitimate and you know, then they are required to address it and answer to it. So, I would encourage everyone to get their feedback in. We will be providing feedback, either through our representative or directly to them. And if you want us to provide your feedback, we will also be able to provide your feedback to AMBAG. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/22/2018
4	City of Gonzales	Wolgamott	Harold	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	Public Works Director for Gonzales. This plan talks about many things. And one of the good things that I like about the plan is the balance of regionalization, regional transportation needs with local transportation needs. We all have roads that need to be repaired, and this is all about funding this is where do you spend your money. So we can sit here in Gonzales and argue that for all the money to be for our local streets but we know the importance for regional transportation we know the needs for the 101 corridor. And so balancing that out is what this plan is about and I am going to thank AMBAG for trying to balance out the best you can. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/22/2018
5	Public	Lopez	Chris	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	My name is Chris Lopez, I live in Greenfield. Um, I would just like to encourage that we continue as a community to focus on the frontage street improvements up and down the 101 corridor. As we look at those areas, we have seen a lot more accidents there just in these last few months, and I have gotten an innumerable amount of calls from folks who live in work just along the frontage about the things they have seen the things their children have seen having to pull onto the freeway around those accidents and their ideas are they are huge and a lot of them just continue to say we have looked at the planning we support it, when is it coming and how can we do that. And so we just encourage you to continue to look at that and encourage you to continue to push that plan forward. Because it means a lot to our communities. It reduces congestion over the summer, especially when we have a lot of Agriculture traffic on the road. And it helps our community and those folks who work in agriculture get to work safely and it will help alleviate some of their families concerns about their travel and knowing that they are getting to where they are going more safely if our roads are better built to get them from their point A and B which are sometimes areas that are forgotten because there are no homes or businesses in those areas, we continue to allow them to have, you know, their families piece of mind at home as well it means a lot to our community. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/22/2018
6	Public	Hernandez	Joel	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I just want to touch base on a picture that I saw on the performance measures. Um, I think it is real important, Paul and I were talking about the importance of having vanpools, because it is what Chris was mentioning it is the importance of reducing some of these greenhouse emissions into having people carpool. Especially the farmworkers that go out into the fields. In Salinas, we have a big transportation issue, with so many cars driving outside of the city that I think that some of that can be alleviated with these vanpools that we have seen them circulating around the county. I think that is an efficient way of trying to reduce some of those gas emissions. Thank you.	Vanpool programs are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS and are discussed in Chapters 2 & 4.	Public Hearing	1/22/2018
7	Public	N/A	N/A	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Guisiera que implementaran el bus para trasportor discapacitados a costo bayo para la ciudad le Gonzalez o para fuera de la ciudad pero dentro del Condado. In English provided by translator: I'd like to have access for low cost buses for disabled people in Gonzaleso outside the city but within the County.	Monterey-Salinas Transit provides a discounted transit pass for disabled people within Monterey County. In Spanish provided by translator: El servicio de transito Monterey-Salinas ofrece un pase con descuento para personas discapacitadas en el Condado de Monterey.	Comment Card	1/22/2018
8	Public	N/A	N/A	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I lo quisiera que los vases de trasportacion que pasen mas seguido parque pasan muy cadu hora y seria que posara cadu 1/2 hora por favor. In English provided by translator: I would like to have more buses that come more often because right now there's only one bus every hour and it'd be great if there was one bus every half hour, please.	Additional transit service and frequency is included for Monterey County in the 2040 MTP/SCS. In Spanish provided by translator: Un servicio de transito adicional u mas frecuente esta includio en el MTP/SCS 2040 en el Condado de Monterey.	Comment Card	1/22/2018
9	Public	Stanger	Peter	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	There is an error in the 2040 draft plan on Chapter 2, page 20. The plan states that non-profits such as Ecology Action and Bike Santa Cruz County. Simply, Bike Santa Cruz County is NOT a 503c tax exempt non-profit. Bike Santa Cruz County is part of a political action coalition that enjoys a comfortable relationship with the SCCRTC as long as they continue to adhere to the plan for a trail with a rail on the old railroad corridor that SCCRTC staff and management advocate. This is in spite of widespread public opposition and discontent with their plans.	This is a comment on SCCRTC's Draft 2040 RTP, not the Draft 2040 MTP/SCS. Your comment will be forwarded to SCCRTC.	Email	1/26/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
10	Public	Bagshaw	Dana	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	A lot of work here - too much to take in. My fear is that by trying to make everyone happy, we are not getting the leadership we need to significantly reduce carbon emissions for our future. For example, we need to consider alternative modes of transportation like solar-powered ultra-light rail with the panels above the tracks, directly supplying the trains.	Emerging and future transportation technologies are continually being studied and evaluated included and discussed as part of future MTP/SCS updates as appropriate.	Comment Card	1/30/2018
11	Public	Chumer (sp?)	Alexandra	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Thank you for the informative hearing. I have two brief comments: (1) I am still waiting for a functional public transit system that takes less than 3 hours between downtown Santa Cruz & South County. Such transit would need to be frequent and also needs to run on a corridor independent of auto traffic. Our current bus system is laughable and my son routinely took 3 hours to get home from school; (2) Widening highways encourages more cars, more emissions and only temporarily relieves congestion. We should not be widening Hwy 1. We should prioritize the reduction of greenhouse gases which pose an existential threat to our community and our very species. Thank you!	There are a number of projects included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that provide alternative choices to driving alone. Additionally, improvements to transit service and frequency are included for SC METRO route in the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Comment Card	1/30/2018
12	Public	Lundholm	Dean	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	I have just a couple of small points, I think, bullet points anyway. This list I see many times, and it is all good words. But, I don't see it implemented very often. As I understand this process, getting information from the cities and counties, that in my experience as a housing advocate, the cities and counties have little idea of what they are going to build the next year much less for 22 years. The third is that you talk about sustainability, yet there is much more money for highways than there is for transit.	A number of projects are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that provide alternatives to driving alone. However, roadway improvements are needed to move not only people but freight through and in and out the region. The AMBAG region will continue to provide mobility options to for passenger and freight travel as well as meet our regional GHG targets.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
13	Campaign for Sensible Transportation	Saint	Mike	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Like the last gentleman said, my main concern is our support of automobiles especially when we look at these charts and most of the money is going to build highways and put more pavement out in the number 1 corridor. Specifically I have a study that was done September 2016, and just I will make a few comments I know a lot of people want to talk. But, it basically points out that the opponents of the highway widening that the benefits of widening highways tend to be temporary as more capacity induces demand for more congestion and that the widening project is not consistent with local, regional or state sustainability legislation such as SB 375. Even CalTrans has acknowledged that widening freeways on highway one would not relieve congestion over the long term and may not even help in the short term. Bear with me I don't want to read this whole thing. One other comment was that the SCCRTC expects the carpool lanes that would be part of the widening of highway 1 corridor eventually to fully accommodate 2035 travel demand along the corridor reducing peak hour travel times on segments from an hour to just 15 or 20 minutes. Sounds really good, but the caveat here is carpool lanes would also increase VMT which is where the project is problematic. Under SB 375 it is required to reduce VMT by 5% by 2035 which 5% I think that should be much higher. Yet the highway 1 widening project would increase VMT significantly. SCCRTC projects about a 30% increase in the AM/PM peak periods on VMT. I just want to make one statement. So the question for Santa Cruz County therefore is not how can you cure congestion but how can you support sustainable growth and give people choices.	A number of projects are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that provide alternatives to driving alone. However, roadway improvements are needed to move not only people but freight through and in and out the region. The AMBAG region will continue to provide mobility options to for passenger and freight travel as well as meet our regional GHG targets.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
14	Public	Steinbruner	Becky	General & DEIR	Thank you good evening my name is Becky Steinbruner and I am a resident of Aptos. And I guess I am a little confused here, there seem that there are different studies that are being discussed. I thought that there was something called Moving Monterey Bay Forward Draft 2040, is that the same as this? Because it seems there is some sort of a different document back there on the table. Online there are appendices and discussions about road modeling. So, I just wanted to put that out there because to me it seems a little confusing as to what we are really discussing here and what else is out there. There are a lot of transportation studies and things that I am hearing that in terms of greenhouse gases the numbers being discusses are not even the same and cannot be the same because of different state and federal guidelines. So it is just this process is just very confusing for people and I really tried to do my homework. I want to just point out that in the document on the back table, it says that this plan is consistent with the Santa Cruz County General plan, that plan has not been updated since 1994, and so I have some questions about the congruity of that. And under the growth inducing impacts section 6.1.1 it says that the AMBAG Region is going to increase from 767,670 to by 2040 883,300 and yet in the version online that I read of the growth modeling it actually predicted a decrease in population and it didn't explain that but it did go into detail in the document that several sets of data had been put in and compared to other models and it looked like population was going to go down. So that is not consistent with what is being reported in section 6.1.1 of this report on the back table. I also have a lot of concerns about water resources in the area and I want to point out that the document on the table does not even mention the San Lorenzo river valley watershed or the Soquel Creek Watershed those are two critical watersheds for Santa Cruz County. The report only talks about Pajaro and I know this regional report and Pajaro river does cover a big area but I think the report is negligent on considering that. And I think I am out of time and I will submit a written comment.	Both the Draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), also known as <i>Monterey Bay 2040 Moving Forward</i> or Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) were available for public review. The comment period for both documents (Plan & DEIR) was from December 4, 2017 to February 5, 2018. This is a comment on the DEIR and will be responded to as part of the environmental review process. All DEIR comments were forwarded to Rincon Consultants, Inc. for response.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
15	Public	Otter	Lee	DEIR	Thank you Mr. Supervisor. 480 pages, Rincon did quite a job here, so this is pretty impressive challenge to us reviews. The first 60 pages or so are largely focused on mitigation measures for our regional transportation system and so I want to zero in on that and more particularly things that present a Coastal Act nexus, and maybe right at the top of the heap there is the issue of global climate change and sea level rise adaptation. This is something that we just got to take into account if we are looking down the road to 2040 and beyond, because whatever pattern I believe is in place by 2040 will have a lot to do with the pattern that exists for the rest of the century and we can see this in the existing pattern of roads, railways, bikeways and so forth that are in the central coast already. So, our agency will be submitting written comments later on so I will certainly not tire you out with all of those. But, I did want to first put in a plug for the continuity of the Monterey Bay Scenic Trail, which is part of the California Coastal Trail System and relate to you how the sea level rise adaptation needs to account for that. So, we need to anticipate impacts for regional transportation systems, that is roads, rail, bikeway, pedestrian pathways and the draft MTP does, but I believe it stays at 60,000 feet when it should be down around 30,000 feet and so there some addition detail might be a good idea. And this is because we believe the policies and mitigation measures should provide for periodic retreat and realignment in response to shoreline erosion and flooding. And planned retreat might be more practical for low capital investment projects like segments of the coastal trail that can be feasibly pulled back from the edge of the bluff as the need dictates. In contrast ridged structures like bridges and so forth are high investment and often cannot be feasibly or progressively retreated and they should be I would like to see the MTP call for the design so they are substantially elevated higher than is needed right now but will be needed down the line in the future. And we should error on the side of caution that is, provide lots of room for shoreline flooding shoreline retreat in so forth. We will be advocating that in our written comments and I will close with that.	This is a comment on the DEIR and will be responded to as part of the environmental review process. All DEIR comments were forwarded to Rincon Consultants, Inc. for response.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
16	Santa Cruz Climate Action Network	Seals	Pauline	DEIR	I am Pauline Seals, Santa Cruz Climate Action Network. First of all, I want thank you for doing this, and I want to thank you for all the work on bikes and all that other stuff. Yeah, I didn't have time to read everything, but I did go to the Greenhouse Gas Section. The one thing I noticed is that you are using out of date models, that is to say the IPCC most recent thing is not that recent at all. It was published in 2013, based on data from 2011, because of the time it takes to put it together. There is a much more recent document, a U.S. document called NCA 4, which has more like 6 feet by 2100 or even sooner, of sea level rise. This needs to be taken into account. In the Green House Gas section which I went through briefly, there is a lot of reference to per capita. Well, you know Per Capita doesn't count, it is the whole area. What the whole area is doing is the only thing that counts. And the conclusion was the whole plan would conflict with the state's ability to achieve between SB 32 greenhouse gas reduction targets. I'm pointing at the document, not making this up. So, even with that, there will also be newer climate models being put into them, and it is not possible. And we have been a giant Greenhouse Gas Emitter, mostly through transportation. So, I look at this and I go \$3 billion for roads \$2.6 for transportation. Forget that, \$.5 billion or less for roads \$5 billion for transportation. Because then it wouldn't be just going to maintenance then you could really revolutionize and create a world-class transportation system or at least get started. Such as if you have ever traveled around the cities in Europe, or even the country side in Europe. They are so far ahead of us, it is sad. Thank you for the chance to speak.	This is a comment on the DEIR and will be responded to as part of the environmental review process. All DEIR comments were forwarded to Rincon Consultants, Inc. for response.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
17	Public	Nataro	Ryan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I just wanted to make a general comment. I am glad that the study goes out to 2040, because the nature of surface transportation is going to be so much different with the implementation of autonomous vehicles with their better use of vehicles having more passengers kind of like. Also the electrification of personal transportation, which we have already seen in bicycles and skateboards, but you may very well see in vehicles for those that are less able to move around. I think what this points out is that the utilization of corridors that are paved and flat are going to be much greater over time, than fixed solutions that do not provide flexibility. I am an advocate for seeing that the freeway is available to increase its capacity and that capacity can be increased in non-peak times through more efficient spacing of vehicles. But also there is other options for providing vehicle throughput. The same thing with the rail corridor which if this plan is executed for flexibility, would be able to provide quite a bit of new ways to get around, at least in Santa Cruz County.	Emerging and future transportation technologies are continually being studied and evaluated included and discussed as part of future MTP/SCS updates as appropriate.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
18	Public	Pethoe	Peter	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Okay so my proposal is kind of outlandish, as you can probably figure out. What we need is more water. Okay. So, I guess you probably read the recent Sentinel that had a water issue that had some stuff on Desalinization and not desalinization. And it seems to me that is a moot point, because there is a company in Norway called BKK, that produces a lot of power and it gets, what it does is it pumps natural gas from oil fields off shore, all the way down to Spain and Portugal all over western Europe, including Russia and Germany and England gets natural gas from Norway. Alright, so where was I going. So this company has this big huge power plant in Norway and produces a lot of greenhouse gasses. So, what they are trying to do is capture the gas and mix it with seawater and produce chemicals. The chemicals are most likely, there are several different chemicals, Soda Ash for instance is the main one and it is used for the manufacture of gas. So, they are working on it and already moved the smoke stacks, and this will be an advanced test grant and initially and they already moved the smoke stacks so that they can be installed in the next process, it takes a while and they are keeping their mouths shut so it is difficult to get information about how it is coming along I am trying all the time to find out what is happening there. So, what you are going to end up with, so they are going to produce this product and one of the things that they don't need and we need is desalinated water. Or water that doesn't have as much salt in it, so it can actually be maybe be cleaned up even further, so you end up with I think trade off. But we need Carbon Dioxide and where do we find Carbon Dioxide in our economy? Well we had lots of it coming from the Davenport Cement Plant. So, I suggest we rebuild the Davenport Cement Plant, and get it open and it will rise a bunch of good industrial based jobs, good paying jobs and gets us going again. And you can also transport this cement over the rail line all the way down to connected with hustling junction to the regular grid. So that is one of the things. Then you can also take the cement and make ties for the rail road and also transit will follow.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
19	Public	Scott	Barry	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I live in Aptos, and I work in the energy efficiency sector with utility companies and so forth. And in the energy efficiency and generation sector, there is something called loading order. And that means how do you meet demand. And it starts with no demand at all. Reducing demand the megawatt no, don't use energy, that is the very first and cheapest lowest hanging fruit thing to do. Then you go to, okay, efficient appliances and renewables and the last thing you want to do is burn coal. Well, transportation has the same kind of a loading order. It starts with fewer trips and shorter trips. Then is goes to walking as the first priority, then cycling after that, then transit, at the end of that is personal vehicles, personal motorized vehicles, and that includes electric bikes I am sorry people, transit is the equitable thing. When I go outside my place, let's look at walking. I have a sidewalk on one side the opposite side of the street down to the round-a-bout, and if I go to the other direction I have no sidewalk what-so-ever. It is unsafe for bikes on and it is certainty unsafe for walking. When we look at the measure D funding package, we have a quarter of that going to highways which are low on the loading order. And we have a trail plan, and that is great. But, I want to see more transit, and people that know me know that I want to see rail transit. We have a working rail line that we bought for transit and it is sitting there it is permitted and it is operational and it needs new tracks and a small investment to be operational to provide equitable transportation to south county connecting at Pajaro. And my question to the Regional Transportation Plan is I wonder if you are going to take the recently released 2018 State Rail Plan, the CalTrans State Rail Plan that talks about shifting trips from Highways in a big way to Rail trips, by 2040. It talks about more than \$136 billion being dedicated to finishing and creating and growing an interconnected state wide rail plan. That plan the maps in that plan includes the Santa Cruz Branch line and if you listen to Debbie Hale, down in the Transportation Agency of Monterey County, you will know how excited they are about the Pajaro Station and the Salinas to Gilroy extension that is going to be in service by 2022, with a station at the end of our line connecting in both directions. So I wonder whether or not I hope that the Regional Transportation Plan will go back to the drawing board a little bit if it hasn't already included that vision that funding that shift in priority by CalTrans away from Highways toward transit, rail transit specifically. Thank you.	Emerging and future transportation technologies are continually being studied and evaluated included and discussed as part of future MTP/SCS updates as appropriate. SCCRTC's Unified Corridor Study is underway and is evaluating the transportation uses of the rail right-of-way along with improvements to Soquel Drive/Avenue and Highway 1. The goal of this effort is to determine the best combination of projects and improvements along each route so that they complement one another and enhance the mobility in the region. The study is expected to be completed in December 2018. The results of this study will be incorporated into the next MTP/SCS update.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
20	Public	Stumbaugh	Thomas	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I came to this county in early 1960s. Taught at Watsonville High School for a while and my ex-wife and I am my three kids lived over in Watsonville. We used to load them into my '37 Chevrolet drive to Santa Cruz and back and never run into a crawling traffic situation, just drive over here and back, you know. Now in the 1970s I lived over by the golf course off of Rio Del Mar Boulevard and there was some scuttlebutt about building another highway across the mountain and the gist of that was that "Oh no, if we build that people will come over by the scores" So, they didn't build it, any transportation thru ways and so on and so forth, and people came anyway. And now we have this mess we have now. And I wish you all, actually I wish the young people who are not here, a lot of luck building their way out of this mess and I don't think they ever will until we find a way to control the population. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
21	Public	Nelson	Jack	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Thanks for the opportunity to speak, I am Jack Nelson I am a retired land use planner and environmental planner here locally in the county of Santa Cruz past Co-Chair for the Campaign For Sensible Transportation, also served last year as the chair for the Sierra Clubs Transportation committee. I have only got a short time to speak so I would like to use two graphical exhibits that perhaps can speak more quickly than I can and this is to kind of pile on previous comments about loading order and energy demand, there is also a question of space demand. So, we see 4 transportation modes compared here. The first one shows about 54 cars carrying about 54 commuters, you can see the roadway is totally congestion and cars its totally emitting Greenhouse Gasses, it's a mess. The second one is the same people in three busses, du du du, you can see how little space buses take up. The third one is the same people in one light rail car, better yet more energy demand still. Over here we have the least energy demand of all, people on bikes and maybe there is someone walking down the sidewalk. This is why Highway 1 is congested, automobiles congest. They need too much space. You have that many people, they need too much space. So, this is just a graphical way of showing that. My second exhibit. I was on my morning run this morning, cause I am retired of thinking “Freeway Widening equals Climate Inaction” I am not saying climate destruction, I am saying inaction. Because we are at 400 parts per million and rising CO2 emissions, climate scientist are telling us that 400 ppm melts western artic ice sheet it melts the Greenland Icecap, it delivers this. All we have to do folks, is at RTC and AMBAG, all we have to do is climate inaction and we get this. Yes, we are looking the Welcome to River Street Sign the famous big blue steel sign that some people wonder, why did we spend the money, all the people in the future will wonder why we kept building the greenhouse gas machine and not think of them. So, that is not going into a lot of detail about the regional transportation plan, but as we all know I think what we are trying to do is have it both ways that say we are green and make the highway widen we can't have it both way. Thanks so much.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
22	Public	Porter	Ed	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Good evening, and thank you for coming out on an evening like this. There is always a problem with thick plans like this, because they have to be so general that nobody will really ask or demand something serious out of them. And I just noticed for example that there is a provision in the Transportation section, that says that we will, I am not sure if the verb is implement. I think it might be implement Automated Transportation. Well if you ask average folks whether we are going to do that or not, I think 100% of them would say yes we are going to do that, population of our country and our community is going to do that. So putting that in there is sort of gratuitous, it is going to happen. But, what is missing is some of the detail or some of the methodology of getting that done. For example, the previous speaker is nice to follow because he puts up nice graphics that I have used before. The one with all the people who got out of their cars is a wonderful graphic, and we at Santa Cruz PRT advocate exactly that, so I thank him because we didn't have to bring a graphic to show that. And further, that Santa Cruz PRT, or PRT in general Personal Rapid Transit it is often called automatic transit networks, is a form of rail that needs to be discussed much more than it is certainly much more than it is in this plan. The interesting thing about it is all the systems that have been working world wide, the earliest one I know about was started in 1973, but now millions and millions literally millions of passenger trips there has not been one single fatality nor even one serious injury. In all of those millions of passenger trips, and I think that is the goal. And every time I hear about more freeway, to me that is more of the same, that is more of 40,000 fatalities a year and about 20 times that in maiming's and people that are damaged for life and cannot walk again and things like that. So, if I look at that plan and it says any more highways at all, that is more of the same and that is no good and that is unacceptable. So, I don't know, do an EIR and say okay it is good enough, we won't change it any, that is sort of what always happens. And yet I hear comments from folks here who are talking about specific additions and changes. I don't think it is going to happen, but I would love to hear that it is and there is going to be additional discussion and maybe a pleasant revision driven by the people of the community.	A number of projects are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that provide alternatives to driving alone. However, roadway improvements are needed to move not only people but freight through and in and out the region. The AMBAG region will continue to provide mobility options to for passenger and freight travel as well as meet our regional GHG targets.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018
23	Public	Swanson	Ron	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Good evening, I am Ron Swanson a resident of Santa Cruz. And thank you for the opportunity to a couple people here to talk about the definition of sustainability. Back in the 1980s the United Nations approved a commission that was headed by the prime minister of Norway and in 1987 they came out with their definition, which said that in essence sustainability only works if you think of future generations. Fast forward to the time when CalTrans came up with a definition of sustainability, which you see here as the three E's: Environment, not seeing it here economics, and equity cultural respect I guess comes close. And nowhere in the official definition does time come into play, and I learned at another hearing like this a few years ago that this definition is official, for the state. So any RTC or MPO, metropolitan planning organization, that uses a sustainability in its discourse has to use that definition. And that definition, because it does not look to the future is basically broken. So, this entire process, I am sorry to say, can't really get started, until we as a community here, who are presumably a little more concerned about the future than some parts of California, because we are looking right out the window here, just about, at our rising sea level, and that it is also effecting other, climate change is also effecting communities because of the fires and because of drought. We must revise this definition before we can really achieve success. I recognize that all of the consultants all of the staff members are beholden to this definition, so I can't bust you for anything you are doing. Because you are perfectly within the framework that has been dictated to you. And only until we take this on, can we possibly start looking at the future and design a transportation system based on solar energy. As I am doing with the students at San Jose State, who understand the laws of physics, and understand that their future depends on us to reshape the definition of sustainability to include them, not just us. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/30/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
24	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>Here is my opinions for the 2040 MTP/SCS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hwy 1 should have 3 lanes each way through Santa Cruz County (from the Fish Hook to Freedom Blvd) – this is long overdue, as I remember my Uncles arguing over this in the 60's. Hwy 1 through Moss Landing to Monterey should have a protective K-rail on the median. More Frontage Roads along Hwy 1 – so local residences can easily get around without going on the Hwy 1. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> From Auto Plaza Drive to Bay Ave From Seacliff Dr. E to Rio Del Mar From Morrissey Blvd to La Fonda From La Fonda to Soquel Dr From Lee St to Market St. Connect Mission Dr to Thurber Lane Connect Winkle Ave to N. Rodeo Gulch Rd Connect Bay Ave to Park Ave A Bike Trail along Hwy 1. Brookwood Dr add a two way bike path. A Bike Trail from Santa Cruz to Scotts Valley METRO bus access to all County Park & Rides <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A pedestrian overpass at the Summit (access to both sides of Hwy 17 for park & ride). METRO bus access to all Hospitals & Public venues <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Like DeLaveaga Golf Course has Shakespeare Santa Cruz. Like the Tannery has a Theater. A bike trail from Santa Cruz (thru Scotts Valley) to Los Gatos – There are several electric bikes that go over 100 miles on a charge. This will help get cars off of Hwy 17 by having a dedicated bike trail for bike commuters(maybe follow the old Suntan special rail route). 	Thank you for your comment. Your comment will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Email	2/1/2018
25	Public	Pisano	Michael	Various	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing: Work with Banks to developed a hybrid construction loan & work with UCSC to developed more Faculty/Staff house on campus by; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Partnering with interested faculty/staffs purchasing power. If we can get together 10 (or more) UCSC employee's that have been prequalified for a mortgage and turn that into a construction loan. So 10 x \$500,000 = \$5 million dollars of potential construction loan dollars to build with. How many 2bd/2ba condos could we build with \$5 Million dollars? Include other Public Service Workers (Teachers, Fire, Police, and City & County Staff). Please keep in mind the interested parties may be giving up most equity based on deed restricted affordability (less increasing on improvement equity). The buyer would make their money back when they sell. How about Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) at least between UCSC, Downtown & the Boardwalk. All Nighter LOOP: A One METRO bus circular run (From 11:00pm to 7am); <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A METRO bus circular looping through the County on several bus routes; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> OUTBOUND: From Santa Cruz to Watsonville on Soquel (Follow the 71Route) INBOUND: From Watsonville to Santa Cruz on several routes (come back on Soquel, Bay (thru Capitola Villages), Alternate thru Portola, Capitola, & 41st back to Santa Cruz (to capture as many Restaurants & Swing Shift Business's) To help get Restaurant & Swing Shift workers home throughout the County. This is a One Way outbound & inbound route – Maybe every loop is 60 minutes or 90 minutes. We have several employers that start at 6am and let out at 2:30pm (3 shift coverage (Day, Night & Swing shift). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> They have an easy car commute into work, but help increase the congestion after work - since they do not have access to a bus at 6am, they are forced to take a car. Work with those 3 shift companies to gain an employee payroll deduction bus pass. If can add Scotts Valley to the All Nighter Loop would help. 	Thank you for your comment. Your comment will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Email	2/1/2018
26	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All METRO busses should have Automated Vehicle Locators (AVL) and WiFi. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe work with Cruzio or Comcast to add Wi-Fi devices to buses & METRO stations. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have it Advisement based Wi-Fi to add revenue for the METRO. AVL should also have bus capacity notification (is there room on the bus?) Have a electronic signage connected to the AVL at bus transfer sites around the County to notify of pending busses. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A transfer site is where two or more bus routes stop to drop off or pick up passengers. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> le. Water & Ocean <p>Thank you for your time and consideration</p>	These improvements are being considered for SC METRO as part of the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Email	2/1/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
27	Public	Coile	Jennifer	Various	<p>Page 2-19, Topic: Hollister Municipal Airport, Comment: Cal FIRE Air Attack base is located at the Airport.</p> <p>Page 4-19, Topic: Fig 4-4. Regional Transit Network, Comment: Hard to read...does it show County Express Bus from Hollister to Gilroy?</p> <p>Pages 2-20 to 23: Topic: Goods Movement, Comment: No mention of widening of the 156 to facilitate goods movement from Salinas Valley/Pajaro Valley to State Highway 5.</p> <p>Appendix A, page 42, Topic: Regional Growth Forecast, Comment: “San Benito’s population growth slowed to four percent between 2000 and 2010. The trend of the 1990s was reversed. Hollister grew by only one percent while San Juan Bautista increased by 20 percent.” Hollister had a moratorium on building permits imposed by the State 2003-2008, then the recession.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Figure 4-4 will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.</p> <p>SR 156 does not connect to I-5 and there are no current plans to build a new SR 156 connection to I-5.</p> <p>For Hollister, AMBAG's recognizes that trends over the past 15 years may have been influenced by outside factors and thus may not be indicative of future growth patterns. To address this issue, AMBAG looked at a longer history of growth trends (back to 1990) to project future growth rates. Incorporating the longer historical trend period mitigated the influence that any short-term moratorium would have had on the forecast.</p>	Letter	2/5/2018
28	Public	Dryer	Dianne	Various	<p>I strongly support the following components of the draft 2040 Plan, which reduce the number of vehicles. They seem FEASIBLE NOW and in the near term, and are cost efficient. They require lots of INFORMATION out to the public and to businesses to bring about behavioral change! TDM transportation demand management strategies. Individualized marketing and assistance programs to employers to increase carpooling and vanpooling, including incentives and disincentives strategies. Expanded bus service for high ridership routes to serve the University and north/south major routes, through Watsonville. Increased frequency on high ridership and express service routes, including Hwy 17. Maintenance of current transit infrastructure. Reduced travel times: Improve travel times through reduced headways, transit signal priority, transit queue jumps, and high occupant vehicle signal priority. Rail AND Trail. Please increase factual information to the public now! Keep the rail option open. Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	<p>A number of projects are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that provide alternatives to driving alone. However, roadway improvements are needed to move not only people but freight through and in and out the region. The AMBAG region will continue to provide mobility options to for passenger and freight travel as well as meet our regional GHG targets.</p> <p>SCCRTC's Unified Corridor Study is underway and is evaluating the transportation uses of the rail right-of-way along with improvements to Soquel Drive/Avenue and Highway 1. The goal of this effort is to determine the best combination of projects and improvements along each route so that they complement one another and enhance the mobility in the region. The study is expected to be completed in December 2018. The results of this study will be incorporated into the next MTP/SCS update.</p>	Email	2/5/2018
29	Public	Garrett	Brett	Various	<p>Incomplete Discussion of Autonomous Vehicles on page 2-26: This page discusses autonomous vehicles, shared mobility, and electric vehicles, but it neglects the synergy that occurs when all three of these technologies come together as one system. There is a tremendous potential for people to share rides in automated electric vans, increasing convenience while reducing carbon emissions and reducing the number of vehicles on the road. On the other hand, autonomous vehicles could potentially have disastrous effects on our transportation system and traffic congestion in particular. If everyone owns a self-driving car, and if those cars are sent out to run errands (such as fetching a pizza from across town), our streets could easily become clogged Even though we don’t know yet whether autonomous vehicles will become either a blessing or a curse, over the long term. It’s largely up to government officials to implement decisions and policies that encourage shared use while discouraging private ownership. The MTP document should emphasize government’s role in realizing the “upsides” (and preventing the “downsides”) of new technology, through investments and regulations.</p> <p>Errors on page ii: The word Councilmember is misspelled (for Jesus Olvera-Garcia) Richelle Noroyan is a member of Santa Cruz City Council. She is not Mayor.</p> <p>Clarity needed on pages 3-8 and 3-11: Tables 3-1 and 3-2 show Total Revenue and Total Expenditures, but it’s not clear to me which years (nor how many years) are included in the data. Also, I stared at these tables for a long time before seeing “all figures in 1,000’s”.It would be much more clear if the column headers showed, for example, “Total in Future Dollars (thousands)” or “Total in Future Dollars (x1000)”</p> <p>Carbon Emissions are Too High: The Metropolitan Transportation Plan should be much more aggressive in reducing carbon emissions. I am very concerned to discover that the MTP offers almost no improvement compared to the “no project” alternative, according to the EIR. Some possible ways to further reduce carbon emissions include: Build Personal Rapid Transit infrastructure in our larger cities, Emphasize public transportation and reduce emphasis on cars, Implement more Transportation Demand Management strategies, Implement a regional Carbon Fee-and-Dividend program (similar to the one advocated by Citizens’ Climate Lobby).</p>	<p>Additional text will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS to clarify this information.</p>	Email	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
30	FHWA	Clemons	Tashia	Performance Measures (Chapter 5)	<p>We have completed our review of the Draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Draft 2040 MTP/SCS) that was submitted by your memorandum dated December 4, 2017. Our review emphasized the Federal Highway Administration transportation performance management (TPM) requirements established under MAP-21 and the FAST Act. Based on our review, we offer the following comments for your consideration as you develop the Final 2040 MTP/SCS:</p> <p>I. Phase-in of New Transportation Planning and Performance Management Requirements: As a general comment, pursuant to 23 CFR §450.340(a), all metropolitan transportation plans adopted after May 26, 2018, must be developed in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning; Metropolitan Transportation Planning - Final Rule that was published in the Federal Register on May 27, 2016 (81 FR 34050). The new planning regulations also require that two years after the effective date of each federal rule establishing performance measures under 23 USC 150(c), an MPO may only adopt a metropolitan transportation plan that has been developed in accordance with the performance-based provision and requirements in both the final rule for transportation planning and in the final rule for the applicable performance measures [23 CFR §450.340(f)].</p> <p>Enclosed for your use and information is a table that summarizes the publication and the current effective dates for the three final rules published in the Federal Register related to the highway program transportation performance management (TPM) performance measures. If the adoption of the AMBAG 2040 MTP/SCS is scheduled to occur after May 26, 2018, the Final 2040 MTP/SCS must be developed in accordance with the performance-based provisions and requirements in both the transportation planning final rule and in the final rule for the highway safety performance measures (81 FR 13882).</p> <p>II. Development and Content of the Transportation Plan: The federal planning regulations at 23 CFR §450.324 require that each metropolitan transportation plan include, at a minimum: (1) A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with §450.306(d). (2) A system performance report (and subsequent updates) evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in §450.306(d), including progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data.</p> <p>III. New Performance Based Planning Process Requirements: 23 CFR §450.306 requires that the MPO develop, in cooperation with the State and public transportation operators, their long-range transportation plan through a performance-driven, outcome based approach to transportation planning for the metropolitan area. The metropolitan planning process must establish and use a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support the nation goals described in 23 U.S.C. 150(b) and the general purposes described in 49 U.S.C. 5301(c), including: (1) Performance Targets in the MPO Planning Process - Within 180 days after the State or provider of public transportation establishes their performance targets, each MPO is required to establish performance targets that address the performance measures or standards established under 23 CFR part 490 (where applicable), 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 49 U.S.C. 5329(d) to use in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the MPO region. The selection of targets that address performance measures described in 23 U.S.C.150(c) shall be in accordance with the appropriate target setting framework established at 23 CFR part 490, and shall be coordinated with the relevant State(s) to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable. (2) Integration of Other State Transportation Plans and Process into the MPO Planning Process - In addition, 23 CFR 450.306(d)(4) requires each MPO to integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as any plans developed under 49 U.S.C. chapter 53 by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program including:</p> <p>(a) The State asset management plan for the NHS, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 119(e), (b) Applicable portions of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), including the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and (c) Appropriate (metropolitan) portions of the State Freight Plan.</p> <p>IV. Metropolitan planning agreements: Finally, as a general comment, pursuant to 23 CFR §450.314, the MPO, State, and the providers of public transportation must jointly agree upon and develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data, the selection of performance targets, the reporting of performance targets, the reporting of performance to be used in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO (see § 450.306(d)), and the collection of data for the State asset management plan for the NHS. These provisions shall be documented either: as part of the metropolitan planning agreements, or in some other means outside of the metropolitan planning agreements as determined cooperatively by the MPO, State, and providers of public transportation.</p>	This will be included in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
31	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	A major hurdle to completing transportation projects is inadequate funding. In the long term, the limited completion of projects will result in more congestion and increased emissions. Unfortunately, many of the transportation projects are focused on maintaining and expanding existing road networks and not enough on active transportation. The Air District suggests that active transportation projects have a higher priority in scheduling and funding.	The Draft 2040 MTP/SCS includes \$643 million for Active Transportation projects. Additional improvements are also included as part of local streets and road improvements.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
32	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Prioritize the use of roundabouts at new intersections and adaptive signal control at existing intersections.	This is included in the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
33	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Since much of the areas' congestion is due to people traveling in single occupancy vehicles, a higher priority needs to be given to transportation projects that focus on the reduction of vehicle miles traveled.	A number of programs and projects are included in the 2040 MTP/SCS that reduce VMT and provide transportation options to driving alone.	Letter	2/5/2018
34	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Expand the development of projects electrifying the medium to heavy-duty truck fleets as they are a significant source of regional emissions.	The electrification of medium to heavy duty truck fleets is not in AMBAG's purview but we will continue to coordinate with the California Air Resources Board.	Letter	2/5/2018
35	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Emphasize a transition away from fossil fuels for bus and para-transit fleets in the region.	AMBAG will continue to work with our transit partners to encourage and provide efficient buses.	Letter	2/5/2018
36	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Promote guidelines for developing regional, County and municipal and codes to support the development of electric vehicle infrastructure.	AMBAG developed a number of toolkits to help local jurisdictions implement the SCS including electric vehicle infrastructure. AMBAG also prepared a study, <i>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for the Monterey Bay Area</i> which is available to all local jurisdictions.	Letter	2/5/2018
37	Monterey Bay Air Resources District	Frisbey	David	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Consider development around emerging technologies such as connectivity, autonomous vehicles, carsharing programs and fleet modernization. Discuss the expansion of these technologies and their impact on traffic congestion.	Emerging and future transportation technologies are continually being studied and evaluated included and discussed as part of future MTP/SCS updates as appropriate.	Letter	2/5/2018
38	Public	Weaver	Michael	Vision (Chapter 1) and Appendix A	1) The Tri-County population growth forecasts seem overly optimistic. What specific methodologies were used to come up with these numbers? What is the breakdown of anticipated population increases in the different Tri-County areas? Is it new people moving in, increased birth rates, people living longer?	In Appendix A (2018 Regional Growth Forecast Technical Documentation) on pages 8-25 which explain the methodology, inputs and assumptions in detail. Draft forecasts are consistent with forecasts produced by the California Department of Finance which use different methods and assumptions, but arrive at a similar forecast. The bulk of future population growth is expected to be a result of net natural increase (the number of births exceeding the number of deaths) resulting from births and longer life expectancy. That pattern (most growth due to births outnumbering deaths) is consistent with the region's growth trends for the past several decades.	Email	2/5/2018
39	Public	Weaver	Michael	Appendix A	2) What constraints to population growth were applied in the Tri-County population forecasts? For example available potable water and highway capacities? What were the adjusted numbers before and after applying known constraints? Side by side comparisons would be very helpful.	The forecast is based on demographic and economic factors and was reviewed by local jurisdictions for their feedback on any potential capacity constraints.	Email	2/5/2018
40	Public	Weaver	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	3) Your document informs the reader: “Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Traffic Systems Management (TSM) are two types of techniques used to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the transportation system. In TDM, the focus is on changing peoples’ travel behavior; in TSM, system operational and/or service improvements are implemented to facilitate traffic flow.” From a practical perspective, in unincorporated Monterey County, for example, how can I get to Star Market and get my groceries, and get home again with the groceries? Either on public transportation, or on a bicycle?	Trip and route planners are available online. MST provides a trip planner on its website at www.mst.org and TAMC provides a regional bicycle map on its website at www.tamcmonterey.org .	Email	2/5/2018
41	Public	Weaver	Michael	General	4) In the event of a medical emergency in an unincorporated part of the County, how might EMT response times change? What travel time methodology might be used for this study? Have the CHP, the Sheriff’s Departments or the various Fire Districts been asked about this?	Emergency response times are not under the purview of AMBAG. CHP is the responsible agency for unincorporated Monterey County for dispatching EMT services.	Email	2/5/2018
42	Public	Weaver	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2) and Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	5) Recall that Monterey Counties “MST” began as Monterey-Salinas Transit circa 1992. It began as a way to improve the “efficiency and effectiveness” of the choked traffic on California State Highway 68. Now, some 25-years later, there is admittedly very little demand for MST buses for residents on SR 68. One bus a day serves the current demand for public transportation between the cities of Monterey and Salinas. Yet, this MST has expanded out into the entire County of Monterey, become a County-Wide District and, as I understand it, is heavily subsidized by about 75% with Federal and State tax dollars. Traffic on Highway 68 is LOS F on every segment between Toro Park and Monterey and has been so since TAMC designated it as LOS F in year 1997. How has public transit served other areas of Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties? What are the ridership levels? What are the yearly costs for each? How much is each subsidized by Federal and State tax dollars? What are the subsidized costs per mile per rider?	Each transit operator provides regular reports on ridership, costs and revenue to its Board of Directors.	Email	2/5/2018
43	Public	Weaver	Michael	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	6) The Draft MTP and SCS make assumptions that failed planning efforts, like the Monterey-Salinas Transit, can continue and be improved upon. The latest ideas in Monterey County are a daisy-chain of traffic roundabouts and bicycle lanes on State Highway 68. These latest ideas may have some effectiveness in the populated cities of the Tri-County area. However, most of the areas in the Counties are made up of rural areas that include farmlands and rolling hills. Others are unincorporated areas with residential housing. Can you produce charts and graphs that break down the numbers of people per square mile in the Tri-County areas? Can you provide charts showing various areas in each County and public transit ridership levels?	MST provides regular ridership reports by route for Monterey County.	Email	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
44	Public	Weaver	Michael	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	7) Your document informs the reader: “Currently there are considerable challenges associated with financing transportation investments. The Plan highlights the importance of finding new and innovative ways to pay for transportation, including the ever expanding backlog of investment needs just to maintain the existing transportation system.” In the case of Monterey County, it is recognized Statewide as having some of the most poorly maintained roads in the State of California. Further, the roads have been in terrible condition for the past couple decades. One Monterey County Supervisor recently referred to this situation as a crisis. From a practical perspective, repairing and maintaining the roads we already have should be given priority and be done first, before any consideration of tearing up existing roads for millions and millions of dollars of planned new roundabouts and new bicycle lanes.	The 2040 MTP/SCS includes nearly 2/3 of the funds for maintenance and operations projects, including nearly a third of the funding for local street and road improvements.	Email	2/5/2018
45	Public	Weaver	Michael	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	8) Under Financial Assumptions, your document tells us: “The 2040 MTP/SCS is based on existing and reasonably available revenues. The existing revenues identified are those that have been committed or historically available for the building, operation, and maintenance of the current roadway and transit systems in the Monterey Bay Area. Essentially, these revenues are existing transportation funding sources projected to 2040.” If this statement was true, we would currently have well maintained roads, instead of being seriously backlogged. In the case of Monterey County, I understand we are currently (approximately) \$750,000,000 in arrears in road repairs and maintenance.	The 2040 MTP/SCS must include only existing and reasonably available funds expected to the region through 2040. The constrained project list is included in Appendix C and totals roughly \$9.7 million, however, our transportation needs exceed our expected available revenue by more than double.	Email	2/5/2018
46	Public	Weaver	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	9) Monterey County Official Plan Lines for SR 68: Your document fails to show Official Highway Plan Lines (OPL) adopted by Monterey County in 1977, modified slightly and readopted in 1980. CalTrans knows of these. Monterey County Public Works has copies of the recorded maps and documents A portion of these Official Plan Lines are known the Corral de Tierra Bypass (not the Fort Ord Bypass). These Official Plan Lines, those located in the Toro Area, were a traffic mitigation measure for numerous housing subdivisions. Further, Monterey County taxpayers paid for portions of the Right-of-Way for the purpose of the Official Plan Lines and Monterey County still owns the property. Two conceptual plans were recently produced by a retired Monterey County Traffic Engineer, Neal Thompson, and sent to CalTrans, TAMC, and some Monterey County officials. Due to their size, these will be labeled Exhibit A and Exhibit B and mailed to AMBAG for their review.	The 2040 MTP/SCS is a long-range transportation plan and does not include specific project details such as highway plan lines. This information is shown at the project level documents and plans.	Email	2/5/2018
47	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	General	Caltrans commends the work of AMBAG staff on developing its draft MTP/SCS 2040. The document appears comprehensive, thorough and well organized. The high level of involvement that staff has coordinated with the public and stakeholder agencies, including Caltrans, is appreciated. This includes coordinating with the RTPAs in the region to develop a comprehensive plan, illustrative maps that depict complex information in a simple format, and a glossary that helps facilitate comprehension for public consumption	Thank you for your comment.	Letter	2/5/2018
48	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	General	Caltrans also commends AMBAG for its extensive public outreach, including its GIS interactive web mapping and web site information on the draft MTP/SCS.	Thank you for your comment.	Letter	2/5/2018
49	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	General	For future MTP/SCS updates, AMBAG may want to consider forming a citizen's technical advisory committee with varied representation from such groups as chambers of commerce, agriculture, freight, residential homeowner's associations and other commercial and private industries. These groups would provide a different perspective than those from traditional governmental transportation agencies.	AMBAG established the Rural Transportation Stakeholder Group to provide input into the regional transportation planning process. Additionally, AMBAG held subgroup meetings of an economic development group to obtain feedback on key issues. AMBAG is also a member of the county level business councils as well as the Monterey Bay Economic Partnerships. These groups provides a different perspective to AMBAG on the MTP/SCS than the traditional organizations and agencies.	Letter	2/5/2018
50	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	General	The draft includes excellent documentation on public outreach activities in Appendix D.	Thank you for your comment.	Letter	2/5/2018
51	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-12, under the "Bicycle Network" section it only discusses bicycle classification in terms of Class 1, Class II and Class III. Please update this section to recognize that there are now four types of bikeways that includes Class IV which is a separated bikeway or cycle track. Instead of introducing this by stating that the "Bike lanes in the region are classified in three categories:..." it may be more clear to state that "There are four recognized bikeway classifications that include the following:" since a bike lane is more aligned with Class II specifically. Moreover the classification system does not necessarily define or correspond with bicycle traffic patterns.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
52	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-13, does Figure 2-3 reflect the existing and proposed Regional Bicycle Network to be reached by 2040? Or does the map reflect what only is existing now? Please clarify. Also it is challenging to distinguish the color difference between the green line for Class III and black lines for roads and freeways. A more contrasting color is recommended.	Figure 2-3 reflects the existing and proposed Regional Bicycle Network to be reached by 2040.	Letter	2/5/2018
53	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-14, in the "Complete Streets" section, is it possible to discuss the State's role in implementing Complete Streets as it relates to the State Highway System in the region. Specifically, the California State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, <i>Toward an Active California</i> lays out foundational policies and actions that Caltrans and its partner agencies will take to achieve the department's ambitious statewide goals to double walking and triple bicycling trips by 2020. This is relevant to bicycle and pedestrian issues and needs on, across and adjacent to the State Highway System in the region. More information about the plan can be accessed at: http://goactiveca.org/ .	Additional information regarding the state's role will be added in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
54	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Would it be possible to add a section that discusses Park and Ride in the region? This includes existing and proposed park and ride lots and the plan for park and ride improvements moving into the future. Perhaps a park and ride map would be beneficial as well.	Additional information regarding park and rides will be added in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS. Maps of the park and ride facilities are included in the county level Regional Transportation Plans prepared by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
55	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Primary Air-Carrier airports with annual enplanements over 10,000 are <i>required</i> to have an Airport Ground Access Improvement Program per Government Code 65081.1. The Monterey Regional Airport is the only airport with 10,000 or more enplanements, and therefore requires AMBAG to complete an Airport Ground Access Improvement Program per Government Code 65081.1. It is noted that although the MTP specifically states, "... TAMC <i>will develop</i> this program in coordination with AMBAG," there is no date of completion projected. Has this process started? It is strongly recommended that AMBAG staff to review the link to California Law and Government Code 650801.1. https://law.justia.com/codes/California/2011/gov/title-7/65080-65086.5/65081.1/ there are portions of this required plan provided in further paragraphs, although not a completed plan.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
56	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Public Participation (Chapter 6)	Chapter 6 (Public Participation) should include Title VI information regarding public outreach efforts. See pages 74-80 of the California Transportation Commission's 2017 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Go to: http://catc.ca.gov/programs/tip/docs/tip-2017-guidelines-mpos-011817.pdf	The discussion of Title VI outreach is included in Chapter 5. Additional information will be added to Chapter 6.	Letter	2/5/2018
57	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J : General	Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(b), the RTP shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions. Please provide more detail for the short-range strategies that will be used to help meet the long-range goals and requirements of this plan by 2040.	Both short-range and long-range strategies and actions are discussed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 and listed in Appendix C.	Letter	2/5/2018
58	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: General	Item (h): Please add page number 4-38 to checklist.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
59	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Consultation/ Cooperation	Item (i) (ii) Appendix D: mentions a timely notice was included in regards to the comment period but does not show the press releases, flyers, or dates of the notice. We recommend providing a table with the dates, times, and outcomes from the comment period. Please add this information to the RTP pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(a).	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
60	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Consultation/ Cooperation	Item (viii): Please discuss whether or not an additional opportunity for public comment was necessary. Please add this information to the RTP pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(a).	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
61	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Consultation/ Cooperation	Item 1 (x): Please discuss the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies utilized in order to measure and ensure full participation during the comment period. Please add this information to the RTP pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(a).	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
62	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Consultation/ Cooperation	Item 8: There is no indication of the comment period duration within the cited pages on the checklist. Please add this information to the RTP pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(a) and 23 CFR 450.316(a)(i).	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
63	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Title VI and Environmental Justice	Item 1: Please add page numbers 5-6, 5-8, and 5-10 to checklist.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
64	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Modal Discussion	Item 5: Please add page number 2-12 to checklist.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
65	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Modal Discussion	Item 7: Please change the page number provided to page 2-14.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
66	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Programming/ Operations	The list of projects in Appendix C does not make it clear which projects are unconstrained and constrained. Please provide a clear delineation of which projects are part of the constrained and unconstrained lists.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
67	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Financial	Item 4: The lists cited for financially constrained projects are unclear and too generalized. Please provide more detail pursuant to Government Code 65080 (4)(a).	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
68	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Financial	Item 7: There is no explicit mention of consistency between the RTP and ITIP. Please provide a statement regarding consistency pursuant to the 2016 STIP Guidelines Section 33.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
69	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Financial	Item 8: There is no explicit mention of consistency between the RTP and RTIP. Please provide a statement regarding consistency pursuant to the 2016 STIP Guidelines Section 19.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
70	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Environmental	Item 1: Please add EIR Document page number to checklist.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
71	Caltrans District 5	McClendon	Kelly	Appendix J: Environmental	Item 4: Please add EIR Document page number to checklist.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
72	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	General	Page iii: We would recommend adding photo credits to the document.	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
73	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Vision (Chapter 1)	Page 1-6: Please add a definition of <i>"Self-Employed"</i> to page I-6 and wherever else applicable.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
74	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-4: Please revise as follows: "At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway <u>rail</u> transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel."	Fixed guideway can include more than rail transit facilities.	Letter	2/5/2018
75	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-4: Please add "State Route 183" to the bullet list.	Additional improvements to SR 183 are not included in the 2040 MTP/SCS and therefore are not highlighted on page 2-4.	Letter	2/5/2018
76	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-7 (Figure 2-2): Please change the color, denoting "rail" to a different color, as it is difficult to read. In addition, the map does not seem to reflect the extension of service from the Bay Area to Monterey County - TAMC project Capitol Corridor Extension.	Figure 2-2 will be verified to make sure that it matches the project list included in Appendix C.	Letter	2/5/2018
77	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-7 (Figure 2-2): The following routes/service should be included: MST Express bus 55/Salinas-Gilroy-San Jose and San Benito County Express service from Hollister to Caltrain. Also, please clarify why the ITCs Commuter Express buses from Santa Cruz to San Jose over Highway 17 were not included.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
78	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-10: The discussion of "regionally significant local transit service" does not mention CHOMP employee shuttles from Marina to CHOMP, CSUMB shuttles or UCSC shuttles.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
79	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-10: "A full list of providers is included in the coordinated Plan, described below." This list was not included. PEC/Employer buses including IT companies from Santa Cruz to Silicon Valley and Ag vanpools should be mentioned. TNCs were not discussed until page 2-16. The above-mentioned providers and the list should be included.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
80	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-10: Monterey AirBus provides shuttle service from two stops in the region to the San Jose and San Francisco airports. The shuttles carry significant daily volumes on fixed schedules. As such, they should be discussed in the document.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
81	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-11: It was unclear why rail freight was not discussed.	This discussion on page 2-11 refers to passenger rail only.	Letter	2/5/2018
82	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-12: Bus shelters should be included in list of the "examples of bicycle and pedestrian projects around the region." Note that Salinas has used CDBG funds from US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to pay for shelters in low income neighborhoods.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
83	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-12: Not sure about the definition of "bicycle kiosk". Suggest using "shared bike program".	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
84	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-12: Does "sidewalk enhancements" include intersections /ADA curb cuts?	Yes.	Letter	2/5/2018
85	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-12: Please revise as follows: "Bike ways lanes in the region are classified in four categories:" Please include description of Class IV facilities, which are included in the DEIR.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
86	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-19: Please revise as follows: "The Monterey Bay Area's airports play an important role in the total regional economy, providing service to agriculture, tourism, government, emergency services, and other business interests throughout the region."	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
87	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-20: Please revise as follows: "Therefore, it is necessary for the health of the region that all the major roads, highways and railways carrying goods to and from crop production locations (such as US 101, SR 46, SR 129, <i>SR 183</i> , SR 152 and SR 156) are maintained to support efficient delivery and shipment of goods."	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
88	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-21 (Figure 2-4): In legend, "rail" - please clarify if this term refers to freight lines.	In Figure 2-4, rail includes freight rail.	Letter	2/5/2018
89	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-22: Please add the following: "... a continued expansion of the region's agricultural and industrial production."	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
90	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-20: There is no mention of the link from Highway 101 to the 1-5 Freeway via SR 156 and the need/planned project to widen this highway.	SR 156 does not connect to I-5 and there are no current plans to build a new SR 156 connection to I-5.	Letter	2/5/2018
91	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-25: No mention of apps like Waze, which people are currently using to decrease congestion and improve traffic flow.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
92	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 2-26: "Several transit agencies across the state have begun partnering with these TNCs as a way to augment non-urban corridor services" Are there any case studies or recommendations for local agencies?	AMBAG will continue to track the use of TNCs as a way to augment non-urban corridor services. Additionally, TNCs were discussed as a strategy as part of the AMBAG evaluation of Transportation Alternatives for Rural Areas which was completed in 2017.	Letter	2/5/2018
93	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Page 3-7 (Figures 3-1 and 3-2): Are these cumulative 2018-2040?	Yes.	Letter	2/5/2018
94	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-8: Recommend including a link for Toolkits in the Appendices.	A link to the SCS Toolkits is included on page 4-8.	Letter	2/5/2018
95	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-18: What is the status of light rail in Monterey County? In the past, we understood that light rail was planned for Monterey County.	The Monterey Branch Line is an unconstrained project in the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
96	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-19 (Figure 4-4): Hard to read the map. It is unclear whether the Express Bus Hollister to Gilroy and MST Line 55 to Gilroy/San Jose are included.	Additional information will be added to the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
97	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-22: "Expanding traveler information systems" - please define these terms.	The definition is included on page 2-25.	Letter	2/5/2018
98	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page: 4-26: Please revise as follows: "Agriculture is the economic engine of the region and is an important asset to preserve <i>for the country's food supply</i> ."	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018
99	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	"of the non-metallic minerals, construction - grade aggregate is the most abundant and commonly used mineral resource in Monterey County. Should Santa Cruz or San Benito County also be included given the aggregate operation near Aromas?	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
100	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-40 (Table 4-3): Please add " <u>community colleges</u> " to responsible parties regarding workforce-training facilities.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
101	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-40 (Table 4-3): 1st bullet: "Facilitate local jurisdiction adoption and implementation of a complete streets policy by recommending adoption of the region's guidelines. Encourage local jurisdictions to implement design principles consistent with the regional complete streets guidelines <i>where feasible</i> , whenever completing local streets and road projects. Initiate a technical assistance program to help local agencies develop street designs or implement complete streets that are sensitive to their surroundings and contexts."	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
102	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-40 (Table 4-3): "Work with Caltrans to incorporate multimodal design into highway projects such that transit can be accommodated on the highway." Please confirm that this would be feasible on state highways in this region.	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
103	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Page 4-40 (Table 4-3): "Plan for and improve infrastructure for electric vehicles." Should responsible "Parties" include PG&E or others?	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
104	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Performance Measures (Chapter 5)	Page 5-4: Percentages are unclear. It looks as if "Drive Alone" and "Carpool" are the same category. Are the remaining percentage of trips "Active Transportation"?	Drive alone and carpool are two separate categories.	Letter	2/5/2018
105	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Performance Measures (Chapter 5)	Page 5-5: This section states: "All of the farmland being consumed in the Plan is within existing spheres of influence or is within Community Plan Areas as designated by the General Plans in the region." The Sphere of Influence shown on the Salinas 2040 map is proposed and not existing. We need to work with AMBAG staff to clarify the correct Sphere of Influence boundaries for the 2040 Salinas map in order to craft an accurate performance measure.	The 2040 scenario estimates the land use in the future for the region including the proposed sphere of influences for local jurisdictions. AMBAG reviews and updates this with each update of the MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
106	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Performance Measures (Chapter 5)	Page 5-7: Was the North of Boronda FGA affordable housing included in the calculation of the percent of low income and minority populations within 1/2 mile of transit stop (as part of the performance measure)? Figure 5-2 (page 5-9) seems to show the whole North of Boronda FGA as "transit accessible" so does document assume all of North of Boronda FGA is low income/minority?	Yes, this is correct. The methodology is included in Appendix G.	Letter	2/5/2018
107	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Performance Measures (Chapter 5)	Page 5-11 (Figure 5-2): Difficult to understand the distinction of the transit routes 1/2-mile buffer and the definition of the "transit accessible " area as it is difficult to read on the map.	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018
108	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-6: Please add " CFR " (from page 6-7) to the glossary.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
109	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-12: "U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development: Federal agency charged with increasing homeownership, supporting community development and increasing access to affordable housing free from discrimination." Please add, " Funding supports transit and pedestrian safety in low income neighborhoods. " Note: (Salinas has previously used CDBG for bus shelters, curb cuts and sidewalk improvements.)	HUD funding is not limited to supporting transit and pedestrian safety.	Letter	2/5/2018
110	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-13: "A particular form of travel (e.g. walking, <u>bicycling</u> , traveling by automobile, traveling by bus, or traveling by train).	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
111	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-14: Please add a definition of " Low Income " .	The definition is included on page 7-14.	Letter	2/5/2018
112	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-16: Please add a definition of " PTA " (mentioned in STA definition on page 7-19).	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
113	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-17: Please clarify if it is "Regional Housing Needs Assessment or Allocation? Quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction of the AMBAG region based on population growth projections and fair share allocations. "	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
114	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Glossary (Chapter 7)	Page 7-17: Please add a definition of " RTIP " (mentioned in STIP definition on page 7-19).	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
115	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix A	Page A48-9: "Between 1990 and 2010 there was one populated annexation in the AMBAG region - Watsonville." In 2008, the City of Salinas annexed 2,388 gross acres, the North of Boronda Future Growth Area, for 12,000 housing units and 3.92 million square feet of non-residential uses. If populated is defined as 12 or more registered voters, we believe the North of Boronda FGA should be included.	Comment noted. AMBAG will update the language in Appendix A to reflect that Watsonville had the only heavily populated annexation. The North of Boronda Future Growth Area annexation in Salinas had approximately 100 residents in a jurisdiction of more than 140,000 (annexed area population affected the overall jurisdiction population by less than 0.1%). By comparison, Watsonville's annexation had more than 2,000 residents in a jurisdiction of less than 45,000 (nearly 5% population change).	Letter	2/5/2018
116	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-7: On Table C-1a: MON-SNS 141-SL, please add the following: Sidewalk and lighting.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
117	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-10: On Table C-1d: MON-SNS035-SL, should be " Gabilan Street" not " Gavilan ."	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
118	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-16: On Table C-1e: MON-SNS111-SL, please add the following: "Install signal or roundabout. "	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
119	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-16: On Table C-1e: MON-SNS112-SL, Please add the following: "Install signal or roundabout. "	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
120	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-16: On Table C-1e: MON-SNS158-SL, Traffic signal installation completed 2017.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
121	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix C	Page C-16: On Table C-1e: MON-SNS159-SL, Traffic signal installation completed 2017.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
122	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix D	Page D-4: "Copies of the flyers are included as attachments at the end of this Appendix." Please attach the flyer.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
123	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix D	Page D-4: "A complete list of stakeholder groups (not individuals who signed up as part of a workshop or the survey) is attached to this appendix." Please attach.	Additional information will be added for clarification.	Letter	2/5/2018
124	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix E	Page E-5: The two bullets (listing service), do not identify the County/Transit Agency: for Line 23 and the "Coast Daylight/Starlight Express".	Additional information will be added for clarification.	Letter	2/5/2018
125	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix F	Page F-8: "The AMBAG RTDM deployed two primary models, a destination choice model and a gravity model for this model component." In the text that follows, it is not clear what a gravity model is and we did not find it defined elsewhere in the document.	Please see the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Technical Report for more information on the model. The report can be downloaded from: http://www.ambag.org/programs-services/modeling .	Letter	2/5/2018
126	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	Salinas 2015 Baseline Salinas Map: Red line for the City's Existing SOI is intermittent as currently shown on map; need to show complete circumference encompassing the City.	This will be corrected in the Final 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
127	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	<p>Salinas 2040 Scenario Map: Retail designation area for Target Areas K and L do not match City of Salinas Economic Development Element (EDE) Target Areas (larger) - see EDE Target Areas map attached.</p> <p>Target Area K should be an Employment Center vs. Industrial based on Place Type definitions.</p> <p>Retail area in Target Area V (Carr Lake) has shifted location and use with EDE adoption in December 2017. See EDE Target Areas map attached. Request that it be designated S-6: Neighborhood Mixed use.</p> <p>SOI shown is not the City's existing SOI. Need to clarify that it is the future SOI boundary by stating "Proposed SOI." This proposed boundary needs to be based on the City's recently adopted EDE (refined Economic Opportunity Areas). This issue was also discussed in 5-5 above. As previously mentioned, we would like to discuss the boundaries of the Proposed SOI" with AMBAG staff to ensure it is correctly reflected on this exhibit and elsewhere in the subject document.</p> <p>Is S-6: Neighborhood Mixed Use proposed in the North of Boronda FGA? The color on the map is difficult to distinguish from Town Mixed Use.</p>	The Salinas 2040 Scenario Place Type map will be updated. Yes, the neighborhood mixed use area proposed in the North of Boronda GFA area is S-6.	Letter	2/5/2018
128	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	Salinas Opportunity Area Map (Figure 24): Does not include Target Area L-2, See EDE Target Areas map below.	The Opportunity Area maps were developed in 2016 through early 2017. AMBAG received comments from Salinas staff at various stages during the development process. The Opportunity Area maps include areas within a jurisdiction's current city limits. Once the city limits are amended to include this area, AMBAG will incorporate this change in the next update of the Opportunity Areas which is expected to begin next year.	Letter	2/5/2018
129	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	Table 4: Why was Gross Employment Density not considered for SA-1 and SA-3 (Regional Retail (SA-1) and second highest sales tax generation (SA-3))?	The gross employment density for SA-1 and SA -3 was predominately low to medium as shown on Figure 9 in Appendix I.	Letter	2/5/2018
130	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	Opportunity Area SA-1 (Narrative): Why was Gross Employment Density not considered? Regional retail.	The gross employment density for SA-1 and SA -3 was predominately low to medium as shown on Figure 9 in Appendix I.	Letter	2/5/2018
131	City of Salinas	Hullinger	Tara	Appendix I	Opportunity Area SA-3 (Narrative): Why was Gross Employment Density not considered? Second highest sales tax generation area.	The gross employment density for SA-1 and SA -3 was predominately low to medium as shown on Figure 9 in Appendix I.	Letter	2/5/2018
132	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	General	<p>California Coastal Commission staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Transportation Plans (2040 MTP/SCS:), and. the companion DEIR. We applaud the level of planning and support for non- automotive transportation alternatives that the 2040 MTP/SCS represents. The overall goals of protecting and improving the Monterey Bay region's transportation system in an environmentally sensitive fashion are consistent with numerous California Coastal Act policies, including Coastal Act Policy Section 130252 regarding non-automotive transportation alternatives.</p> <p>We strongly support the overall approach of developing an area-wide, long-range transportation plan for the entire Monterey Bay region. The 2040 MTP/SCS aims to maintain and enhance the mature transportation systems that already exist in the region. As such, this system establishes the framework for future development throughout the region including the Coastal Zone (CZ). Please note that while the CZ typically is only a few thousand feet (or less) wide in already urbanized areas, it extends up to 5 miles inland within the more rural areas of the 2040 MTP's geographical scope (i.e., along the Big Sur Coast, in the Elkhorn Slough watersheds and in northern Santa Cruz County).</p> <p>And, because it will affect the content of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for each county, and the budget allocations for future transportation projects, adoption of an effective MTP/SCS is of particular strategic importance. Noting that future development will impact the entire region's watersheds, and the ability of the public to access the coast from-inland locations, our comments are directed at the entirety of the 2040 MTP planning area (not the Coastal Zone alone).</p>	Thank you for your comment.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
133	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	General	<p>General comments: Coastal Act requirements. Pursuant to the California Coastal Act; all development in California's Coastal Zone is subject to a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). The region's two coastal counties, and most of its coastal cities (all but Pacific Grove and Monterey) have Coastal Commission-certified Local Coastal Programs (LCPs) and issue the necessary CDP's within their jurisdictions. The certified LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act (seaward of the first public road) serve as the standard of review for all new CZ development projects, including transportation projects. In certain instances, the Coastal Commission itself will need to act on a proposed project. Examples of such projects include those located where there is no certified LCP; those within the Commission's retained CDP jurisdiction (such as State lands, existing and filled wetlands, etc.; local CDPs that have been appealed; or, where local governments have requested Coastal Commission review of projects that overlap jurisdictional boundaries. The Commission also directly reviews certain federal projects, pursuant to its responsibilities under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1971.</p> <p>In most cases, the cornerstone of each local government's LCP is its general plan and zoning, prepared in accordance with the State's General Plan Law (and subsequent acts, including the Coastal Act and SB 375 concerning greenhouse gases (GHGs)). The 2040 MTP/SCS anticipates future transportation needs, based on existing and projected future development in accordance with local government General Plans within and outside the region's Coastal Zone. This in turn establishes which projects will receive transportation funding, as administered through each county's Regional Transportation Plan and implementing Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP).</p>	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018
134	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	DEIR	<p>For each transportation improvement project the overall structure of the 2040 MTP/SCS DEIR appears to call for 1) identification of applicable impacts, per CEQA; and, 2) application of appropriate mitigation measures, as listed in the draft 2040 MTP/SCS DEIR document (in a very general way). Overall, we believe rigorous implementation of this approach can (potentially) provide for conformance with corresponding Coastal Act policies such as those pertaining to environmentally sensitive habitats; scenic resources; air quality (now including GHGs, per Air Resources Board); minimizing energy use; protection of agricultural lands and water quality; and, mitigation of archaeological and paleontological impacts. Developing projects that will succeed in receiving necessary CDPs relies on consultation with local government and Coastal Commission staff--especially with respect to issues not explicitly addressed by CEQA. Examples of such issues include recreational and scenic qualities, public access opportunities, coastal trail continuity planned retreat or other adaptation to anticipated climate change impacts, and protection of coastal agricultural lands if not otherwise addressed by the CEQA process.</p> <p>Recommendation: the 2040 MTP/SCS should explicitly encourage every agency proposing transportation project(s) within or impacting the Coastal Zone to proactively contact and coordinate with Coastal Commission and local government LCP staff-as early as possible in the project cycle. The purposes of such early coordination are to:</p> <p>Identify applicable LCP and Coastal Act policies, opportunities and constraints, before the project design is finalized;</p> <p>Develop reasonable alternatives for meeting the identified transportation need, for consideration during the environmental review process; Avoid unnecessary delays in the permitting process, especially through collaboration with local governments, and by insuring that necessary environmental studies concurrently address both Coastal Act and CEQA requirements, simultaneously; and, Identify appropriate, feasible mitigation measures, if there are unavoidable impacts.</p>	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
135	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	<p><u>General comment: coastal watershed and wildfire vulnerability context.</u> Protection of coastal water quality is an important Coastal Act issue. All of the region’s watersheds including San Benito County’s Pajaro River watershed-provide freshwater inflows to Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, habitat for critical wildlife (e.g., migratory steelhead), and sand replenishment to our coastlines. Further protection of these watersheds is critical for both agriculture and domestic water supply, either directly through impoundment/diversion or indirectly through recharge of the aquifer. During drought, water supply is especially important for community resiliency. We believe that the future availability of water resources will likely be the main determinant of the location and limits of further development. Today’s local zoning and projected maximum total buildout will likely have to be adjusted accordingly. This in turn will affect projected need for transportation infrastructure. Therefore, we now need to question those land use policies that facilitate residential subdivision and development in areas that lack adequate future water supplies, and in areas especially vulnerable to wildland fires, flooding and other hazards. In short such residential development is .generally an incompatible use in such resource-constrained and high-hazard environments-and, where it must be allowed, densities should be minimized, mitigation measures made mandatory, and transportation system demand projections adjusted accordingly. In sum, the Coastal Act (and good land use planning) dictates not that new development be limited, but instead shifted to those places best able to accommodate it (per Coastal Act Section 30250). This means that to promote sustainable communities within the MTP/SCS planning area new density should be directed away from areas prone to wild fire, floodplains, low-lying areas vulnerable to sea level rise (SLR), bluff edges exposed to shoreline retreat, wetlands, .coastal dunes and other environmentally sensitive habitat areas (Coastal Act Sections 30231, 30233, 30240, 30253). The most productive agricultural lands and aquifer recharge areas should be protected as well (Coastal Act Sections 30231 30241-30242). If these constraints are combined with water supply limitations, itis likely that future development patterns will differ significantly-and transportation demand and facilities will need to shift accordingly (Coastal Act Sections 30250, 30254). <u>Recommendation:</u> the 2040 MTP/SCS should emphasize the need for regularly updating the regional transportation demand analyses, to map and rigorously take into account the above-cited constraints (sensitive habitats, hazards, SLR, water supply, agriculture). Because it is the agency with the broadest overall regional perspective; this role may be most appropriate for AMBAG .Each regional transportation agency, and affected local jurisdictions will then be in a position to update their respective land use and transportation plans accordingly.</p>	AMBAG recently received a grant from Caltrans as part of the SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grant Program for the Central Coast Highway 1 area from Castroville to the Santa Cruz County line. The project will identify climate change impacts and related risks to multimodal transportation infrastructure in the project area. The study will then identify a suite of transportation and adaptation scenarios to remedy the identified climate-related vulnerabilities and evaluate the proposed adaptation approaches, including the economic impact of each of the identified adaptation approaches. The Nature Conservancy and the Center for Blue Economy (Middlebury Institute) are subrecipients of the grant. The study is expected to be completed in Spring 2020. Results of this study will be incorporated into the next update of the MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
136	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>General comments: coastal public access context. The California Coastal Act mandates that maximum opportunities for public access to the coast shall be provided, subject to several common sense considerations (Calif Public Resources Code Sec. 30210-30214 et seq.) In Sec. 30254, the Legislature further instructs that the rural sections of State Highway Route 1 remain in a scenic two-lane configuration. One of the best-known public access features of the region is the partially complete Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST), part of the California Coastal Trail (CCT) network. The MBSST is envisioned to eventually provide for both a bikeway and a pedestrian route between Pacific Grove and Davenport. The 2040 MTP/SCS we believe, represents a highly appropriate opportunity to prioritize completion of the MBSST, as well as connecting CCT segments to the extent that it will encourage walking and bicycles as preferred commute modes, this will help communities meet their GHG goals consistent with SB 375 (and Coastal Act Sec. 30253 regarding air quality, minimizing energy consumption, and vehicle miles traveled). As a matter of public policy, completion of the MBSST/CCT will be an asset for both public recreation- and public health, for our region's tourism economy and for supporting sustainable communities. Now, how does the public actually reach the coast? The majority of visitors from outside the Coastal Zone (CZ) get to the beach-or coastal trail trailheads by automobile. Within the geographical scope of the 2040 MTP/SCS, the majority of coastwise State Highway Route 1 (SR 1) either forms the Coastal Zone boundary, or falls entirely within the CZ. As such, it comprises the prime mode for the public to move along the coast, and to access coastal trail trailheads. SR 1 is especially indispensable for access to beaches, aquaria, scenic vantage points, and supporting visitor services of every kind. Accordingly it is existential for our tourism-oriented economies. But, of at least equal importance, is the ability of the public to go to their coast. Understood in this way, the functions of U.S. Hwy. 101, SR 68, SR 183, SR 129, SR 152. SR 156 and SR 17, as well as local arterials such as San Miguel Canyon Road and San Andreas Road, take on a much larger importance. Each of these roadways lie within the scope of the 2040 MTP/SCS. In addition, the region's rail corridors- including Amtrak's Coast Line, as well as the dormant Monterey Branch Line (MBL) and limited use Santa Cruz Branch Line (SCBL)-are considered valuable supplements to the roadway system. This applies to rail's capacity to move freight as well as people. It has been posited every rail car can move the same tonnage as four highway big rigs (CSX website; SCCRTC hearing of 1/18/2018). Therefore, to the extent that a functioning rail freight system exists, it proportionately can protect the capacity of the roadway system for all users. Thus, rail lines can represent an economical, GHG-efficient mode for certain-types of freight movement and, for getting the public to the coast (and home again).</p>	A discussion of the region's passenger and freight rail is included in Chapter 2.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
					<p><u>Recommendation:</u> the 2040 MTP/SCS should clearly indicate that: the MBSST/CCT are (non-motorized) components of the regional transportation system and should be given funding priority as such; the role of SR 1 as the region's premier coastwise public access route be explicitly recognized; the designation of the Big Sur Coast segment of SR 1 as both a State Scenic Highway and a National Scenic Byway be emphasized, and that it be maintained in accordance with the recommendations, ratified by all agencies that participated in the development of the Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP)(c.2.002). CHMP signatories included, among others, the lead agency Caltrans; the Federal Highway Administration, the California Coastal Commission, TAMC, and Monterey County; the rural sections of SR 1 must remain in a scenic 2-lane configuration, pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30254; and, public access from inland areas to the coast is facilitated by the region's many State Highway routes, local arterials, transit services (including Amtrak Thruway buses) , and rail-potentially including the MBL and SCBL; therefore each transportation improvement project providing access "to the coast should be evaluated accordingly, and priority given to those -projects that best provide for public access both locally and regionally.</p>	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018
137	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	<p><u>Timeline and climate change context.</u> One limiting factor for the MTP/SCS is its chronological horizon of 2040. The obvious "elephant in the room" is that projected sea level rise (SLR), and other anticipated climate change impacts (e.g., more frequent large floods, shoreline retreat, drought, etc.) will take their most severe toll well beyond the planning horizon of 2040. Yet, the transportation system pattern that we approve and fund prior to 2040 will, as history demonstrates, establish a template for development far into the future.</p> <p>Some of the more credible scientific projections predict up to 1 to 2 meters (approx. 3-6 ft.) of SLR for the California central coast region by 2100-thus, only a 1-2 ft. rise by the MTP end point of 2040. Not much of a concern for the 2040 MTP, if all climate change impacts suddenly halt at that point in time. But, the same credible projections show that climate change will most likely be in full acceleration mode by that time, particularly as it may be exacerbated by methane and other GHG releases from melting ocean floor and permafrost areas. Eventual full melting of the West Antarctic and Greenland icecaps, plus thermal expansion of the ocean, could over some centuries yield something on the order of ten times the SLR predicted for 2100.</p> <p>We realize scenarios for conditions in 2100 are outside of the planning horizon of this draft 2040 plan. However, the extremely long-term planning requirements for transportation and other infrastructure calls on public agencies to begin taking future conditions into account. Thus, we believe the MTP/SCS should recognize and incorporate policies essential for longer-range climate change adaptation, especially SLR adaptation. This could prove very beneficial for the region as many funding sources at the State and Federal level are calling for the incorporation of climate resilient infrastructure designs.</p>	AMBAG recently received a grant from Caltrans as part of the SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grant Program for the Central Coast Highway 1 area from Castroville to the Santa Cruz County line. The project will identify climate change impacts and related risks to multimodal transportation infrastructure in the project area. The study will then identify a suite of transportation and adaptation scenarios to remedy the identified climate-related vulnerabilities and evaluate the proposed adaptation approaches, including the economic impact of each of the identified adaptation approaches. The Nature Conservancy and the Center for Blue Economy (Middlebury Institute) are subrecipients of the grant. The study is expected to be completed in Spring 2020. Results of this study will be incorporated into the next update of the MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
138	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>In addition, specific additions to the draft 2040 MTP/SCS are accordingly suggested below:</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> the 2040 MTP/SCS would benefit, we believe, by including a specific list of potential transportation system vulnerabilities, and examples of Central Coast transportation facilities that will need to adapt in order to remain resilient to expected climate change phenomena. Expected planning-level geotechnical problems include but are not confined to increased stream and tidal flooding; large and small landslide instabilities; accelerated mass wasting (especially persistent rockfall); and shoreline erosion/retreat, due to SLR and increased storm intensity. These are already partially touched upon by the MTP, but amplification would be helpful for identifying future vulnerabilities, locations needing site- specific planning, and future funding for corrective projects. Including a preliminary list of "hot spots" within the transportation system based on the many climate change/SLR vulnerability assessments occurring throughout the region would benefit the initiation of the long term planning horizon needs for infrastructure projects.</p> <p>Rail lines: suggested additional treatment in the 2040 MTP/SCS text. Improvement and better use of the region's rail corridors could be amplified in the MTP/SCS. In particular, consideration should be given to the role that at least some of the region's rail corridors might play in meeting Coastal Act policies promoting mass transit and the minimization of energy use, along with SB 375 requirements regarding minimization of GHG impacts. We also foresee a need for thoughtful advance planning for rail facilities' adaptation to sea level rise impacts, beyond 2040. Accordingly, consistent with our earlier comments on the California State Rail Plan (CSRP), we recommend that the following rail-related topics receive specific treatment and priority in the MTP/SCS.</p>	AMBAG recently received a grant from Caltrans as part of the SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grant Program for the Central Coast Highway 1 area from Castroville to the Santa Cruz County line. The project will identify climate change impacts and related risks to multimodal transportation infrastructure in the project area. The study will then identify a suite of transportation and adaptation scenarios to remedy the identified climate-related vulnerabilities and evaluate the proposed adaptation approaches, including the economic impact of each of the identified adaptation approaches. The Nature Conservancy and the Center for Blue Economy (Middlebury Institute) are subrecipients of the grant. The study is expected to be completed in Spring 2020. Results of this study will be incorporated into the next update of the MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
139	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p><u>High Speed Rail (ESR) & Coast Daylight.</u> The proposed HSR alignment only barely grazes the northeasterly comer of AMBAG's MTP/SCS planning area. Nonetheless, both the HSR and the revived Coast Daylight service (as described in the CSRP) will provide important non- automotive transportation alternatives for travel between San Francisco and Los Angeles. We believe the MTP/SCS would benefit from noting the advantages of these two new services in terms of protecting the capacity of coastal Highways 1 and 101, for both economic mobility and recreational travel. Sufficient highway capacity infers less need for future highway widening and the associated (potential) environmental impacts, on critical wetland habitats and beach areas along the coast.</p>	Passenger rail is discussed in Chapter 2.	Letter	2/5/2018

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
140	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Coast Daylight service. For the revived Coast Daylight service, the MTP/SCS should note that by providing <u>non-automotive</u> transportation alternatives northbound from the Monterey Peninsula (connecting at the new Castroville station) and southbound from Santa Cruz County (connecting at the proposed new Watsonville/Pajaro station), these service improvements will support preservation of the SR 1 Moss Landing segment as a scenic rural byway consistent with Legislative direction in Coastal Act Section 30254. However, over the long run, SLR is likely to inundate the existing, low-lying UPRR alignment through the midline of Elkhorn Slough. Major adaptive measures will be needed and the opportunities and challenges for these measures should begin to be identified now.	AMBAG recently received a grant from Caltrans as part of the SB 1 Adaptation Planning Grant Program for the Central Coast Highway 1 area from Castroville to the Santa Cruz County line. The project will identify climate change impacts and related risks to multimodal transportation infrastructure in the project area. The study will then identify a suite of transportation and adaptation scenarios to remedy the identified climate-related vulnerabilities and evaluate the proposed adaptation approaches, including the economic impact of each of the identified adaptation approaches. The Nature Conservancy and the Center for Blue Economy (Middlebury Institute) are subrecipients of the grant. The study is expected to be completed in Spring 2020. Results of this study will be incorporated into the next update of the MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
141	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Capital Corridor extension. Likewise, for TAMC's proposed Capital Corridor extension from San Jose to Salinas the MTP/SCS should note that by providing non-automotive transportation alternatives northbound from the Monterey Peninsula (connecting at the new Castroville station), it will support preservation of the SR 1 Moss Landing segment as a scenic rural byway consistent with Legislative direction for Coastal Act Section 3.0254 as well as potentially relieving some congestion on SR 156 through the Elkhorn Slough System watershed, northeasterly from Castroville. Within Elkhorn Slough, over the long run, the UPRR tracks or alignment will need to be adapted to expected SLR, as for the; extended Coast Daylight service discussed above.	The Capitol Corridor extension from San Jose to Salinas is included in the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018
142	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Santa Cruz Branch Line (SCBL). This 32-mile line was recently acquired by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC). The MTP/SCS should expand its discussion of this corridor for maximizing its ability to enhance public access in light of the above-referenced Coastal Act objectives, including as appropriate for coastal lateral access (as a strand of the MBSST), commuting and freight transportation.	The Santa Cruz Branch Line (SCBL) is discussed in Chapter 2 of the 2040 MTP/SCS. More details on the SCBL are included in SCCRTC's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.	Letter	2/5/2018
143	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Santa Cruz Big Trees & Pacific Railway. The MTP/SCS appropriately includes a discussion of the existing <u>freight and passenger excursion</u> train operation that extends from Felton (Roaring Camp) through the scenic San Lorenzo River gorge, connecting to the SCBL at the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk. Although shown on the draft CSRP map or short line freight operations (draft CSRP Exhibit 6.2), there is no accompanying discussion. We note that the MTP corrects this oversight, at least for regional planning purposes.	Comment noted.	Letter	2/5/2018
144	California Coastal Commission	Craig	Susan	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	Monterey Branch Line (MBL). On p.2-11 of the draft 2040 MTP/SCS, under "Commuter and Light Rail" the status and potential future role(s) of the SCBL are already addressed. However, there is no comparable discussion for TAMC's MBL. And, both the SCBL and MBL are omitted from Figures 2-2 and 4-4: 2040 Regional Transit Network (though shown on Figure 2-4 Goods Movement System). One specific concern that may warrant identification in the MTP is the classic 5-span steel truss bridge across the Salinas River estuary. It appears to be abandoned, unpainted, rusting in place. But, it represents valuable existing difficult-to-replace infrastructure. If not maintained, it may have to be replaced when restored rail, fixed guideway and/or MBSST bikeway connections eventually become available. We recommend discussion in the MTP document and direction to assure that future planning options are not prejudiced through failure to preserve potentially reusable facilities.	The Monterey Branch Line is an unconstrained project in the 2040 MTP/SCS.	Letter	2/5/2018