Appendix AA: Public Comments for Draft CMCP
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<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>June 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>North County Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP) – Public Comments Draft CMCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Theme</th>
<th>Incorporation into CMCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to reduce travel delay and meet travel demand along the SR 76 corridor.</td>
<td>• Implement TSMO improvements to SR 76 for both regional travel and local community mobility. • Assess major infrastructure changes to SR 76 as part of future consideration and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater travel demand in North County and State Highway System is resulting in more travel along major arterials.</td>
<td>• 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. • Advance arterial roadways (i.e., Mobility Boulevards) as core corridors for moving people and goods within North County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider “Vision Zero” statement for the region to improve safety for all users, including people walking and biking.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphases of completion of Inland Rail Trail in North County.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The COVID-19 pandemic has affected how transit service is utilized in North County CMCP. Transit should change to meet customer behaviors.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use agencies are currently evaluating growth opportunities along future high-frequent corridors (e.g., SPRINTER) near downtown areas and within the mobility hubs.</td>
<td>• Coordinate and leverage proposed transit-oriented development (TOD) by NCTD and cities in North County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete implementation of Coastal Rail Trail.</td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects and Programs for Future Consideration and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment and routing of BRT/Commuter Express services along Regional Spines and Mobility Boulevards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of multi-purpose trails and pathways to recreational destinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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 developed plans 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://record.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=549397f4d8db1468e7@regofcityofcarlsbad">https://record.carlsbadca.gov/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=549397f4d8db1468e7@regofcityofcarlsbad</a>. Below are specific comments regarding the draft plan:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Mobility Hub: 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: e) Palomar Airport Road / San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Wide Mobility Boulevard Improvements &amp; Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: d) For all identified • Upgrade signalized intersections to smart intersections, recommend formalizing program language consistent with SANDAG including the following flexible fleet programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Regional Spines: c) 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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 off ramp intersections designed in the 1960s, include in the plan all multimodal interchanges throughout I5 NCC and North County CMCP with the similar approach used in the Birmingham Drive interchange in the NCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Regional Spines: 4. To address the community barrier created by I5 and the current auto-centric on and off ramp 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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=3Ck_qATyz2M&amp;rel=1332">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Ck_qATyz2M&amp;rel=1332</a>. Please include the related recommendations in the presentation as recommendations in this letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Regional Spines Cont.: b) Recommend using program language consistent with SANDAG including the following flexible fleet programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: a) Delete all reference to flexible lanes on Palomar Airport Road and other arterials in Carlsbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: b) Revise Carlsbad Mobility Hub• NEV Area roadway to • &quot;Rideshare/Ridesharing and Microtransit&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: c) Recommend all Rapid (BRT1) be revised to routes on I5 and SR 78 as explained in the first comment under Regional Spines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: d) For all identified • Upgrade signalized intersections to smart intersections, recommend review to: Upgrade signalized intersections to smart intersections including Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE). ICE guidelines shall conform with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Projects and Programs: e) Palomar Airport Road/San Marcos Boulevard Corridor Wide Mobility Boulevard Improvements &amp; Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>Recommend  up to (a) Upgrading all intersections through interchange to smart interactions with recommended IDA analysis and proposed intersection improvements. Recommend increasing cost estimate $10 million or per an engineer’s estimate of probably cost and revise cost accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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 high-speed bicyclist including electric bicycles. Recommend increasing budget estimate $30 million or complete engineer’s estimate of probably cost and revise cost accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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 N, 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 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 highlights and identifies key gaps and barriers 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 previous 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 use 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)(b) and (d)) in estimating and analyzing GHG from the RTP and the effect on growth and whether the effects of such growth will be significant in the context of the region’s plans, natural setting, and growth patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>City of Carlsbad</td>
<td>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 irreversible 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 15069. 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 revenue 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Page 106  1. Map should show the existing Route 350 (the only high-frequency route in City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td>Attachment 2: 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-15/1578 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 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>SR-76: a) Appendix N, Figure 1: Please highlight SR-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>SR-76: c) Regional Spine: Please check the box for Segment 1 (El Camino Real to Mekrose Drive) for High-Frequency Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>SR-76: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>15-1) Please have the I-5 include full access to California Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>1:5 b) SR-78 and I-5 Interchange improvements need to be highlighted as a top priority project for North County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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 Fousat Road, and the neighborhoods along Rancho Del Oro).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard: a) Attachment 4, Plan ID NC03: Under &quot;Descriptions,&quot; please include &quot;Provide connectivity to NCTD facilities.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard: b) Please place more emphasis on completing the Inland Rail Trail through Oceanside,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Oceanside Boulevard: c) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Fire Mountain neighborhood (bounded by Oceanide Boulevard, 1-5 and El Camino Real) and the Loma Alta neighborhood (bounded by Oceanide Boulevard, Canyon Drive and El Camino Real).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Oceanide 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail: a) Please add the Coastal Rail Trail to the Mobility Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail: b) Please include Loma Alta Bridge to the priority Coastal Rail Trail improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>El Camino Real: a) Please prioritize smart intersection improvements at El Camino Real/Vista Way and El Camino Real/Mision Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>El Camino Real: b) Please extend the Next Gen 477 rapid bus service through Segment 1 of El Camino Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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 Oceanide Boulevard), the Henie Hills neighborhood (bounded by El Camino Real, Vista Way and Oceanide Boulevard) and the Oceana neighborhood (bounded by El Camino Real, SR-76 and Mesa Drive).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>El Camino Real: d) Please add to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) An enhanced bicycle facilities and sidewalk to Segment 1 (Peyri Road to Oceanide Boulevard).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Rancho Del Oro: a) Please include Rancho Del Oro as a Mobility Boulevard and acknowledge the need for the SR-78/RDO interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>College Boulevard: a) Please provide a grade separation at College Boulevard and the Sprinter line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Melrose Drive: a) Please provide grade separated crossings for both the Sprinter and the Inland Rail Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Melrose Drive: b) Please provide a NCTD FLEX On-Demand service to the Peacock neighborhood located southwest of Melrose Drive and Oceanide Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>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 Road crossing being counted as a signal too? Please clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>Melrose Drive: d) Please check Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) Segment 1, on the key map, what is labeled as &quot;River Rd to Olive Ave&quot; actually shows &quot;North Santa Fe Avenue to Olive Avenue.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>North Santa Fe Avenue: a) Please add North Santa Fe Avenue to the Mobility Boulevard Attachment: i) Please check the Segment 1 box for &quot;Upgrade and development to Inland Rail Trail and Trailheads.&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>General Comments: a) Please include Rancho Del Oro Road/SR-78 interchange in the North County CMCP. 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? 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oceanside: Public Works Department/Traffic Engineering Division</td>
<td>General Comments: d) Please consider using another color in the boxes other than yellow. Yellow is hard to see when printed. e) Strategic Anchor, Mobility Hubs, Bikeways: It is noted, “upgrade rail trail facilities to allow shared use with NEVI.” Where has this been done and is this expected to be implemented? Should bike/walking paths be separated from vehicles?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

The Committee recommends the Plan incorporate Oceanside’s “Smart and Sustainable Corridors Plan (SSCP)” and the Coast Highway Corridor Plan (CHCP) so that 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 Corridors) 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 for cyclists.

Oceanides Biocycle and Pedestrian Committee

We recommend that the following language be included: "Double-Track the SPRINTER corridor to the maximum extent possible to provide resiliency, operational flexibility and maximize headroom performance.”

Oceanides Biocycle 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.

Oceanides Biocycle and Pedestrian Committee

We recommend that the following language be included: "Double-Track the SPRINTER corridor to the maximum extent possible to provide resiliency, operational flexibility and maximize headroom performance.”

Oceanides Biocycle 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.

Oceanides Biocycle and Pedestrian Committee

We recommend that the following language be included: "Double-Track the SPRINTER corridor to the maximum extent possible to provide resiliency, operational flexibility and maximize headroom performance.”

Oceanides Biocycle 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.
We need safe bike pathways in the corridors, such as, along the 5, 76 and 78 for commuting by bike.

The Plan devotes very little to station parking, just stating that it is a constraint on SPINTER 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 choose carless or car-constrained 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.

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 their replacement (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.

We need to be careful that 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.

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 of American Bicyclists Certified Instructors (LACI). 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.

We have been waiting for over 40 years for improvements at the 78/5 interchange which is very dangerous.

I'm happy to see some focus on improving the spritner, it has so much potential! it would be nice to see some idea of overhauling the infrastructure 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, thank you!

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. 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.

We need safe bike pathways in the corridors, such as, along the 5, 76 and 78 for commuting by bike.

We live 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.

ABSOLUTELY DO NOT IMPLEMENT A MILEAGE TAX for this plan!!!

Interesting I can’t find Appendix Y. Funding

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.

We have been waiting for over 40 years for improvements at the 78/5 interchange which is very dangerous.

I’m not sold on the comprehensive north county plan and if I had to vote on the on or another tax increase to fund these projects, I would vote no. You all don’t listen to the public

I'm happy to see some focus on improving the spritner, it has so much potential! it would be nice to see some idea of overhauling the infrastructure 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, thank you!

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. 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.

We need safe bike pathways in the corridors, such as, along the 5, 76 and 78 for commuting by bike.

We live 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.
Agency | Comment
--- | ---
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.
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!
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.
Public | This plan makes no sense to improve transit in the area. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars and will make traffic worse.
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%.
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.
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?
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?
Public | Draft p. 108, “MORBUTY AS A SERVICE” – Please explicitly include/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.
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.
Public | Draft p. 137 – again, explicitly include community-level microtransit and flexible fleets among “early action” items.
Public | Draft Chapter 7 – THANK YOU for identifying and prioritizing flexible fleets/microcomorbility as an early action investment item, A2.
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.
Public | Draft p. 124 – THANK YOU for including funding for micromobility services!
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.
Public | I feel that there is too much emphasis on mass transit and bicycles. Ridership on mass transit already does not support what is needed in order to make it worthwhile. We need to put more emphasis on improvements for motor vehicles because that is what the people want. They want to traffic to flow.
Public | The transit system that SANDAG has decided for San Diego and counties that this is the best for the population is ridiculous. It will not work. There are too many obstacles.
Public | 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. I have stated this, SANDAG does not care about the people.
Public | Pleasecontinue to include bike paths, lanes and pathways with trails. We need to able to safely transport without vehicles!
Public | It seems like a good draft and I will be interested to read the final draft, as well.
Public | 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. I do believe that 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 it having readily available where the train stops would make driving a car to work less critical and riding a train a 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.
Public | Thanks for being willing to listen! Donna Meyer Escondido, CA
Public | We don’t want your 15 minute cities: https://www.facebook.com/1176706807/posts/pbo129577973471b6d6b46d53232c3f98c57e5260835d11c11f5c16c54263e791a6f1f8103?fbclid=IwAR2uBbWhsEPc01OXw9GxXHdGID6Y.jpeg. Climate change is a lie. Does that make me one of the “barriers” you will be addressing?
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.
Public | I’m in a mobile home Park in North County. It would be such a help to so many in our complex to have better access to public transportation. The closest bus stop is perhaps 2 miles away.
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 we hope you take this to heart.
Public | Greetings, There is No component for public art in this plan. Why is that? Steve Dilley
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)?
Public | We want to drive cars. Plan for that.
Public | We don’t want 15 minute cities. Please invest in traffic flow/cars/north county.
Public | No, it does little to lighten the burden of North County communities. You have faved 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.
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.

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.

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 cheating 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 shares. 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 mixed zoning, where appropriate, to allow errands to be accomplished within a short distance, and to eliminate parking minimums.

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 that 1%cent 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.
3. Man-made problems to public transit to do daily activities: drop of kids at school and to get to work for 2 x day. Work in various areas of the county that require driving to get to the location quickest and easiest.
4. While I have no problem with a carpool/fast track 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.
5. Who is paying for this? A mileage tax on each car? The fees for the “managed” “smart” lanes? I vote NO
6. 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.
7. 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?
8. 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.

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 &amp; #3 as 1-15 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 Northdale 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.
Public

Why are there no plans to widen SR 67 from Ramona to Lakeside?

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. The problem in Southern California, as mentioned in one of the comments, is that mass transit doesn't go where people live. 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.

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 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. BUSSES, 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!

Public

Widen the 78 and fill in the pot holes.

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.

Public

Have you seen the billboard adds comparing gasoline tax in every other state to our's? This over ambitious project 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. 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.

Public

No! I to almost all of it. This is the $165 Billion plan to take away our cars and charge a mileage tax. Yes, to 15 to 78 upgrade. Yes, to carpool on 78. Yes to 115 to 78 upgrade. NO, to taking away the traffic lanes so the few hundred bikers 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.

Public

COMPLETE the updates/ upgrades that were promised in the last sales tax increase.

Untill to deliver what YOU promised, I do NOT trust you with a single penny of my tax dollars.

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 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. BUSSES, 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!

ReplyId

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???

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.

Public

Why are there no plans to widen SR 67 from Ramona to Lakeside?

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. The problem in Southern California, as mentioned in one of the comments, is that mass transit doesn't go where people live. 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.

Public

BRT on El Camino Real should extend to future Park and Ride at I-5 and Manchester. This will allow travel from central North County to the Park and Ride to catch future BRT and carpool traveling south-erly from this point. Added benefit is access to the Mira Costa community outside Ramona.

Public

most of La Costa Ave from Ranchi Santa Fe Road to I-5 is heavily impacted with excess and grid locked traffic. The problem in Southern California, as mentioned in one of the comments, is that mass transit doesn't go where people live. 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.

Public

Wow. I grew up in NY. Took mass transit all my life. Mass transit is towing the line. It will take 115+ years to pay off the debt for this thing. Yes, to 15 to 78 upgrade. Yes, to carpool on 78. Yes to 115 to 78 upgrade.

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.

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 one on it,hello,found San Diego and return to the previous method of managing highways.

Public

Most people don't want to be swollen 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.

Public

Public transit is a complete FAI. 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 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 wake 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 own anyone else's so that others can travel on my dime!

Public

I ride my bicycle a lot, but bollards, segregated bike lanes, bike lanes to the right of turning traffic and door zone discouragement from riding more. Recent bicycle infrastructure has made things WORSE. Want to encourage cycling?... fix the road.

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.

Public

Yes to I-15 to 78 upgrade.

Yes, to carpool on 78.

Yes, to I-5 to 78 upgrade.

Yes, to carpool on 78.

Yes to 115 to 78 upgrade.

NO, to taking away the traffic lanes so the few hundred bikers 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.

Public

COMPLETE the updates/ upgrades that were promised in the last sales tax increase.

Untill to deliver what YOU promised, I do NOT trust you with a single penny of my tax dollars.

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 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. BUSSES, 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!

ReplyId

Public

Widen the 78 and fill in the pot holes.

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.

Public

Widen the 78 and fill in the pot holes.

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.

Public

Widen the 78 and fill in the pot holes.

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.
Parking can cost up to $100,000 per stall, which takes away both physical space and the incentive to drive alone. Parks and transportation alternatives are needed. The new CARB Scoping Plan makes clear what I have been trying to tell SANDAG for over 15 years: "free parking" is not good. We need to stop funding parking for the 200,000 employees of the state. The Scoping Plan states that we can't electrify our fleet fast enough to achieve the state's goals. We need to also reduce VMT by 25% by 2030, calling into question the SB 375 target CARB gave to SANDAG: a 19% reduction. If people have to be incentivized to use mass transit, it will only serve a small portion of the population. Mass transit may be a viable alternate, but it need to be made safe, and once safe, the populace need to know the benefits of such an investment.

We are dangerously close to the point of no return. Here is what the Secretary General says about our greenhouse gas (GHG) emission, which mostly comes from cars: 2.1 Zero-emission vehicles 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 vehicle miles traveled (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 we need to cut VMT by 25% by 2030, 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.

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 incorporated into our plan. Chapter 4's Vision, Values, Goals, Objectives, and Metrics of the CMCP makes clear what I have been trying to tell SANDAG for over 15 years: "free parking" is not good. 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 we need to cut VMT by 25% by 2030, 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.

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, but it need to be made safe, and once safe, the populace need to know the benefits of such an investment.

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 incorporated into our plan. Chapter 4's Vision, Values, Goals, Objectives, and Metrics of the CMCP makes clear what I have been trying to tell SANDAG for over 15 years: "free parking" is not good. 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 we need to cut VMT by 25% by 2030, 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.
Agency: Public Works

**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").
- b. **Attachment 3, Regional Spine Sheets:** Please include sheets for "Coastal Rail Trail" similar to the Inland Rail Trail.

**Diego County?** Is there a plan to get the North East populations downtown, for shopping, food and entertainment, without a car? Could you please direct me to the Escondido has no plan headed south, other than to an Escondido mall. Do you have another plan to get them downtown or to...  How can one get to the Burbank Airport?, , Rancho Bernardo, 4S and Poway are not considered North County. What part of San Diego are we? On most of the north 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... and 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.)

**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.
- 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 will 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"
- 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 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.

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 that 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 assigned the costs of the assigned parking spaces, the Full Price. The Vacant Parking 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.

**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.
- 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 to add) taxes on gasoline. The Oceanic 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.

**Public**

- The rapid expansion of e-bikes, 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, where the roads meet current standards and are properly maintained. But it is also important that educational resources be made available to encourage cyclists ride safely. Classes should be taught by 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.

**Public**

- Esondido has no plan headed south, other than to an Esondido 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. How would you update the transportation plan that supports the North East part of San Diego County, or whatever you call us?