



# **K** Draft 2050 MTP/SCS Comments and Responses

This page left blank intentionally.

## Introduction

The 2050 MTP/SCS is the blueprint for a regional transportation system that further enhances our quality of life, promotes sustainability, and offers more mobility options for people and goods. The 2050 MTP/SCS is built on an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system so it meets the diverse needs of our changing region through 2050.

On November 17, 2025 AMBAG released the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for public review and comment. Six public workshops and public hearings were held in January 2026 to facilitate public comment on the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR.

Generally, the comments received on the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS covered the following broad issues:

- Support for/opposition to transportation modes and specific projects
- Formatting on the MTP/SCS document and figures
- Comments on the project list
- Comments on sustainability, climate change, and housing issues

The close of the public comment period for the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS and Draft EIR was January 30, 2026. Staff has compiled the comments received on the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS and prepared written responses, which are included as an attachment to this Appendix.

## Draft 2050 MTP/SCS Public Comments and Responses Received During the Public Comment Period

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
1	AMBAG Board Member	Ansaldó-Sánchez	Fernando	Chapter 2	<p>I am writing to provide input on the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). While I serve on the AMBAG Board of Directors, I will be unable to attend the upcoming meeting due to a previously scheduled Soledad City Council meeting occurring at the same time. I appreciate the opportunity to submit my comments in writing.</p> <p>I respectfully urge AMBAG's Board of Directors to prioritize the inclusion of direct, reliable transit connections between South Monterey County and the Monterey Peninsula.</p> <p>Transportation remains one of the greatest barriers to educational access for many residents of Soledad and the greater South Monterey County. Students traveling to Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) and California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) face limited, indirect, time-consuming, and often unreliable transit options. These challenges make it difficult for students to attend classes consistently, access campus resources, and fully participate in academic life.</p> <p>For students in rural communities such as Gonzales, Soledad, Greenfield, and King City, the lack of direct transit connections results in long commutes, missed classes, financial strain, and, in some cases, delayed graduation or decisions to stop out entirely. These barriers disproportionately impact first-generation college students, low-income students, and those without access to a personal vehicle.</p> <p>Including direct transit routes between South Monterey County and the Monterey Peninsula in the 2050 MTP and SCS would significantly improve educational access, equity, and regional mobility. These investments would also support regional sustainability goals by reducing single-occupancy vehicle travel, lowering greenhouse gas emissions, and expanding environmentally responsible transportation options.</p> <p>Improved transit connectivity would strengthen the entire region by supporting student success, workforce development, and long-term economic stability, while ensuring rural communities are not left behind in regional planning efforts.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this input as we develop the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. I appreciate the AMBAG Board's leadership and commitment to creating a more connected, equitable, and sustainable Monterey Bay region.</p>	<p>MST currently has a local fixed route circulator in each of the four incorporated cities in south county. Those local routes operate every half hour on weekdays, generally 6am to 6pm, and they provide connections to Line 23. Line 23/23X is MST's regional service that connects south county to City of Salinas. Line 23 operates hourly weekdays from about 5am to 9pm and Line 23X supplements it creating 30-minute frequencies northbound from 5am-8am on weekdays and southbound from 3pm-6pm on weekdays. Line 23 operates hourly on weekends from about 7am to 8pm. From Salinas, the public can transfer to Line 20 (the future SURFI BRT) to access the Monterey Peninsula. Line 20 operates weekdays, every 30-minutes (5am-6pm) and every 60 minutes (6pm-10pm). Line 20 operates weekends, every hour (7am-9pm).</p> <p>In general, MST plans to continue this level of service, which slightly exceeds the MST-board adopted service plan that was adopted in 2022. Line 20 will convert to the SURFI line in early 2028, with 15-minute frequencies on weekdays (6am-10pm) and 30-minute frequencies on weekends (7:30am-8:30pm). MST has a long-term vision for rapid bus service along the Highway 101 corridor so that passengers traveling between south county and Monterey peninsula will have an overall faster trip as included in the 2050 MTP/SCS.</p>	Email	1/12/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
2	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapters 4 and 5	<p>As a member of the AMBAG Board of Directors and as a resident of Del Rey Oaks, I want to thank the staff and partner agencies for the thoughtful, comprehensive effort that went into the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS. The document reflects deep technical rigor and a genuine commitment to aligning mobility, climate, and community priorities across the Monterey Bay region. I offer the following comments in a spirit of partnership, with the goal of helping the Final Plan land even more clearly and be easier to implement.</p> <p>1) Clarify GHG ambition and ongoing accountability I appreciate the Plan's compliance with CARB's -6% per-capita 2035 target and the strong modeled result. While the plan correctly states that it meets CARB's -6% per capita GHG reduction target by 2035, it should also consistently reference the modeled outcome of approximately -7.7%, thereby establishing a transparent margin of safety. To make this crystal clear for readers, consider consistently presenting both the statutory target and the modeled reduction in all relevant sections, along with a brief explanation of the "margin of safety." (See "Meeting GHG Targets," 4-38; plus "Outcomes—Performance Outcomes" and Table 5-1, 5-3–5-4.)</p> <p>2) Move from narrative to an implementation-ready funding appendix The constrained plan and maintenance needs are explained well. To support near-term decisions, consider adding a concise Revenue Options Appendix that compares potential tools (e.g., renewals, developer contributions in Priority Growth Areas, VMT/Mileage-based pilots) by yield, equity implications, and feasibility, and maps each option to specific programs with a 2026–2028 action timeline calendar. (See "Financial Plan," 3-1–3-12; especially Figure 3-1 &amp; Figure 3-2 on 3-7, Table 3-1 on 3-8, and Table 3-2 on 3-12; also ES "Financial Plan," ES-7.)</p> <p>3) Highlight mode shift and safety with interim targets The performance framework is strong. To make it more actionable, consider introducing a few 2030 and 2035 numeric checkpoints or interim targets (e.g., severe injuries per 1,000 VMT, residents/jobs within ½ mile of high-quality transit, walk/bike mode share), visualized on a public dashboard. This would keep the focus on outcomes while remaining flexible about project selection. (See "Outcomes—Performance Outcomes," 5-3–5-4 (Table 5-1); "Transportation Performance Management," 5-16; "Safety Performance Measures," 5-18; and "System Performance Measures," 5-19.)</p> <p>4) Emerge from "monitoring" to light-touch policy on AVs/curbs The technology section is clear, descriptive, and current. To better connect it to SCS outcomes, consider a short Curb &amp; Automation Policy Toolkit (for example, guidance on pricing deadheading, zero-emission pick-up/drop-off near transit, and signal priority) so local partners have an off-the-shelf menu when opportunities arise. (See "Future Transportation Technologies," 2-25.)</p>	Staff will review the relevant sections and add additional clarifying language, as appropriate.	Email	1/14/2026
3	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Executive Summary and Chapter 3	<p>The purpose of the MTP/SCS is a 20+ year long range planning document. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is the short term implementation document of the MTP/SCS that identifies all of the revenue constrained funding for funded projects for five years.</p>	The purpose of the MTP/SCS is a 20+ year long range planning document. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is the short term implementation document of the MTP/SCS that identifies all of the revenue constrained funding for funded projects for five years.	Email	1/14/2026
4	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapter 5	<p>The transportation performance management targets and dates are set by FHWA &amp; Caltrans. Staff will explore interim reporting years in future MTP/SCS update cycles.</p>	The transportation performance management targets and dates are set by FHWA & Caltrans. Staff will explore interim reporting years in future MTP/SCS update cycles.	Email	1/14/2026
5	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapter 2	<p>Additional text related to Future Technologies will be added to Chapter 2.</p>	Additional text related to Future Technologies will be added to Chapter 2.	Email	1/14/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
6	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapter 2	5) Elevate goods movement decarbonization and safety Freight performance is tracked well. To complement adding a high-level Zero-Emission Freight Roadmap (charging at logistics clusters, drayage milestones, safety upgrades on EJ corridors), tied to realistic funding and technology timelines. (See "Goods Movement," 2-19–2-23; and Figure 2-4 "Goods Movement System," 2-21.)	The 2050 MTP/SCS supports zero emissions freight and a commitment to EV and hydrogen charging. AMBAG's core support of these freight concepts is included in Chapter 2 in reference to the California Central Coast Sustainable Freight Study (CCCSFS). The CCCSFS provides an overarching plan for freight in the Caltrans District 5 Central Coast megaregion, including a project addressing zero-emissions freight charging, analyses of disadvantaged communities in proximity to freight, safety projects along Environmental Justice corridors, and other freight-related topics.	Email	1/14/2026
7	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapter 5	6) Translate equity analysis into visible commitments The equity analysis is robust, but funding accountability is not formalized. To make benefits more tangible, consider establishing equity program "floors" (e.g., a minimum share of program dollars) and publishing an annual GIS scorecard tracking delivery and access improvements in low-income and historically under-engaged communities. (See "Outcomes—Focus on Equity," 5-9–5-15; including Figure 5-3 "Transit Access," 5-15.)	While the AMBAG region currently does not have public drayage activity or associated intermodal facilities, California requires all new drayage trucks operating at seaports and intermodal railyards to be zero emission vehicles. AMBAG will continue to monitor the situation and support these important zero-emission initiatives as they arise.	Email	1/14/2026
8	AMBAG Board Member	Uy	John	Chapter 4 and 6	7) Publish a two-year implementation workplan For transparency and collaboration, consider a concise Two-Year Implementation Workplan (projects, dollars, responsible agencies, milestones) aligned with AMBAG's public engagement commitments. (See "Implementation Strategies," 4-40–4-42 (Table 4-1); and "Public Participation," 6-3–6-7 for engagement commitments.)  As I see it, the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS is a solid foundation for our region's sustainable future. The recommendations above are intended to enhance its clarity, feasibility, and community impact, ensuring that the final plan remains ambitious yet achievable.  Thank you for considering these comments. I appreciate the AMBAG staff's openness to feedback and your continued dedication to a cleaner, safer, and more equitable Monterey Bay region.	Staff will explore different ways to better track implementation of the MTP/SCS. In addition, SB 375 modernization legislative changes are considering focusing more on implementation and may include an implementation reporting requirement.  Staff will explore different ways to better track implementation of the MTP/SCS. In addition, SB 375 modernization legislative changes are considering focusing more on implementation and may include an implementation reporting requirement.	Email	1/14/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
9	Santa Cruz YIMBY	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 4	Yes, Good Evening members, my name is Rafa Sonnenfeld, I will be talking on behalf of Santa Cruz YIMBY. I wanted to urge AMBAG to strengthen the MTP/SCS so it actually enables info housing production, not just climate goals in the abstract. First the plan is to clearly align its growth assumption with the region's sixth cycle RHNA obligations. Housing needs are not aspirational, they are legal minimums, and the SCS should explicitly show that its land use patterns and infrastructure planning assume at least RHNA level housing productions, especially this decade. For example, in the city of Santa Cruz the regional growth forecast estimates that by 2030 there would be an increase of just from 24,415 housing units to 26,441 housing units. The RHNA process has allocated the target housing growth goal of 3,736 new housing units by 2030 i.e. 1,700 more than AMBAG expects the city to grow by in that time. And in places like Scotts Valley, where the regional growth forecast is 5400 homes by 2030 the RHNA requires 1,220 new homes by 2031 which would be a forecast of 814 units more than AMBAG is forecasting in that time period.	The adopted California 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines provides that RHNA allocations must be consistent with the development pattern in the SCS. When developing the 2026 Regional Growth Forecast for inclusion in the 2050 MTP/SCS, AMBAG did not limit growth in the forecasted development pattern based on a city's or county's current zoned capacity. This approach helped to ensure that growth could be focused in higher resourced Opportunity Areas, even if those areas had not historically experienced significant growth or did not currently have additional zoned capacity. In addition, AMBAG consulted with all 21 local jurisdictions about their existing general plans and foreseeable changes to their general plans over the period covered by the 2050 MTP/SCS. The development pattern in the 2050 MTP/SCS does not preclude an individual community from accommodating its RHNA. Per the 2024 RTP Guidelines, "Unlike the RHNA process which allocates the amount and economic distribution of housing to be accommodated within the housing element planning period, there are not comparable, formal parameters for the entire RTP planning period. Furthermore, the RHNA is a requirement for jurisdictions to plan for housing units to accommodate HCD's determination of regional housing need over an 8-year planning cycle, while the MTP/SCS planning assumptions, which cover a minimum 20-year planning horizon, shall satisfy a broader set of transportation, emissions, and environmental requirements..."	Public Hearing	1/14/2026
10	Santa Cruz YIMBY	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 4	Second, the plans high quality transit corridors should be more than lines on a map. If we want transit-oriented housing we need clear service commitments, clear land-use expectations, like by right multi-family zoning and reduce parking near those corridors.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/14/2026
11	Santa Cruz YIMBY	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 4	And thirdly I'm concerned that the major roadway capacity projects remain in the constrained program without a clear housing or VMT lens. Investments that induce sprawl directly undermine info housing and the SCS itself.	The 2050 MTP/SCS includes a variety of multimodal transportation projects and programs. There are few roadway expansion projects included in the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS with most needed for safety and/or goods movement. Nearly 85% of the expenditures in the MTP/SCS are for multimodal and operational improvements. The model includes these projects and are reflected in the performance metrics discussed.	Public Hearing	1/14/2026
12	Santa Cruz YIMBY	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 4	Finally, AMBAG should use its strongest tool funding leverage to require jurisdictions to actually legalize and permit housing near transit. If we want this to be a truly sustainable community strategy housing has to be treated as a core input not just an after thought. Thank you very much.	A number of implementation strategies related to connecting transportation investments to infill housing are included in Table 4-1 in the 2050 MTP/SCS.	Public Hearing	1/14/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
13	Public	Hurst	Lowell	General	Lowell Hurst here in Watsonville. You know, I'm a former mayor and council member for many years. I'm currently an alternate on the Santa Cruz RTC, and so I follow that as closely as I can, but it's pretty clear to me that we need coordination between Monterey County and Santa Cruz County, and San Benito as well to make some progress on our transportation issues. Many people who live in Hollister come to Watsonville for work, and likewise, and they need improvement options. Certainly, the transportation between Santa Cruz and Watsonville, at peak commute times, is pretty congested, and we need some alternatives to that.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
14	Public	Hurst	Lowell	Chapter 2	Which leads me to the railway issue, and that's been very controversial. In fact, it's super controversial in Santa Cruz County. Where they're... it's polarized, where some people just don't want any kind of transportation on the rail line, and others do and so, that's being sorted out, but I think AMBAG can also give us some guidance and some clarification on, you know, what kind of options and what kind of you know, progress can be made. We're interested certainly in the TAMC opportunities at Pajaro junction, the rail line that maybe connect us to the outside world. And we're certainly interested in some kind of better way to commute to Santa Cruz. Rather than sitting in stalled traffic for an hour and a half to go 12 miles.	Chapter 2 of the 2050 MTP/SCS discusses various transportation options and strategies for Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties, including rail improvements.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
15	Public	Hurst	Lowell	General	So, there's plenty of improvements to be made, and I'm glad AMBAG is on the scene to help us, and I certainly advocate for the adoption of the EIR and the progress that can be made, in connecting our regional centers together for work, play, and visitors serving you know, visitor serving is a great big industry in both Monterey County and Santa Cruz County, and we need to support that in any way we can. Can you imagine, though, tourists with no cars, tourists with no cars. That's what I think we ought to take a good look at. And I will include my comments here this evening, except that I want to advocate for more options, and certainly more resources to solve our transportation problems. Thank you very much. Good luck to AMBAG.	Thank you for your comment.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
16	Public	Baertsch	Robert	Chapter 5	Table 5.1, the performance measures in the plan, draft plan. Yeah, so the work trips under the economic section, work trips within 30 minutes, with drive alone is 84% of all trips and for transit, you're going from 36% down to 33% in the future. So you're planning for less transit. And I thought the policy of this organization was to improve transit access so people can get to their jobs within 30 minutes, so I would urge the report to be more aggressive on the Goals for transit above 33%.	This metric focus on how many trips can be made by mode within 30 minutes. The region's aim is more transit trips being made in 2050, however, this metric shows that not as many of the work transit trips can be made within 30 minutes. Table 4-1 in the 2050 MTP/SCS includes strategies to improve transit access and the jobs-housing balance.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
17	Public	Baertsch	Robert	Chapter 2	And I think new technology could be used to this. And I think rather than pouring more money into existing technology like buses I think currently in Santa Cruz County, we spend \$2.80 per passenger mile. In Monterey, it's \$4 per passenger mile for a bus. And, you know, driving is 70 cents. I mean, that's more expensive than Uber, actually. What we're paying for our public transit system, so I think we need some better performance measures for transit and I think the private sector could provide solutions that are cheaper than our existing, uh, transit systems.	Additional text related to other transportation technologies will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
18	Public	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 4	I also had some comments on Figure 4-10. Recommending that, uh, you align the transit and growth, including a map of the current state of the high-quality transit network and ensuring projected growth and opportunity areas aligns with the actual transit shifts.	Figure 4-10 includes all high quality transit including existing and future service.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
19	Public	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 5	There also doesn't appear to be a measure of the overall VMT in this plan. There's only the congestion VMT, and it's hard, really hard to understand what the overall change in vehicle miles traveled is when the plan doesn't include that metric. Include the total change in VMT over the plan's lifespan and the actual percentage change for GHG reductions, rather than just 2035 projections.	AMBAG mandated target from the California Air Resources Board is a GHG metric. However, GHG and VMT metrics were both included in the Draft EIR for the 2050 MTP/SCS released in November 2025. The GHG data is included in Section 4.8 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change) and the VMT data is included in Section 4.15 (Transportation) of the Draft EIR.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
20	Public	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 5	I'd also encourage you to redefine job access including the number of people living within a half mile of jobs, rather than just travel time in minutes to jobs.	As part of each MTP/SCS update, AMBAG reviews and updates the Plan performance measures. Development of the performance measures was part of a public process in which staff explored modifications to existing and new performance measures. Staff felt that access to jobs was an important metric to include. There are three other jobs related metrics including: Jobs near high quality transit, Jobs near bike facilities, and Jobs in Opportunity Areas. The Jobs located in Opportunity Areas metric is similar to the one that you're proposing in which it measures where jobs and infill development occurs.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
21	Public	Sonnenfeld	Rafa	Chapter 5	And to implement project scoring, I'd recommend you implement a way that we can actually see how all of the projects that are in the, uh, entire AMBAG region score against performance outcomes, so we can compare the benefits rather than just the costs.	The purpose of the MTP/SCS Plan performance measures is to evaluate the entire scenario, or package of transportation investments as a whole, for the tri-county region. The regional travel demand model is not calibrated to rank individual projects against each other.	Public Hearing	1/27/2026
22	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	General	General Comments: Please ensure that the MTP Checklist is accurate and encompasses all the pages in the MTP/SCS that meet the corresponding requirements.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
23	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	General	Please review the referenced page numbers throughout the documents for accuracy.	Comment noted.	Letter	1/28/2026
24	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Executive Summary	Executive Summary Figure ES-1: Regional Map (page ES-4): The map shows State Route (SR) 146 as being a state route in San Benito County. SR 146 has been relinquished in San Benito County. Please adjust map to show the SR 146 route shield only in Monterey County and remove bold line weight on the route in San Benito County.	Figure ES-4 will be updated to reflect this change in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
25	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Chapter 2: Transportation Investments Figure 2-1: 2050 Regional Highway Network (page 2-5): Consider adding a shield for SR 156 in Monterey County near Castroville.	Figure 2-1 will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
26	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	SR 1 between Watsonville and Santa Cruz should be depicted as 4-6 lanes, there is a small amount of orange near the SR 1 shield. Please correct the color.	Figure 2-1 will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
27	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Local Arterials - Transit (page 2-6 and 2-8): Please change "Greyhound Lines" to "FixBus."	These references will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
28	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Bus Transit (page 2-8): Please use consistent agency abbreviations, "Santa Cruz METRO" should remain as "METRO" or update the first reference to ensure consistency.	These references will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
29	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	It would be useful for the reader to include an explanation of the services that private transit agencies provide for the region (FlixBus/Amtrak).	Additional text will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS to describe these services.	Letter	1/28/2026
30	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (page 2-11): In the first paragraph please consider adding a statement that illustrates that both Caltrans and AMBAG have an adopted Complete Streets Policy illustrating each agency's commitment to implementing comfortable, convenient, and connected biking and walking facilities. A reference to "Appendix H-Complete Streets" may also be helpful to the reader.	Additional text relating to Complete Streets policies will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
31	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities (page 2-12): Please update the wording in the first sentence of the third paragraph to reflect: Before bicycle and pedestrian projects can be identified as part of the 2050 MTP/SCS, the projects must be illustrated in an adopted transportation planning study or plan.	Additional text will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
32	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation - Bicycle Network (page 2-12): In the first paragraph: Please consider changing the second sentence to the following... TAMC, SCCRTC, and Caltrans continue to coordinate with each other on the development of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
33	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Please update the sentence regarding "City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Plan Update" reflecting that it was initiated in 2024 and is anticipated to be complete in mid-2026.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
34	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Bikeways definitions: Class III Bikeway: (1)Shar rows should be spelled sharrows	This will be corrected in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
35	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Class IV Bikeway: Typically they do not include "barricades" as mentioned. Please consider replacing "barricades" with planters, landscaped medians, flexible posts, or other relevant wording.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
36	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation - Complete Streets (page 2-14): Please correct the title of Appendix H to reference its official title, "AMBAG Complete Streets Policy" and not as "guidelines."	This will be corrected in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
37	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Complete Streets, second paragraph, fourth sentence: Please update the sentence regarding the SCCRTC's Rural Highway Safety Plan. The Plan will be completed in 2026.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
38	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation Figure 2-3 (page 2-15): The figure does not include existing Class IV bike facilities. Please consider adding these to the map.	Figure 2-3 will be updated to include Class IV bike facilities in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
39	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Active Transportation - Trails (page 2-16): Please include Caltrans as a stakeholder for the required coordination for the development of the MBSST.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
40	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 2	Other Transportation Technologies (page 2-26): Consider an additional section on advancements in aviation and highlighting the developing technologies within the AMBAG region.	Additional text will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
41	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 4	Chapter 4: Introduction - California Transportation Plan (page 4-5): CTP - Caltrans is not updating or adopting a CTP in 2026 at this time. Please remove or reword the sentence "The next CTP update is scheduled to be adopted in 2026." Please describe more generally without a date.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
42	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 4	Figure 4-5: 2050 Regional Highway Network (page 4-21): SR 1 between Watsonville and Santa Cruz should be depicted as 4-6 lanes, there is a small amount of orange near the SR 1 shield.	Figure 4-5 will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
43	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 4	Climate Change and Adaptation Planning (page 4-28): The SCCRTC's Climate Adaptation Vulnerability Assessment and Transportation Priorities Report was completed in 2025, and the assessment looked at transportation assets in the County of Santa Cruz' jurisdiction and along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. It did not consider all assets within Santa Cruz County. Please consider rewording for clarity.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
44	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Chapter 5	Chapter 5: Outcomes Distribution of Transportation Investments (page 5-9): Consider including a description of what a non-modelable project is for reader clarity.	Additional clarifying text will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
45	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix C	Appendix C: Project Lists Project List (page C-8): MON-TAMC008-TAMC-2026, Holman Highway Safety Improvements: Please include "SR 68" when referring to Holman Highway.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
46	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix F	Appendix F: Modal Documentation AMBAG ABM Sensitivity Tests - Summary of Sensitivity Tests (page F-14): In the sentence: "Based on the model sensitivity tests conducted, the model is sensitive to some changes while not sensitive to others." For the benefit of the reader, please include examples to enhance clarity.	Additional clarifying text will be included in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
47	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix F	Transportation Electrification Programs - Electrify Your Fleet Program (page F-22): Table F-12: Electric School Buses and Electric Shuttle Van: Column labeled "Total # of E-buses," the total number of buses shows as 5, but the rows above total to 4. Please correct or explain the difference in the total.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
48	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix F	The table shows the total as 50% in the column labeled "% of Funding to Title 1 School or Low-Income Community," please double check to confirm or update with the correct percentage, if needed.	Staff will verify the column headings in Table F-12 and update, if needed.	Letter	1/28/2026
49	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Appendix J: MTP Checklist (General) Checklist item #2 (page J-4): The checklist indicates that Chapters 2 and 4 include information on short and long-range strategies and actions. It is unclear what the short and long-term strategies and actions are as they are not specifically identified.	This will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
50	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #4a (page J-4): The checklist indicates that Page 4-7 identifies the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities. However, this information could not be located. Please amend the SCS and checklist accordingly.	This will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
51	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #7d (page J-5): The checklist indicates that Chapter 5 and Appendix G include an evaluation of how local policies and investments have impacted costs necessary to achieve progress toward identified performance targets. This information could not be found. Please amend the RTP and checklist accordingly.	This will be updated in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
52	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Consultation/ Cooperation Checklist item #1 (page J-6): Please fill out the checklist for this question.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
53	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #1vi (page J-6): The checklist indicates that Chapter 6 and Appendix D demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received. However, this information could not be found. Please amend the RTP (perhaps by adding a summary of public input received on the draft RTP and how it was addressed) and checklist accordingly.	Additional text will be added to Chapter 6 and Appendix D.	Letter	1/28/2026
54	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #1ix (page J-7): The checklist indicates that Chapter 6 and Appendix D include information regarding coordination with the statewide transportation planning involvement and consultation processes. However, this information could not be found. Please amend the RTP and checklist accordingly.	Additional text will be added to Chapter 6 and Appendix D and the checklist will be revised.	Letter	1/28/2026
55	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #1x (page J-7): The checklist indicates that Chapter 6 and Appendix D include information about the periodic review of the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan. However, this information could not be found. Please amend the RTP and checklist accordingly.	Additional text will be added to Chapter 6 and Appendix D and the checklist will be revised.	Letter	1/28/2026
56	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item 3 (page J-7): The checklist indicates that page D-6 of Appendix D discusses consultation with the appropriate State and local representatives, including representatives from environmental and economic communities, airport, transit, and freight. While some of this information was alluded to, explicit discussion was not included. Page 6-6 did include more explicit discussion. Please update the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
57	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #5 (page J-7): The checklist indicated that pages 4-29 through 4-37 specify the appropriate State and local agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation that were consulted. However, in general, specific agencies were not identified. Page 6-6 provides a brief discussion which may be an appropriate place to add more detail. Please amend the RTP to explicitly mention the agencies which were consulted. Update the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
58	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #7 (page J-7): The Checklist indicates that Chapter 6 and Appendix D include information about how tribal concerns were addressed. However, Appendix D does not include any information to this effect. Page 6-8 includes information addressing this item. Please amend the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
59	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Modal Checklist item #1 (page J-9): The checklist notes that a variety of pages in the RTP include information about intermodal and connectivity issues. While the RTP includes information about these issues, the page numbers included in the checklist should be adjusted. Pages 2-10, 2-23, and 2-24 include this information, not page 2-25. Please correct the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
60	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #7 (page J-9): The checklists notes that a discussion of the California Coastal Trail is included on pages 2-11 through 2-17. However, this information is only found on page 2-16. Please correct the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
61	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Checklist item #8 (page J-9): The checklist notes that a discussion of rail is included on pages 2-11 and 2-12. However, this information is found on pages 2-10 and 2-11 instead. Please correct the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
62	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Financial Checklist item #8 (page J10): The checklist indicates that page 3-9 includes a consistency statement between projects in the RTP and RTIP. However, this information could not be found. Please revise the RTP and checklist accordingly.	The text will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
63	Caltrans District 5	Rider	Brandy	Appendix J	Environmental Checklist item #5 (page J-11): The checklist indicates that EIR pages ES-9 through ES-52 address mitigation activities. However, the Executive Summary mitigation table ends on page ES-32. Please amend the checklist accordingly.	The checklist will be revised in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/28/2026
64	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 5	1. Technical Performance and Metrics The Problem: Metrics lack transparency and clarity needed to track progress. While we support the plan's goals, the current performance metrics are often disconnected from reality or missing key baseline data. Without clear, scannable data—such as current-state maps and baseline comparisons—it is impossible for the public to verify if the plan's projections are actually achievable.	The methodology and data source for each performance measure is included in Appendix G.	Letter	1/30/2026
65	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Recommendations Align Transit and Growth: Provide necessary context for Figure 4-10 (2050 High Quality Transit) by including a map of the current-state High Quality Transit network.	Figure 4-10 includes all high quality transit including existing and future service.	Letter	1/30/2026
66	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Ensure projected growth in Opportunity Areas aligns with actual transit shifts. The figures that list an increase in the percent of population that lives within half a mile of high quality transit is not explained nor supported by evidence, as the population growth within transit corridors does not explain the increase.	As described in Appendix G, the measure of increased growth within Opportunity Areas near high quality transit is not a transit usage metric but instead measures the increase of population that lives near high quality transit.	Letter	1/30/2026
67	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapters 4 and 5	Table 5-1 (Performance Measures) projects that under the 2050 plan, 42.9% of the population will live near high quality transit while 48.4% or 42.7% (low + non-low income and minority + non-minority populations, respectively) of the total population will live with access to transit within a half mile. These numbers don't seem to pass the small test when compared to Figure 4-10 and the land area covered, including a population overlay as an additional figure would help make more clear how many people would be served as envisioned.	Staff will verify the numbers and add additional clarifying text for this metric.	Letter	1/30/2026
68	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Additionally, the rail corridor should only qualify on the 'access to high quality transit' map within a half mile of planned or existing stops (e.g Salinas Amtrak station). One cannot board or deboard a train at any point along its route.	The purpose of Figure 4-10 is to show the high quality transit corridors. As described in Appendix G, transit access calculations are based being within a 1/2 mile of the transit stop, not the route or corridor.	Letter	1/30/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
69	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 5	Track Total VMT and GHG Changes: Include the total change in VMT over the plan's lifespan and the actual percentage change for GHG reductions (including 2022 baselines and 2050 targets), rather than just 2035 projections, or just VMT projections for congestion. Overall VMT is a critical measure that our region should be tracking, not just the amount of traffic subject to delays.	AMBAG's mandated target from the California Air Resources Board is a GHG metric. However, GHG and VMT metrics were both included in the Draft EIR for the 2050 MTP/SCS released in November 2025. The GHG data is included in Section 4.8 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change) and the VMT data is included in Section 4.15 (Transportation) of the Draft EIR.	Letter	1/30/2026
70	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 5	Improve Equity and Access Metrics: Measure how many people can currently reach healthcare or parks within 30 minutes compared to the "2050 no-build" scenario.	Table 5-1 on page 5-4 in the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS includes 2022 existing, 2050 no-build, and 2050 MTP/SCS calculations for healthcare and parks access within 30 minutes.	Letter	1/30/2026
71	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 5	Redefine Job Access: include an additional Measure for "job access" by analyzing the number of people living within a half-mile of projected jobs, rather than just travel time in minutes to transit, and distance of housing and jobs to transit. The direct walkshed of projected jobs is an important component of the region's economic health.	As part of each MTP/SCS update, AMBAG reviews and updates the Plan performance measures. Development of the performance measures was part of a public process in which staff explored modifications to existing and new performance measures. Staff felt that access to jobs was an important metric to include. There are three other jobs related metrics including: Jobs near high quality transit, Jobs near bike facilities, and Jobs in Opportunity Areas. The Jobs located in Opportunity Areas metric is similar to the one that you're proposing in which it measures where jobs and inflow development occurs.	Letter	1/30/2026
72	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 5	Implement Project Scoring: Score all projects based on performance and outcomes so the public can compare benefits rather than just costs. Without a framework that shows metrics on a project by project basis, the public has little to no insight into how each of the projects supports or conflicts with the regional goals.	The purpose of the MTP/SCS Plan performance measures is to evaluate the entire scenario, or package of transportation investments as a whole, for the tri-county region. The regional travel demand model is not calibrated to rank individual projects against each other.	Letter	1/30/2026
73	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapters 4 and Appendix A	2. Align the SCS Explicitly with 6th-Cycle RHNA and Near-Term Housing Reality The Gap: The SCS fails to treat RHNA as a floor The growth forecasts in the draft don't match 6th-cycle RHNA obligations. RHNA is a legal minimum, not a ceiling. If the plan assumes lower growth than what the state requires, we will end up under-planning the infrastructure needed to support those homes. The data shows a clear discrepancy: ● City of Santa Cruz: The draft projects only 26,441 total homes by 2030, while RHNA requires 28,151 units by 2031—a gap of over 1,700 homes. ● Scotts Valley: The draft forecasts 5,400 homes by 2030, while RHNA requires 6,214 units by 2031—a gap of over 800 units.	The adopted California 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines provides that RHNA allocations must be consistent with the development pattern in the SCS. When developing the 2026 Regional Growth Forecast for inclusion in the 2050 MTP/SCS, AMBAG did not limit growth in the forecasted development pattern based on a city's or county's current zoned capacity. This approach helped to ensure that growth could be focused in higher resourced Opportunity Areas, even if those areas had not historically experienced significant growth or did not currently have additional zoned capacity. In addition, AMBAG consulted with all 21 local jurisdictions about their existing general plans and foreseeable changes to their general plans over the period covered by the 2050 MTP/SCS. The development pattern in the 2050 MTP/SCS does not preclude an individual community from accommodating its RHNA.	Letter	1/30/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
74	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Recommendations Include an explicit RHNA consistency check: Add a table comparing SCS growth assumptions against 6th-cycle RHNA allocations for every jurisdiction.	<p>Per the 2024 RTP Guidelines, "Unlike the RHNA process which allocates the amount and economic distribution of housing to be accommodated within the housing element planning period, there are not comparable, formal parameters for the entire RTP planning period. Furthermore, the RHNA is a requirement for jurisdictions to plan for housing units to accommodate HCD's determination of regional housing need over an 8-year planning cycle, while the MTP/SCS planning assumptions, which cover a minimum 20-year planning horizon, shall satisfy a broader set of transportation, emissions, and environmental requirements..."</p> <p>The adopted California 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines provides that RHNA allocations must be consistent with the development pattern in the SCS. When developing the 2026 Regional Growth Forecast for inclusion in the 2050 MTP/SCS, AMBAG did not limit growth in the forecasted development pattern based on a city's or county's current zoned capacity. This approach helped to ensure that growth could be focused in higher resourced Opportunity Areas, even if those areas had not historically experienced significant growth or did not currently have additional zoned capacity. In addition, AMBAG consulted with all 21 local jurisdictions about their existing general plans and foreseeable changes to their general plans over the period covered by the 2050 MTP/SCS. The development pattern in the 2050 MTP/SCS does not preclude an individual community from accommodating its RHNA.</p>	Letter	1/30/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
75	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Adopt RHNA as the "floor" for modeling: Explicitly state that the plan assumes at least RHNA-consistent production and justify any future forecasts that fall below HCD numbers.	Per the 2024 RTP Guidelines, "Unlike the RHNA process which allocates the amount and economic distribution of housing to be accommodated within the housing element planning period, there are not comparable, formal parameters for the entire RTP planning period. Furthermore, the RHNA is a requirement for jurisdictions to plan for housing units to accommodate HCD's determination of regional housing need over an 8-year planning cycle, while the MTP/SCS planning assumptions, which cover a minimum 20-year planning horizon, shall satisfy a broader set of transportation, emissions, and environmental requirements..."	Letter	1/30/2026
76	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Disaggregate housing by location: Show exactly how much of this RHNA-scale growth is expected to occur in infill areas and transit corridors versus the rest of the region.	This recommendation would be inconsistent with growth forecast preparation included in the adopted CTC RTP Guidelines.  Residential land use maps are included for each jurisdiction in Chapter 4 and Appendix I. The MTP/SCS is evaluated at the transportation analysis zone level (TAZ) and not the parcel level. In addition, AMBAG's regional travel demand model evaluates household trips, not housing units. Housing and housing growth are shown in tables in Chapter 1 and Appendix A.	Letter	1/30/2026
77	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	3. Ensure Infrastructure Supports Rather Than Undermines Infill Housing The Impact: Current project modeling validates car-dependent sprawl The MTP/SCS serves as the primary roadmap for regional growth. Including large-scale highway expansions without addressing their impact on land use validates a model that undermines climate and housing goals. These projects often make car-dependent sprawl more viable, drawing investment away from urban centers.	The 2050 MTP/SCS includes a variety of multimodal transportation projects and programs. There are few roadway expansion projects included in the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS with most needed for safety and/or goods movement. Nearly 85% of the expenditures in the MTP/SCS are for multimodal and operational improvements. The model includes these projects and are reflected in the performance metrics discussed.	Letter	1/30/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
78	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Recommendations Adjust the SCS Model: Update the model to account for how roadway expansions disincentivize infill and encourage spread-out development.	The regional travel demand model includes the few proposed roadway expansion projects and they are reflected in the performance metric results included in the 2050 MTP/SCS.	Letter	1/30/2026
79	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 4	Score projects based on housing impact: Evaluate major projects for their impact on infill development and total VMT, rather than focusing primarily on vehicle delay.	The purpose of the MTP/SCS Plan performance measures is to evaluate the entire scenario, or package of transportation investments as a whole, for the tri-county region. The regional travel demand model is not calibrated to rank individual projects against each other.	Letter	1/30/2026
80	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 2	Refocus highway strategies: Use the plan to advocate for a multimodal approach within highway corridors, emphasizing bus priority, express transit, and safe crossings.	The 2050 MTP/SCS includes a variety of multimodal transportation projects and programs. There are few roadway expansion projects included in the Draft 2050 MTP/SCS with most needed for safety and/or goods movement. Nearly 85% of the expenditures in the MTP/SCS are for multimodal and operational improvements.	Letter	1/30/2026
81	Santa Cruz YIMBY			Chapter 2	Tier projects within the "Preferred Scenario": Give higher weight to "Fix-It-First" projects that improve transit speed, reliability, and active transportation.	The 2050 MTP/SCS includes a variety of multimodal transportation projects and programs that support all of the Plan's vision and goals. Nearly 85% of the expenditures in the MTP/SCS are for multimodal (transit and active transportation) and operational improvements.	Letter	1/30/2026
82	Santa Cruz YIMBY			General	Link infrastructure to housing production: Explicitly state that regional transportation investments are intended to support—and are dependent on—meeting RHNA housing goals in infill areas.	A number of implementation strategies related to connecting transportation investments to infill housing are included in Table 4-1 in Chapter 4.	Letter	1/30/2026
83	LAFCO of Monterey County	McKenna	Kate	General	Alignment with LAFCO's Legislative Purposes: Among LAFCO's legislative purposes are encouraging the orderly formation of local governmental agencies, preserving agricultural land resources, discouraging urban sprawl, and promoting the efficient delivery of local government services. Consistent with these objectives, LAFCO is supportive of AMBAG's Plan. The Plan evaluates regional travel patterns and transportation needs to develop a network that enhances mobility and accessibility throughout the region. It emphasizes concentrating housing and employment within urban centers and near transit, encouraging compact growth, and investing in operational, safety, and active transportation improvements while maintaining a state of good repair for existing infrastructure. By prioritizing mixed-use development within established urban areas rather than expansion at the urban fringes, the Plan aims to reduce vehicle travel distances and associated greenhouse gas emissions. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) land use pattern recognizes farmland as a vital regional economic resource and includes implementation strategies designed to minimize the impacts of transportation and land use projects on agricultural lands.	Thank you for your comment.	Letter	1/30/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
84	LAFCO of Monterey County	McKenna	Kate	Appendix I	<p>Minor Mapping Corrections: Overall, Appendix I (SCS Maps) contains city-level maps showing place type designations based on city General Plan land uses and showing city limits and spheres of influence. These place types maps are used in the analysis of scenarios and opportunity areas. Upon review of Appendix I, LAFCO staff identified several minor mapping discrepancies affecting the Cities of Greenfield, Salinas, and Soledad. Specifically, certain city limit boundaries and spheres of influence shown on the maps do not align with LAFCO's current city boundary information (see Attachment 1 – Table Summary of Minor Mapping Corrections).</p> <p>LAFCO's proposed corrections do not request any changes to place type designations. Rather, they are intended solely to ensure that city limit boundaries and spheres of influence accurately reflect current LAFCO maps. For reference, attachments to this letter include a table summary of minor mapping corrections (Attachment 1), the relevant AMBAG Appendix I city place types maps with the areas of discrepancy identified (Attachments 2, 4, and 6), and the corresponding LAFCO city maps (Attachments 3, 5, and 7).</p>	<p>AMBAG will work with LAFCO Monterey County staff to revise the city limit and sphere of influence boundaries. Any boundary changes will be reflected on the respective figures in Appendix I in the Final 2050 MTP/SCS.</p>	Letter	1/30/2026

**Draft 2050 MTP/SCS Public Comments and Responses Received After the Close of the Public Comment Period**

85	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>I am writing, sending comments, largely from an historical perspective. I recall some years ago reading a public notice in the Monterey Herald about the availability of a Draft Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan. This was pre-computer. It stated copies of this new document were available at the TAMC office in Salinas on Alisal Street. At the time it was the same address as the Monterey County Department of Public Works (It is now the location of the Salinas Police Department building). I phoned and was told, "Sure, stop by, we have extra copies." I did stop by, was greeted, and was introduced to all three members of the TAMC staff. They had jointly written the document. Their office building at the time was located in an out-building behind the Monterey County Public Works Department. They explained the Plan was a new State requirement attempting to better coordinate (Monterey County) governmental entities (Cities and County) with shared knowledge and plans for highways and roads. I took the document home, read it, and wrote a letter of some comments and questions, then drove back to drop the letter off and the copy of the document. I was thanked and was told I could keep that copy as they had several more.</p>	<p>This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	Email	1/31/2026
86	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>I recall receiving a better explanation for "Highway Levels of Service" The Traffic Engineer, one of the three employees explained Levels of Service on roads and highways as being similar to grades in school, the range was "A" to "F", with F being failure, gridlock. The TAMC staff had chosen level of Service "C" to be the Monterey County standard. That is traffic Levels of Service would not be allowed to go below the C. I expressed concern because Highway 68 seemed be getting more congested.</p>	<p>This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	Email	1/31/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
87	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>This Draft document had questions and concerns responded to and was adopted as the Monterey County Plan by TAMC (and CalTrans), and was to be used by City Councils and Boards of Supervisors as they reviewed impacts from prospective land use plans. (1)</p> <p>Subsequently, there was a Congestion Management Plan. Also Fort Ord was closing and an idea came up to put a new freeway through former Fort Ord beginning near Toro Park Estates and over to Del Rey Oaks. Where would the money come from? Ah, the first of many County sales tax increase measures was put on the ballot. It was known as Measure B.</p> <p>1) I note the current year 2026 staffing of TAMC is 17 individuals. Some Monterey County roads evolved into Levels of Service F on some of their highways. Then hearing bodies seemed to stop counting, and eventually eliminated the A through F designations.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
88	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>Measure B was promoted heavily by Monterey County politicians, including the Supervisor (at the time) for much of the then Highway 68 area. "A Bypass will fix things". A Bypass with different Official Plan Lines than that had been adopted in the 1970's (and recorded in the first Monterey County Toro Area Plan) seemed to have been forgotten about. Measure B was heavily debated and on election day drew a slight majority of YES votes. The County began collecting the additional sales tax revenue, for several years. Then the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayer's Assn. pointed out that sales tax increases required a 2/3rds yes vote and challenged Measure B in court. The Judge agreed with the challenge and Monterey County was required to reduce the sales tax rate (in the 1980's) until such time as the overcharge amounts matched the reduction.</p> <p>Not giving up on more sales taxes to fix the impacts of traffic because of the growth, TAMC followed up by supporting increases for more tax revenue with County Sales Tax Measures N, A, and Z with various plans. All three of these failed at the polls.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
89	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>Along with a new Monterey County General Plan that was in the works, Monterey County scrubbed plans for a freeway through former Fort Ord. However, they failed to inform Cal Trans, District 5, of this decision to just scrub it. They just eliminated it.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
90	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>The County Board of Supervisors and City officials came up with an idea for a "TAMC Citizen's Advisory Committee" for the purpose of discussing traffic, roads, potential impacts. Applications were available. Mike Weaver was one of the persons applying for a seat on this new Committee. Mike was at the Monterey County Fair one day when Monterey County Supervisor for South County, Perkins, approached him and said, "Congratulations, we voted to make you a member. Good luck to you. Maybe you'll find it won't be easy."</p> <p>Mike was not quite sure how to take this congratulations, but was one of about a dozen Citizens from throughout Monterey County that was to set about discussing road and traffic issues. From the beginning, it was the new management of TAMC that was controlling the agenda issues. They made the agendas. TAMC staff also took the meeting Minutes and formulated them into briefs on their agenda items.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
91	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>Mike recalls that one agenda item discussion was about the possibility of the County TAMC sponsoring buses on Highway 68 to cut down on amounts of traffic. Mike also recalls he and other Advisory members were skeptical about this because people living along Highway 68 would not be riding the bus to grocery stores in Salinas and Monterey and then trying to get home with their frozen foods. It would not work. However, there was Congressional Federal money in the pipeline being promised on this, so TAMC adopted it. The first of the "Monterey-Salinas Transit" buses began running between Salinas and Monterey. The name was later changed to "MST". Bottom line is: it did not work for the purpose proposed. People could get to work on the Peninsula but could not get back home again on Highway 68 until the next day. And buses were impractical for grocery shopping and such.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
92	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>This MST program expanded almost, it seems, with the thinking "if only we can find a use for the buses". In a few years all new buses were purchased as the federal money kept rolling in. The older buses were parked on former Fort Ord on a weed infested lot and left to languish. It was KSBW TV News that broke the story on this. It was never real clear what happened to these older buses but word came down they think they were sold to some South American Country.</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
93	Public	Weaver	Michael		<p>Another idea that was referred to the TAMC C-A-C were phones next to Monterey County highways, every couple miles or so. Again I recall the majority of the CAC members were skeptical. The TAMC Board approved it and despite increasing amounts of cell phone use the program is still going though with some cutting back, maybe, finally, getting rid of it. Question: What was the cumulative cost, to date, of the phones next to Monterey County roads?</p>	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026

Number	Agency	Last Name	First Name	Chapter	Comment	Response	Comment Format	Date
94	Public	Weaver	Michael		An issue that the TAMC C.A.C. requested to be allowed to weigh in on was a new proposed freeway by Carmel to Highway 1. It was very controversial. The C.A.C. eventually did receive a briefing on the plans. Although not binding, as the C.A.C. was advisory, the greater majority of the members voted no.	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
95	Public	Weaver	Michael		Throughout my time on the C.A.C. and in meetings and letters I have emphasized and promoted the Scenic Highways and roads in Monterey County and their need for protection. Monterey County has done a good job with the lack of billboards. No new ones are allowed. State Highway 68 was designated a State Scenic Highway at the same time as Highway 1 through Big Sur with a visit by Lady Bird Johnson and California State Senator Fred Fair. It was former Monterey County Congressman Burt Talcott that got Laueles Grade Road designated as the first County road in the State of California to officially be designated Scenic. These roads continue to need protection. I do not find Scenic Roads and Highways mentioned in the subject 2036 Monterey County RTP. Did I miss it?	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
96	Public	Weaver	Michael		By the way, many sequential vehicle Roundabouts on Highway 68 would destroy the Scenic Highway. I support the timed signalization project.	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026
97	Public	Weaver	Michael		Following the failures of County Sales Tax Measures B, N, A, and Z, it was the Measure X tax measure that did pass, barely, with 67.7% of the vote YES. It required a 2/3rds majority to pass. I followed this Measure X pretty carefully and the promotion was primarily "Let's Fix Our Roads". In speaking with citizen's prior to election day the response to Measure X didn't seem to elicit much excitement but almost all that responded to a question of "What did you think of Measure X?" was: "We need something in Monterey County to fix our roads as they are in bad condition." I am convinced this is the reason it was passed. I am disappointed to find pretty much a mixed bag wish list of many projects throughout Monterey County that are recipients for spending Measure X funds on, but have little to do with fixing our roads.	This comment will be forwarded to TAMC as it is in regards to their Draft 2026 Regional Transportation Plan.	Email	1/31/2026