



Appendix D: Public Comments on the Draft Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan and SBCTA Responses

San Bernardino County Long Range Multimodal
Transportation Plan

San Bernardino, CA

February 14, 2025



INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table 1. LRMTTP Public Comment Log

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
Courtney Aguirre (SCAG)	Email	See SCAG comments in Table 2 below	See SCAG comments in Table 2 below.
Christian Alamillo	Online Form	<p>The IE desperately needs more investment in transit and active transportation projects. Our car dependent infrastructure has bled our cities dry of financial integrity, cleanliness, safety, public health, and a sense of community. Highway expansion is costly, environmentally damaging, and seems to never alleviate traffic. I work in San Bernardino and would love to utilize a train, bus, or bike for my commute instead of driving through that godforsaken 215/60 interchange everyday.</p> <p>I support Metrolink/Arrow expansion, Omnitrans BRT, and a safely designed network of bicycle infrastructure. I hope to experience a more walkable San Bernardino in my lifetime.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. Specific Actions within the LRMTP Action Plan, Section 10, page 51 speak directly to the need to develop a Core Transit Network around which local land use and active transportation planning can be organized.</p>
Steve Bardwell	Email	<p>The Morongo Basin Conservation Association (MBCA) is pleased to provide comments on the LRMTTP. As one of the six regions within the LRMTTP, the Morongo Basin is distinct among the regions studied. Its predominantly rural character, ecological diversity and natural beauty draws millions of visitors from the nearby megalopolis of Southern California. Its proximity to the I-10, I-15, and I-40 makes the Morongo Basin a thoroughfare to these major highways. The projection of the 40% increase in growth of the Morongo Basin is in stark contrast to the limited growth projected for the Morongo Basin within the Countywide plan (CWP). The lack of infrastructure</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The growth projections within the LRMTTP are consistent with the projections included in the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan, but may not represent the latest development data at the local level. We have updated the Morongo Basin Subarea Plan to better reflect several of the issues you describe in your comment. Increased truck traffic is a concern across the County, which is why one of the Key Actions for Goods Movement includes the development of a regional freight corridor plan (LRMTP page 53). Multiple improvement projects along SR-62 within the Morongo Valley area are included in SBCTA's 10-Year Delivery Plan. The SBCTA</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>(water and sewer) will constrain future growth. The discrepancy between these two visions of the future must reconciled or fully explained and not codified in the LTMTTP.</p> <p>The following issues must be acknowledged and addressed within this forward-looking plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Barstow International Gateway (BIG) logistics center will generate additional traffic on State Highway 247. This highway will serve as a shortcut to the massive warehouses along the I-10 corridor. More roadway maintenance will be needed with this increase of traffic. 2. State Highway 247 is in the process of receiving Scenic Highway status that will increase traffic on this highway. 3. State Highway 247 is a notoriously unsafe highway and an increase in traffic will further exacerbate safety issues. 4. The constraints on the ability to improve this highway due to existing improvements, Right of Ways and topography. 5. The use of State Highway 247 by trucks transporting agricultural products from the Imperial Valley. Trucks may be using this highway to circumvent weight limitations. 6. The increased traffic on State Highway 62 due to the above issues on 247. 7. State Highways 247 and 62 sever wildlife corridors between the desert and mountains. The need for safe passage of wildlife must be considered and anticipated with the LRMTTP. <p>The North Desert area will be significantly impacted by</p>	<p>Board has also expressed concern about the SR 247/62 corridor and requested that Caltrans make a presentation on that topic. They did so as part of the SBCTA June 5, 2024 Board of Directors agenda, item 29. The agenda and a video recording of the meeting are available at:</p> <p>https://www.gosbcta.com/board/meetings-agendas/.</p> <p>In addition, SBCTA is developing a project in the Cajon Pass to extend a northbound truck lane on northbound I-15 3.5 miles to SR-138 to help relieve congestion there, which could help to keep trucks on the freeway system rather than alternates like SR 247/62. SBCTA is currently conducting an SR 247/62 Emergency Bypass Study that could set the stage for additional safety and operational improvements on that route. Presentations and public outreach on that project will occur later this year. As for Brightline West, the current project which is starting construction does not include a station in the North Desert area; however, there could be an opportunity to add a station at a future time if the population and employment in that area continues to grow.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>the construction of the Brightline West high speed rail project. The LRMTTP could take the opportunity to advocate for the inclusion of a rail stop in the north desert for this rail project. One can imagine the frustration of commuters stuck on their commute on I-15 as they watch the train passing at high speed!</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We hope to see these issues more fully covered in the final version of this plan.</p>	
Chuck Bell	Email	<p>The Lucerne Valley Economic Development Association strongly supports MBCA's comments – ATTACHED.</p> <p>We are also affected by traffic and road conditions on Hwy. 247 – but also Hwy. 18 between Lucerne and Apple Valleys. The Victor Valley Road project list does not seem to include either Highway. They have to be addressed. New traffic counts to start with.</p> <p>We need to be involved in this plan. Please include us on your distribution list.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment; please see the response to Mr. Bardwell's comment as well. The Victor Valley Subarea Plan does include improvements to a section of SR 18 between Apple Valley and Tao Rd. We are happy to add you to our distribution list and continue to discuss improvements in the Victor Valley area.</p>
Danilo Braga	Online Form	<p>I like what I see. My only wish is to fund alternative modes of transportation more over roadways. Seems busses and trains get a fraction of road funding.</p> <p>Until alternative modes of transportation are able to be more reliable and convenient than roads, it will never be mainstream. It won't happen with this lackluster funding.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see LRMTTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated.</p>
Danilo Braga	Online Form	<p>Please scrap the ONT tunnel project that involves cars. Cars are too inefficient. One plane's and train's worth of passengers will severely clog up the system.</p> <p>Also, please improve Metrolink schedules. The removal</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ONT Connector is available at https://www.gosbcta.com/ontconnector/. While the public comment period for the EIR has closed, there will be additional opportunities to provide input</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		of the express train in the morning is not feasible to those who commute into LA. This push is forcing me to drive again. The return of the late train is great. Let's keep that.	in upcoming phases. SBCTA will continue to work with Metrolink regarding on-time performance and on its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program which aims to improve frequency throughout the network.
Jeffrey Chan	Online Form	Metrolink is missing from this survey and prioritization; fund Metrolink SCORE projects and double-track in SB; electrify Metrolink San Bernardino Line to connect BLW. Increasing Metrolink SB Line frequency to every 30 minutes each direction and increasing weekend service.	Thank you for your comment. SBCTA will continue to work with Metrolink on its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program and evaluation of zero-emissions technology options. The LRMTP Action Plan, Section 10, page 51 specifies the need to continue developing a Core Transit Network which would include 30-minute daytime headways on the San Bernardino Line.
Catrina Choudhry	Online Form	I am DEEPLY OPPOSED to the Ontario International Airport Tunnel Connector. OmniTrans currently offers ONT Connect shuttle service. I would much rather see funds earmarked for the ONT Connector underground tunnel be used by OnmiTrans to increase the current frequency and waive fares entirely to encourage ridership. Since the infrastructure currently exists, these changes could be implemented immediately instead of enduring the construction phase.	Thank you for your comment. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ONT Connector is available at https://www.gosbcta.com/ontconnector/ . While the public comment period for the EIR has closed, there will be additional opportunities to provide input in upcoming phases. We will also share your comment with Omnitrans.
Nicholas Christensen	Email	It has come to my attention, as a resident of Morongo Valley and a business owner in Yucca Valley, that the transportation study concerning our section of San Bernardino County may be woefully overlooking some transportation realities that affect us acutely here in the high desert. Namely, I am speaking of the increase in heavy truck traffic along Highway 62 and Highway 247, corridors which are not well equipped (especially Highway 247) to accommodate big-rig trucking. 247 is a two lane highway with little visibility in many corridors, no	Thank you for your comment. Increased truck traffic is a concern across the County, which is why one of the key Actions for Goods Movement includes the development of a regional freight corridor plan (LRMTP page 53). Multiple improvement projects along SR-62 within the Morongo Valley area are included in SBCTA's 10-Year Delivery Plan (see Morongo Basin Subarea Plan). The SBCTA Board has also expressed concern about the SR 247/62 corridor and requested that Caltrans make a presentation on that topic. They did so as part of the SBCTA June 5,

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>street lighting, and no passing lanes. How is it that your organization is failing to account for the notable increase in truck traffic corridor, including but not limited to Agricultural transportation of fruits and vegetables, massive hay trucks, and other industrial container trucks?</p> <p>What it is more, it should be abundantly evident to you that the anticipated Barstow International Gateway (BIG) project will increase that traffic notably. The new fulfillment centers will likely use 247 as a trucking corridor to receive and send goods from Highway 10, as this is the shortest possible route for trucks coming West on Highway 10, and looking to link up with BIG. Please, include these elements in your study if you haven't started to already. The safety of our communities, and the unique rural character of our scenic highways depends on your attention.</p>	<p>2024 Board of Directors agenda, item 29. The agenda and a video recording of the meeting are available at: https://www.gosbcta.com/board/meetings-agendas/. In addition, SBCTA is developing a project in the Cajon Pass to extend a northbound truck lane on northbound I-15 3.5 miles to SR-138 to help relieve congestion there, which could help to keep trucks on the freeway system rather than alternates like SR 247/62. SBCTA is currently conducting an SR 247/62 Emergency Bypass Study that could set the stage for additional safety and operational improvements on that route. Presentations and public outreach on that project will occur later this year.</p>
Lucas Cuny	Online Form	<p>Need increased frequency in runs between Redlands and San Bernardino on the Arrow. There needs to be a direct route either by bus or shuttle from downtown San Bernardino transit to San Bernardino Valley College which runs between peak school hours. Valley is another key destination in the region.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Arrow service is at 30-minute intervals during peak hours (1-hour off-peak), and Omnitrans Route 1 runs directly between the Transit Center and Valley College at approximately 15-minute intervals. That is the maximum service available at current transit funding levels. We hope you will have an opportunity to check out Route 1. Your comment will be shared with Omnitrans.</p>
Bruce Daniels	Email	<p>In response to your call for comments on your draft transportation plan, I offer the following:</p> <p>The plan needs to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NON-ROAD ACCESS 2. INTERMOUNTAIN TRAIL 3. CALTRANS SR 18 AND 	<p>Thank you for your comment. We understand that there are limited active transportation projects in the LRMTTP within the Mountains subarea; one reason is a need for San Bernardino County and the City of Big Bear Lake to prioritize local projects for funding, and the other is that the trails in the Mountains area are largely recreational in nature (e.g. they do not provide work or school trips, or reduce vehicle miles traveled)</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>330 WORK WITH CALTRANS ALONG SR 18, INCLUDING TUNNELS FOR HIKERS, PEDESTRIANS AND WILDLIFE CORRIDORS</p>	<p>and therefore do not score well through the State's Active Transportation Program. We do see a need for greater coordination between SBCTA and other agencies in this area, including the US Forest Service, and we have included a relevant Action in Section 10 of the revised LRMTP and Mountains Subarea Plan. Non-road access is not currently included in the LRMTP due to the substantial level of funding that would be required.</p>
Kevin Dedicatoria	Written Comment	<p>I am writing my public comment on Agenda Item 10. I attached resources for the committee to review and consider at the end of my comment.</p> <p>I highly encourage SBCTA to revise and expand the existing transfer agreements with Metrolink and local transit systems. For example, VVTA does not track transfers on their systems and has no clear transfer agreements for their riders. Except for L.A. Metro, Metrolink riders can only transfer to local transit to or from a Metrolink station. That discourages and limits local transit ridership in San Bernardino County system wide. Omnitrans transfer agreements are confusing and can discourage potential riders from taking the service.</p> <p>I also advocate for the 30-minute frequent, reliable Metrolink service all day on the San Bernardino Line and more service along the Inland Empire-Orange County lines. I am a strong proponent for restoration of late-night trains on the San Bernardino Line and more weekend service on both lines. Events, like L.A. Dodger games and West Hollywood Pride, continue after the current Metrolink trains leave. I am behind</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. SBCTA will continue to work with transit operators to streamline transfer agreements and fare media. Many operators in San Bernardino County utilize Token Transit as a common way to purchase and use transit passes from multiple providers. Going forward, SBCTA will explore the potential for payment options using credit or debit cards that eliminate the need for specific fare cards. SBCTA endeavors to include as many groups and stakeholders in its outreach processes and welcomes the opportunity to engage further.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>SBCTA and the rest of the Metrolink board to secure the necessary investments for expanded, safe, and reliable service.</p> <p>I am excited for the upcoming West Valley Connector BRT project! I suggest SBCTA review the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) analysis on the project. It could serve as a blueprint to attract more federal and state funding for priority corridors. I highly encourage the following: dedicated bus lanes along Milliken in the future, expanded service hours and permanent weekend service, and more dense housing and economic development throughout the route.</p> <p>I commend and encourage SBCTA for ongoing improvements and enhancements to transit stops and safety. I hope this turns into progress to boost transit ridership countywide. I think feelings of safety throughout journeys are as important as the data SBCTA rely on.</p> <p>I also support the following: fare integration and adoption of interoperable fare payment and trip planning technology across San Bernardino County and regional public transportation services and modes. I made my case to Cal-STA's Transit Transformation Task Force meeting in August 2024 for a universal fare system across Southern California. It's frustrating San Bernardino County and the rest of Southern California has nothing like Clipper Card in the Bay Area.</p> <p>I advocate for SBCTA (alongside RCTC and OCTA) to integrate into L.A. County's TAP system. At a Meet the</p>	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>Planner meeting, Omnitrans' Service Planning Manager mentioned the inability of using TAP for fare payment as a top complaint for riders. Metrolink is pursuing a separate open-loop system, but local transit riders should not be excluded or required to ride Metrolink to benefit from an existing universal fare system. SCAG mentions that, "though the TAP program serves transit users in Los Angeles County, there is potential for future interactions with Metrolink or transit providers in neighboring counties."</p> <p>Is SBCTA aware of the upcoming TAP+ system? This will allow contactless credit and debit card payments on buses throughout L.A. County. I encourage SBCTA to look at them to justify TAP integration.</p> <p>Montclair Transit Center connects the Omnitrans core network, Foothill Transit, Metrolink, and soon the Metro Gold/A Line. This also includes the only 24-hour service between Los Angeles and San Bernardino County: Foothill Transit Silver Streak. I notice SBCTA's marketing rarely mentions or promotes the Montclair Transit Center. I advocate for more marketing, housing, and economic development along this transit hub.</p> <p>I also support Table 10 for San Bernardino County. Current Measure I funding alone cannot keep up with active and public transportation ambitions. I advocate for a separate sales tax dedicated to operations, expansion, and investments of public transportation and transit-oriented development (e.g., Metrolink, Omnitrans, VVTA, local transit outside San Bernardino County with stops in the County). I agree that more</p>	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>flexibility and availability of Measure I funds, like toll revenues, be allocated for public and active transportation. Tables 6 and 9 cannot happen without the committed public funds. San Bernardino County should seize any opportunities to implement Tables 6 and 9 and secure the revenues for them!</p> <p>What is SBCTA and SBCOG doing on Table 6 to benefit the LGBTQ+ population? We are part of San Bernardino County also! Table 9 is a prime opportunity to open doors for our population. For example, SBCTA did not acknowledge or do any events to honor Pride Month or LGBTQ History Month. Metrolink did not promote or dedicate exclusive services to L.A. or West Hollywood Pride events. I didn't even know about any Pride events in San Bernardino County! No resources or marketing have been allocated for the needs of the LGBTQ+ population. I advocate SBCTA work with public and sector partners to communicate and deliver resources for an underserved and overlooked part of the county.</p>	
Kevin Dedicatoria	Online Form	<p>Regional (i.e., SBCTA, RCTC, L.A. Metro, OCTA, VCTC) payment system covering local transit & Metrolink with contactless card app & phone; see Clipper Card in Bay Area, Ventra in Chicago, or countywide Pronto in San Diego County</p> <p>Balance road projects that benefit goods and active transportation in Victor Valley, San Bernardino Valley where possible</p> <p>Expand Metro A Line to Ontario International Airport</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. SBCTA will continue to work with transit operators to streamline transfer agreements and fare media. Many operators in San Bernardino County utilize Token Transit as a common way to purchase and use transit passes from multiple providers. Going forward, SBCTA will explore the potential for payment options using credit or debit cards that eliminate the need for specific fare cards. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>More local transportation/bus rapid transit investments in Pomona/West & Victor Valleys</p> <p>More toll road revenues go to public transit operations</p> <p>Dedicated tax revenue streams for active transportation and public transit operations by renewed Measure I or separate tax</p> <p>Metrolink Arrow to ONT Airport</p> <p>Electrify Metrolink</p> <p>Stop pursuing the ONT Connector project Implement the VVTA Master Plan & Omnitrans Priority Corridors</p> <p>Bus rapid transit Metrolink IEOC investment for more frequencies and performances Reach out to LGBTQ+ population and organizations & other population groups</p>	<p>years (see LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. SBCTA is continuing to work with Metrolink in studying various technology and zero-emissions options, as well as implementing its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ONT Connector is available at https://www.gosbcta.com/ontconnector/. While the public comment period for the EIR has closed, there will be additional opportunities to provide input in upcoming phases. The LRMTP Action Plan, Section 10, page 51 specifies the need to continue developing a Core Transit Network which would include improved Metrolink frequency and enhanced bus services. SBCTA endeavors to include as many groups and stakeholders in its outreach processes and welcomes the opportunity to engage further.</p>
Kevin Dedicatoria	Email	<p>I am writing on Agenda Item 5: Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan – Final Report. I commend and thank everyone working on the SBCTA Long Range Multimodal Transportation Plan (LRMTP). It is a blueprint to build on for the county and each subregion.</p> <p>I support the selection of the Priority Transit Corridors. I believe the Foothill Boulevard and San Bernardino Boulevard corridors are best for multimodal and economic investments across the Valley subarea. I encourage full bus rapid transit investments (e.g., bus</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. SBCTA continues to work with SCAG and State of California agencies to secure funds for transportation improvements. More information can be found in the LRMTP funding opportunities memo. We will continue to work with our regional partners to on transit technology compatibility.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>only lanes) throughout the corridors to decrease travel times and improve the service experience.</p> <p>I hope SBCTA and Omnitrans will reconsider the Foothill West, Grand-Edison, Euclid, and Haven Priority Transit Corridors soon. For example, the local road and freeway congestion have grown in Chino and Chino Hills. Widened roads will make the situation worse. Instead, let's expand the Omnitrans frequencies and OmniRide services in Upland, Chino, and Chino Hills. I support better multimodal connections on the 4 corridors for the following: active transportation, local transit, housing, retail, and major nearby destinations outside the area.</p> <p>I like the LRMTTP Key Actions for Disadvantaged Communities and Funding. Safety and comfort are important for current and future ridership. I was disappointed the westbound Holt and Vineyard stop has a shelter and bench. However, the eastbound stop does not have a shelter. Neither have trash bins. Benches and shelters are essential against the weather. I advocate for consistent safety and comfort at transit stops like shelters, trash bins, benches, and lighting.</p> <p>I am grateful to SBCTA's commitment to actions for disadvantaged communities and inclusive language. I am advocating SBCTA and SBCOG to implement both, especially towards the LGBTQ+ population. Some of us have jobs, families, but many also struggle with transit, housing, healthcare, and other services. I suggest SBCTA reach out to organizations like TruEvolution, Pomona Pride Center, and Equality California for PASTACC meetings and help on inclusive communication.</p>	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>I will end my public comment with questions about the LRMTTP.</p> <p>Who are the SBCTA's state and regional partners to secure additional funding?</p> <p>Or are they exclusive to just Riverside County and Metrolink?</p> <p>Will the public transit technologies under sections 9.4 & 9.5 and Tables 13 and 14 cover just San Bernardino County and possibly Riverside County transit?</p> <p>Or will that expand to Metrolink and L.A. County transit too (e.g., Foothill Transit)?</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	
Jerry Du	Online Form	<p>As a Chino Hills resident, I would like to see expanded hours of service for Omniride in Chino Hills and weekend service as well. This has been implemented for Bloomington Omniride, and it should be possible for Chino Hills residents to have reliable transportation around Chino Valley. Connectivity between transit centers surrounding Chino Valley are nonexistent, there is no direct service to connect Downtown Pomona, or the Corona-West Metrolink Station with Chino or Chino Hills. A return of previous fixed routes around Chino Valley will likely see higher ridership than in years past, due to the wave in transit ridership observed in the Omnitrans and other transit systems. These changes can better serve the residents of the area, who currently are some of the most car-reliant in the region.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Funding for transit operations in the region is limited (see LRMTTP Section 8.3) but local transit operators continue to look for opportunities to improve service. Your comment will be shared with Omnitrans.</p>
Brianna Egan	Email	<p>I have reviewed the LRMTTP Draft Document and am providing comments on specific pieces by section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision: Overall I support the use of performance tracking measures to evaluate progress over time and 	<p>Thank you for your comment. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>reassess projects. In particular I support the measures that track safety, miles of bike paths and lanes by class, transit ridership by system. I would suggest also adding measures to track mode share countywide and average trip time for bus and rail lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit: I support the focus on bus corridors and bus rapid transit treatment for faster bus service. I would suggest increasing the funding in Measure I to 10% as allowed but not pursued by the board. I support the completion of Brightline West and improvements to Metrolink San Bernardino Line including SCORE projects and frequency improvements to 30 minutes each direction. I do not support including ONT Connector as a BRT or Urban and Regional Rail project as it does not fall under either of these categories. The ONT Connector project should be cancelled as it is not a proven transit model and risks burning millions of transit dollars. It does not meet service-led planning criteria as described in the newly-released California State Rail Plan. In fact, the SRP identifies a need for Metrolink connections between ONT and San Bernardino and Riverside. SBCTA must reassess and pursue rail options that have been studied before such as: Metrolink SB Line and/or Riverside Line extensions to ONT Airport, LA Metro A Line extension to ONT Airport, or Metrolink Arrow extension to ONT Airport. This is a critical regional connectivity project that deserves rail connection, rather than unproven and wasteful car tunnels. SBCTA should expand Metrolink projects such as double-tracking and electrification of the line to run zero-emissions and faster service as well as through-run high speed rail trains similar to the Caltrain upgrades completed in 2024. Recently passed 	<p>transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. SBCTA is continuing to work with Metrolink in studying various technology and zero-emissions options, as well as implementing its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the ONT Connector is available at https://www.gosbcta.com/ontconnector/. While the public comment period for the EIR has closed, there will be additional opportunities to provide input in upcoming phases.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>legislation AB 2503 now streamlines and exempts rail electrification projects on publicly-owned ROW from CEQA review. This project would qualify, thus reducing costs and timeline. I do not support the ZEMU Hydrogen Arrow project and it has seen numerous cost increases and overruns and poses serious safety concerns with the hydrogen fueling station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways: I oppose new highway capacity additions (lane additions and highway widening) and new freeway interchanges which induces more truck traffic and pollution. For highway projects, the draft plan should propose adding toll lanes on existing highway lanes and applying revenue to transit projects to reduce traffic on the same corridors. I would support exploration of congestion pricing and VMT mitigation programs. • Active Transportation: I support Complete Streets projects and continuous protected bike lanes, especially Class I and Class IV. • Goods Movement: To truly address freight traffic and goods movement, SBCTA should coordinate with BNSF and Union Pacific to identify funding and plan for electrification of freight railroads such as the Cajon Pass to shift freight from trucks to trains on electricity. • Equity: In planning and analysis, please prioritize disabled and low-income communities who cannot drive or cannot afford to have a car. • Safety: I support first-last mile bike and pedestrian improvements to Metrolink stations. <p>I want to emphasize how wide roads lead to faster car speeds and more serious pedestrian and motor fatalities. Complete Streets elements and road lane narrowing can slow cars to improve safety. I would</p>	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>further more suggest shade structures are needed at Metrolink stations and bus stations where transit riders wait in high heat over the summer months.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health: As a public health advocate and medical professional in training, I want to emphasize how transit and emissions reductions plays a large role in the health of our community. To reduce air pollution and lung diseases we should not continue widening highways and roads. We should invest in transit and active transportation. • Land Use: I support SBCTA and cities to identify sites for transit-oriented development for zoning changes and develop housing on agency-owned land. Affordable housing is greatly needed in SB County. TOD can boost ridership of transit. • Environment and Air Quality: Please note that technology-neutral zero-emissions plans does not serve the community. Hydrogen technologies are considered zero-emissions but they are not “green” because 95% of hydrogen is derived from fossil fuel sources and delivery of hydrogen involves burning fossil fuels. Zero-emissions focuses should go towards electrification of the rail network and battery-electric hybrid systems. • Alternative Futures: Regarding modeling scenarios, I support the Enhanced Network and Smart Growth + Transit Expansion as these provide the most benefits and this is the direction we should be going in the county. • Funding: I oppose funding plans for interchange projects and local highway projects which will result in road widening and greater emissions and pollution. I would like to see an increase in BRT and active 	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>transportation funding according to Measure I. I largely support projects submitted for Caltrans ATP Cycle 7 (sidewalk improvements, safe routes to schools, bike lane networks). SBCTA should work to fund these projects from Measure I funds as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Plan: For Mobility, to position the transit network to be competitive for state and federal funding, work to align the projects with the California State Rail Plan including the service vision and corridors. This includes ending the ONT Connector project as currently planned and pursuing rail alternatives between ONT and Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink station. For rural communities: Collaborate with RCTC on the Coachella Valley rail line to connect with Riverside communities. I support fare integration and universal payment system/mobility wallet or credit card payment system on all San Bernardino transit modes. For Goods Movement, as mentioned above collaborate with logistics industry, BNSF, and UP to develop freight rail electrification program to reduce emissions from freight rail and shift freight from trucks to rail. For Climate Adaptation and Resiliency, abandon the ONT Connector project and instead coordinate with Brightline West and Metrolink to build a rail connection to ONT airport. Do not invest further in Arrow hydrogen fuel cell multiple units until it is adequately tested and financial modeling is performed. This project threatens to worsen climate change because hydrogen is much more fuel-intensive than even diesel. Instead you should explore conversion of DMU and ZEMU to BEMUs with Stadler for electric service, which is the gold standard around the world. <p>Thank you for considering my comments. I urge you to</p> 	

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>listen to the comments of advocates who have taken the time to review the plans, engage with the community meetings, and write in. There are consistent themes that have been heard throughout the process that are evident from the community outreach. It's imperative that you truly plan for the network of the future and the climate realities at hand for a more resilient, equitable, and sustainable system that works for drivers, transit riders, and logistics alike.</p>	
<p>Thanya Espericueta (Caltrans)</p>	<p>Email</p>	<p>2.2.1 Transit Page 11 of 65. There is a discussion of specialized transit providers in the district that help fill the transit network. Consider adding specific examples of the providers and the areas they serve.</p> <p>2.2.4 Goods Movement Page 13 of 65 There are maps for each of the multimodal networks previously discussed (active, transit, highway/freeway network). Consider adding a Goods Movement map for consistency.</p> <p>2.2.4 Goods Movement Page 13 of 65 Defining what short line railroads are would benefit general public that may be unfamiliar with term</p> <p>4.2 How will we get there? Page 19 of 65 Appreciate the distinction between "tracking measures" and performance measures that are used to evaluate the scenarios. Consider expanding on the discussion of how/why the performance measures were selected over others.</p> <p>Appendix A – Community & Stakeholder Engagement - No comment on edits. Including all the stakeholder meeting materials, survey results, questions asked during meeting, etc. adds transparency to the stakeholder engagement process and is appreciated.</p> <p>Appendix B - Transit Conditions – no comments</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. We have made some edits to the document in response to your suggestions, particularly regarding Goods Movement and references to the regional map in the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>Appendix C – Modeling Assumptions – no comments Existing conditions- no comments Grant Funding Memo- No comments on edits. Just want to mention the grant program table is structured nicely and having a section for eligible activities helps highlight the need for operational and maintenance funds (only 3 of the 19 programs funds O&M)</p>	
David Flores	Online Form	<p>Give us anything BUT more car infrastructure please. We have so many families and people struggling in SB county, and the need for a car is another bill stacked on top of everything else we need to pay for. Funding car alternative transportation, like safer sidewalks, protected bike lanes, bus and rail etc. makes us healthier, our air cleaner, is cheaper, more sustainable and substantially safer. I want the rail projects and investment into public transportation infrastructure that even people from other countries would take notice and applaud us for it. They definitely won't do that for yet another highway expansion. So I stand in staunch opposition to all the car projects as we have paved over and fractured enough with unsafe roads, and support wholeheartedly all of those projects, from double-tracking and electrifying the SB line to utilizing the Arrow to its full potential without all the gimmicks of hydrogen and building our cities around people and the environment first.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. SBCTA will continue to work with Metrolink on its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program and evaluation of zero-emissions technology options.</p>
Justine Garcia	Email	<p>Apologies for the delayed comment. I was reviewing the plan documents and I think it's addressed maybe in Appendix B, Section 2, but I wanted to make sure we are not forgetting a future alignment of West Valley Connector, or some sort of BRT Line through Rancho Cucamonga along Foothill that then heads south into Chino via Central or Euclid. I believe this is what the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Foothill and Euclid corridors are included in Omnitrans' list of priority corridors, represented by the brown and green lines on Figure 1 of LRMTP Appendix B, Transit Vision. The specific investments on these corridors have not been determined and would be planned in coordination with Omnitrans and local jurisdictions.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		dark green line "Euclid", on Figure 1 is showing but just wanted to make sure. The City of Rancho Cucamonga sees this as a critical future connection to the southern edge of the west valley.	
J Hardman	Email	<p>I know it's not a priority, but the Yaamava Casino creates a lot of traffic. Friday through Sunday, and also during the week. There have been some very serious vehicle accidents.</p> <p>I feel that some serious consideration should be given to a dedicated mode of going to and leaving the Casino SAFELY !! Adding lane's has not worked !! For example a Monorail or a Shuttle System like the Arrow train between downtown Redlands and San Bernardino. The Casino brings TONS of Revenue to the Inland Empire, I don't think It would be a loss to consider this proposal !!, Also the San Manuel Indians contribute a lot money to the community !!</p> <p>Well that's my input, whether it's taken seriously or not, THANK YOU</p>	Thank you for your comment. While a rail connection to the casino is unlikely due to high costs, Omnitrans Route 1 provides service nearby. SBCTA will continue to coordinate with tribal entities regarding transportation improvements, including the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians.
Rosemary Hoerning	Online Form	<p>The City of Montclair requests that the Planned San Antonio Creek Trail Lineal Park be included in the high comfort off street non-motorized bicycle trail, which will connect to the SP/PE Trail. Page 56</p> <p>The lineal bicycle and pedestrian trail is planned through the entirety the City of Montclair, approximately 3 miles. The City is currently completing the first segment on the San Antonio Creek Trail Lineal Park between Kingsley Street and Orchard Street.</p>	Thank you for your comment. An updated list of Active Transportation Projects has been included in the LRMTP . This included additional input from individual cities to confirm accuracy and add projects as needed.
William Klein	Email	Please stop wasting money on freeway widening projects and hydrogen trains, and focus on frequent, electric metro rail lines. Freeway widening does not reduce congestion, intermodal freight and fast public transportation does. The best thing you could do is	Thank you for your comment. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>force trucks off the road and onto rail with congestion pricing. Failing that, make metro a viable alternative to the churn of road congestion. Widening the roads just encourages more driven miles to fill the empty space.</p> <p>Hydrogen is similarly a step backwards, increasing operating costs without improving transit times like electrified rail service would. Please stop investing in a broken system and invest in proven technology, canary wire electrified trains.</p>	<p>LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. SBCTA will continue to work with Metrolink on its Southern California Optimized Rail Expansion (SCORE) program which aims to improve frequency throughout the network, as well as evaluation of zero-emissions technology options.</p>
Lance Lamore	Online Form	<p>Please invest heavily in transit oriented development around the existing transit lines.</p> <p>Low cost items include: Please plant more trees along the Pacific electric trail and add water fountains</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Specific Actions within the LRMTP Action Plan, Section 10, page 51 speak directly to the need to develop a Core Transit Network around which local land use and active transportation planning can be organized.</p>
Nicholas Leong	Online Form	<p>After reviewing the Long-Range Multimodal Transit Plan, I urge the board to prioritize projects that put pedestrians, cyclists, and transit ahead of private transportation. This is because, historically, we have always been a minority and are the most vulnerable users of transportation in the county, not to mention the pollution and traffic private transportation causes and which these alternatives do not or do to a lesser extent to that of private transportation. I also urge the board to prioritize proven technologies for transit projects, and not unproven technologies such as hydrogen trains or tunnels with low-capacity autonomous pods running through them. Doing this will use our tax dollars more effectively and efficiently, allowing more transportation that may not be in the Vision to be fulfilled, or for the Vision to come to life sooner.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment on project prioritization. While SBCTA does have an obligation and a need to fund roadway improvements under Measure I, the region has expanded its transit, shared-ride services, and active transportation significantly over the past 10 years (see LRMTP Sections 8 and 11). For potential future funding measures, the SBCTA Board has expressed interest in greater flexibility in how funding is allocated. SBCTA will continue to work with our partner agencies, including Metrolink and Omnitrans, to evaluate transportation technology and zero-emissions options.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
Paige Mann	Online Form	Thank you so much for continuing to promote public transportation, connections, walkability, safety, and safer bicycling conditions. I'm particularly looking forward to continued Eastward expansion of the Santa Ana River Trail. Thank you.	Thank you for your comment.
Jim Miller	Online Form	The SCAG and SBCTA traffic models that determine future growth do not assign a land use value for federal lands. As such visitor vehicle counts to the San Bernardino Mountains, which is estimated at more than 20 million vehicle trips per year, is not reflected in any long planning documents. Since there are numerous disadvantaged communities in this area, the traffic models can be viewed as discriminatory due to their failure to address greatly needed transportation capitol improvements. Proof of this is found in the SBCTA 10 year delivery plan in which no projects are funded on any state highways that travel through the San Bernardino National Forest. Therefore SBCTA is not meeting any of the states "social equity" requirements when not specifically addressing the lack of funding for these disadvantaged communities.	Thank you for your comment. While it is correct that the SBTAM modeling does not account for the type of recreational and tourism traffic that the mountain areas encounter, and does not address weekend travel, the Mountain Area Transportation Study (MATS) referenced in the Mountain Subarea Plan did construct a special small-area model specifically for that purpose. In addition, MATS identified a number of improvements on and off state highways that could address the bottlenecks and operational problems identified by stakeholders, including the City of Big Bear Lake. It is a point well taken, however, that there appears to be limited funding being devoted to implementation of some of those improvements on state highways. The three projects identified in the 10-Year Delivery Plan are Moonridge Road Realignment and Roundabout, Stanfield Cutoff Roundabout, and Stanfield Cutoff Pavement Improvement. Caltrans has some \$370 million in funds identified in their State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) 10-Year Project Book for State Routes 18, 38, and 138, but most of this is related to roadway maintenance (e.g. pavement and drainage). SBCTA is happy to initiate further discussions with Caltrans, City, and County to determine additional projects from the MATS study on state highways that could be prioritized, but the lead agency will need to be Caltrans.

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
Bob Patterson	Email	<p>The meeting is very informative about a lot of possible projects.</p> <p>I didn't hear much about any of the many bike/cycling projects in the Highland-Redlands, mountain communities (Big Bear) areas.</p> <p>We have talked a lot about the Safe Route to Schools path across the Santa Ana wash. The SART being completed to Mentone, and finally building and completing several project in biking/cycling community of Big Bear valley.</p> <p>I hope we can keep these projects on a priority list moving forward 🙏!</p> <p>Ginger, Thank you for your help.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We understand that there are limited active transportation projects in the LRMTTP within the Mountains subarea; one reason is a need for San Bernardino County and the City of Big Bear Lake to prioritize local projects for funding, and the other is that the trails in the Mountains area are largely recreational in nature (e.g. they do not provide work or school trips, or reduce vehicle miles traveled) and therefore do not score well through the State's Active Transportation Program. We do see a need for greater coordination between SBCTA and other agencies in this area, including the US Forest Service, and we have included a relevant Action in Section 10 of the revised LRMTTP and Mountains Subarea Plan.</p>
Mark B Roberts	Online Form	<p>The plan as written includes many, many projects that would require a continuing major effort and is very ambitious and thoughtful. But I would suggest adding continue working on building grade separation projects.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Grade separations are included in the LRMTTP as a priority for Goods Movement and as a key action in the Action Plan, page 52; however, the funding remaining for the Measure I grade separation category has been mostly expended on prioritized grade separation projects.</p>
Bill W.	Online Form	<p>Once again, the high desert gets as little as possible. I moved to Adelanto in 1991 after growing up in Cucamonga (sans Rancho). Since that time, the state, county, city and utilities have talked about Hwy. 395 and Hwy 18 (west of 395). After 30 years, 395 finally saw improvements through Adelanto, but really it should have had phase II done first. Hopefully that comes to fruition in the next few years. Hwy 18 on the other hand has seen tons of improvement east of 395, but nada west of it. As the area continues to grow, traffic gets worse and deaths on the stretch by my neighborhood happen way too often. Sirens and helicopters at night are a regular occurrence and road</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Specific improvements planned for the Adelanto area are included in the Victor Valley Subarea Plan. Development of operational and safety improvement recommendations for SR-18 west of US 395 is included in SBCTA's funded 10-Year Delivery Plan. A report has been prepared by SBCTA and LA Metro developing a plan for flattening the profile, providing better drainage, and adding a center turn lane on this segment of SR-18. This will be followed by a Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) starting later this year.</p>

Name:	Source:	Comment(s):	Response:
		<p>closures are probably a weekly topic on VVNG (Facebook group). After Caltrans gave up on the driving portion of the E-220 High Desert Corridor, those funds should have been funneled to widening, flattening and making 18 a safer east/west corridor from Hwy 395 to Hwy 14. San Bernardino needs to catch up with LA County.</p>	
Curtis Yakimow	Online Form	<p>The Town of Yucca Valley has reviewed the draft plan and sub-plans. The planning documents reflect the majority of impacts on the Town as well as identifying and recognizing the need for potential mitigation in the critical areas of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State Hwy 62 capacity enhancement 2. State Hwy 247 capacity enhancement 3. Freight corridor traffic flows through Yucca Valley on State Hwys 62/247 4. Impacts on local circulation resulting from traffic diversion to State Hwys 62/247 related to Interstate 10 & 15 traffic flows - particularly freight travel. 5. Recognition of State Hwy 62 as critical access to MGAGCC in 29 Palms. <p>The Town appreciated the opportunity to participate in the development of these plans.</p>	Thank you for your comment.

Table 2. SCAG Comment Log

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
1	Action Plan	PDF 59	<p>Re: this action item: Develop design guidelines for a tiered mobility hub network that co-locates transit and active transportation amenities such as bike sharing. Please consider adapting or using the mobility hub guidelines SCAG will be</p>	The action item has been revised to reference ongoing SCAG work.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
			finalizing in winter/spring 2025. Please clarify within the text- what is the timeframe for these actions to be implemented (e.g., near-term, mid-term, long-term).	
2	Active Transportation	PDF 12	Consider citing the number of bikeways that remain unbuilt.	Comment noted; the number of unbuilt bikeways is difficult to quantify since the list of projects is frequently changing.
3	Active Transportation	PDF 12	"The County has 645 miles of bikeways compared to over 11,400 miles of roads." The intent of this statement is to show there are significantly less miles of bikeways compared to roads. However, it could be helpful to clarify if these are centerline miles or counting each direction of the roadway.	The text has been revised to clarify these are centerline miles.
4	Active Transportation	PDF 31	For the first sentence under 6.3, consider adding the connection between active transportation and equity as active transportation can increase travel choices: "Active transportation plays a vital role in the integration of multimodal mobility and is consistent with the goals of promoting sustainability, advancing equity , and improving air quality outlined in this LRMTF."	This addition was made.
5	Active Transportation	PDF 31	Part of the second bullet is unclear. Perhaps text is missing? "...installing sidewalks and multi-use paths that link key destinations and provide access along areas with high (?) vehicle speeds or volumes, using the existing inventory of sidewalks across the County as a launch point;	This addition was made.
6	Active Transportation	PDF 31	Consider adding specificity for active transportation funding/set-asides in the third bullet. It is currently a broad recommendation to coordinate funding, which could apply for any mode.	The text has been revised to clarify that the sentence refers to active transportation projects. The funding landscape is uncertain regarding the details of potential new sources that could increase available funding.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
7	County Overview	PDF 3	Consider adding language describing how a community is quantitatively determined to be "disadvantaged" and the threshold for "low-income."	An explanation of the statutory community designations has been added.
8	County Overview	PDF 8	SCAG is referenced throughout the document. It would be helpful to provide information on the relationship of SBCTA to SCAG at the beginning of the document.	An explanation of the relationship of SBCTA and SCAG has been added to Section 1.1.
9	Equity	PDF 20	Although specified in the "Goals" column, consider specifying transportation cost burden under the "Objectives" column: Reduce transportation cost burden to underserved communities.	This addition was made.
10	Equity	Overall	Recommend SBCTA to define or adopt an equity definition to provide clear direction of what "disadvantaged community" means; a clear definition will guide how policy or actions can be developed to protect these populations; the SB1000 Equity Toolkit is also a great resource that should be extensively discussed.	For the purposes of this plan, statutory definitions for the state were used.
11	Equity	PDF 9	Last sentence in section doesn't make sense. This section can also include explanation of what SBCTA will do to help promote equity in SBCTA's jurisdiction (i.e. will projects be prioritized in disadvantaged communities? Will additional equity studies be done to ensure projects funded will benefit disadvantaged communities?) Prioritization of equity at the state and federal levels is a good thing but won't be helpful if SBCTA isn't already developing project scopes that benefit/uplift disadvantaged communities.	Wording has been revised for clarity. Actions related to equity are included later in the document (Section 9.4).
12	EVs (and ZEVs)	PDF 29	First paragraph, last sentence: "The conversation to zero-emission buses will include both electric and hydrogen-powered fleets." If possible, considering adding further detail about the anticipated fleet needs and breakdown in vehicle fuel preference (electric vs. hydrogen). It would be helpful to understand which fleets intend to focus on electric vs. hydrogen and for any routes in particular for the entire county.	The operators are in varying stages of transition and the precise mix of propulsion technology may change as vehicles are tested in the diverse geographies of the county.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
13	EVs (and ZEVs)	PDF 38	When discussing hydrogen in paragraph 3, could also include reference to WRCOG's Clean Cities & Communities Coalition and their WRCOG Inland Empire ZEV and Hydrogen Working Group, which focuses on the Houston to LA I-10 Hydrogen Corridor Project and is always seeking new participants and partners from SBC.	Comment noted.
14	Funding	PDF 9	Section 3.2.6 should discuss transit operating revenue for new Metro A Line service to Montclair and Arrow Service. Also, are Omnitrans and VVTA sufficiently funded?	Transit operations funding is discussed in Section 8.3.
15	Funding	PDF 47	Funding discussion omits operating costs for Metro A Line and transit tunnel to Ontario Airport.	The section has been revised to note the impacts of the A Line and ONT connector.
16	Funding	PDF 50-51	Consider discussing declining gas tax and need to explore new or offsetting funding in addition to sales tax.	The plan acknowledges the problem of declining gas tax revenue, but a replacement funding mechanism must be determined by state and federal policy.
17	Funding	PDF 50-51	Beyond support, SBCTA could take lead in more competitive applications on behalf of the local agencies (admin, etc.) to help compete.	Comment noted; roles on specific applications will be determined in coordination with SBCTA's partners on a case-by-case basis.
18	Funding	PDF 56	Consider financing options like TIFIA to accelerate or maximize Measure I investments.	Comment noted.
19	Funding	PDF 56	Consider SBCTA taking a larger role in grant applications/administration for partner agency projects.	Comment noted; roles on specific applications will be determined in coordination with SBCTA's partners on a case by case basis.
20	Funding	PDF 58	Discuss potential of VMT bank to fund non-highway or affordable housing projects.	Development of a mitigation bank is included in the LRMTF

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
				Action Plan, and specific funding eligibility will be determined as the bank is developed.
21	Funding	PDF 48	Second paragraph: "Victory Valley" should be "Victor Valley". Also spell out Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA).	The text has been revised.
22	General	PDF 20	Would it be possible to classify performance measures by each goal category, or link the goals to a specific objective(s)?	This was considered during the plan development process, but the performance measures do not map to the objectives one-to-one and have been listed together to reduce redundancy.
23	Goods Movement	PDF 13	Section 2.2.4 describes the goods movement system, but does not provide a map illustrating key freight corridors, rail lines, and major intermodal facilities (similar to what is shown in the LRMTF Story Map). Given the importance of goods movement to SB's local economic growth, this would provide context to where that activity is occurring, and where the primary ingress/egress points for freight traffic are within the county.	A reference has been added to the SCAG Connect SoCal Goods Movement Technical Report, which includes several maps of the freight system.
24	Goods Movement	PDF 13	It may be worth emphasizing that the transportation and warehousing sector alone accounts for 129,800 jobs (December 2023,) in San Bernardino County; approximately 15% of all employment (see SCAG Economic Insights & Trends Tool (https://scag.ca.gov/economic-insights-data-resources)). If not here, then more detailed employment stats may be appropriate in section 6.4.	This addition was made.
25	Goods Movement	PDF 13	The third paragraph describes the UP/BNSF intermodal facilities, but it could also include mention of both Class I's large classification yards in San Bernardino (UP West Colton and BNSF Depot in San Bernardino).	This addition was made.
26	Goods Movement	PDF 13	Although managed by a separate entity, the Ontario International Airport is also a significant generator of logistics trips in the county. A quick description of the airport, freight volume trends	Discussion of ONT has been added.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
			and key shippers that operate dedicated terminals at the airport would be appropriate in this section, and in the larger discussion of goods movement further down in the report.	
27	Goods Movement	PDF 16	Section 3.2.4 - It may also be worth mentioning that population and jobs growth are directly linked to increased freight traffic and the congestion/air quality issues created by truck traffic. While San Bernardino is a waypoint in the larger national supply chain network, it is also the fifth most populous county in California and a significant consumer of imported goods as well.	Comment noted.
28	Goods Movement	PDF 17	Section 3.2.7 - Note the impacts of high volumes of truck traffic on the state of good repair for the county's highways and local roads. This compounds the resiliency challenges created by climate change and the revenue gap that the county and local agencies face when trying to maintain even more deteriorating roads and bridges.	This addition was made.
29	Goods Movement	PDF 18	Safety: Add "freight traffic" to the list of multimodal traffic conflicts to improve.	This addition was made.
30	Goods Movement	PDF 20	Environment-Objectives: include more specific objectives for clean freight (e.g. BEV or hydrogen MD/HD trucks, supporting ZEV infrastructure), and include a performance measure for ZEV transition (# of ZEV freight vehicles, number/capacity of permitted and constructed ZEV charging/fueling stations)	The LRMTTP supports transition to clean freight, but the specifics of implementation are still being determined. SBCTA may revisit performance measures for clean freight as implementation progresses.
31	Goods Movement	PDF 29	Update 6.2 Highways, 2nd paragraph to "...which are supported by fuel efficiency standards, transition of the statewide truck fleet to zero-emissions , and policies to reduce VMT."	While the state remains supportive of transitioning truck fleets to zero-emissions, CARB has rescinded its regulation requiring this to happen statewide.
32	Goods Movement	PDF 30	5th bullet in list: ideally incorporate both infrastructure and operational strategies for FLM access to highways.	This addition was made. The text has been revised.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
33	Goods Movement	PDF 30	7th bullet in list: "...investing in projects and educational outreach to minimize conflict..."	This addition was made.
34	Goods Movement	PDF 33	Rewrite the last bullet to include more discussion of both the need for workforce development in the freight and trade industry to address truck driver shortages (ZE or not) and the lack of technicians to maintain ZE vehicles and install the needed infrastructure to support charging (EVCS and connecting electrical grid) or hydrogen fueling.	The text has been revised.
35	Goods Movement	PDF 35	Land use coordination with local agencies should also include coordination around: compliance with AB 98; establishing "charge ready" corridors and warehouses/industrial facilities across the county;	The text has been revised.
36	Goods Movement	PDF 36	Last paragraph: "...support agencies in incorporating alternative fuel technologies into their fleets, to include buses, autos, trucks, and municipal service vehicles (waste collection, street sweepers, step vans, etc.)... " - It is critical that in addition to private sector transportation services, municipal services switching to BEV or H2 vehicles will support the overall transition, and also help prime related markets (workforce development, utility upgrades, dealer support service, etc.).	The text has been revised.
37	Goods Movement	PDF 38	First paragraph, last sentence: Note that the Hydrogen Hub Program has awarded funds to the ARCHES project, which will establish the hydrogen hubs across California. SBCTA may want to look for project partnership opportunities with them, as hydrogen fueling may be critical to the long haul fleet that operates between San Bernardino and to other western and southwestern states. It also may support the Arrow service's transition to ZEMU.	The text has been revised.
38	Goods Movement	PDF 38	Second paragraph, first sentence: Note that the statewide goals for freight ZEV are being set by the ACT and ACF regulations; streamlining legislation to support infrastructure development	While the state remains supportive of transitioning truck fleets to zero-emissions, CARB has rescinded its regulation

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
			and land use alignment is in place through AB98, AB 970, AB1100, AB 1236, and SB 1000.	requiring this to happen statewide.
39	Highways	PDF 7-8	Include discussion on SB743 as it relates to new highway/HOT lanes projects.	The text has been revised.
40	Highways	PDF 13	Should include performance metric for pavement condition and SOGR for transportation infrastructure.	Thank you for your comment.
41	Highways	PDF 22-23	TSMO and/or ITS should also be strategies.	TSMO and ITS have been added as strategies.
42	Highways	PDF 23	Figure 13 should show I-10 Express Lanes as completed or operational.	The outdated express lane map has been removed.
43	Highways	PDF 55	Consider adding in PCI scores for SOGR evaluation.	The action plan has been revised to include PCI in SOGR evaluation.
44	Land Use	PDF 28	It would be useful to include a sentence in the introduction summarizing how improved coordination of land use and transportation planning may improve countywide sustainability and air quality outcomes.	This addition was made.
45	Land Use	PDF 29	Last bullet of Land Use section: "...Adjust development standards to require consideration of all transportation modes and reduce parking minimums where they make sense ." If possible, please be more direct in reducing parking minimums. "where they make sense" is abstract in a long-range transportation plan. Small adjustments to parking minimums, whether in rural or urban areas, can help reduce overdevelopment of parking, reduce the overall development footprint, and improve sustainable practices and air quality.	The text has been revised to remove "where they make sense."
46	Land Use	PDF 28	Last sentence of fourth bullet. "For example, SBCTA and transit agencies can identify regional corridors where transit services will be expanded and collaborate share this information with cities as they to encourage and consider zoning changes and new developments."	The text has been revised.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
47	Modeling Results	PDF 35	It would be helpful if a legend was provided for Table 5 to explain the color coding.	The table has been revised.
48	Modeling Results	PDF 37	Please also provide revenue percentage shares on the pie chart featured in Figure 16.	The chart has been revised.
49	Performance Measures	PDF 13	Table 3: Suggest more specifically aligning each of the eleven indicated performance measures with one (or more) of the six goals.	This was considered during plan development; however, the performance measures do not map to the objectives one-to-one and have been listed together to reduce redundancy.
50	Safety	PDF 27	Please clarify which plans this sentence refers to: "The existing plans have general strategies and more subarea or jurisdiction focused recommendations that are not necessarily or funded."	The text has been revised.
51	Safety	PDF 27	It may be helpful to include transportation safety performance measures related to impacts on disadvantaged communities and vulnerable road users.	As discussed in Section 4.2, safety metrics could be tracking measures moving forward, but the performance measures used for evaluating scenarios are limited by the capabilities of travel forecasting models.
52	Stakeholder Engagement	PDF 23	Please update references to SCAG teams involved. Please add SCAG's Multimodal Integration team to the Mobility Working Group members.	The text has been revised.
53	Transit	PDF 27	Consider these additional strategies to motivate transit ridership: Mobility as a Service (MaaS), mobility hubs, dedicated lanes and transit signal priority treatments, and transit-oriented development (TOD, understand this is referenced under land use, but helps to reinforce it here as well). Consider reinforcing the importance of maintaining a state of good repair and transit asset management - as an approach for improving reliability and resilience, for example. Consider emphasizing the importance of inter-agency coordination on fleet transitions (e.g., negotiating	Comment noted.

Comment #	Category:	Page #:	Comment(s):	Response
			with utility providers, allowing for shared facilities- even across counties/service areas).	