

## Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan Public Outreach

The major public outreach efforts conducted during the development of the 2015 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) are identified below. These activities were conducted to gather information that was used in the development of the 2015 ITSP and to provide information to local, regional, and State partners.

### Native American Tribal Listening Sessions

Caltrans convened four regional Tribal Listening Sessions from July to December 2013 to discuss the California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2040, the California Freight Mobility Plan, the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

#### Harrah's Rincon Resort

July 30, 2013

Valley Center, CA

#### Caltrans Woodland Training Center

October 22, 2013

Woodland, CA

#### Redding Rancheria

November 14, 2013

Redding, CA

#### Tachi Palace Hotel & Casino

December 18, 2013

Lemoore, CA

### ITSP Public Workshops

All ITSP Workshops were held from 3:30 – 5:30 PM

#### Fresno

November 5, 2014

Caltrans District 6 – Manchester Office, Yosemite Room

2015 East Shields Avenue Suite 100

Fresno

#### Sacramento

November 12, 2014

California State Railroad Museum, Stanford Room

125 I Street

Sacramento

#### Redding

November 17, 2014

Caltrans District 2 Office West Venture Lassen Training Room

1031 Butte Street #118

Redding

#### Salinas

November 18, 2014

Salinas Cesar Chavez Library

615 Williams Road

Salinas

Fontana

November 19, 2014

Caltrans District 8 Fontana Office

13970 Victoria Street

Fontana

Webinar

November 12, 2014

80 plus people in attendance. Majority of participants were from transportation agencies including MPOs, RTPAs and Caltrans. Other organizations, including transit providers, planning departments, and environmental and advocacy groups were also in attendance.

### Survey Results

A total of 292 online survey responses were received.

### Main Themes

The following main themes are those related to interregional transportation and not on local commute issues.

Funding – The obvious theme is a lack of transportation funding. This includes insufficient funding for the interregional system and for bicycling in general.

Connecting All Regions – There was a call for continuing to invest in highway connections between regions.

- Many stated the highways are the only real mode that can link many parts of the state.
- Highways are seen as necessary for recreational travel and goods movement.
- Intercity rail corridors are important and need improvements, but highways link the public to the stations.
- If Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds are diverted away from modes that rural areas use for more urbanized area, then they will not be able to meet the interregional transportation needs of the local populations and the interregional travelers.

Support for many existing Focus Routes – There were many comments about drastically changing investment direction because regions do support the investment in the existing focus routes.

Rail Corridors – There were many different views on rail.

- There was a split between supporting High Speed Rail and against High Speed Rail with more positive than negative.
- There was a call for more intercity and commuter/light rail, with many comments on specific routes.
- Comments did ask to not use too much funding for rail because it will not be fiscally viable in many regions.

Bicycles – There were conflicting calls for bicycle improvements.

- A lack of funding was mentioned, even though the ATP is a larger than the ITIP.
- Some called for an increase in bicycle facilities, which will lead to an increase in bicycling – with a few of those saying it will increase interregional bicycling.
- A similar size response questioned the need for investing heavily on interregional bicycling, stating very few people would use bicycles for interregional trips (such as from Redding to Sacramento).

Goods Movement – Many respondents emphasized the need for highways to move goods throughout the state. While others suggested how to remove trucks from the highways (increased freight rail and others called for increased facility usage fees for trucks).

#### Other Themes

Air Quality Concerns – There were comments on addressing air quality, including infrastructure for electric vehicles.

Interregional Bus Service – Some supported interregional bus service while others questioned its value.

#### Survey Results

##### Question 4

This question showed the majority of the participants understood the need for investing in the interregional transportation system. The first four responses received over 95% very true and somewhat true responses. 88% believed the system was incomplete and needs improvements. Only 6% thought it was a waste of resources.

##### Question 5

The top priority for investing interregional funds was new and safer highways (43%) with more intercity rail service (24%) and Bicycle Pedestrian Projects (21%) at similar levels.

##### Question 6

There was a slight majority recommending funding should be split in proportion of usage – 52% versus 46% (Agree and Somewhat Agree versus Disagree and Somewhat Disagree).

##### Question 7

The respondents were not satisfied with the availability of bicycle facilities on highways, with the availability and efficiency of the highway system, including the highway's role in goods movement, being the second most unsatisfied (considering the Not at All Satisfied and Somewhat dissatisfied categories).

##### Question 8

The two highest priorities were Transporting Consumer and Business Products and Transporting Agricultural Products.

##### Question 9

Automobile was the highest answer for anticipated interregional travel assuming high availability of all modes. Under the very frequently answer – 66% said automobile, 21% High Speed Rail, 17% intercity rail, 10% bicycle, 9% airplane, and 6% interregional bus. Airplane increased in the somewhat frequently answer (37%) with the other modes all being between 17% and 26%.

#### California Transportation Commission Meetings

1. December 10, 2014
2. March 26, 2015
3. May 28, 2015
4. August 27, 2015

#### Rural Counties Task Force Meetings

1. September 19, 2014
2. November 21, 2014
3. January 16, 2015
4. March 20, 2015
5. May 15, 2015

6. July 17, 2015

#### Active Transportation and Livable Communities Meetings

- August 21, 2014

#### Native American Advisory Council Meetings

1. August 27, 2014
2. November 12, 2014
3. February 18, 2015

#### Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Consultation

- June 15, 2015

#### Trinidad Rancheria Tribal Consultation

- March 5, 2015

#### Humboldt County Association of Governments – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

- March 5, 2015 [www.hcaog.net/sites/default/files/tac\\_agenda\\_03.05.15.pdf](http://www.hcaog.net/sites/default/files/tac_agenda_03.05.15.pdf)

#### San Diego – Outreach to Local and Regional Partners

- December 12, 2014

#### State Transportation Improvement Program Development Meeting – Participants included Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and Caltrans’ Districts

- July 29, 2015

#### California Transportation Plan (CTP) Policy Action Committee Meetings

1. April 15, 2014
2. August 19, 2014
3. November 18, 2014

#### CTP Public Workshops

All workshops were held from 4:00 – 7:00 PM. The California Transportation Plan 2040 had a designated booth for the 2015 ITSP.

##### Sacramento

Tuesday, March 10 2015

North Natomas Library, 4660 Via Ingoglia, Sacramento

##### Redding

Thursday, March 12, 2015

City of Redding Community Room

777 Cypress Avenue, Redding

##### San Diego

Tuesday, March 17, 2015

Valencia Park/Malcolm X Branch Library and Performing Arts Center

5148 Market Street, San Diego

##### Riverside

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Riverside City College

4800 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside

[Los Angeles](#)

Thursday, March 19, 2015

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

818 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles

[Fresno](#)

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

Fresno City College

1101 East University Avenue, Fresno

[Oakland](#)

Thursday, March 26, 2015

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter

101 Eighth Street, Oakland

[CTP – ITSP Tribal Webinar](#)

March 11, 2015

[ITSP Draft 2015 Public Comment Period](#)

May 11, 2015 – June 8, 2015

[ITSP Distribution](#)

ITSP e-mailed to the CTP distribution list on 9-1-2015