



K

Draft 2045 MTP/SCS Comments and Responses

Introduction

The 2045 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 2045 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 2045.

On November 22, 2021 AMBAG released the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review and comment. Four public workshops and public hearings were held in January 2022 to facilitate public comment on the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR.

Generally, the comments received to date on the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS covered the following broad issues:

- 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 climate change concerns

The close of the public comment period for the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR was January 31, 2022. Staff has compiled the comments received on the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS and prepared written responses, which are included as an attachment to this Appendix.

K

Attachments

Draft 2045 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	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>I was wondering if you would be so kind as to support a Bus Stop at The Enterprise Technology Center (ETC) in Scotts Valley? I don't know if the MTP/SCS is the proper place for this large ask. Unless adding funding for a Santa Cruz County Multi-Lateral Bus Stop Commission would be appropriate?</p> <p>Background: The ETC has about 1000 cars a day parking in its parking lots. I currently work at the UC Scotts Valley Center at the ETC, and I am asking for support as a Local Citizen. The nearest bus stop to the ETC is by the Kaiser on Scotts Valley Drive - which is an unlit 15-minute hilly walk and deters many from using our Metro to get to the ETC. Your support would be very much appreciated. The Metro counters all ideas with a No. The Metro found a savings of \$94,000 a month by removing two bus routes in Scotts Valley for five students to use. The Felton Fair private property time point bus stop was removed saving between 5to10 minutes in travel time on bus route 35. The very much appreciated Metro Route 35 addition now traverses Scotts Valley drive in both directions to help lower commute times to Live Oak to the ETC from 3-hours to 2.5hrs (by car is ~10 minutes). This bus stop may add 5to10 minutes of time but will reduce a commute by a half-hour from 2.5hrs to 2hrs (from 3hrs to 2hrs - a whole hour saved to be with family sooner). To my understanding, the UC has ~100 students that work at the ETC, and they work less than 20hrs a week. The cost of a Metro On-Demand service at \$8 a day would be \$40 a week.</p> <p>Over the last 5-years we have had many attempts with a Metro approval for a bus stop at the ETC, but budgets cuts, waiting for Measure D & SB1 voter approval, limited drivers, bus drivers fear of missing the Santas Village exit to turn around on Hwy17 all have delayed this much-needed bus stop. We need an answer to help lower our carbon footprint for our County. I think there needs to be a committee brought together of stakeholders consisting of; AMBAG, the Metro, RTC, E&DTAC, ITAC, Caltrans, the City of Scotts Valley, ETC, UCSC, MAC, and the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors to help quickly add a bus stop at the ETC, and add pedestrian safety. So by the time we figure out and implement a solution to add a bus stop at the ETC - We will have the Metro drivers trained to use for a bus stop at the ETC. I understand this is a heavy lift, but many solutions are available. Thank you for your time.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Email	11/18/2021

Draft 2045 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
2	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>"I am asking AMBAG to add the following to the 2045 MTP/SCS;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overhead Crosswalk Lighting – especially needed on Hwy 9 pedestrian crossings – Solar Powered - (LED Overhead Pedestrian Crossing). 2. In pavement lighting fixtures – to help keep pedestrians safe at crosswalks - (Pedestrian information). 3. In Road Warning Lights - (Pedestrian information). 4. Bollards Sensor Activation - (Pedestrian information). 5. More Time Cards – for adding more time for crossing in long crosswalks - (Green Man +). 6. Bike Ramp for Stairs - (Bike Ramp). <p>Please add the proper funding to allow these 6-safety-items to be installed & maintained in Santa Cruz County.</p> <p>#1. LED Overhead Pedestrian Crossing; To overly brighten the crosswalk for a safe crossing; https://carmanah.com/overhead-lighting-crosswalks/</p> <p>https://www.traffictoday.com/news/vulnerable-road-users/crosswalk-night-time-safety-system-launched-at-atssa-expo.html https://www.ledpedestriancrossing.com/?gclid=CjwKCAiAt9z-BRBCEiwA_bWv-ANRVy3ZjeEPnY95NnEWifRo-AHhBw4ojRI3JetC7wNes6HX3WCHdhoC2XkQAvD_BwE</p> <p>#2, #3, #4 Pedestrian information; To automatically turn-on crossing lights; https://www.lightguardsystems.com/smart-crosswalk-in-roadway-warning-light-irwl-system/</p> <p>https://xwalk.com/?gclid=CjwKCAjw7rWKBhAtEiwAJ3CWLHUm7CJm00Ie7bdvDDQTu-6TfHE-QRviq5JTGCpd9AUslo5Bka3uhoC1GoQAvD_BwE https://lanelight.com/products/pedestrian-crosswalk-lights/</p> <p>#5 Green Man + https://www.ahtc.sg/green-man-by-lta/ https://youtu.be/0ytbRa0gLOg</p> <p>#6 Bike Ramp:</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Email	11/18/2021

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
3	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>Pedestrian Lights on Overpass: I would like to see funding added on the Granite Creek/Hwy17 overpass pedestrian path to have pedestrian lighting added - Scotts Valley is currently approved for improving the pedestrian path & bike lane with the SCCRTC 2021 Consolidated Grant Program – Preliminary Recommendations, but no pedestrian lighting is included. Those that are walking at night from, the large employer of the Enterprise Technology Center in Scotts Valley to the bus stop located on Scotts Valley Drive cannot see where they are walking on the pedestrian path - this would be a well-spent safety upgrade.</p> <p>Blinking Lights on Overpass Crosswalks; I would like to see funding added for blinking lights at the crossing of overpasses. I was visiting family in Mt. View and saw these blinking lights on the Hwy 85 overpass on/off-ramp crosswalks on El Camino Real.</p> <p>For example; Hwy1 & 41st, and Hwy1 & Soquel Drive: The crosswalk on the on-ramp to Hwy1 from Soquel Dr is set back pretty far, and at night it is very hard to see anyone in this area - let alone in the daytime. Adding blinking lights to these areas would be a well-spent safety upgrade. Thank you for your time & consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Email	11/18/2021
4	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is developing a single use pass for all transportation options for those counties connected to the San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>Would the MTP/SCS be interested in funding having Santa Cruz County (or our Tri-County area) join the MTC or at least allow use of the Clipper Card Fast-Pass for those using the Amtrak Hwy17 bus, or on other Metro options, Bart, Trains & VTA. To my understanding the MTC requires \$100,000 a year to join, but cheaper options should be available.</p> <p><u>With</u> over 80,000 commuters traversing hwy 17 a day – this would help encourage alternate use of multi-modal transportation.</p> <p>MTC link; https://mtc.ca.gov/tools-resources/mtcabag-library <u>Clipper info</u>; https://mtc.ca.gov/news/clippersm-tops-300000-daily-boardings-mark</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the regional transit operators staff as they are responsible for passenger fares and passes in the AMBAG region. In addition to the traditional farebox, MST operates an open-loop payment system where any passenger can use Visa and Mastercard contactless-enabled bank cards and mobile wallets (Apple Pay, Google Pay, Samsung Pay, and Fitbit Pay) are accepted. MST has researched participation in the Clipper Card program and it would be cost-prohibitive due to the high installation and ongoing maintenance fees and the low number of riders coming from the San Francisco Bay Area.	Email	11/24/2021

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
5	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has joined 101 cities & nine counties to help all with the Bay Area’s transportation needs. MTC directly distributes more than \$1 billion year to local public transit agencies and other recipients, and prioritizes requests from local agencies for millions more in state and federal funds.</p> <p>It seems that Santa Cruz County & Monterey County should join together to help keep the viability of transportation in both Counties – like the MTC... Like; Adding a Clipper Card MTC link: https://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/what-mtc</p> <p>Further Info: The transportation needs in Santa Cruz County is large, and is not very well funded. Our Metro is the best that I have experienced.</p> <p>Although: The Metro does not go to many large employers in our county. Our Metro is the only form of mass-transit options available in our County. Our Metro does not yet have an Automatic Vehicle Location system to help drive more use. The Metro frequency is lacking and causes many to find other means of travel. The Santa Cruz Metro pricing is ok, but should be free for certain residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free Ride for Jurors Free Ride for Veterans Free Ride for Seniors. Free Ride for Kids under 18. Free Ride for Middle & High School Students. Info by Dr. Kari Edison Watkins, PhD, PE <p>Further Information links; https://its.ucdavis.edu/its-calendar/ http://tscore.ce.gatech.edu/</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the regional transit operators staff as they are responsible for passenger fares and passes in the AMBAG region.</p> <p>In addition to the traditional farebox, MST operates an open-loop payment system where any passenger can use Visa and Mastercard contactless-enabled bank cards and mobile wallets (Apple Pay, Google Pay, Samsung Pay, and Fitbit Pay) are accepted.</p> <p>MST has researched participation in the Clipper Card program and it would be cost-prohibitive due to the high installation and ongoing maintenance fees and the low number of riders coming from the San Francisco Bay Area.</p>	Email	12/1/2021
6	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>I have asked many local groups, but to no avail. What can AMBAG do to influence UBERPool & LyftLine to make available this feature to Santa Cruz County (I know same name as the Metro Lift-Line)? I sometimes take the Amtrak Hwy17 bus to visit family in Mt View, CA. I then grab a Uber to Mt View from the San Jose Diridon station. I was amazed at the savings I was able to gain with UberPool in late 2019. The normal Uber ride to Mt View from San Jose was \$20.00, and If I took UberPool the ride share was \$14.00. I was further amazed: if I walked two blocks from the Diridon station to pick up a UberPool ride – my UberPool ride was \$8.00. So from \$20 to \$8 was a \$12 savings. Think of the commute savings...This is a win-win for Uber drivers & Uber riders - The riders get the ability to add money for themselves on ride they would not get, and riders save money by sharing a ride. Thank You for your time & consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with the regional transit operators staff as they are responsible for passenger fares and passes in the AMBAG region.</p> <p>Transit operators do not regulate or have authority over UberPool or Lyft.</p>	Email	12/15/2021

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
7	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>I would like to see more information on what makes a walkable city? What goals are we going to use to make are County more walkable... Some cities have robots delivering food, (like Mt. View) – do not know what this will do to delivery employees, but with the great resignation – who knows.</p> <p>I would like to see funding for a Bus Stop Committee: The Santa Cruz Metro had a Bus Stop committee, but disbanded after losing funding due to budget deficit. A bus stop committee can draw into meetings; local public works, Caltrans, etc.. to help improve or add bus stops. May have access to funding to complete projects.</p> <p>I would like to see funding for a Pedestrian Committee: The SCCRTC had a Pedestrian Committee, but it was disbanded. A Pedestrian Committee can draw into meetings; local public works, Caltrans, etc.. to help improve walkable pedestrian safety. May have access to funding to complete projects.</p> <p>Thank You for your time and consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC, Santa Cruz METRO and County of Santa Cruz staff as they are responsible agencies for implementing your suggestions.	Email	1/12/2022
8	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>If funding could be available for more Bike Lockers in Santa Cruz County. We are given great rebates for electric bikes, but at \$3000 needed to purchase a decent ebike with the high propensity for those ebike to be stolen. To add bikelink controlled bike lockers at more retail locations.</p> <p>If funding could be added to add quick EV charging stations in Soquel Village. If funding could be added to add quick EV charging stations at Retail locations, and at other public parking lots (or public parking garages).</p> <p>Thank You for your time and consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC and County of Santa Cruz staff as they are responsible agencies for implementing your suggestions.	Email	1/12/2022
9	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>Add incentives to add Flex Fuel stations in Santa Cruz County: We have no flex fuel stations (E85) in Santa Cruz County to help lower our carbon footprint – while we wait for other changes & other sustainable incentives. Here is an example of the closest nearby locations - https://propelfuels.com/</p> <p>Thank You for your time and consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC and County of Santa Cruz staff as they are responsible agencies for implementing your suggestions.	Email	1/12/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
10	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>We have many workers that work early in the morning, and later in the evening, but we do not have a bus service during most of these times.</p> <p>Other Counties have a “All Nighter Service” to get people home safe from work. We have several work locations that start shifts at 6am, and we have many restaurants/bar that end their workday after midnight. The GO program in Downtown Santa Cruz is awesome, but it does not have the funding to fund an earlier or later Metro service. I was in manufacturing for several decades and know that I had some workers that strongly requested to only working later shifts.</p> <p>Can there be special funding, in the “Draft 2045 MTP/SCS”, to allow a special circular “All Nighter” bus service to capture all of our counties Metro stations to help get people home safe from work?</p> <p>I envision a daily hourly one-way circular bus route that travels around the county, between Midnight & 6am, that would stop at all the counties transit centers in Watsonville, Capitola, Scotts Valley & Santa Cruz (7-days a week).</p> <p>Thank You for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The 2045 MTP/SCS must be a financially constrained plan so not all transportation investments and services are able to be included.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC and Santa Cruz METRO staff as they are responsible agencies for updating the project list and implementing your suggestions.</p>	Email	1/13/2022
11	Public	Downing	Rebecca	Executive Summary and Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	<p>My name is Rebecca Downing and I live in Seacliff Aptos and I have a comment and a recommendation. Both the Executive Summary and the Strategy section state that the plan is required to analyze where people are going and how they want to get there in order to build a transportation network that addresses the mobility and accessibility needs of the region, that's a quote from the plan.</p> <p>It continues to note associated strategies, including focusing on growth in transportation corridors and operating more travel choices, and increased efficiencies in the current transportation system, and these strategies address where people are going, but not how they want to get there. I have asked at previous RTC meetings and I think I've asked your staff possibly and made some phone calls to conduct more comprehensive outreach to determine both where and how residents wish to travel. If this work has been done throughout our region, you know, it should be included in the plan. And if not, I ask you to request inclusion and reporting of this work in the moving forward document so that it reflects the desires of those who will be affected by these transportation projects. Thank you.</p>	<p>The AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) was developed to replicate travel behavior and forecast travel behavior in the future. This is done based upon state and national household travel surveys, Census data, employment and traffic data. The RTDM utilizes innovative techniques to capture travel behavior at a more individual-based level and incorporates disaggregate level data into some of the modeling stages. Transportation projects are evaluated based on how well they meet existing and project travel demand, i.e. where people live and where they want to go (work/school/shop, etc.). Mobility and accessibility are key goals when evaluating each transportation project/program/services.</p> <p>In addition, AMBAG conducted virtual workshops in spring 2021 asking participants to provide direct feedback on their priority transportation options and what they would use. A short online survey to provide feedback on potential new strategies to gather more input on housing, economic and transportation options was also available for those who were unable attend a workshop.</p>	Public Hearing	1/19/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
12	Public	Wilshusen	Linda	Appendix G	Please explain how the performance measures can show identical outcomes for drive alone and carpool on Table G-1.	The AMBAG region does not have many carpool or high occupancy vehicle lanes. Therefore, people traveling alone and traveling in a carpool have similar travel times and other performance outcomes.	Public Hearing	1/19/2022
13	Public	Wilshusen	Linda	Appendix C	Please confirm that the project lists are identical to the local RTPs.	Yes, the project list that is in our tri-county AMBAG Metropolitan Transportation Plan for each county are the same project lists that are in at the SCCRTC's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List, TAMC's project list for their RTP, as well as San Benito's RTP.	Public Hearing	1/19/2022
14	Public	Wilshusen	Linda	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	Are these SCS maps consistent with the county general plans?	The SCS maps in the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS were developed based on direct input from the local jurisdictions on land use for 2020 and 2045. The SCS maps go out to the year 2045 and many of the jurisdictions, including both local cities and counties have general plans that may only go out to the horizon year of 2030 and sometimes 2035. The SCS maps are not inconsistent with the local general plans but since they have different horizon years they are not identical.	Public Hearing	1/19/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
15	Public	Zappala	Holly	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	I live in one of the unincorporated Santa Cruz County Mountain communities off Highway 17 and my comments are regarding the potential interchange project, and specifically the one off of Laurel road, Sugarloaf and Glenwood cutoffs. This project is listed at the bottom of page 2 of 54 on the Regional Transportation Plan Project List. And so this is one that's been talked about for many years and I was disappointed to see that it was listed as unconstrained in the Next 23 years. Just, this project is incredibly important, and I'd like to ask that it be moved to the constrained list with funding secured. And so as traffic has increased throughout the Bay Area, Highway 17 has become increasingly dangerous to drive. And, you know, it's one of the most dangerous roads in the country. And, you know, I think, perhaps, most significantly, the thing that makes it dangerous is that, you know, it has these, these two different, these two functions that are very different. It's serving as a highway with these fast moving vehicles and then it's also a local road for, you know, there's thousands of people, like me who live along it and use it to access their driveway and their neighborhoods. And so, you know, you have these two uses that are very different, and it's just not ideal. You have all of these conflict points, where you have vehicles making left-hand turns, they're slowing down to exit, you know, getting on the freeway, they're accelerating from a complete stop to enter, and then it causes all of these unexpected changes in the traffic and it's especially significant when the traffic is heavier. So then, these conflict points create accidents and, you know, strain on first responders, stop traffic and delays for anyone using the highway. I just think that it's really important that we reduce these conflict points to allow vehicles to move more efficiently and safely. So currently around Sugarloaf, Laurel and Glenwood, there's 28 of these conflicts point, so that interchange project would reduce the number to four. And so, for those of us who live along Highway 17, it's become really, increasingly dangerous to enter and exit our homes, And in these neighborhoods, there's no commercial uses. So, we really need to get on Highway 17 to go anywhere. So, as a resident of one of these communities, I just wanted to share my comments, that, you know, I would gladly travel farther on a frontage road, in exchange for the safety and reliability of an interchange. So, just to close, this project is vital to enhancing the safety, mobility, and accessibility on Highway 17. And I hope that we can consider moving it to the constrained lists with funding secured. Thank you.	Operational improvements to Highway 17 are included in the unconstrained project list. The 2045 MTP/SCS must be a financially constrained plan so not all transportation investments and services are able to be included. Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC staff as they are responsible for updating the project list.	Public Hearing	1/24/2022
16	Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail (Santa Cruz FORT)	Segal	Faina	General	The Friends of Rail and Trail first want to thank the Commission staff for all the work they have put into developing the Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We are, however, disappointed in the minimal attention given to our Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (SCBRL) in the plan, the omission of updated funding sources, the disconnect between goals and projects, and the lack of vision for the fundamental changes needed to transform our transportation system into a more equitable and sustainable system. Accordingly, we offer the following comments for consideration in the final approved RTP:	Thank you for your comments.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
17	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>1. How Projects Meet Goals</p> <p>The 2045 goals, targets and policies cited in Appendix C of the draft RTP provide an excellent overview of our hopes for a more energy-efficient and less congested future. They include state mandates to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) from transportation sources to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Global warming is already drastically changing our local and worldwide climate in ways that will cause social turmoil and much human suffering in the coming years. Locally, we are already familiar with multi-year droughts, horrific fires, and eroding shorelines. The science is irrefutable that GHG emissions are a primary cause of global warming and climate change. The primary approaches that are used worldwide to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation include improvements in vehicle technology and reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), primarily via public transportation investments. Yet the transportation option that was identified in the 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis & Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) as producing the greatest reduction in both VMT and GHG emissions, that is, electric light rail, is not given more than a passing reference in this draft RTP.</p> <p>So, while our RTP goals are laudable and the challenge of global warming formidable, the draft RTP itself does not rise to the occasion. In fact, the Plan does not anywhere make the link between its extensive project list and how these projects will achieve the Plan's goals.</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022
18	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>While many pages of the draft Plan include references to statewide sustainability, transit, and rail plans, our own public rail transit project on the RTC-owned coast rail line is highlighted only inasmuch as it is "on the financially-unconstrained list of projects, due to the lack of identified and likelihood of available funding to the region for a passenger rail project." (p2-13)</p> <p>It should be noted that most of the projects on the draft RTP's project list do not have funding sources identified during the project development stage. Yet, the rail transit project in particular, due to extensive analysis over the past decades, has over 60% of the estimated high-end capital cost identified as likely...quite unlike any of the Highway 1 widening projects on the Constrained Project List. Also, we're wondering how it happens, then, that NEW multi-million dollar Highway 1 projects are shown on the Constrained Project List without public discussion of total project costs or funding sources? [Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes and Bus on Shoulders Freedom Blvd to State Park \$102M and Hwy 1: Reconstruct Bay Ave/Porter St and 41st Avenue Interchange \$14M.]</p> <p>FORT strongly encourages the Commission to recommit to its identified goals, targets and policies in the RTP, and to include, in the future, a constrained list of projects that can show evidence they will actually get us nearer to achieving those goals.</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
19	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>2. Rail Planning</p> <p>In Chapter 1, the draft Plan identifies the crucial role that a planning document like the RTP serves: “planning . . . positions our community to receive funding for projects that require a well thought out plan and helps to develop collaboration on projects.” Yet the Rail section in Chapter 2 includes a simple factual description of the SCBRL and the last 20 years of its acquisition and study but makes <u>no further reference to future planning of the branch line’s use for passenger or freight service.</u> The draft Plan cites multiple references made in regional and state transportation planning documents to our SCBRL and how that planning and coordination could lead to funding. These include:</p> <p>Chapter 2 notes the inclusion of our SCBRL in the 2018 goals of the California State Rail Plan, including: “a new station in Pajaro/Watsonville, an analysis of connections between Santa Cruz, Monterey and the high-speed rail line at Gilroy, implementation planning for connecting Santa Cruz and Monterey to the statewide rail network at Gilroy, and establishment of hourly service by 2040, if recommended by the 2022 rail plan.” (p2-15)</p> <p>It also notes that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is “actively pursuing rail service that includes local service as well as greater regional access...local light rail service would connect the cities of Seaside and Monterey to Castroville for connections to Pajaro station and the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond.” (p2-15)</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
20	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>Although not referenced in the draft Plan, our local Draft AMBAG 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan says in its passenger rail section, “rail projects are an important component of the regional transportation network that enhance mobility opportunities for the region’s diverse population and lead to economic vitality for the region. The planned rail services complement each other and result in reducing auto trips on regional highways . . . The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) are working to bring rail service to Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, so that residents can use rail to travel to jobs, education and entertainment.” (p2-11)</p> <p>“The 2018 California State Rail Plan and the 2020 California Freight Mobility Plan stress the importance of short line railroads, including the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. . . AMBAG(‘s). . . U.S. 101 Central Coast California Freight study in 2016 . . . recommends upgrading the rail on the Santa Cruz Branch Line to Federal Rail Administration Class 2 rail, allowing freight train speeds of up to 25 mph on sections in Santa Cruz County in order to improve freight connectivity to other regions in California and nationwide.” (p2-15)</p> <p>Given the importance of planning in being successful in competing for public project funding, the Commission should include in the RTP additional discussion of the Transit Corridor Alternatives Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) evaluation of transit investment options and its selection of electric passenger rail as the locally preferred alternative for the SCBRL.</p>	The Santa Cruz County 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study, as developed by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, identified electric passenger rail as the preferred alternative. This project is included in both SCCRTC's 2045 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2045 MTP/SCS as an unconstrained project.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
21	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>3. Funding</p> <p>The project list fails to directly connect back to goals, targets, and policies identified. This is especially true when it comes to the SCBRL. On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) that the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) website calls “a generational investment in America’s intermodal transportation system of which freight and intercity passenger rail are an integral part. . . will provide unprecedented federal funding for rail improvement projects in America. Over the next five years, that means greatly expanding existing FRA programs and creating new programs to enhance our nation’s rail network. The bipartisan infrastructure law includes \$102 billion in total rail funding, including \$66 billion from advanced appropriations, and \$36 billion in authorized funding.” The IIJA also includes \$27 billion just for bridge repairs. This funding will significantly change the focus on rail throughout the country and specifically in California with its current emphasis on rail through the State Rail Plan. California alone is in line to receive \$4.2 billion from the IIJA. And yet Chapter 5 of the draft RTP on funding completely down plays this dramatic new funding source, saying “as part of negotiations for a multiyear federal infrastructure plan, congress adopted a new federal transportation act (Investing in a New Vision for the Environment and Surface Transportation in America or INVEST act) which is expected to increase funding for transportation. Details on what this means for projects in Santa Cruz County will be integrated into RTP updates once available.” (p5-2,3). We also want to call to your attention that later in Chapter 5, there is an outdated discussion of federal funds for infrastructure, saying “while Congress and the President agree that the nation’s infrastructure is a priority, there has been no consensus around specific programs that would be funded or how to pay for transportation system projects.” (p5-6). The Plan’s description of Unconstrained Projects is: “projects that cannot be implemented over the next 25 years unless there are significant changes in the amount of local, state, and federal funding available for transportation.” Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years from both this new federal funding and resulting impact on state funding, we feel rail projects now definitely meet this definition of “significant changes.” We ask the Commission to revise this section to provide more current and complete description of the IIJA.</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022
22	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>We realize the final passage of this legislation may have happened after the current draft of the RTP was completed, but it is sufficiently important to make these revisions now before the RTP is adopted. It should also specifically be mentioned in the Rail section of the Plan.</p> <p>Given the magnitude of increased funding that will be available over the next 5 years, we also ask the RTC to move the following rail projects from the unconstrained list to the constrained list.</p> <p>Public Transit on Watsonville-Santa Cruz Rail Corridor - RTC-P02 - \$825,000 unconstrained Rail line: Freight Service Upgrades - RTC-P41 - \$25,000 unconstrained Recreational Rail Infrastructure - RTC 25 - \$5,340 unconstrained</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Draft 2045 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
24	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	Vision (Chapter 1) and Appendix C	<p>Please accept the Santa Cruz County Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT) comments on the DRAFT Santa Cruz County 2045 Regional Transportation Plan as pertaining as well to the Goals and Policies, Performance Measures, and Project List in the DRAFT 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan & the Sustainable Communities Strategy.</p> <p>In particular, FORT would like to highlight three paragraphs early in the attached letter as they embody our key comment on the Santa Cruz County Draft RTP, which applies as well as the Draft MTP:</p> <p>Global warming is already drastically changing our local and worldwide climate in ways that will cause social turmoil and much human suffering in the coming years. Locally, we are already familiar with multi-year droughts, horrific fires, and eroding shorelines. The science is irrefutable that GHG emissions are a primary cause of global warming and climate change.</p> <p>The primary approaches that are used worldwide to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation include improvements in vehicle technology and reduction in the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), primarily via public transportation investments. Yet the transportation option that was identified in the {Santa Cruz County} 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis & Rail Network Integration Study (TCAA/RNIS) as producing the greatest reduction in both VMT and GHG emissions, that is, electric light rail, is not given more than a passing reference in this draft RTP.</p> <p>So, while our RTP goals are laudable and the challenge of global warming formidable, the draft RTP itself does not rise to the occasion. In fact, the Plan does not anywhere make the link between its extensive project list and how these projects will achieve the Plan's goals.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your consideration of our comments.</p>	<p>The 2045 MTP/SCS achieves the regional greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).</p> <p>The Santa Cruz County 2021 Transit Corridor Alternative Analysis and Rail Network Integration Study, as developed by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, identified electric passenger rail as the preferred alternative. This project is included in both SCCRTC's 2045 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2045 MTP/SCS as an unconstrained project.</p>	Email	1/31/2022
23	Santa Cruz FORT	Segal	Faina	N/A	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>We find it shortsighted for the Commission to adopt a twenty-year planning document that pays relatively little attention to one of the three key transit corridors identified in the RTC's 2019 Unified Corridor Study - the Santa Cruz Rail Branch Line. In doing so, this Draft RTP ignores the 20 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars in planning that have gone into refining successful project outcomes in the most underutilized transportation corridor in our county.</p>	This comment refers to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) not AMBAG's 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
25	California Coastal Commission	Drake	Sean	General	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Coastal Commission strongly supports many of the priorities enumerated in the Draft MPT/SCS, including thoughtfully planning future transportation projects to protect and conserve natural, agricultural, and other coastal resources; mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change; advancing multimodal and active transportation opportunities; promoting affordable housing and visitor-serving facilities; and others. The Commission has a longstanding history of partnering with Caltrans, regional transportation agencies, and local governments to advance plans and projects that further these priorities consistent with the Coastal Act and Local Coastal Programs (LCPs). Commission staff appreciate the Draft 2045 MPT/SCS and associated Draft EIR as high-level framework documents that chart out how these shared priorities may continue to be implemented throughout the Monterey Bay region over the coming decades. With that frame in mind, our comments: (1) reiterate critical aspects of the planning and regulatory roles of the Coastal Commission and local governments under the Coastal Act and how these roles relate to transportation decisions, (2) seek clarity on the extent of climate change adaptation planning in the MTP/SCS, (3) remark on the discussion of active transportation; and (4) provide miscellaneous comments and suggested revisions of specific text.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	Letter	1/31/2022
26	California Coastal Commission	Drake	Sean	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	<p>2. Climate Change Adaptation</p> <p>As is recognized in the Draft MTP/SCS, the effects of climate change pose a significant threat to the Monterey Bay region. The draft is thorough in its discussion of opportunities to mitigate the effects of climate change by conserving natural resources and by designing a transportation system that will minimize greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. However, discussion of climate change adaptation is largely absent from the draft. Adaptation is not mentioned in the introductory section that characterizes the term “resilient” and summarizes AMBAG’s vision for the MTP/SCS. The remainder of the document focuses on sustainability almost exclusively in terms of GHG minimization. Of the 174 pages in the draft, aside from a few cursory mentions, climate change adaptation is confined to a one-page section beginning on page 4-27.</p> <p>The Draft MTP/SCS’s focus on GHG mitigation is understandable given that that was the emphasis of SB 375, the legislation motivating development of the document. However, the report’s focus on climate change mitigation and cursory discussion of climate change adaptation seems problematic. From our perspective, both topics are coequal public policy objectives in climate change resiliency planning. As such, we suggest that the final MTP/SCS include a discussion that provides greater context for the relationship between mitigation and adaptation, states that mitigation is the focus of this document, and recognizes that future coordinated planning is essential to adapt the Monterey Bay region to the effects of climate change. Adaptation planning for future transportation/infrastructure projects is further necessitated by Coastal Act Section 30421 and 30270 which require state and regional agencies to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts of sea level rise.</p>	Additional language regarding climate change adaptation will be added to the 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
27	California Coastal Commission	Drake	Sean	Sustainable Communities Strategy (Chapter 4)	<p>3. Active Transportation and the California Coastal Trail</p> <p>The Coastal Commission has been a longstanding partner with Caltrans, regional transportation agencies, and local governments in promoting active transportation in California's coastal zone as a means of maximizing public access to and along the coast, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and improving the overall livability of coastal communities for residents and visitors alike. A particular point of focus for this coordination has been continuing to promote and develop the California Coastal Trail (CCT), a continuous and interconnected public trail system along the California coastline from Oregon to Mexico. As it continues to expand, the CCT provides an increasingly critical active transportation resource that connects coastal communities to natural resources, other active transportation and public transit networks, and one another. For these reasons, the Commission has placed a high priority on developing plans and projects that continue to build out the CCT.</p> <p>Given these efforts, we are gratified to see that page 2-16 of the Draft MTP/SCS recognizes the CCT and the roles of the Coastal Commission and the State Coastal Conservancy in developing the trail. We would suggest adding to this section that the CCT's presence in the Monterey Bay region is not confined to the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail, and that continuing to build out segments of the CCT has the potential to provide enhanced active transportation connectivity throughout the region, including on State Parks lands and other public lands. To help readers visualize this potential, we would suggest that this section of the MTP/SCS reference the CCT Mapping Viewer, which is an interactive online map of existing CCT segments that was published by Coastal Commission and State Coastal Conservancy staff in February.¹ This tool can be helpful to AMBAG and its partners for identifying gaps or improvement areas in the region's coastal active transportation network.</p>	Additional language regarding the California Coastal Trail will be added to the 2405 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
28	California Air Resources Board	Kimura-Szito	Lezlie	General	<p>California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff appreciate the opportunity to review the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) draft Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) known as “2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy.” To achieve the State’s climate mandates, California needs significant and immediate changes to how we plan, fund, and build our communities and transportation systems. The SCS plays a critical role in supporting the State’s climate efforts, and local objectives to create an economically vibrant region that responds to the needs of its diverse communities and provides better access to jobs and cleaner air for its residents.</p> <p>In reviewing the draft RTP/SCS, CARB staff looked to identify whether additional information would be needed to conduct the SCS GHG evaluation under the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, Senate Bill (SB) 3751, and how the items identified during the review of AMBAG’s Technical Methodology were addressed as documented in CARB’s letter to AMBAG in May 2021. CARB staff will conduct its final evaluation, as outlined in the Final Sustainable Communities Strategy Program and Evaluation Guidelines (SCS Evaluation Guidelines) once AMBAG adopts its final 2022 RTP/SCS. Based on our review of the draft RTP/SCS, CARB staff requests that AMBAG provide the following additional information as part of its final 2022 RTP/SCS submittal.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	Letter	1/31/2022
29	California Air Resources Board	Kimura-Szito	Lezlie	Various	<p>Documentation of GHG Emissions Estimates</p> <p>Chapter 4 of the draft RTP/SCS discusses planned GHG emission reduction strategies, and Chapter 5 and Appendix F outlines the estimated GHG emissions reductions from the SCS; however, AMBAG will need to provide additional information on how the estimates were derived for CARB staff to conduct its evaluation of the GHG estimates. Of the items identified in CARB’s May 2021 letter (see attached), CARB requests particular attention to providing documentation of:</p> <p>Performance metrics in AMBAG’s plan to demonstrate how they align with SCS goals to meet the 2035 GHG reduction target (for example, household vehicle ownership, mode split, and others).</p> <p>The assumptions and quantification methods used for each off-model strategy in the 2022 RTP/SCS. This documentation should include a discussion of how the potential for double counting among strategies was addressed in cases where an overlap with travel demand model quantification could occur.</p> <p>How EMFAC was applied in estimating the GHG emissions for the plan. AMBAG should use the same version of EMFAC (EMFAC 2014) and the adjustment factors used in the last SCS in accordance with SCS Evaluation Guidelines when calculating its GHG emissions estimates.</p> <p>The auto operating cost and induced travel calculations used.</p>	Additional language regarding the GHG emission reduction strategies will be added to the 2045 MTP/SCS. AMBAG will submit the required information as documented in CARB’s SCS Evaluation Guidelines as part of its SCS submittal for CARB’s official review.	Letter	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
30	California Air Resources Board	Kimura-Szito	Lezlie	General	The SCS Evaluation Guidelines are intended to clarify the scope of CARB's updated evaluation process and can be a helpful resource when documenting underlying SCS strategy assumptions and their quantification. As part of the final review process, CARB staff may request additional information to conduct and support our final evaluation pursuant to SB 375.	Comment noted.	Letter	1/31/2022
31	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>1.We only have one viable park & ride in the Santa Cruz County; Please add funding to increase the Pasatiempo Park & Ride to encourage alternate forms of commuting – there is adequate land near the Pasatiempo park & ride to triple the current park & ride size.</p> <p>2.Please add funding to allow UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) to increase the UCSC Van Pool access to other UCSC locations outside of the UCSC physical campus; like Van pools to the UCSC Scotts Valley campus, Van pools to the UCSC Delaware Campus, and Van pools to the UCSC Marine Lab campus.</p> <p>3.Please fund incentives to bring flex fuel filling stations & hydrogen fuel filling stations to Santa Cruz County – as the nearest are over-the-hill in San Jose.</p> <p>4.Please allow funding incentives for diverting bio-waste from landfills to convert to Bio-Fuels.</p> <p>5.Please allow incentives to purchase for Hybrid Vehicles – similar incentives to electric vehicles – We need a longer hybrid period before going to all electric vehicles – as the infrastructure is not here for all electric vehicles. And for safety and choices – as the recent hurricane in New Orleans only had one gas station open by generator, and electricity was off there for almost a month.</p> <p>Thank You for your time & consideration</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The 2045 MTP/SCS must be a financially constrained plan so not all transportation investments and services are able to be included.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC, Santa Cruz METRO and County of Santa Cruz staff as they are responsible agencies for updating the project list and implementing your suggestions.</p>	Email	1/31/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
32	Public	Pisano	Michael	Transportation Investments (Chapter 2)	<p>It would be interesting to add a way (or machine) to deposit plastic bottles to pay for bus tickets. To increase Safety; Please add funding to add a sidewalk on both sides of Soquel Dr between Robertson St & 41st Ave.</p> <p>FYI: “Clean California” for grant money to beautify local areas; Might be able to use for 41st & Soquel, and to add bus shelters at the Pasatiempo Park & Ride. https://cleancalifornia.dot.ca.gov/</p> <p>Please add funding to add (see pictures below);</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overhead crosswalk LED lighting on all Hwy 9 crosswalk, and for crosswalk on parts of Soquel Dr. 2. Please add funding for in-street-crosswalk safety blinkers. 3. Please add funding to add bike ramps at outside stair cases. 4. Please add funding for more time-card boxes to cross at large intersections – like at; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Hwy 9 & Hwy 1 at River St. b. 41st & Soquel Dr c. Ocean St & Water St <p>Overhead crosswalk lighting; https://carmanah.com/overhead-lighting-crosswalks/ https://www.trafficechnologytoday.com/news/vulnerable-road-users/crosswalk-night-time-safety-system- launched-at-atssa-expo.html</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The 2045 MTP/SCS must be a financially constrained plan so not all transportation investments and services are able to be included.</p> <p>Your comments will be shared with SCCRTC, Santa Cruz METRO and County of Santa Cruz staff as they are responsible agencies for updating the project list and implementing your suggestions.</p>	Email	1/31/2022
33	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	General	<p><u>General Comments:</u> Caltrans would like to commend AMBAG for providing a robust discussion of the region with a clear direction towards a sustainable future. As well as working with the other agencies in the region to come up with a comprehensive and coordinated long range plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	Letter	1/28/2022
34	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>Where possible, AMBAG should ensure that specific page numbers are referenced in the RTP Checklist instead of entire chapters. This makes it easier to use the RTP checklist and ensure the corresponding requirements are met.</p>	Comment noted.	Letter	1/28/2022
35	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Various	<p>All GIS maps throughout the document are showing State Route (SR) 146 within San Benito County. That segment of SR 146 is no longer in the State Highway System. It has been relinquished to the National Parks. Please add a footnote in the maps indicating that SR 146 has been relinquished.</p>	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
36	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p><u>Consultation and Cooperation, RTP checklist, Appendix J:</u></p> <p>(2) Why is this question not applicable? Will it be answered by the time the final RTP is adopted?</p>	<p>AMBAG had not received any comments on the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS at the time of release in November 2021. All comments received on the Draft 2045 MTP/SCS will be included in a new Appendix K for the Final 2045 MTP/SCS. The checklist in Appendix J will be updated for the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
37	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>(3; 4; 5; & 9) The pages referenced imply the proper agencies were consulted, but the specific agencies do not seem to be identified. Please provide the specifics for this question.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
38	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>(6) There is no specific reference to the California State Wildlife Action Plan. Please ensure this requirement is met.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
39	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>(12) The RTP checklist does not specify where this requirement can be found. Please add a page number to be referenced.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
40	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>(15) Why is this question not applicable? Please explain.</p>	<p>The checklist refers to the adopted MTP/SCS not the draft MTP/SCS. This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
41	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p><u>Title VI, RTP checklist, Appendix J:</u></p> <p>(1) Specific page numbers are not mentioned in the Checklist. Please provide page numbers.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
42	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>Modal, RTP checklist, Appendix J:</p> <p>(1) There is more discussion regarding this question elsewhere. Please provide additional page numbers to be referenced in the RTP Checklist.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022
43	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	<p>(4) The page referenced does not cover the entire discussion of the topic. Please revise the pages referenced to include the entire discussion on airports and aviation.</p>	<p>This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/28/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
44	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	(7) The page referenced does not cover the entire discussion of the topic. Please revise the pages referenced to include the entire discussion on the California Coastal Trail.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
45	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	Programming: RTP checklist, Appendix J (3): There is insufficient information regarding the unconstrained project list. Please include a listing of all unconstrained projects within the region.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
46	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	Page 3-6: Revise "State Highway Operations and Protection Program" to "State Highway Operation and Protection Program" in multiple places on page. Also suggest revising "Regional Share State Transportation Improvement Program" to "State Transportation Improvement Program" in 1st paragraph.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
47	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	Page 3-9: Revise "Regional Improvement Program" to "Regional Transportation Improvement Program" in 1st paragraph on page.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
48	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Financial Plan (Chapter 3)	Page 3-9, ATP: suggest updating Active Transportation Program discussion to indicate that the program is now augmented with \$100 million annually from SB-1 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
49	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	Financial, RTP checklist, Appendix J: (2; 7; & 8) The consistency statement is assumed but not explicitly made in the page referenced. Please revise.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
50	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix J	Environmental, RTP checklist, Appendix J: (1; 4; & 5) The reference in the checklist is unclear on where the requirement is met. Please provide specifics that make it easier to identify.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
51	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Public Participation (Chapter 6)	Public Participation: Page 6-4, 1st sentence: Revise "January 2020 and designed" to "January 2020 and was designed."	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
52	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Public Participation (Chapter 6)	Page 6-5, AMBAG Board of Directors, Caltrans D5 is an Ex-Officio member that was not included in the list.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
53	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Public Participation (Chapter 6)	Page 6-6, Coordinating with Partner Agencies: Revise "San Benito County Council of Governments" to "Council of San Benito County Governments" in 1st sentence.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
54	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix B	Appendix B: Page B-6: Suggest spelling out SAFE acronym.	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022
55	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix B	Page B-7: Revise "State Highways Operation and Protection Program" to "State Highway Operation and Protection Program" Also under "Local Revenues," revise "SBtCOG" to "SBCOG."	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
56	Caltrans District 5	Monroy-Ochoa	Orchid	Appendix B	Page B-8: Local Transportation Sales Tax, end of second bullet: revise “and a sales tax in San Benito County beginning in 2020” to “and Measure G (San Benito County).”	This will be updated in the Final 2045 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2022

Draft 2045 MTP/SCS Public Comments and Draft Responses Received After the Close of the Public Comment Period

57	Public	Downing	Rebecca		Both the executive summary and strategies section state that "This Plan is required to analyze where people are going and how they want to get there in order to build a transportation network that addresses the mobility and accessibility needs of the region." It continues to note associated strategies including focusing on growth in transit corridors and offering more travel choices and increased efficiencies within the current transportation system. These strategies address where people are going but not how THEY want to get there. Please include a plan to conduct more comprehensive outreach to determine both where and how residents wish to travel. Online surveys, emails and public meetings do not capture the views of those least likely to participate this way. Most residents are too busy driving to work to take the time to respond. Asking all residents where they want to go, how they want to get there, AND, to inform the 2045 work, what would get them out of their vehicle, is required to create equitable, sustainable choices for us. It must be comprehensive if you are to develop regional projects people will use. If this work has been done throughout our three counties, it should be included in the plan. If not, I ask you to for its inclusion and reporting of this work in the Moving Forward Monterey Bay 2045 plan so it reflects the desires of those who will be affected by its projects.	<p>The AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) was developed to replicate travel behavior and forecast travel behavior in the future. This is done based upon state and national household travel surveys, Census data, employment and traffic data. The RTDM utilizes innovative techniques to capture travel behavior at a more individual-based level and incorporates disaggregate level data into some of the modeling stages. Transportation projects are evaluated based on how well they meet existing and project travel demand, i.e. where people live and where they want to go (work/school/shop, etc.). Mobility and accessibility are key goals when evaluating each transportation project/program/services.</p> <p>In addition, AMBAG conducted virtual workshops in spring 2021 asking participants to provide direct feedback on their priority transportation options and what they would use. A short online survey to provide feedback on potential new strategies to gather more input on housing, economic and transportation options was also available for those who were unable attend a workshop.</p>	Email	2/6/2022
----	--------	---------	---------	--	--	--	-------	----------