

# Appendix AA: Public Comments for Draft CMCP

---

To: San Diego Association of Governments and Caltrans District 11  
From: North County Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP) Project Team  
Date: June 2023  
Subject: North County Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP) – Public Comments  
Draft CMCP

---

## Overview

The North County CMCP project team reviewed all comments received during the 45-day public review period. The comments generally consisted of factual errors and requests of new transportation concepts, projects or programs.

The final report, attachments and appendices incorporated factual errors identified during the public review period. The project team reviewed the new transportation concepts, projects or programs to determine consistency with the following principles:

1. Reduction in VMT through system-based planning or implementation of transportation infrastructure and services of regional significance.
2. Alignment with local, regional and state goals, policies, and initiatives.
3. Supports well-functioning transportation and mobility functions across jurisdictions, communities, users, and markets.

The project team also reviewed new transportation concepts, projects or programs to determine consistency with CMCP. The project team determined new transportation concepts, projects or programs as inconsistent with the CMCP based on the following guidelines:

1. Did not mitigate VMT from transportation projects or be included as part of a system-based solution to multi-modal options of regional significance.
2. Did not advance sustainable rural transportation solutions.
3. Did not support state (e.g., SB743, California Transportation Plan 2050) or regional (e.g., Regional Plan) priorities and initiatives.

When appropriate, transportation projects and concepts were incorporated into the three Strategic Anchors (i.e., Attachment 1 - Mobility Boulevards, Attachment 2 - Mobility Hubs, and Attachment 3 - Regional Spines). The requested projects have not been evaluated for feasibility or costed; they are noted for future planning efforts (e.g., 2025 Regional Plan). As the CMCP is a strategic blueprint for North County's transportation system and a requirement for SB1 funding from the State of California, it is not an obligation but an effective planning exercise to inform future planning efforts, including SANDAG's 2025 Regional Plan. Project-specific planning, alternatives, environmental clearance, and

engineering are to be evaluated, addressed, and documented through subsequent project-specific efforts.

## Summary of Comments

**Table 1** shows the themes of the public comments and incorporation into the CMCP document that will help guide future transportation planning, design, implementation, and operations.

Table 1. Theme of Comments Incorporated into the CMCP

Comment Theme	Incorporation into CMCP
Improvements to reduce travel delay and meet travel demand along the SR 76 corridor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement TSMO improvements to SR 76 for both regional travel and local community mobility.</li> <li>• Assess major infrastructure changes to SR 76 as part of future consideration and evaluation.</li> </ul>
Greater travel demand in North County and State Highway System is resulting in more travel along major arterials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue acknowledgment of North County corridors (e.g., State Route 78) as important and critical connections to large employment centers and activity centers in North County.</li> <li>• Advance arterial roadways (i.e., Mobility Boulevards) as core corridors for moving people and goods within North County.</li> </ul>
Consider “Vision Zero” statement for the region to improve safety for all users, including people walking and biking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand “Vision Zero” efforts to improve walking and bike safety while managing travel demand — including expansion of roundabout programs, scramble crosswalks, protected bicycle facilities, and other safety improvement strategies.</li> </ul>
Emphases of completion of Inland Rail Trail in North County.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance completion of Inland Rail Trail, between the Cities of Vista and Oceanside. Facility is a high priority and is a part of a long-standing commitment to regional active transportation network in North County communities.</li> </ul>
The COVID-19 pandemic has affected how transit service is utilized in North County CMCP. Transit should change to meet customer behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance NCTD’s focus on core network while implementing flexible service formats (e.g., Flex Services, Microtransit) to meet current and future evolving trip patterns.</li> </ul>
Land use agencies are currently evaluating growth opportunities along future high-frequent corridors (e.g., SPRINTER) near downtown areas and within the mobility hubs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate and leverage proposed transit-oriented development (TOD) by NCTD and cities in North County.</li> </ul>
Coast Highway and Carlsbad Boulevard is a primary north-south corridor west of Interstate 5 and should be a candidate for multi-modal, mobility investments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advance Mobility Hub improvements (e.g., active transportation facilities, roundabouts) and services along Coast Highway (Oceanside Mobility Hub) and Carlsbad Boulevard (Carlsbad Village Mobility Hub)—to provide higher quality investments for local mobility to destinations along the coastline.</li> </ul>
Complete implementation of Coastal Rail Trail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support implementation of Coastal Rail Trail as a regional and state priority for active transportation improvements through the I-5 North Coast Corridor Public Works Plan.</li> </ul>

# Future Consideration and Evaluation

Table 2 displays projects and programs received during the public review period that should be considered for future planning efforts (e.g., Regional Plan, local corridor plans).

Table 2. Comments for Future Consideration and Evaluation

Projects and Programs for Future Consideration and Evaluation
Additional budget in “Reconnecting Communities” strategy layer for connection of local access, between communities and across state highway interchanges—including Vista Way across I-5/SR 78 interchange.
Alignment and routing of BRT/Commuter Express services along Regional Spines and Mobility Boulevards.
Expansion of Reconnecting Communities strategy to include construction of new or reconstruction of existing bridges to meet multimodal needs across NCTD rail corridors (i.e., COASTER, SPRINTER).
Expansion of multi-purpose trails and pathways to recreational destinations.

## TITLE VI STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) assure that no person shall, on the basis of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance, as required by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Federal Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations), and Federal Executive Order 13166 (Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency). Caltrans and SANDAG will make every effort to ensure nondiscrimination in all of their programs and activities, whether they are federally funded or not, and to ensure that services and benefits are fairly distributed to all people, regardless of race, color, or national origin. In addition, Caltrans and SANDAG will facilitate meaningful participation in the transportation planning and decision-making process in a nondiscriminatory manner, including providing meaningful access for persons with limited English proficiency (LEP). For more information on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 at Caltrans please visit: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/civil-rights/title-vi>.

## Public Comments on Draft CMCP

The following pages show the comments received during the public review period.

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
160	City of Carlsbad	General Comments: These corridor studies stem from Senate Bill 1 and will assist SANDAG and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to nominate projects, with preference to be given to projects that demonstrate collaboration between the regional agencies and Caltrans. The City has provided comments to SANDAG during the development of the current Regional Plan which were shared with the North County CMCP Technical Working Group and are still relevant for suggested revisions to the proposed plans programs and projects of this plan. Please refer to our previous comments to SANDAG regarding the Regional Plan included in a City Council Memorandum dated Oct 21, 2021 Re: SANDAG 2021 Regional Transportation Plan Draft EIR Comment Letter- referenced at following web address - <a href="https://records.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=5493674&amp;dbid=0&amp;repo=CityofCarlsbad">https://records.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=5493674&amp;dbid=0&amp;repo=CityofCarlsbad</a> . Below are specific comments regarding the draft plan:
161	City of Carlsbad	Mobility Hubs: Recommend changing the On-demand shuttle connecting transit center to employment centers to a "On-demand flexible fleet" to facilitate the option of rideshare programs
162	City of Carlsbad	Mobility Boulevards: a) Request inclusion of the Coast Highway / Carlsbad Boulevard as a Mobility Boulevard. Throughout the Technical Working Group meetings, the City of Carlsbad and Oceanside requested that Coast Highway and Carlsbad Boulevard be included as a "Mobility Boulevard" in the North County CMCP. This primary north-south corridor is the most highly utilized corridor in North County from a multimodal users perspective and most consistent with the definition of a Mobility Boulevard as an alternative path to the state highway system (I-5), has a high potential for higher quality investments for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit, and connects the subregions primary activity centers in Oceanside, Carlsbad and neighboring cities to the south.
163	City of Carlsbad	Mobility Boulevards: b) College Boulevard: The recommended active transportation improvements include a Class-IV protected bikeway to Palomar Airport Road. The City of Carlsbad recommends that this be revised to a Class-I facility within the city limits. The city is developing a plan for the extension of College Blvd. between Bobcat Lane and El Camino Real which includes a plan to provide both Class-II bike lanes and a separate Class-I multi-use path along this new alignment.
164	City of Carlsbad	Mobility Boulevards: c) Palomar Airport Road/San Marcos Boulevard: Recommend a Class-I multi-use path be provided along El Camino Real within the City of Carlsbad instead of the proposed Class-IV protected bikeway due to the high vehicle speeds, wide roadways, and potentially limited visibility of bicyclists at the primary intersections. It is also recommended to provide flexible fleets/OnDemand transit along this corridor as a primary connection from the Poinsettia Coaster Station to the Business Parks along Palomar Airport Road and eventually Cal State San Marcos. Recommend upgrading all intersections through interchange to smart intersections with recommended revisions as explained below. Requesting a proposed multimodal bridge over NCTD rail road right of way and tracks to facilitate adequate space for vehicle lanes, a Class I pathway, sidewalks, and class IV or buffered class II for the highspeed bicyclist including electric bicycles.
165	City of Carlsbad	Mobility Boulevards: d) El Camino Real: Recommend a Class-I multi-use path be provided along El Camino Real within the City of Carlsbad instead of the proposed Class-IV protected bikeway due to the high vehicle speeds, wide roadways, and potentially limited visibility of bicyclists at the primary intersections.
166	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines: a) In the area serviced by North County Transit District (NCTD), fixed route transit ridership declined from 2015 to 2021 and has not returned to the pre-pandemic ridership levels as shown in the below graph included in NCTD's Annual Comprehensive Financial Report For the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2022 and 2021.
167	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines: b) Interstate 5 (I5) and State Route 78 (SR78) – Recommend prioritizing the NCC improvements and managed lanes on both I5 and SR 78. The new managed lanes would facilitate next gen Rapid (BRT) and Flexible Fleet public transit programs which support Senate Bill 1 Chapter 8.5 Congested Corridors, section 2391. The NCC EIR includes an additional Managed Lane to provide 8 free lanes and 4 managed lanes.
168	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines: To implement the flexible fleet programs with minimum delays on the I5 and SR 78 routes, we recommend revising the projects scopes included in this plan and subsequently the Regional Plan to include 8 free lanes and 4 managed lanes on I5, and adding the previously scheduled proposed lanes on SR78 included in the current Transnet Extension Ordinance.
169	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines: We recommend moving up the projects priorities to be completed by 2035 which could support the Next Gen Rapid projects and flexible fleet public rideshare transit programs. Recommended priority projects for this corridor include: 1. Completing the I5 and SR 78 multimodal interchange 2. Completing the Village Trench Project 3. Completing additional managed lanes on I5 and SR78 in the Transnet Extension Ordinance. 4. To address the community barrier created by I5 and the current auto-centric on and offramp intersections designed in the 1960s, include in the plan all new multimodal interchanges throughout I5 NCC and North County CMCP with the similar approach used in the Birmingham Drive interchange in the NCC.
170	City of Carlsbad	4. To address the community barrier created by I5 and the current auto-centric on and offramp intersections designed in the 1960s, include in the plan all new multimodal interchanges throughout I5 NCC and North County CMCP with the similar approach used in the Birmingham Drive interchange in the NCC.
171	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines Cont.: a) A overview of the current trends in our region and many of the recommendations included in this letter are explained in our short presentation to SANDAG Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) on May 11, 2022 at the following web address - <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Cj_qAtqg2M&amp;t=1332s">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Cj_qAtqg2M&amp;t=1332s</a> . Please include the related recommendations in the presentation as recommendations in this letter.
172	City of Carlsbad	Regional Spines Cont.: b) Recommend using program language consistent with SANDAG including the following flexible fleet programs. • Rideshare: Drivers and passengers headed in a similar direction can share the ride in a vehicle. This includes carpool, vanpool, and pooled ride hailing services such as uberPOOL and Lyft Shared. • Microtransit: Multi-passenger shuttles can carry up to 15 passengers and provide rides within a defined service area. This technology-enabled transit service allows users to reserve a ride ahead of time or on-demand. Smaller, all-electric shuttles, also known as neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV), are a form of microtransit that provides a sustainable and convenient solution for short trips around communities. • Ridehailing: On-demand ridehailing services allow someone to request a ride in real time. Services link the passenger with available drivers based on their trip length, number of passengers, origin, and destination. This includes services such as Uber, Lyft, and taxis.
173	City of Carlsbad	Projects and Programs: a) Delete all reference to flexible lanes on Palomar Airport Road and other arterials in Carlsbad
174	City of Carlsbad	Projects and Programs: b) Revise Carlsbad Mobility Hubs• NEV Areawide Shuttles to • "Rideshare/Ridesh ailing and Microtransit"
175	City of Carlsbad	Projects and Programs: c) Recommend all Rapid (BRTs) be revised to routes on I5 and SR 78 as explained in the first comment under Regional Spines
176	City of Carlsbad	Projects and Programs: d) For all identified - • Upgrade signalized intersections to smart intersections, recommend revise to: Upgrade signalized intersections to smart intersections including Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE). ( ICE guidelines shall conform with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), Section 4C.01b and 01c regarding intersection control. An engineering study shall include consideration of a roundabout (yield control). If a roundabout is determined to provide a viable and practical solution, it shall be studied in lieu of, or in addition to a traffic control signal. Refer to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) website for more information on the Traffic Operations Policy Directive 13-02, Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE), and other resources for the evaluation of intersection traffic control strategies: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/liaisons/ice.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/liaisons/ice.html</a>
177	City of Carlsbad	Projects and Programs: e) Palomar Airport Road/San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Wide Mobility Boulevard Improvements & Enhancements

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
178	City of Carlsbad	Recommend --a)Upgrading all intersections through interchange to smart intersections with recommended ICE analysis and proposed intersection improvements. Recommend increasing cost estimate \$10 million or per an engineer's estimate of probably cost and revise cost accordingly.
179	City of Carlsbad	Recommend b)Requesting a proposed multimodal bridge over NCTD rail road right of way and tracks to facilitate adequate space for vehicle lanes, a Class I pathway, sidewalks, and class IV or buffered class II for the highspeed bicyclist including electric bicycles. Recommend increasing budget estimate \$30 million or complete engineer's estimate of probably cost and revise cost accordingly.
180	City of Carlsbad	Other General Comments: a) Transit Demand Analysis: The expansion of transit throughout the subregion is a key element of the North County CMCP however the analysis provided in Appendix C does not provide any information to support the significant expansion of traditional fixed route transit. To understand how transit can be utilized to improve the ways people travel throughout North County a full demand analysis and supporting market research data should be provided in the document. Appendix R, Travel Patterns, should be similarly structured to understand how the recommended transit services can address the current travel patterns in the subregion. b) Barriers for Active Transportation: Freeways interchanges are among the most significant barriers for active transportation users in the subregion due to the high-speed design features and number of conflict points. In the City of Carlsbad, the I-5 freeway divides the city and disconnects active transportation users between the highly attractive coastal destinations in the west and the residential and business park areas in the eastern portions of the city. The "Gaps and Barriers" section of the CMCP fails to highlight these critical gaps at freeway interchanges. Improvements at the freeway interchanges are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans so the draft CMCP should provide guidance on how these freeway barriers will be overcome with specific project recommendations for active transportation improvements at all freeway interchanges in the city. c) The final North County CMCP should prioritize all remaining and un-finished projects that were identified during the North Corridor Public Works Plan (NC PWP) and seek ways to streamline implementation. d) The draft North County CMCP inventories and assesses existing and future conditions in each city. However, despite previously providing information to SANDAG staff, the assumptions used for "existing" and "planned" land use and transportation in the City of Carlsbad are not consistent with our adopted land use and transportation plans or policies (e.g., forecasted housing and roadway capacities). Predicting the effect of transportation plans or projects on land uses and land use planning is critical to developing context sensitive solutions for transportation projects. Therefore, utilization of the most recent planning assumptions is not only necessary but is required as specifically stated therein Government Code Section 65080. Furthermore, the land use assumptions for "uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region" (as required by Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(B)(i)) should also be the same, as that provided to the State Air Resources Board (as required per Government Code Sections 65080 (b)(2)(H and J) in estimating and analyzing GHG from the RTP and the effect on growth and whether the effects of that growth would be significant in the context of the region's plans, natural setting, and growth patterns.
181	City of Carlsbad	Other General Comments continued: e) The draft North County CMCP identifies new policies, programs, and projects that were not included in the RTP or the NC PWP. The North County CMCP seems to create a funding requirement for some future activity that is reasonably foreseeable and/or an irrecoverable commitment to specific program or construction project. As of this writing, it is unclear what procedures related to CEQA apply to the adoption of the North County CMCP. If the scope of the North County CMCP is a "project" as defined by CEQA (and NEPA), then the City of Carlsbad will need to be consulted as a Responsible Agency per CEQA Guidelines Section 15096. As such, the Lead Agency (i.e., SANDAG) should consider whether the project is covered by a previous environmental review. To determine whether a project can tier from a certified program EIR, the Lead Agency should consider whether the later project (Public Resources Code Section 21068.5) is consistent with the program for which the original EIR was prepared and certified; is consistent with applicable land use plans and zoning in which the later project would be located; and would not trigger the need for a subsequent or supplemental EIR. In this instant, there would need to be an evaluation of impacts to existing Land Use Plans, and the lack of a reasonable range of alternatives that show what would occur if funding or land use assumptions for the new projects have not been prepared. f) The draft North County CMCP only lists potential projects; it does not show potential alignments, right of way needed or coordination with specific agencies. More information needs to be provided on project implementation phasing (both short-range and long-range improvements), unfunded projects and various funding mechanisms that can bridge the unfunded gaps. g) Carlsbad respectfully requests that SANDAG support the city's service bureau requests as efficiently as possible. Further delays in completion of the regional travel demand model could adversely impact our rezone schedule and jeopardize our ability to timely meet our Housing Element program requirements, thereby potentially placing our HCD housing element certification at risk. Additionally, the city requests that future decisions to update the 2021 Regional Transportation Plan respect the fact that Carlsbad and other local jurisdictions have been waiting on the availability of the regional model for local projects for some time and that further delays could result in additional liability, time, and costs for member agencies.
216	City of Escondido	Page 103 1.We agree with the concept of proposed bike facilities along Center City Parkway and along Mission, and we recognize that this document is necessarily a high-level planning document and can't possibly get into the constraints that could occur during the engineering phases of projects. That said, we offer caution that a full Class 1 or Class IV facility along Mission may be challenging, particularly at the east end of Mission. In this location, for example, given the speed of the roadway and the lower traffic volumes, and the context of the neighborhood, a Class II facility may be more appropriate. We request that notes be added to the plan to state that the plan is conceptual and further engineering study may support alternative facilities or routes. 2.Please adjust the map so that the east end of Escondido is not cut off.
217	City of Escondido	Page 105 1.Extension (of Sprinter from) Escondido (Transit Center) to southern Escondido (Phase D) should state to North County Mall - distance should be 3 miles
218	City of Escondido	Page 106 1.Map should show the existing Route 350 (the only high-frequency route in City)
219	City of Escondido	Attachment 5 - Early action items for Escondido 1.From our meetings with the team, we understood that the 15/78 Interchange project (NC20), as well as the Valley Parkway Mobility Blvd project (NC13), would be included on the Early Action Items list. Unless we have misread the attachment, that does not appear to be the case. Throughout development of the CMCP, the I-15/SR78 project has been identified as a priority by all committee members along the SR-78 corridor and should be identified in the Early Action List. In addition, we believe that transit demand and the need for improvements as demonstrated by the planned route 471 and the East Valley Specific Plan, that is sure to result in additional density along this corridor, necessitate early action on the Valley Parkway Mobility Blvd that connects Valley Center and surrounding tribal lands with transportation options. In addition, Valley Parkway is a key route for first and last mile connections to transit that are necessary to serve social equity communities of this area. Please modify pages 1 and 2 to include these projects in the Early action bundles, as well as pages 6 and 7. We have attached marked-up pages for your convenience.
102	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	SR-76: a) Appendix N, Figure 1: Please highlight SR-76
103	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	SR-76: b) Attachment 4: In addition to grade separation at SR-76/Douglas and SR-76/College, please provide grade separation at SR-76/Foussat and SR-76/Rancho Del Oro as well
104	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	SR-76:c) Regional Spine: Please check the box for Segment 1 (El Camino Real to Melrose Drive) for High-Frequency Transit
105	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	SR-78: Please include the construction of SR-78 and Rancho Del Oro interchange. This interchange needs to be added to the Strategic Anchor: Region Spine section of Attachment 3. This interchange is shown on the City's circulation Element and its construction will help alleviate the congestion on College Boulevard
106	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	I-5: a) please have the I-5 include full access to California Street

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
107	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	I-5: b) SR-78 and I-5 Interchange improvements need to be highlighted as a top priority project for North County
108	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Sprinter: a) Attachment 3, Proposed Strategies: Of the two suggested railroad track grade separations that are being proposed, City of Oceanside prefers grade separations at College Boulevard and Crouch Street
109	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Mission Avenue: a) Please consider providing NCTD FLEX-On-Demand service to hillside neighborhoods (e.g., Marlado Heights neighborhood north of SR-76 between Benet Road and Foussat Road, and the neighborhoods along Rancho Del Oro).
110	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Oceanside Boulevard: a) Attachment 4, Plan ID NC03: Under "Descriptions," please include "Provide connectivity to NCTD facilities."
111	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Oceanside Boulevard:b) Please place more emphasis on completing the Inland Rail Trail through Oceanside,
112	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Oceanside Boulevard: c) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Fire Mountain neighborhood (bounded by Oceanside Boulevard, 1-5 and El Camino Real) and the Loma Alta neighborhood (bounded by Oceanside Boulevard, Canyon Drive and El Camino Real)
113	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Oceanside Boulevard: d) Please add to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) A micro transit or NEV between the Sprinter Stations and El Corazon Park to Segment 2, El Camino Real to College Boulevard. El Corazon encompasses one of the largest soccer complexes in San Diego County. It has a large aquatics center, a senior center and two mixed-use residential developments with hundreds of units. In addition, construction of the Frontwave Arena, an 8,000-seat sports and entertainment center, is currently under construction with completion anticipated in early 2024.
117	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Coastal Rail Trail: a) Please add the Coastal Rail Trail to the Mobility Boulevard.
118	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Coastal Rail Trail: b) Please include Loma Alta Bridge to the priority Coastal Rail Trail improvements
119	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	El Camino Real: a) Please prioritize smart intersection improvements at El Camino Real/Vista Way and El Camino Real/Mission Avenue
120	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	El Camino Real: b) Please extend the Next Gen 477 rapid bus service through Segment 1 of El Camino Real
121	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	El Camino Real: c) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Fire Mountain neighborhood (bounded by El Camino Real, Vista Way and Oceanside Boulevard), the Henie Hills neighborhood (bounded by El Camino Real, Vista Way and Oceanside Boulevard) and the Oceana neighborhood (bounded by El Camino Real, SR-76 and Mesa Drive.
122	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	El Camino Real:d) Please add to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) An enhanced bicycle facilities and sidewalk to Segment 1 (Peyri Road to Oceanside Boulevard).
123	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Rancho Del Oro: a) Please include Rancho Del Oro as a Mobility Boulevard and acknowledge the need for the SR-78/RDO interchange.
124	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	College Boulevard: a) Please provide a grade separation at College Boulevard and the Sprinter line
125	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	College Boulevard: b) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Mira Costa neighborhood (bounded by College Boulevard, Vista Way and Cameo Drive).
126	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	College Boulevard: c) Please add to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) In Segment 1: North River Road to Mesa Drive ii) A grade separation at College Boulevard and SR76
127	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Melrose Drive: a) Please provide grade separated crossings for both the Sprinter and the Inland Rail Trail.
128	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Melrose Drive: b) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Peacock neighborhood located southwest of Melrose Drive and Oceanside Boulevard.
129	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Melrose Drive: c) Strategic Anchor, Mobility Element, Melrose Drive: In Segment 1, there is mention of ten signals, but when counted, there are only nine. Is the Rail Road crossing being counted as a signal too? Please clarify.
130	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Melrose Drive: d) Please check Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) Segment 1, on the key map, what is labeled as "River Rd to Olive Ave" actually shows "North Santa Fe Avenue to Olive Avenue."
131	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	North Santa Fe Avenue: a) Please add North Santa Fe Avenue to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) Please check the Segment 1 box for "Upgrade and development to Inland Rail Trail and Trailheads." North Santa Fe Avenue is a major corridor leading to the Inland Rail Trail/San Luis Rey River Trail. ii) Please add sidewalk improvements on the east side of North Santa Fe between SR-76 and Champlain Street. This will provide access to Guajome Regional Park.



**Draft North County CMCP Comments**

#	Agency	Comment
132	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Vista Way: a) Vista Way west from 1-5 to Broadway Street is not included with the Mobility Boulevard-Vista Way study. We believe it should be included, specifically, in the context of reconstruction of the I-5/SR78Nista Way interchange. The nearest connection, from west of 1-5 to east of 1-5, that does not go through residential neighborhoods, is Oceanside Boulevard. Currently, making the connection between the two segments of Vista Way, drivers must get on SR-78 and exit at Jefferson Street. Also, there are no pedestrian or bike accesses at this crossing, which need to be constructed as part of the interchange improvements.
133	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: a) Please include Rancho Del Oro Road/SR-78 interchange in the North County CMCP.
134	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: b) Appendix N: The volumes are based on 2016 counts and are seven years old. Is there a plan to collect more recent traffic volume counts?
135	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: c) There are many references to "River Road." This specific road is not found anywhere. Should the referenced name be "North River Road?" Please make the road name correction throughout the draft report. Example locations where this is mentioned are: i) Strategic Anchor, Regional Spine, State Route 76 ii) Strategic Anchor, Mobility Boulevard, Melrose Drive
136	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: d) Please consider using another color for check marks in the boxes other than yellow. Yellow is hard to see when printed.
137	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: e) Strategic Anchor, Mobility Hubs, Bikeways: It is noted, "upgrade rail trail facilities to allow shared use with NEVs." Where has this been done and is this expected to be implemented? Shouldn't bike/walking paths be separated from vehicles?
138	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: f) Early Action, Inland to Coast: Example "NC45," what is "SPRINTER Electrification?"
139	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: g) Early Action, Inland to Coast: Along with "grade separation," please include signal interconnect communication between the closest traffic signal and the railroad crossing.
140	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	General Comments: h) Traffic calming devices were mentioned as part of the Mobility Boulevard study. What type of traffic calming devices are proposed for collector roads?
182	City of San Marcos	General: There are quite a few attachments and appendices. Ensure all references are hyperlinked in the final on line text for ease of use.
183	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 13: Local Initiatives: The City of San Marcos ATP currently underway should be listed together with the current mobility efforts the jurisdictions are bringing forward.
184	City of San Marcos	CMCP Page 72: Figure 3-16: Confluence of Barriers in San Marcos: A University District Specific Plan Amendment was last adopted in 2022 and resulted in a different street alignment for the UDSP area west of Twin Oaks Valley Road. In addition, the amendment closed to vehicular access segments of Mid City Lane on the east side of Twin Oaks Valley Road. Further, the footprint of the UDSP grew as additional property on the east side was incorporated. Please update the overlay in the image to match the current street alignment in the UDSP.
185	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 99: Figure 5-2: Strategy Layers: Consider including some form of this explanatory graphic directly into each attachment that uses these symbols.
186	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 101: Regional "smart" Highway Capacity Management: Graphic appears to show a direct access lane at San Marcos Blvd. Text in the attachments refers to a direct access lane at Twin Oaks Valley Road. Please clarify. See also comment below about direct access ramp locations.
187	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 103: Active Transportation Network: Graphic shows Class IV bike facilities on San Marcos Blvd. Note that Class IV facilities are likely incompatible with existing right-of-way, development, and the proposed local access vehicular lane on portions of San Marcos Boulevard (multi-way).
188	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 104: Reconnecting Communities: Scale of graphic is illegible for purposes of determining which locations are targeted by this strategy. Suggest creating multiple graphics at a scale where the areas targeted by this strategy can be discerned.
189	City of San Marcos	CMCP page 105: Sprinter: Scale of graphic is illegible for purposes of determining which locations are targeted by this strategy. Suggest creating multiple graphics at a scale where the areas targeted by this strategy can be discerned. Suggest also referen cing detailed sheets in the attachments that may supplement this graphic to make it clear where the improvements might be located.
190	City of San Marcos	Attachment 3: Regional Spine Sheets: Sprinter Improvements Track Map: Adjustcolor-codingof Phase A, B, C, D to match the segment colors on the preceding page, "Regional Spine Context Map". Phase A is shown as influencing the Oceanside mobility hub- please confirm accuracy.
191	City of San Marcos	Attachment 4 NC16: Mobility Hub: San Marcos Suite of Improvements: Intra-City shuttle connecting CSUSM with SPRINTER and other key locations: Expanded connectivity should be considered to align with the San Marcos General Plan and to optimize the utility of the shuttle. The shuttle system could connect the city's core activity centers, retail, and recreational destinations including Palomar Community College, the San Marcos Creek District, the University District, California State University San Marcos, and the Civic Center. Refer to General Plan Figure 3-3.
192	City of San Marcos	Attachment 4 NC19: Mobility hub: Palomar Airport Road/Carlsbad Business Park Suite of Improvements: Carlsbad Business Park: On-Demand Shuttle connecting Poinsettia Station to Palomar Airport Rd: Consider extending on-demand shuttle service to the east along San Marcos Blvd. to Las Posas in order to serve the new housing projects proposed on both sides of San Marcos Blvd. between Mc Mahr and Via Vera Cruz as well as Breeze routes 347 and 445.
193	City of San Marcos	Attachment 4 NC25: SR 78 Operational Improvements and Managed Lanes: Direct Access ramps: Direct access ramps would introduce additional traffic conflicts on San Marcos Blvd. and Twin Oaks Valley Road, further divide communities, and significantly impact productive commercial properties. Additional analysis should be done along the corridor to determine appropriate locations and impacts.
194	City of San Marcos	Attachment 4 NC27: North County Roundabout Programs: In Mobility hub areas; 20 intersection conversions across the study area: Please advise where additional information about the 20 intersections identified for study and potential conversion to roundabouts are listed
195	City of San Marcos	Attachment 4 NC44: Sprinter Grade Separations: Grade Separations at: El Camino Real, Melrose Drive, Vista Village Drive/Main Street, North Drive, Civic Center, Auto Parkway: Locations listed are those planned in the 2021 Regional Plan. Add the Proposed CMCP Grade Separations: York Drive, Buena Creek Road, and Pacific Street.
196	City of San Marcos	Attachment 5: Early Action Bundles: Early Action: Mobility Gateway: Consider incorporating pedestrian and bicycle oriented improvements to the San Marcos Blvd. underpass at SR-78 as a part of the early action bundle. Doing so will connect the mobility hub across the SR-78, reconnecting the community and enhancing travel through San Marcos Blvd.
197	City of San Marcos	Appendix F: Land Use Patterns: The document considers the acreage within a half mile radius of Sprinter and transit stops. Consider offering a calculation of the acreage within a half mile specifically of a high-quality transit stop today, and how that number will change with the implementation of increased service proposed by the CMCP (thereby making an increased number of transit stops meet the "high-quality" standard).
198	City of San Marcos	Appendix M: Safety Analysis: The report details collision data for pedestrians and bicyclists and aims for improvements and programs to reduce conflicts through traffic calming, restricting right turns on red signal, and other measures. Consider a bold "Vision Zero" statement for the region to significantly improve walking and biking safety. Consider scramble crosswalks at appropriate locations where pedestrian traffic is significant and should be prioritized.
203	County of San Diego	CMCP impacts that could have potentially significant adverse effects to the unincorporated county or County facilities should be evaluated using the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance. These guidelines are available online at: <a href="http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/procguid.html">http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/pds/procguid.html</a> .

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
204	County of San Diego	Local Initiatives (pg 22) a) The plan should take into consideration and reference the County's 2018 Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The ATP can be found at this link: <a href="https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/advance/activetransportationplan/FinalATPOctober2018.pdf">https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/advance/activetransportationplan/FinalATPOctober2018.pdf</a> . b) Certain appendices to the County's ATP may be helpful to reference in prioritizing projects to implement the NCCMCP: Appendix A in the link below contains Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) maps for bicycle facilities, based on the pre-2018 (ATP adoption) Mobility Element Network and based on the Mobility Element Network as updated with the ATP. Maps covering areas within the NCCMCP geographic scope include Bonsall (maps on pages 5 and 6 of the PDF page counter), Fallbrook (maps on pages 15 and 18 of the PDF page counter), North County Metro (maps on pages 27-28 of the PDF page counter), and San Dieguito (maps on pages 41-42 of the PDF page counter). Appendix A_wDraftFinalCover.pdf (sandiegocounty.gov). Appendix B: ATP Toolbox, providing guidance for planning and design of active transportation improvements. The guidance is based on types of improvements in relation to Mobility Element Network classifications and is not set up with individualized guidance by community/subregional plan area. <a href="#">AppendixB.pdf (sandiegocounty.gov)</a>
205	County of San Diego	Section 5: Mobility Assessment: a) active transportation: The map showing planned Class I and Class IV bicycle facilities is not the most current. The current County General Plan Mobility Element Network can be found at the link below. <a href="https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/GP/MobilityNetworkAppendix_2022.pdf">https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/docs/GP/MobilityNetworkAppendix_2022.pdf</a> . Maps and tables covering areas within the NCCMCP geographic scope include the Bonsall Mobility Element Network (Figure M-A-2 on page 7 of the PDF page counter and corresponding table on pages M-A-7 through M-A-9 [pages 8-10 in the PDF page counter]), the Fallbrook Mobility Element Network (Figure M-A-7 on page 23 of the PDF page counter and corresponding table on pages M-A-23 through M-A-26 [pages 24-27 in the PDF page counter]), the North County Metro Mobility Element Network (Figure M-A-12 on page 43 of the PDF page counter and corresponding table on pages M-A-43 through M-A-47 [pages 44-48 in the PDF page counter]), and the San Dieguito Mobility Element Network (Figure M-A-19 on page 65 of the PDF page counter and corresponding table on pages M-A-65 through M-A-67 [pages 66-68 in the PDF page counter]). The CMCP should include bike facilities planned in the County's Mobility Element Network (i.e. Class IV Bike Facilities).
206	County of San Diego	Section 5: Mobility Assessment: b) Sprinter: The County is currently analyzing potential for Transit Oriented Development near the Buena Creek Sprinter Station in the North County Metro Planning Area. This is the only rail station in the unincorporated area, this is a significant opportunity of funding for rail projects in the County. The County Planning and Development Services Department (PDS) will be beginning a project in Spring 2023 known as the "Community-Based Transportation Program", which will conduct outreach to understand the mobility needs of the stakeholders in the area near the Sprinter Station. As this project is partly funded through a SANDAG Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) Cycle 5 grant, the County will need to collaborate with SANDAG to meet the transportation goals for the Station, the area, and the region.
207	County of San Diego	Section 5: Mobility Assessment: c) High Frequency core, rapid, & commuter services: The County supports the recommendation to provide flex/micro transit service along Twin Oaks Valley Road with flex service zone between Buena Creek Road and Wild Canyon Drive. Consideration should be given to provide flex/micro transit service within the Buena Creek Road/Deer Springs Road corridor, which would improve east-west transportation options between the County's General Plan Villages of North County Metro North (in the vicinity of the Buena Creek Road/South Santa Fe Avenue intersection) and Hidden Meadows (in the vicinity of the Mountain Meadow Road and Meadow Glen Way intersection, just east of the North County CMCP study area). The County's current Mobility Element Network, this corridor is planned for widening/adding lanes to handle additional capacity anticipated with General Plan buildout. The Mobility Element Network classifications (planned buildout) for the corridor are a combination of 4.1B Major Road and 6.2 Prime Arterial
208	County of San Diego	Parks and Recreation: Use the County Trails Master Plan as a planning and reference document, Consider a multi-purpose trails and pathways for pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians in some areas, Coordinate with County DPR and DPR community stakeholders to incorporate safe multi-use crossings associated with County trail and/or park access such as crossings, bridges or overpasses for recreational use for areas nearby existing or potential future trail connections/trailheads, Coordinate with County DPR and DPR community stakeholders to ensure wildlife connectivity is maintained from adjacent lands to preserved County lands, including wildlife-only crossings, Coordinate with County DPR and DPR community stakeholders to ensure regional trail connectivity and connections to County DPR facilities, specifically for San Luis Rey River Trail Extension, Coordinate with DPR on any DPR managed facilities and associated land impacts, including stormwater runoff, transportation, road closures or delays, vegetation plans and public access: Guajome County Park, San Luis Rey River Park, Gopher Canyon County Preserve, Diamond Trail County Preserve, Escondido Creek County Preserve, Sage Hill County Preserve, Del Dios Highlands County Preserve, Val Serano County Preserve, Santa Fe Valley County Preserve, Bottle Peak County Preserve
209	County of San Diego	Public Works: Transportation/Traffic: 1) CMCP should recommend that prior to any increase in service frequency and/or double tracking improvements, the Sprinter grade separation improvements should be completed to minimize impacts to daily traffic operations along local arterials that traverse the sprinter rail line(s) corridor. The Sprinter Station at Buena Creek Road is the only transit station located within the unincorporated area and the current single Sprinter line presents challenges to traffic operations along Buena Creek Road and South Santa Fe Avenue at the crossing locations
210	County of San Diego	Public Works: Transportation/Traffic: 2) County roads such as Deer Springs Road, Buena Creek Road, and South Santa Fe Avenue should be recognized as Major Arterials and Mobility Boulevards located within the NC CMCP area because of the parallel routes and connectivity that these roads provide for SR-78 and I-15. Improving traffic flow and increasing safety for all road users along these Major Arterial routes should be a regional and NC CMCP priority. These Major Arterials located within the unincorporated area experience heavy use from regional traffic diverted from the congested SR-78 and I-15 freeway facilities especially during morning and evening peak traffic periods.
211	County of San Diego	Public Works: Transportation/Traffic: 3) The County supports improvements that increase traffic flow efficiency and safety along County maintained roadway facilities for all road users while remaining consistent with the County's Public Road Standards.
212	County of San Diego	Public Works: Transportation/Traffic: 4) The NC CMCP should recommend improvements to Park-n-Ride lots located at the SR-78 and I-15 interchanges to encourage carpooling and transit use. Sufficient parking spaces and ample security should be prioritized for planned Park-n-Ride lots enhancements.
199	North County Transit District	the CMCP more comprehensively consider BREEZE bus routes as part of the transportation network. For example, on page 69 the CMCP states: "NCTD's SPRINTER alignment encourages rail trips between adjacent communities (e.g., Vista to Oceanside, Escondido to San Marcos) and growing employment centers (e.g., CSU San Marcos, western Escondido). However, the alignment does not facilitate trips to current major employment centers (e.g., Camp Pendleton, Carlsbad/Vista Business Parks) making SPRINTER less of a regional commuter alternative for these trip destinations." This negates the service provided by various BREEZE routes such as 315 and 445.
200	North County Transit District	page 105, recommend that the following language be included: "Double-Track the SPRINTER corridor to the maximum extent possible to provide resiliency, operational flexibility and maximize reductions in headway times."
201	North County Transit District	page 144, Action Area A4 expand language to provide recommendations that specifically allow for increased BREEZE services to address SPRINTER Station accessibility and close the first mile/last mile gap
202	North County Transit District	page 145, BREEZE is noticeably missing from the language in the document. It is strongly recommended that funds be allocated to also improve BREEZE service levels and capabilities.
89	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Committee supports the CMCP's multi-modal focus and believes this is critical in order to reduce VMT and help address the climate crisis, in addition to addressing mobility challenges and gaps.
90	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Phase 1 of the Phasing Plan calls for investments in "3 - 5 protected bicycle corridors (i.e. Inland Rail Trail, Coastal Rail Trail, Escondido Creek Trail)." We recommend the Plan more emphatically call for "Completion of the Oceanside Segments of the Inland and Coastal Rail Trails.
91	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The City of Oceanside is currently pursuing two key grants with regard to the Coastal and Inland Rail Trails - one to complete final design and construction of the Coastal Rail Trail segment between Oceanside Blvd. and Morse, and the other to conduct an alignment study and Project Study Report for completion of the Inland Rail Trail segment in Oceanside. We respectfully request that Caltrans and SANDAG grant application reviewers carefully consider the importance the CMCP places on completion of these bicycle facilities in providing improved regional mobility and interconnections between communities.
92	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Plan is correct in pointing out that better connections are needed between the Inland Rail Trail and major destinations, as noted on page 103. Completion of the IRT will help address this. Additional Class II and Class IV bike lanes and signage should be recommended to further improve these connections.
93	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	We recommend the Plan incorporate Oceanside's "Smart and Sustainable Corridors Plan (SSCP)" and the Coast Highway Corridor Plan into the "Complete Corridors" section of the CMCP, and include bicycling and pedestrian improvements for Oceanside Blvd, Mission Avenue, Vista Way, and Coast Highway, as noted in Table 5-2 (Quality Investments for Mobility Boulevards) of the Plan. It should be noted that, even with completion of the IRT, Oceanside Blvd. will continue to be an important cycling route for completion of cyclists' trips, and needs to be improved for the safety and comfort/ease of use by cyclists.
94	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	Also, the Coast Highway Corridor Plan's roadway redesign features a "road diet", reducing the number of lanes from 4 to 3, between the arterials, and from 4 to 1, at the new roundabouts. This provides more room for biking and walking. The Coast Highway Corridor Plan's incentive zone will allow for more density, increased height, and less parking. Oceanside has recently secured funding for detailed design, from SR 76 to Wisconson. Funding its construction would be an excellent choice for a SANDAG Smart Growth Incentive Fund grant



Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
95	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Mobility Hub discussion (page 40) should include specifics on the importance of the transit centers that anchor each one, the mobility hub features they should include, and should state that the transit centers should be highly-visible and attractive parts of the communities they serve.
96	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Plan devotes very little to station parking, just stating that it is a constraint on SPRINTER ridership. The Plan should call for managed parking systems with properly priced parking that encourage alternative modes rather than just continuing the unfortunate practice of "free parking", which only contributes to further greenhouse gases and VMT. For the Oceanside Transit Center Redevelopment Project (currently going through City review), we submitted detailed comments to the NCTD and Toll Brothers on car parking systems that would maximize fairness to those who would prefer to drive less, thus reducing VMT. The latest CARB Scoping Plan, especially its Appendix E, makes it clear that California can't achieve its climate mandates without pricing parking.
97	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Plan makes no mention of Road User Charges, despite the fact that, with declining sales tax revenues from gasoline sales, insufficient funding will be generated to support transportation infrastructure. The Plan should discuss Road User Charges and support them to replace (not add to) taxes on gasoline. Attached is the Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee's Resolution on Road User Charges. The latest CARB Scoping Plan recommends RUC implementation by 2025, instead of the previous understanding that it would start in 2030.
98	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The rapid expansion of cycling, and in particular, e-bikes, has demonstrated the need for comprehensive bicycle safety training for all levels of users, including youth as well as adults. The Committee strongly supports use of public roads for cycling, when the roads meet current safety standards and are properly maintained. But it is also important that educational resources be made available to ensure cyclists ride safely. Classes should be taught by League (League of American Bicyclists) Certified Instructors (LCI). Data should be collected to determine if these classes are a cost-effective way to reduce VMT. If so, they should be scaled up by paying a living wage to instructors and paying students that graduate.
99	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	(1) California's current road-use fees (our gas tax, our toll roads and our bridge-use tolls) do not currently cover the full cost of operating and maintaining roads, and gas tax revenues are projected to further decrease as vehicles become more efficient and/or electric powered; (2) having the full cost of motor vehicle road use hidden from users decreases incentives to bicycling and walking, thereby increasing driving and thus adding significantly to air pollution, congestion, sprawl, and GHG emissions; (3) an assessment conducted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) found that 58 percent of our state's roads are in need of maintenance, 20 percent of our bridges need major or preventative maintenance, and 6 percent of our bridges require replacement; (4) roads and bridges are our most important cycling infrastructure; and (5) a RUC has been shown to be feasible by the CTC; and finally,
100	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	(1) our gas tax is our most significant road-use fee; (2) state-mandated increases in battery-electric vehicles will reduce gas-tax revenue; (3) a gas tax is inherently regressive because low-income drivers tend to drive older cars, less fuel-efficient cars; and (4) a gas tax does not account for time, place, driver income, vehicle weight, vehicle pollution level, or instantaneous roadway congestion
101	Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee	The Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee supports replacing the state gas tax with a road-use charge (RUC) pricing and payout system that (1) would cover all road-use costs; (2) would protect the economic interests of low- and middle-income drivers by use of a progressive price structure that also recognizes the need of rural drivers; (3) would protect privacy by requiring a search warrant to obtain location or travel information and has built in safeguards against unauthorized data use; (4) would include an instantaneous congestion pricing-algorithm; (5) would ensure that the per-mile price incentive to drive energy-efficient cars would still be sufficient to support necessary fleet electrification; (6) would ensure that cyclists and pedestrians are not charged under the system, given that they contribute no emissions or wear-and-tear on the road system, and they help alleviate congestion
1	Public	How can I comment when you do not give any details also please stop trying to force us onto buses and trains, we are in construction and need our vehicles and we don't need to pay any more money in fees or taxes our gas taxes are already the highest you people are trying to tax us to death I have lived in California my whole life 58 years and am seriously thinking of leaving this state good luck when all the tax payers leave and you have no one to collect money from . Please spend the taxes we have paid into what it was supposed to pay for route 78 !!!
2	Public	Finish the projects that were promised years ago with the tax raise. Freeway 78 improvements. Interstate 5 & 78 interchange. The new stuff has nothing on getting to work by 7am on camp Pendleton. Also no transportation after 10 pm to get home from anywhere. Need roads.
3	Public	Yes, I would like to provide input on next steps for the Project Team. 1) Why isn't light rail being expanded north south into vista, oceanside and Carlsbad. Why was the plan for the sprinter extension along Palomar airport road eliminated? I'm not sold on BRT as it not much more efficient than the regular bus system. For BRT to be successful, it has to be grade separated from regular traffic and run frequently. The issue with the sprinter is that it doesn't go to any major employment centers. We have been waiting for over 40 years for improvements at the 78/5 interchange which is very dangerous. I'm not sold on this comprehensive north county plan and if I had to vote on the or on another Transnet tax increase to fund these projects, I would vote no. You all don't listen to the public
4	Public	I'm happy to see some focus on improving the sprinter, it has so much potential! it would be nice to see some study of overhead electrification for the line. Bus Rapid Transit is sorely needed in North County, and it's good to see that included in the plan. however, there are still a lot of funds set aside for highway expansion which does not match well with the regions climate goals. we should be cautious investing in such polluting and expensive infrastructure that ultimately incurs much higher maintenance costs for the region than mass transit options. thanks!
5	Public	Highway 78 does not have enough space nor lanes for a carpool lane. This will further create a huge traffic jam on this highway; which will spill into frontage roads and even residential. Perhaps the plan to stop developing in overdeveloped areas is a place to start. We are burdened with inflation, now a toll? It does not make sense.
6	Public	We need safe bike pathways in the corridors, such as, along the 5,76 and 78 for commuting by bike.
7	Public	The parking facilities at Sprinter stations require some minimum security. I would definitely use the sprinter more often if there was security at the parking lots.
8	Public	Interesting I can't find Appendix Y...Funding ABSOLUTELY DO NOT RAISE OUR TAXES for this plan!!!! ABSOLUTELY DO NOT IMPLEMENT A MILEAGE TAX for this plan!!! We in San Diego County and the State of California are being TAXED TO DEATH!!!! You politicians have no clue how you hurt those you pledged to help.
9	Public	All I see in plans for us around north county has to do with bicycles or buses how about making the 76 and actual highway how about making sure traffic lights work together we are not a small city I'm not taking the bus or a bicycle so if you want to help us stop with this nonsense
10	Public	As long as your public transit stations are inundated/surrounded by drug addicts and mentally ill street people, ALL OF THIS is a pointless waste of money. Lack of safety in public transportation is why I will never allow my family to use it. End of story.
11	Public	Somebody needs to stop smoking crack, and fix the roads like you've promised multiple times. This is totally pie in the sky, most people don't want to ride in a mobile homeless shelter.
12	Public	First a comment on the executive summary: on p. 3, "What is in the North County CMCP?" it notes \$420M budgeted for Flexible Fleets; but nowhere else in the exec. summary is implementation of flexible fleets provided. It can and should be, on p. 5, Challenges, and Opportunities; on p. 6, Mobility Framework and Solution (provide a specific "strategy layer"); on p. 7 (add a flexible fleets rectangle); on p. 8, "Implementation"; on p. 9, add as an "early action bundle" item; and as a specific service addition piece on pp. 11 and 12. Flexible fleets is a vital piece of the transportation access puzzle, clearly needs to be emphasized as providing that crucial first/last 5 mile access within e.g. mobility hubs, and into the regional transit system.
13	Public	every effort to create a contiguous, segregated bike lane/path from oceanside beach through Carlsbad would be appreciated! (and enhance community, healthy lifestyle, and value)
14	Public	In the Interactive GIS Map: Please confirm identification of flexible fleets implementation in the Mobility Hubs (MHs): e.g. Oceanside, NEV shuttles, E Bike grants, NEV connector program; and similar with the other MHs - Vista, Carlsbad, Escondido, San Marcos, Carlsbad Village, and Palomar Airport. Thank you for these flexible fleets items!
15	Public	Re: the Interactive Map: Can this map show a layer of North County employment centers? So that it can be seen how mobility hubs relate to employment centers; and how CMCP improvements create improved employment and customer access to employment/business centers.
16	Public	No one I know including myself wants more TSA. People in Oceanside, walk or drive to work. I see empty trains going by all the time. Waste of our tax money. Use our money to repair streets with CONCRETE instead of patch every year. Improve traffic lights and safety areas for bicycles and walkers.
17	Public	The most important part in my opinion of this plan is the improvements of the I-78 and I-5 Junction and the Interstate 15 and 78 Junction. These should be your top priority and it is my opinion they are the greatest traffic snafus in the north county except for the overdevelopment. We must face facts. We cannot sustain the development in Southern California anymore there's no water. Mass transit has always been second fiddle to the automobile in California and always will be reducing traffic congestion should be a top priority. Restrictions on development until new water sources are found are imperative. Thank you.

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
18	Public	I believe Sandag should be dissolved. They do NOTHING but pilfer money from taxpayers and even their own members have no say in how they steal the taxpayers money. We need to give a voice back to the voters. And while I'm here, let's ask the board members "how many of you took the bus into work today? How many of you took the bus to get groceries or to soccer practice?? WAKE UP. Your plan is ill conceived.
19	Public	I highly recommend that SANDAG be DISBAND. They don't care about the people, only their own agenda. That's why they pick and choose who sits on the panel. They don't want opinions different than theirs. Sounds like a Dictatorship. Anything they try to pass or informed on the people needs to be put on the ballot for us to vote on. DISBAND SANDAG NOW!
20	Public	People who ride transportation need closnes home food church seniors rely heavy on trolleys buses Already we feel there is no one for the seniors!!!!
21	Public	Please prioritize finishing the Inland Sprinter rail trail all the way to Oceanside, extend the Sprinter line to North County Fair, speedup and shorten travel time on Sprinter between Escondido and Oceanside, more Express buses between Escondido transit center and downtown San Diego.
22	Public	This plan makes no sense to improve transit in the area. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars and will make traffic worse.
23	Public	Make a correction on draft p. 33: text says "Low-income households currently make up 28% of the total population," but the adjacent graphic says 19.5%
24	Public	draft p. 44, the listing of destinations under "North County Travel Patterns" is confusing in labeling destinations; e.g. rather than saying "Coastal San Diego," which implies City of San Diego only, say something like "Regional Coastal Communities" and maybe in parentheses, list the cities; same for the other labels
25	Public	Draft p. 104, description of "Reconnecting Communities" – graphic shows geographic location/alignment of improvements, but all seem to be on SR78, the Sprinter rail line, and I-5; but nothing along the proposed rapid service BRT lines, p. 106, items A, B, D, E, F and H. Why? Should not the BRT routes also have "reconnecting communities" improvements to speed BRT service?
26	Public	Draft p. 106, "High Frequency Core, Rapid, & Commuter Services" – the example projects appear to be good to speed BRT service, including direct access ramps and transit bypass lanes; but these do not appear to include exclusive BRT travel ways (fully separated from private auto travel). Why? Would not exclusive travel ways substantially speed service/reduce travel time for BRT, esp. combined with "reconnecting communities" work along these routes and with the TSMO/ICM items which are planned?
27	Public	Draft p. 108, "MOBILITY AS A SERVICE" – Please explicitly include/identify microtransit as an important MAAS element; it appears that "NEV Services, Shuttles (e.g., 'gO'side)" is microtransit, if so, please label so. And to this page, please explicitly note that MAAS is a crucial component of SANDAG's "flexible fleets" big move item.
28	Public	Draft p. 136, "Phasing Approach" – I do not see included establishing flexible fleets/microtransit services in the listed mobility hubs; please include. The graphic under "Leveraging ongoing efforts in the corridor" shows existing services; there are existing microtransit services in North County, please include in this graphic.
29	Public	Draft p. 137 – again, explicitly include community-level microtransit and flexible fleets among "early action" items.
30	Public	Draft Chapter 7 – THANK YOU for identifying and prioritizing flexible fleets/micromobility as an early action investment item, A2.
31	Public	I did not see availability of the appendices, but assume that as needed they will be amended per comments received and changes made in the full CMCP report.
32	Public	Draft p. 124 – THANK YOU for including funding for micromobility services!
33	Public	When will the appendices and attachments be available to review? I would especially like to see Appendix W, Isochrone Methodology and Analysis-Proposed Condition (2050)
34	Public	Both the frequency and speed of BRT services after implementation will be crucial to success of this plan. Is there available an analysis and/or exhibit showing the speed of end-to-end service of each of the BRT routes? Is there available a listing of the times and frequency of service of these routes?
35	Public	I greatly object to any mileage tax SANDAG might impose on drivers! You promised to spend great funds on our freeways, and have fallen short. No mileage tax.
36	Public	I feel that there is too much emphasis on mass transit and bicycles. Ridership on mass transit already does not support the system. We need to put more emphasis on improvements for motor vehicles because that is what the people want. They want to traffic to flow. Bike paths are great for recreational riding, but bicycles should not be prioritized over motor vehicles. SANDAG needs a reality check.
37	Public	The transit system that Sandag has decided for San Diego and counties that this is best for the population is ridiculous. It will not work. There are too many obstacles. Sandag does not care, all it wants more money from the people, because people will continue on driving due to the distance of where they live to go to work, shopping, doctor's visits, dropping off kids at school, school activities. How about our seniors and disabled people. Like I have stated, Sandag does not care about the people.
38	Public	Please continue to include bike paths, lanes and pathways with trails. We need to be able to safely transport without vehicles!
39	Public	It seems like a good draft and I will be interested to read the final draft, as well. A few points I would like to make. Even though many companies are requiring their employees to return to their offices, I believe that more companies should give the option of working from home. They should come up with ways to measure productivity if that is a concern. Certainly some employees did take unfair advantage of being at home, not working as diligently, but the majority of employees did well. That would help ease the amount of traffic on San Diego roads. If you are going to increase mass transit, include basic services at each station. People need dry cleaners and grocery stores often during the week and having it readily available where the train stops would make driving a car to work less critical and riding a train more attractive. And make the fares affordable or there will be even less incentive to use mass transit. Provide a secure environment both at the stations and on the trains.  Thanks for being willing to listen! Donna Meyer Escondido, CA
40	Public	We don't want your 15 minute cities. <a href="https://www.facebook.com/1176700807/posts/pfbid02iPYuQ742nQLpN6JMaDh2J9rafz5tPkZmpnBBJ1oNzJNhAmnr1Gojng9Vfw1cl/?mbextid=cr9u03">https://www.facebook.com/1176700807/posts/pfbid02iPYuQ742nQLpN6JMaDh2J9rafz5tPkZmpnBBJ1oNzJNhAmnr1Gojng9Vfw1cl/?mbextid=cr9u03</a> Climate change is a LIE. Does that make me one of the "barriers" you will be addressing?
41	Public	I'm concerned about the significant increase in engineers, blowing their horns at all hours of the night on a regular basis. I do not live right next to a crossing and there's no reason for them to be laying on their horn in the middle of the night. It is a habit not a necessity. I would like to see quiet hours, or even better no horn zones like Oceanside has where there are no train horns allowed. How can we do this? I live in Carlsbad and it's really interfering with my health because of the interrupted sleep because of the very loud and persistent train horns. Very frustrating.
42	Public	I'm in a mobile home Park in North County. It would be such a help to many in our complex to have better access to public transportation. The closest bus stop is perhaps 2 miles away.
43	Public	Don't change a thing...stop wasteful spending and overtaxing. The constant barrage of controlling policies, high taxes and fees in addition to over inflation and greed are what is driving people out of this state. Please leave North county alone. We like not having toll roads and would prefer to sit in traffic than fund any more backwards policies. Thank you for listening and I hope you take this to heart.
44	Public	Greetings, Three is No component for public art in this plan. Why is that? Steve Dilley
45	Public	Chatter on local Poway Facebook page noted that no reference made to include Poway. Is this because the plan addresses the '78' corridor or is the another reason(s)?
46	Public	We want to drive cars. Plan for that.
47	Public	NO MILAGE TAX!!!! Please invest in traffic flow-cars-north county
48	Public	No, it does little to lighten the burden of North County communities. You have failed to add lanes to the 15N corridor instead we get a mess of traffic to create a smoother ride. I'd prefer a bumpy ride that at least goes the speed limit to a smooth stop and go ride on the freeway.

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
49	Public	There's really needs to be a more accessible route between HWY 76 and the 78 freeway -or from north Oceanside to the 78. Commuting from north Oceanside via College and Emerald is unbearable.
50	Public	Eventually the 805 needs some sort of extension (god forbid maybe thru Rancho Santa Fe) because that's where the traffic comes from - 4 freeways going into 2 for north county.  Traffic in vista (vista way is ONE LANE TO THE 76 and clog sup simply due to the deer springs stoplight to turn right). Vista has dealt with drivers and big rigs on neighborhood roads (foothill Dr is the worst) and should have to deal with that.  The 5 fwy carpool lanes need to be timed. So many flex workers are in congestion at 11-2pm and the carpool lane is empty.
51	Public	This Plan fails to address natural resources areas in the plan area. The leaders failed to consider ANY natural resources issues in this document. More pretty pictures that mean nothing to the average person. It does not even consider the actual environment or natural resources. Suggestion to double track Sprinter, for example, will devastate the natural resources/wildlife corridor/floodplain of Loma Alta Creek. The pages are also unreadable for the average person as the attachments are in tiny typeface- certainly unreadable on someone's phone for example. This plan is a failure for North County. I have not reviewed the rest of the area documents but failure to include environment tells me the goal is to build rather than work with the natural environment, thereby leading to more destruction of our natural resources.
52	Public	Wow, what a piece of unreadable project jargon incomprehensible to anyone to the few patient to wade through it. Rewrite this to make it readable in 10-15 minutes without throwing everything into the kettle trying to win over a jury.  Roughly \$10K per North County resident is funded how? Over what duration? Is this the only capital and services improvements expected through 2050? Are there studies as to the disastrous outcomes if nothing is done (i.e., if you improve transportation more people will come and the converse)? No to the expenditures for the light rail until ridership goes up significantly. Active mobility and showing the Bird stuff, LOL. Paying for charging stations, no. Allow local cities to optionally participate via direct funding for regional hubs. For Escondido, it's laughable.  I read most of it and there doesn't appear to have any other versions available such as an austere, capital improvement only, smart traffic control, etc. available. There is no estimated out of pocket taxpayer costs, budget/funding/construction schedule, etc.  More than disappointed as many will not read this document presented as if we were management.
53	Public	After a quick review, my principal comment is that those areas deemed "social equity communities" today, may well be otherwise within a very few years, while others may emerge. I would pay more attention to general population, job centers and key sites (stadiums, etc.) than particular communities. Communities change far faster than roads and infrastructure ever could.
54	Public	No freeway expansion! Any new HOV lanes should be converted from general lanes. Funding for road maintenance to replace the gas tax should be based on VMT x vehicle weight^4 to reflect full road impact. As we phase out gas taxes, I support EVs (of which I am a driver) to be the first group of vehicles to pay VMT/weight-based fees. I believe there is broad enough market adoption of EVs that we shouldn't worry about this tax choking demand for EVs. I also support congestion pricing on all of our freeways. But we need to make sure this doesn't turn our neighborhoods into cut-through corridors from drivers looking to avoid the congestion fees. Therefore, we should institute a slow-streets approach to neighboring roads and streets, using traffic calming strategies to discourage the use of local streets as high-speed cut throughs. I support government-supported car-sharing programs. This can be done by developing guidelines/funding for municipalities to build a car-sharing fleet for their residents, and/or providing a pooled insurance program for families that want to share a car with other families (since these insurance programs don't appear to be available in the private market). Instituting car-sharing programs can contribute significantly to reducing car ownership, which is crucial to decreasing VMT and increasing alternative mode share. Make roads safer for bicyclists. Slow streets down through traffic calming measures. Reduce numbers of lanes on arterials as much as possible. Increase transit frequency to every 15 minutes as much as possible, and maintain the free-fare program for students. Provide incentives (e.g, grants) for employers to provide free transit passes for employees. Institute parking meters in most commercial areas. Parking fees can be used to fund improvements in parking benefit districts in the immediate vicinity of those meters (e.g., increasing walkability and safety, more street trees, free transit passes to employees of the surrounding businesses). Push back against the California Coastal Commission's determination that parking = access in the coastal zone. Parking takes up valuable space for people and other modes of transportation, and therefore reduces access for those without a car. Develop guidelines for municipalities to convert single-family zoning to mix-used zoning, where appropriate, to allow errands to be accomplished within a short distance, and to eliminate parking minimums.
55	Public	1. Very hard to understand exactly what you are proposing 2. From what I read it looks like public transit use is down with only small less than 1percent increases in things like light rail. Read the document. People want to use cars and carpool lanes. Public transit has already reached its maximum appeal. With the use of electric cars automobiles will not continue to contribute to climate change. Many people cannot use public transit to do daily activities: drop of kids at school and get to work 2x day; Work in various areas of the county that require driving to get to the location quickest and easiest and cheapest. 3. While I have no problem with a carpool/fast-trak choice like we now have on the 15; I DO NOT WANT "managed lanes" that charge me every time I get on the road based on the time/congestion. These are FREEWAYS that we already paid for in California. 4. Who is paying for this? A mileage tax on each car? The fees for the "managed" "smart" lanes? I vote NO 5. If you really want public comment...write this is a way people can understand. I have an advanced degree and I can't figure out what you are doing. 6. Answer this in plain English: 1- What are you planning to do/change? 2- How/when will you do it? 3-Who will pay for it? 4-How much will it cost me to drive on the "freeway" under the new program? Otherwise, how can we even begin to comment on this? Thank you for your consideration of my input
56	Public	There were no details for the 78 to I-15 corridor interchange. I drive it daily at 7:30AM or earlier. It can take 30 minutes to go less than 6 miles. I think the lanes need to be changed up. #1 designated as thru, #2 & #3 as I-15 S. there should be another merge south lane that keeps people from folks jamming in at the last minute or cutting across three lanes to make the merge. Signage AT the merge is terrible. people cut over at Nordahl and take the freeway entrance to avoid the jam. I suggest you spend a week or two driving this yourself to see what a terror and death road it is.
57	Public	Is this plan already funded or does it require additional taxation or alternative methods of funding the plan? Will parts of the 78 become a toll road? Is there any plans to widen the 56?
58	Public	No mileage tax to pay for your project. We don't live in a downtown environment and expanding train access is a waste of resources. Stop squeezing the poorest of us to pay for some horrible vision that is supposedly "green." That's what a mileage tax would do.
59	Public	Please solve the traffic problems in North County before you start working on other transit issues. We live on mountain tops (me) and in isolated valleys and must use cars to get around. Our current transportation by NCTD is way underused and inaccessible to many, and making it better will not change who will ride it.
60	Public	Any train that does not run at least every 15 minutes by day and 30 by night may as well not be on the schedule, as passengers will worry about connections, about a late or cancelled train, about a long gap between them that would make it faster to cycle or drive. Locomotives are cheap, engine drivers aren't ridiculously expensive, and carrying the same number of passengers on trains half as long and twice as frequent is a major improvement in a service.
61	Public	Don't forget that the intersection of 67 and 78 is "regionally significant." We need more bus service in Ramona.
62	Public	It is concerning that neither the approaches or challenges note the importance of considering protection of our natural resources- particularly the areas identified in the regional conservation plans. Projects like double tracking of the Sprinter along the constrained wetlands corridor of Loma Alto Creek- that bisects the major regional North/South wildlife movement corridor are particularly problematic.

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
63	Public	Will any of this be paid for through the newly passed Infrastructure Bill? Quarterly and transparent reporting to the public about how their taxpayer dollars are being spent would help increase confidence of all of us that what we pay in taxes actually goes to the projects that will improve our lives. Personally I don't mind paying taxes but I want to see results. I want to know that the government isn't paying \$600 for a hammer. I want my taxes to pay for things that benefit the people and that contractors are being held to account, that they are being fair. Profit is absolutely necessary for businesses to succeed but gouging is not acceptable.
64	Public	NO!! to almost all of it. This is the \$165 Billion plan to take away our cars and charge a mileage tax. Yes, to I5 to 78 upgrade. Yes, to carpool on 78. Yes to I15 to 78 upgrade. NO, to taking away the traffic lanes so the few hundred bikes can have their own lanes. Are you going to charge a wheel tax and include bikes? when do they pay their fair share? You are doing this on the backs of autos/ gas that you are trying to take away. COMPLETE the updates/ upgrades that were promised in the last sales tax increase. UNTIL to deliver what YOU promised, I do NOT trust you with a single penny of my tax dollars.
65	Public	SANDAG is acting corruptly serving their own agenda rather than needs of the voters. They steal the taxes voted for road improvement and use it for buses with very few riders and rail that can't serve the unincorporated population at all. The large cities vote should not override the votes of the smaller cities and unincorporated areas of the county. I am angry, as is many others who are using 2 lane roads to drive down the hill to get EVERYTHING except groceries. This community doesn't even have a K-Mart any more. BUSES, TRAINS and such have no part to play in this community with jobs in every other community outside Ramona. Roads will always play the most important part of commuting for us. We need at least 2 lanes each way on 78 and 67. DO THAT! Reply1d
66	Public	Looks like this is all to make it easier for bike riders and to encourage such. Great....but what about elderly people that are unable to either purchase or ride those bikes, have limited, little, no public transportation in the area? We are still forced to drive or hire others to drive at great expense. Yes, make it safer for bike riders, but start providing safe, timely, convenient public transportation in, and to, areas that are not near bus/rail services. In paying for all of this, let's not make drivers pay for it all, but require bike riders to kick in. After all this is to make it safer for them AND the driver! I keep hearing about a mileage tax.....how about a bike tax???
67	Public	You should include La Costa Ave in south Carlsbad as part of this plan as well since most of La Costa Ave from Ranchi Santa Fe Road to I-5 is heavily impacted with excess and grid locked traffic .
68	Public	Why are there no plans to widen SR 67 from Ramona to Lakeside?
69	Public	Widen the 78 and fill in the pot holes.
70	Public	Looks like a good plan for residential and shopping but doesn't do enough to get people to work and back from the two largest industrial parks. You need a train that runs from the station in Sorrento Valley to Poway up the canyon with stops along the way and feeder lines to both sides of the industrial park. Same for Palomar Airport Rd.
71	Public	BRT on El Camino Real should extend to future Park and Ride at I-5 and Manchester. This will allow travel from central N County to the Park and Ride to catch future BRT and carpool traveling southerly from this point. Added benefit is access to the Mira Costa Campus on Manchester. I understand this may be outside of the scope of the project, but surely there is a way to make this connection happen.
72	Public	Go overall plan. One aspect that plan does not address wrt quality of life is the impact of train horns against the ever increasing coastal rail corridor activity. Train horns have gotten louder and more frequent. With double tracking along the train corridor; particularly through the Carlsbad Barrio and downtown Carlsbad, the train will be more and more frequent with the loud horns. There was a proposal to trench the tracks through downtown and potentially through Carlsbad. However, that is years away if ever to be implemented. In the meantime, SANDAG/Carlsbad should implement silent train crossings similar to Oceanside.
73	Public	As someone who is low income and works long and late hours I'd like to say how incredibly out of touch and useless this plan is to us. This plan only will help those that work 9 to 5 jobs in corporations that have the time any money to spend waiting long times for transportation. I need transportation directly to job sites in an extremely timely fashion. This is quite possibly the worst plan I've ever seen and will not in the slightest help me or the thousands of people like me cleaning workplaces doing maintenance and generally making life for white collar rich people. You should be ashamed.
74	Public	Tax those in the backcountry and do nothing for them. Commit to widen hwy 67 to get voter approval then refuse to widen it. Propose animal crossings while you ignore one of the most unsafe and dangerous state highways in the state. Your organization is a joke. No on all of it, dissolve SanDag and return to the previous method of managing highways.
75	Public	Most people don't want to be reliant on public transportation and even more they don't want an increase in tax during this time of inflation. This creates a major gap in the economic tiers of the it's public. I vote no on this project. Instead the freeways and roads should widen to accommodate the influx of traffic.
76	Public	Public transit is a complete FAIL. You serve less than 3% of the population with it. It costs millions per year to run busses THAT ARE EMPTY 98% of the time! Creating a larger union will only make our pension nightmare even larger! Public transit is inconvenient, and absolute time water and unneeded! It would be more cost effective to go buy 60,000 new ev cars and give them to those that use transit!!! Your woke climate BS will have zero effect for the climate. Why??? Because China and India are opening a combined 1 coal fired power plant per week for the planned next 2 years! ZERO EFFECT! My money is not your money. And I don't owe anything so that others can travel on my dime!
77	Public	Be real. People live outside the routes of bus, tram and train service in San Diego. We made a choice to get out of city limits. We want the choice to drive where and when we want to. Sandag is a communist style form of government... wanting to control who has a vehicle / how much is driven and when. The weighted vote was inspired by an activists ( Lorena Gonzales ) who is self serving. The decision to give this power to 2 cities was not a public choice but made by legislation that does not live here. Time to clean the swamp/ disban Sandag - and get out of our personal lives
78	Public	I think this plan is a great step in the right direction. I think the key thing to keep in mind is that housing and transit are intrinsically connected, so North county should be considering dense housing on as much of their unused space as possible to compliment these transit improvements.
79	Public	Having a goal to reduce the number of cars on the roads is reasonable but in order to get people to use mass transit, it must provide them with good, safe, clean transportation plus convenient services like grocery stores and dry cleaners (just two examples) so there is less of a need to drive all around town. The train systems in Europe are fabulous and the people use them happily. Find out what they are doing right and then do that. If the number of cars continues to increase, no one will be going anywhere and they will do it slower and slower every year. We want Caltrans to do the right thing but we residents need to be willing to do the same.
80	Public	The problem in Southern California, as mentioned in one of the comments, is that mass transit doesn't go where people need to go. I suggested building convenience businesses like dry cleaners and grocery stores but it has to go beyond that. Businesses need to be encouraged to have their offices close to the transit stations. And again, it must be made safe and clean or people will continue to not use it.
81	Public	I grew up in New York city. Took mass transit all my life till I came to California mass transit is tiring, uncomfortable and never takes you where you need to go without wasting hours of your time. And it will be worse here in San Diego county.
82	Public	Please do not waste your tax payer money on this! We don't need it. Fix the roads first. No one wants public transit 25 year north county resident.
83	Public	As an engineer I love trains, but as a resident I almost never use them and never will. Forget them. I ride my bicycle a lot, but bollards, segregated bike lanes, bike lanes to the right of turning traffic and door-zone bike lanes discourage me from riding more. Most recent bicycle infrastructure has made things WORSE. Want to encourage cycling?.. fix the road surface and take down anything that may crash us (inc bollards). My preferred mode of transportation is my EV and flying.
84	Public	People nationwide are suffering from inflation, but more so in California because of our base cost of living, taxes and over regulation. NO GAS TAX!!
85	Public	Have you seen the billboard adds comparing gasoline tax in every other state to our's? This over ambitious project spending tons of money while my street light has been out for 3 YEARS will turn the state Red and completely kill all of this. Stop spending SO MUCH MONEY and fix my street light!
86	Public	this plan does not serve my needs and I am am utterly disgusted that you would even consider rating a road usage tax down my throat to pay for it.
87	Public	Not at all. I travel from Oceanside to Escondido and back Monday through Friday. I have done this drive for 16 plus years. The drive has gotten worse and worse. Each way has doubled. Mass transit doesn't even touch this issue. I have to be at work at 730am and so I would have to leave before 5am just to get to work on time and would have to walk through some unsafe neighborhoods. Also I have children that I need to pick up and certain times so I have to drive to make sure they make it to their practices on time. Adding the driving tax just punished us who are trying to make a living to help pay the high cost of living it costs to live in San Diego.

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
88	Public	Why don't you fix the roads up in north county. Vista way is a grid lock mess. 76 is a grid lock mess. By the time you start to fix a hwy, it takes way too long and too much waste in money spent and you never complete fixing the problems. The people using the mass transit systems are already using it. Quit wasting money on systems people are going to use in a community/county like San Diego. You can also shove your per mile tax where the sun doesn't shine. You are putting California's liberal politics over the overall good of all of our county's tax paying citizens. We deserve better.
141	Public	The League of Women Voters of North County San Diego submit the following comments on the Draft North County Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP). The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan political organization dedicated to empowering voters and defending democracy through advocacy and education on public policy issues of importance to our community. In 2021 our League adopted a San Diego Regional Transportation Action Policy which endorses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a synergistic transportation and climate action plans,</li> <li>• a decrease in vehicle miles traveled through land use and transportation alternatives, and</li> <li>• promotion of cost-effective transportation solutions.</li> </ul> We specifically support a comprehensive, affordable transportation system available to all, including special segments of the population such as the elderly, disabled, and students. We support the far-reaching scope of the CMCP, its multimodal approach, consideration of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the collaboration shown in creating the draft CMCP. Since the CMCP is dependent on the 2021 Regional Transportation Plan which may be modified by SANDAG due to funding, we urge outreach and updates to the community on any impacts to the CMCP. <u>As a trusted community partner, the League would welcome opportunities to participate with you in educational outreach to the community about the Multimodal Corridor Plan.</u>
214	Public	University student who lives in District 1 of Vista California. I recently viewed your plan for the North County Regions and am really looking forwards to seeing this happen. Although common to see comments by older folk to disagree with "15 minute cities" I can guarantee the younger population really is for this. I would love to be able to get to my university using the public transportation in 15 minutes or less. I would like to see the public transportation to be quicker than 30 minutes. As I have classes at Palomar College, 30 minute periods for the train to come can be very detrimental if I happen to oversleep. And I know comments I could receive by this, "Be more time efficient, Just don't sleep in..." Those are irrelevant. How could you have public transportation be quicker? I assure you already know the answer, but if you do not, dedicating a lane to buses is a huge step to having faster public transportation. I do not include trains because I know trains get priority over cars. I know because I use the train daily from school-home. I know there is more to making trains faster, it would be investing into faster rail system and faster trains. Which means analyzing if investing in faster trains is useful in cities like Vista. But I hope this is talked about. Second small input, . Stop investing into the freeways! Please use this money for other transportation initiatives like having security on trains. Investing into freeways for constant road fixes will just make cities along those freeways more and more into debt. I know how much money it takes to yearly fix roads and freeways from the damage CARS make to it. It is an endless money waster. Another input I would like to address is the issues with stoplights. The roads in Vista do not prioritize active modes of transportation and this can be deadly. As I was crossing the E Vista Way street, a very dangerous street for pedestrians, it took me more than 5 minutes of waiting for the hand sign to indicate I could walk. . If we observe traffic systems of cities in Europe, they have a system that always have the right of passage to pedestrians and if it detects a car for example approaching the intersection, that is when it turns red for the pedestrians. Various times in the Santa Fe South and E Vista Way intersection I have been many times almost ran over. Please listen to people like me who advocate for streets to be slower and not so wide. No matter how wide E Vista Way is made, there will still be traffic because the actual issue is not being addressed. Instead, you are making streets like E Vista Way and basically every major street in Vista a minute to cross. If you were to walk across these streets in rush hour you would see what I am talking about, cars do not care about you.
215	Public	Although I am appreciative to Caltrans trying to alleviate traffic congestion in the North County, I do not believe the plan will have the intended outcome. Mass/ Alternate transit is good good in theory, in Southern California it has not worked as intended. Residential areas are too spread out to make it a viable alternative to using cars for transportation. Just throwing money to build alternate infrastructure does not mean the population will use it. Taking travel lanes from cars to give to bikes only exasperates traffic congestion and you will never get enough people to use bikes to alleviate that issues. It will only serve a small portion of the population, while not fulfilling the need of the many. Mass transit may be a viable alternate, but it need to be made safe, and once safe, the populace needs to be shown it is safe and efficient. Please incorporate some alternative transportation in to your plan, but for the foreseeable future, the majority of money needs to be allocates for vehicles.
142	Public	on Page 7. It shows that CA's Climate Mandates are part of the context. Since that it true, another important document, that you erroneously leave out, is CARB's Scoping Plan, which is how CA plans to achieve its climate mandates. Here is what you should take from that document to apply to the CMMP. The CARB Scoping Plan states that we can't electrify our fleet fast enough to achieve the CA Climate Mandates. We need to also reduce VMT by 25% by 2030, calling into question the SB 375 target CARB gave to SANDAG: a 19% reduction, by 2035. It also states that do get that reduction, we must have a Road Use Charge (RUC) by 2025, instead of the earlier understanding that we could wait until 2030. It also makes it clear that we must price parking and this new practice must be widely adopted
143	Public	Just for example, I will include this, from the Scoping Plan: 2.1 Zero-emission vehicles are not enough to solve the climate crisis.  Contrary to popular belief, zero-emission vehicles (ZEV) alone are not enough to solve the climate crisis. The 2022 Scoping Plan illustrates that despite cleaner vehicles and low-carbon fuels, the path to carbon neutrality by 2045 also depends on reducing per capita VMT (the total passenger vehicle miles driven by an average person in California on any given day). To meet the carbon neutrality goal, the Scoping Plan proposes reducing VMT from 24.6 miles per day in 2019 to 18.4 miles by 2030 (a 25 percent reduction) and to 17.2 miles per day by 2045 (a 30 percent reduction).
144	Public	The other aspect of "context" that is missing is our need to stabilize the climate at a livable level. In 2011, AG Harris wrote, in a letter responding to SANDAG's Draft RTP, that climate stabilization is the objective of CEQA. Since it is that important, it should be fully explained in the report. Chapter 4's Vision, Values, Goals, Objectives, and Metrics  This chapter must be rewritten to reflect the grim reality that climate destabilization will overwhelm all good intentions, including our values, goals, objectives, and metrics. Failing to achieve CA's climate mandates would ensure that CA is helping to destabilize our earth's climate, which equates to a "devastating collapse of the human population" (Scientific American), caused by such things as mass starvation. It would lead to human extinction. Make no mistake. It probably will happen.  Here is what the Secretary General says about our greenhouse gas (GHG) emission, which mostly comes from cars:  a) We have a Code Red Climate Emergency.  b) We are solidly on a path to an unlivable planet.  c) We are driving towards Climate Hell with our foot on the accelerator.  d) We are dangerously close to the point of no return.
145	Public	The new CARB Scoping Plan makes clear what I have been trying to tell SANDAG for over 15 years: "free parking" is not free and it should be priced in a car parking system that causes both drivers and non-drivers to benefit equally (ideally, down to the penny) when the very expensive-to-provide parking facility is provided. CARB's Scoping Plan makes it clear that, in order to meet the CA Climate Mandates, charging for parking must become our practice. The corridor being discussed here is in California.
146	Public	On its Page 18, Appendix E of the Scoping Plan states that "free parking" incentivizes driving alone; and that for the State to meet its climate goals, parking cash-out is needed. Also, that a state action is to end its subsidies to car parking for its 200,000 employees. Would the SANDAG do the same for its employees? The employees of the North Area Corridor must do this. This letter shows a painless way to make that happen. Painless in the sense that even employees that drive everyday will not lose any money. In Appendix E of the Scoping Plan, on Page 27, it says that the State should take this action, with reasons then added, as follows:  Reduce or eliminate parking requirements (and/or enact parking maximums, as appropriate) and promote redevelopment of excess parking, especially in infill locations. Building parking for infill development makes construction costs more prohibitive, considering parking can cost up to \$100,000 per stall, which takes away both physical space

Draft North County CMCP Comments

#	Agency	Comment
147	Public	Car Parking that is Not Assigned to a Particular Car but is Instead Available to All Drivers with a Car that is Associated with an Account. This parking would include on-street, employee, transit station, shopping center, beach, school, library, and so on. For example, employee parking should be operated for the financial gain of the employees. The car parking earnings that an employee earns is proportional to the time they spend at the work location. That is independent of whether they drive or not. However, the parking must be value priced. Those that drive every day would lose money, without the addition of an "add-in" payment, sized so that Money Lost = Parking Charge – Parking Earnings – Add-In = zero. The means that we must "bend over backwards" for those that continue to drive everyday. They must break even. Those that get to work without driving, even just one day, will earn money and so will not need, nor get, the "Add-In".
148	Public	Regarding Transit Center parking, the official policy of the Sierra Club shows that they want parking at train stations to be minimal, full-priced, and open to all drivers ("public"): Rail systems are most effective in stimulating compact development patterns, increasing public transit patronage, and reducing motor vehicle use. Station access should be provided by foot, bicycle, and public transit, with minimal, but full-priced, public parking. Accommodation of pedestrians, bicycles and public transit should be given priority over private automobiles.
149	Public	The conclusion is that the practices of the all corridors must at least match the recommendations of the Scoping Plan, because they only about State Mandates, which are easier than the climate stabilization requirement of 80% below our 1990 level by 2030. (Note: the 2030 requirement explains why all the COP 25, 26, 27, etc. meetings are trying to get larger commitments from member countries, for the year of 2030. It also explains the UN Secretary's comments shown above.)
150	Public	Assigned Parking: For this type of parking system, the space is being charged to the person associated with the car that is associated with the space, 24/7 (all day, every day), whether the car is present or not.
151	Public	Apartments, Rewards-Based Unbundling: For apartments, assigned parking should be unbundled from the rent with a "Rewards-Based Unbundling" system. Each month, the household in each unit selects the number of assigned parking spaces they want to rent, including the choice of zero parking spaces. Compared to the "bundled parking" system (often erroneously called "free parking"), rents for the living space will be significantly lower, under any system of unbundling. Management needs to compute the monthly price for the parking with the same method (cost plus profit or as much as the market will bear, or some other method) that is used to determine the rent for the apartment. Rewards-Based Unbundling adds complexity, compared to the standard method of unbundling the cost of the assigned parking. However, it is a critically important, driving mitigation measure. It rewards driving less. It is fully automated, meaning that the money flows out of an account depending on the data that is collected regarding the status of the parking space. Privacy must also be provided. Here is how this works.
152	Public	There are three price rates (each rate is per minute) defined. One is the "Full Price". It is computed by dividing the monthly price (\$300 per month, for example) by the number of minutes in the month. The "Storage Price" is discounted from the Full Price. For example, it might be 30% less than the Full Price. The 3rd price rate defined is the "Vacant Price". Since the parking is assigned, it is still unavailable to other drivers, even though the assigned car is not present. Therefore, the assigned space is still being rented when the space is vacant. The Vacant Price needs to be higher than the Full Price so that the owner gets, as an average, over all of the assigned car parking spaces, the Full Price. The Vacant Price can be computed from the Full Price and the Storage Price, from an assumed average fraction of time that the space is vacant, to achieve the Full Price. Table 2 shows the variable names, the abbreviated variable names used for the algebraic derivations, the definitions, how to calculate the variable, and the example values.
153	Public	Parking Assigned to a Hotel Room: The best case is that hotel patrons arrive by transit and never use a car. Given a hotel's proximity to transit, the ocean, and/or downtown, many guests might not ever use a car during their stay. Complementary bicycles should be provided, as is done in many European hotels. Lists of good bike rides should be provided, including the scenic San Luis Rey River Trail. Many visitors, especially from large American and foreign cities, will arrive to our area on transit. For guest that want to rent an assigned parking space, a "per day" version of the Awards-Based Unbundling system described for the hotel should be used.
154	Public	I appreciate the CMCP's multi-modal focus. This is critical in order to reduce VMT.
155	Public	Please incorporate Oceanside's "Smart and Sustainable Corridors Plan (SSCP)" and the Coast Highway Corridor Plan into the "Complete Corridors" section of the CMCP, and include bicycling and pedestrian improvements for Oceanside Blvd, Mission Avenue, Vista Way, and Coast Highway, as noted in Table 5-2 (Quality Investments for Mobility Boulevards) of the Plan. Oceanside Blvd. is an important cycling route for bike riders. It needs to be improved for the safety and comfort/ease of use by cyclists. Also, the Coast Highway Corridor Plan's roadway redesign features a "road diet", reducing the number of lanes from 4 to 3, between the arterials, and from 4 to 2, at the new roundabouts. This provides more room for biking and walking. The Coast Highway Corridor Plan's incentive zone will allow for more density, increased height, and less parking. Oceanside has recently secured funding for detailed design, from SR 76 to Wisconsin. Funding its construction would be an excellent choice for a SANDAG Smart Growth Incentive Fund grant. Please let me know if you agree. Your agreement would help me urge Oceanside to submit a SGIF proposal.
156	Public	The Mobility Hub discussion (page 40) should include specifics on the importance of the transit centers that anchor each one, the mobility hub features they should include (the car parking systems described above, for example, to be fair to all and to increase ridership), and should state that the transit centers should be highly-visible and attractive parts of the communities they serve. To understand how a value-priced, automated, shared, parking system could maximize ridership, it could be pointed out that parking earnings for a transit rider of driving age would be proportional to the time they spend on a round trip. The net cost to ride would then be, for someone who did not park a car at the transit center, the fare, minus the car-parking earnings. If someone parked a car, the net cost would be the fare, plus the cost to park, minus the car-parking earnings.
157	Public	The Plan does not mention transit-station parking, just stating that it is a constraint on SPRINTER ridership. The Plan should call for managed parking systems with properly priced parking that encourage alternative modes rather than just continuing the unfortunate practice of "free parking", which only contributes to further greenhouse gases and VMT. For the Oceanside Transit Center, there were at least 3 letters to the NCTD and Toll Brothers on OTC car parking systems that would maximize fairness to those who would prefer to drive less, thus reducing VMT. Again, allow me to state that the latest CARB Scoping Plan, especially its Appendix E, makes it clear that California can't achieve its climate mandates without pricing parking.
158	Public	The Plan makes no mention of the coming CA Road Use Charge (RUC), despite the fact that, with declining sales tax revenues from gasoline sales, insufficient funding will be generated to support transportation infrastructure. The Plan should discuss Road User Charge and support it to replace (not add to) taxes on gasoline. The Oceanside Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee has adopted an excellent Resolution on a Road User Charge. The latest CARB Scoping Plan recommends a RUC implementation by 2025, instead of the previous understanding that it would start in 2030.
159	Public	The rapid expansion of cycling, and in particular, e-bikes, has demonstrated the need for comprehensive bicycle safety training for all levels of users, including youth and adults. I strongly support the use of public roads for cycling, when the roads meet current standards and are properly maintained. But it is also important that educational resources be made available to ensure cyclists ride safely. Classes should be taught by League (League of American Bicyclists) Certified Instructors (LCI). Data should be collected to determine if these classes are a cost-effective way to reduce VMT. If so, they should be scaled up by paying a living wage to instructors and paying students that graduate.
213	Public	Escondido has no plan headed south, other than to an Escondido mall. Do you have another plan to get them downtown or to the International Airport?, , Rancho Bernardo, 4S and Poway are not considered North County. What part of San Diego are we? On most of the other maps in San Diego, we are called North County or Northeast County. Where is our transportation plan to review?, Is there a plan for us to get to the San Diego Airport and back, with luggage, keeping in mind we are one of the oldest populations in San Diego County? Is there a plan to get the North East populations downtown, for shopping, food and entertainment, without a car? Is there a plan for us to get to the coast, for a few hours on the beach or shopping, without a car?, Could you please direct me to the transportation plan that supports the North East part of San Diego County, or whatever you call us?
114	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Coast Highway: a) Attachment 4, Plan ID NC26: Under Descriptions, please include "Morse Street to Oceanside Boulevard" for the Coastal Rail Trail (below "Broadway to Eaton")
115	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Coast Highway: b) Attachment 3, Regional Spine Sheets: Please include sheets for "Coastal Rail Trail" similar to the Inland Rail Trail.
116	City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division	Coast Highway: c) Attachment 2, Mobility Boulevard Sheets: Please include Coast Highway (and Carlsbad Boulevard).