

**INTERREGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIC
PLAN**

**“A Plan to Guide Development of the
Interregional Transportation System”**

June 1998

**JAMES W. VAN LOBEN SELS,
DIRECTOR
California Department of Transportation**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Summary	3
	I.1. Introduction	4
	I.2. Planning Guide	5
II.	Purpose of the 1998 Plan	5
III.	Vision for the Interregional System and Strategies to Achieve the Vision	6
	III.1. Vision - Interregional Transportation System	6
	III.2. Strategies - To Move Towards Meeting the Vision	7
IV.	Measuring Performance of the Transportation System	8
V.	Guiding Direction for Plan and Program	10
	V.1. Principles	11
	V.2. Objectives	12
	V.3. Criteria for Programming Improvements	12
VI.	State Highways Overview	14
	VI.1. Caltrans Primary Responsibilities	15
	VI.2. Fundamentals--Background that Frames the Plan	15
	VI.3. Interregional Road System	17
	VI.4. High Emphasis and Focus Routes	18
	VI.5. Gateways	24
	VI.6. What's Been Programmed or Built on the IRRS--1990-1996	24
VII.	Priority Considerations for State Highways	27
	VII.1. High Emphasis IRRS Corridors	27
	VII.2. Focus Routes--Nonurbanized	28
	VII.2.1. Major North/South Routes	28
	VII.2.2. Major East/West Routes	29
	VII.2.3. Interstate and other state Routes	30
	VII.3. Focus Routes Concepts and Approach to Improvements	31

CONTENTS CONTINUED

VII.4. Program Track--Improvements to Focus Routes	44
VIII. Gateways	57
IX. Factors for Timing and Selection of ITIP Improvements	58
IX.1. Factors for Improvements	58
IX.2. Coordination of Regional Plans and Programs	60
X. Intercity Passenger Rail	61
X.1. Intercity Rail Performance Standards	63
X.2. Intercity Rail Route Characteristics	65
X.3. Intercity Passenger Rail Development Policy	66
X.4. Specific Plans for Each Rail Corridor	67
XI. Interregional Mass Transit Guideways	69
XII. Freight Rail	69
Appendix A--IRRS Routes Legislative Description	70
Maps	
High Emphasis Interregional Routes	19
High Emphasis Focus Routes	21
High Emphasis Routes with Named Urbanized Areas	22
Focus Routes with Named Urbanized Areas	23
Projected Population Growth by County	25
Transportation Gateways	26
Intercity Passenger Rail	62

I. SUMMARY

Caltrans prepared this 1998 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) to consolidate and communicate key elements of its ongoing long- and short-range planning. As such, it serves as a counterpart to the Regional Transportation Plans prepared by the 43 Regional Transportation Planning Agencies in California. As the unit of state government responsible for the state highway system (its "trustee" on behalf of the citizens of the state), Caltrans addresses the state highway system in detail, with special emphasis on the statutorily-identified Interregional Road System. Caltrans addresses in less detail other elements of the interregional transportation system, including intercity rail, which serve the state.

The Interregional Road System (IRRS) was identified in statute in 1989. The IRRS serves interregional people and goods movement. It then included 81 state highway routes (or portions of routes) out of the 249 routes comprising the entire state highway system. Six additional routes have been added to the system since that time by locally sponsored legislation, so there are currently 87 IRRS routes.

The 1989 legislation specified that Caltrans would limit its Proposed State Transportation Program proposal to projects on the IRRS and the intercity rail system, except under specific overriding conditions. The legislation required Caltrans to prepare and submit to the Legislature an Interregional Road System Plan. All proposed improvements had to be included in that plan, which could only include projects outside urbanized areas. The plan was prepared with the advice of the California Transportation Commission and in cooperation with regional agencies. It identified 278 state highway improvements totaling over \$3 billion.

This 1998 Plan supersedes the prior 1990 Plan required by the 1989 legislation. SB 45 eliminated the requirement for a IRRS Plan, and there is no statute or regulation requiring Caltrans to prepare a new plan. However, the recent enactment of SB 45 (Chapter 622, Statutes of 1997), which significantly changed the way the state programs and expends transportation funds, makes it important that Caltrans' planning strategies and objectives be readily available to the transportation community. SB 45 requires that the IIP include a specific minimum guarantee of funds to be programmed on IRRS routes in nonurbanized areas.

In developing this 1998 Plan, Caltrans reviewed the status of projects included in the prior plan. Caltrans developed new visions, strategies, principles, objectives, and criteria for operating, developing, and improving interregional transportation facilities and services. Caltrans added new considerations to its planning process, including the concept of "gateways" serving important economic generators. At this point, the analysis indicates that most of the improvements contemplated in the earlier plan that have not in fact been accomplished, are still needed and of high priority.

Nevertheless, Caltrans recognizes that new opportunities and challenges, not identified in earlier planning efforts, may deserve active consideration given the increased flexibility afforded under SB 45. Accordingly, Caltrans intends to complete another Plan update in time for the Year 2000 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle. That Plan update will evaluate a broader range of modes and approaches to address the state's interregional mobility needs.

I.1 Introduction

Senate Bill 45 made significant changes to the priorities and processes for programming and expenditure of state transportation funds. Caltrans' planning responsibilities and processes for long-range highway planning and joint planning remain essentially unchanged under the new law. The changes in SB 45 do, however, provide Caltrans with an important and immediate opportunity to present its vision for the interregional system and its ongoing long-range planning to improve interregional mobility. The Plan also provides an opportunity to renew its commitment to regional agencies and other transportation partners to communicate its approach and priorities for improvements to the interregional system.

The Plan is not a detailed transportation plan. Federal and state statutes and regulations require that urban Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and nonurban Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) conduct continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning throughout California. Caltrans relies on large part on that process for detailed planning outputs. Instead, this Plan encapsulates and communicates key pieces of Caltrans' ongoing long -and short- range planning for the state highway, interregional road system and intercity rail system. The Plan is framed overall by key statewide policy direction for the state transportation system from the Governor's Executive Department and several evolving strategies and policies for transportation issues of statewide interest.

The Plan emphasizes the two larger and more defined areas of responsibility for interregional transportation planning that are under Caltrans statutory responsibility---the state highway system, with an emphasis on the Interregional Road System, and intercity passenger rail. Other important components of the interregional transportation system are included but in less detail. These include freight rail, grade separations and mass transit guideways. Among the evolving policies and strategies is a statewide goods movement strategy and maritime policy for port development. The Plan is based primarily on Caltrans' system planning process and its key products (route concept reports, transportation system development programs, system management plans) and other Caltrans transportation planning efforts. All of these products are developed in cooperation and consultation with regional agencies.

Background information is included only to the extent that it will help convey understanding of a portion of the Plan, or why a particular approach is taken to a category of improvements. For example, Caltrans chose to document the framework for the original Interregional Road System as it is a key portion of continuing planning for interregional movement of people and goods under SB 45.

The contents of the Plan are organized into key headings or chapters that roughly correspond to the major components of the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) identified in SB 45.

I.2 Planning Guide” (Technical Appendix)

The “Planning Component to Guide Selection of IRRS Projects for the Interregional Improvement Program in Nonurbanized Areas” (hereafter called the Guide) is included as a separate technical appendix to the Plan. The Guide is meant to be a user guide for developing high emphasis IRRS routes. Caltrans and regional agencies should use the Guide in joint and continuing planning and programming processes. In particular, the Guide will be valuable in considering issues between adjoining regions of the state.

The Guide is a series of detailed schematic maps for the 34 High Emphasis corridors. The maps provide a visual representation of the interregional corridor and identify the future route concept and improvements needed to meet the concept. The larger improvements identified in the Plan from Caltrans system planning and Regional Transportation Plans are identified for each corridor. The post miles for urbanized areas are identified in order to show areas of heightened coordination for cooperative planning and programming and for ease of technical programming considerations for all users of the Plan.

The schematic maps are clear representations of the importance of the continuing cooperative planning process between Caltrans and regional agencies. They are also examples of significant ongoing regional and Caltrans agreement on many corridor concepts and longer and shorter range improvements needed for key routes.

II. PURPOSE OF THE 1998 PLAN

The 1998 Plan describes and communicates the framework in which the state will carry out its responsibilities for the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP). It also identifies how Caltrans will work with regional agencies to consult and seek consensus on the relative priority of improvements. It recommends complimentary actions by regional and local agencies to provide optimum integration of the state’s transportation systems.

The Plan lays out a recommended course of actions and considerations for the Interregional Improvement Program for the twenty-year planning period (roughly 1998-2020). It identifies key principles, objectives, and strategies that will guide implementation of the IIP during that time frame. The Plan charts a course for improvements to the state highway system and for intercity passenger rail and provides a framework for other eligible categories.

The twenty-year period corresponds to the Regional Transportation Plan cycle for regional agencies. It considers the time period for related plans and programs, specifically the Congestion Management Programs and City and County General Plans. It is also consistent with Caltrans system planning route concept reports and transportation system development programs.

As with all long-range planning, priorities are clearer for near-term, and less clear for the years farther out in the twenty-year planning period. Consequently, this Plan should be updated periodically to reflect major changes, trends of statewide and interregional significance, and evolving transportation policy and strategies.

III. VISION FOR THE INTERREGIONAL SYSTEM AND STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THE VISION

This portion of the 1998 Plan is divided into the primary components of the Interregional Improvement Program. A brief Vision Statement and the key strategies to achieve the Vision are stated. Later chapters of the Plan provide more detail on the approach to improving a particular portion of the interregional system.

III.1. Vision - Interregional Transportation System

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| A. State Highways | Provide a dependable and reasonable level of service for the interregional movement of people and goods, accessibility into and through "gateways" and connectivity to intermodal transfer facilities. |
| B. Intercity Passenger Rail | Intercity passenger rail service provides a clear and attractive alternative to automobile and air travel in the major corridors linking the urban centers of California--and, via national interstate trains, to the rest of the nation. Service is frequent, direct, reliable, and fast. |
| C. Grade Separations | Provide safe railroad grade crossings at state highways, and minimize disruptions and delay to interregional movement of people and goods. |
| D. Mass Transit Guideways | Provide cost-effective modal investments for the highest traveled and highest density guideway corridors that support interregional travel and have overriding statewide significance. |

III.2. Strategies--To Move Towards Meeting The Vision

A. STATE HIGHWAYS

- Focus investments on a key subset of Interregional Road System Routes that are major north-south and east-west routes serving the state as a whole . . . High Emphasis Routes.
- Improve the routes to minimum facility standards, directing priority programming to major underdeveloped routes.
- Identify key gateways of major statewide significance and target improvements to, through, and within the gateway area.
- Rely on and advocate investments by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies of State Highway funds under their control, to address capacity and operational needs in urbanized areas and on the non-IRRS portion of the state highway system.
- Improve non-IRRS routes using the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for smaller operational improvements and facility improvements within traditional SHOPP rehabilitation and reconstruction projects. (Note: major improvements are not funded through the SHOPP.)
- Make optimum use of the capacity available on the existing “built” system through operational improvements and strategies.
- Coordinate operational plans, improvements and strategies with regional agencies, the goods movement industry, and other modal and intermodal owners and operators (e.g., airports, seaports, freight rail, and intermodal transfer and distribution centers).
- Apply and integrate new technologies into management of the “built” system, and plan and design new technologies into new construction.

B. INTERCITY PASSENGER

- Increase speeds and reduce running times on all routes, thus enhancing their efficiency and effectiveness as a transportation alternative.
- Increase capacity on all three routes consistent with adequate ridership demand and feasibility.
- Improve reliability and on-time performance through track, signal and station projects.

- Protect the state investment in rolling stock through careful monitoring of California Car warranty provisions and oversight of maintenance.
- Comply with all federal and state safety and public facility requirements, including the upgrade of facilities to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

C. GRADE SEPARATIONS

- Provide public education about grade crossing awareness.
- Reduce the incidence of accidents at grade crossings on state highways and, work with local agencies, under the aegis of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), to reduce the incidence of accidents at grade crossings on local streets and roads.
- Work with passenger and freight rail owners to cooperatively fund improvements at critical accident locations.

D. MASS TRANSIT GUIDEWAYS

- Advocate for significant state interest in guideways serving the highest traveled and highest density travel corridors, where guideway development will support interregional mobility.
- Participate with RTPAs and transit providers in corridor studies and major investment studies that examine cost-effective guideway investments to support interregional mobility.

IV. MEASURING PERFORMANCE OF THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The ongoing Caltrans transportation system performance measures effort is a growing and critical effort that will incorporate performance measurement into how we plan, program, manage, operate and maintain the system for the users. This portion of the Plan is brief because the performance measurement effort is new and the initial ground work is being laid this year. Significant work, however, has been done to move forward in the near term. This section is a “bookmark” to highlight the importance of outcome based performance measurement to the interregional system, update the transportation community on work-to-date, and Caltrans’ intent to include and apply additional work in this critical area in future plan updates.

The purpose of the performance measure effort is to develop indicators or measures to assess the performance of California’s multi-modal transportation system to support informed transportation decisions. It is additionally to establish a

coordinated and cooperative process for consistent performance measurement throughout California.

Four goals and objectives guide the effort:

- Understand the role the transportation system plays in the larger society.
- Focus on results and people at the system level rather than projects and process.
- Build system relationships with clearly defined roles, adequate communication channels, and accountability at all levels.
- Establish policies leading to sustained improvement in transportation system performance while accommodating continued growth in California.
- Caltrans is developing performance measurements based on the following actions:
 - Secure broad stakeholder participation in the development of the measures. (A steering committee representing regional agencies and other transportation partners is guiding the effort.)
 - Establish a framework for understanding how any subsystem action improves the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the total transportation system.
 - Identify the desired outcomes of the transportation system.
 - Focus on the customer - the system user - in setting standards for system performance.
 - Identify key indicators which will simply and clearly demonstrate the level to which the desired outcomes are achieved.
 - Lay out a plan for conducting an assessment of system performance with a design for data collection, analysis, and information distribution.

Caltrans, guided by input from the steering committee, has initially identified eleven key outcomes to enhance the transportation system. The outcomes are identified and defined below. All eleven outcomes are important to the transportation system, however, Caltrans' immediate efforts concentrate on the

four outcomes of accessibility, mobility, reliability, and cost effectiveness. These four are included in the Plan and are joined to the principles, objectives and criteria that guide it. The additional outcomes will be joined to the Plan as the performance measures work evolves.

The outcomes and definitions are identified below in order to begin dialogue within the larger transportation community on this important area:

OUTCOME DEFINITIONS

- ACCESSIBILITY/MOBILITY--Reaching desired destinations with relative ease within a reasonable time, at a reasonable cost.
- RELIABILITY--Providing reasonable and dependable levels of service by mode.
- COST-EFFECTIVE--Maximizing the current and future benefits from public and private transportation investments.
- SUSTAINABILITY--Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.
- ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY--Helping to maintain and enhance the quality of the natural and human environment.
- SAFETY & SECURITY--Minimizing the risk of death, injury, or property loss.
- COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT & PRESERVATION--Ensuring respect for community values and addressing equity concerns
- CUSTOMER SATISFACTION--Providing transportation choices that are convenient, affordable, and comfortable.

V. GUIDING DIRECTION FOR PLAN AND PROGRAM

The Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) and Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) will be guided by the principles, objectives, and criteria identified below. Another section of the Plan will identify strategies for each eligible program component.

V.1. Principles

Eight key principles guide this Plan. The principles recognize the diversity of the state and important but varied interests between rural and highly urbanized areas. A key factor is the importance of the state's transportation infrastructure to the quality of life in California, and to the state's position in both national and international trade and commerce. The key principles are:

- California's transportation planning process relies on open communication and an ongoing cooperative relationship between all members of the transportation community. Caltrans and the RTPAs must mutually consult, cooperate, and seek consensus on transportation priorities and strategies.
- Caltrans has primary responsibility for the interregional mobility of people and goods. Regional and local agencies have primary responsibilities for regional and local mobility and for actions to manage commute and other congestion in their areas. Larger metropolitan areas are responsible for managing interregional commute congestion within the Transportation Management Area.
- The rural areas of the state contribute to the state's economic well-being and quality of life. The state has a vital interest in agriculture, mining, and timber production. Recreational travel and tourism are vital to the state and regional economies, and are considered in all aspects of transportation planning.
- Connecting people and goods to growing urban centers, urbanized areas and major gateways is vital to the economy and quality of life in California.
- Movement of goods and services into and through urbanized areas and gateways and to intermodal facilities is a critical component of the interregional program.
- The designated interstate system is the backbone of the state's transportation system for interregional, interstate and international goods movement, access to seaports, air cargo terminals and other intermodal transfer facilities. Improvements within major gateways in urbanized areas will often involve interstate routes.
- Key segments of the state highway system are incomplete or underdeveloped. These will be developed to minimum facility standards as programming priorities allow, considering a range of qualitative and quantitative planning and operations factors.

- Intercity passenger rail is an important component of the state's interregional transportation system. Caltrans will continue to expand intercity rail service in the three key statewide corridors and add additional corridors as demand and funds dictate. The state will advocate for an appropriate continuing level of interstate passenger rail service. Additionally, over the long-term, the state will pursue true high speed rail (HSR) development in California, when economically feasible.

V.2. Objectives

Six key objectives are identified for the Interregional Improvement Program. The objectives are:

- Complete a trunk system of higher standard (usually expressway/freeway) state highways.
- Connect all urbanized areas, major metropolitan centers, and gateways to the freeway and expressway system to ensure a complete statewide system for the highest volume and most critical trip movements.
- Ensure a dependable level of service for movement into and through major gateways of statewide significance and ensure connectivity to key intermodal transfer facilities, seaports, air cargo terminals, and freight distribution facilities.
- Connect urbanizing centers and high growth areas to the trunk system to ensure future connectivity, mobility, and access for the state's expanding population.
- Link rural and smaller urban centers to the trunk system.
- Implement an intercity passenger rail program (including interregional commuter rail) that complies with federal and state laws, improves service reliability, decreases running times, and reduces the per-passenger operating subsidy.

V.3. Criteria For Programming Improvements

Selection of projects for the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program will be based on the criteria below. A common criteria is defined for projects under the interregional improvement program as a whole. Additional criteria are identified based on each objective for the Plan and program. A project may meet one or several of the criteria under the common or objective linked criteria. The primary program category (15 percent or 10 percent) is identified under which the project would typically be considered. A mix of program categories may apply to a particular project or series of projects in a corridor.

Overall Common Criteria:

- Benefit Cost Ratio
 - Reduces Delay
 - Improves Safety
 - Overriding Statewide Interest
- Objective: Complete a trunk system of higher standard state highways. Criteria:
- On High Emphasis Route
 - On Focus Route
 - Completes Key Segment
- 15%
- Objective: Link rural and smaller urban centers to trunk system. Criteria:
- On High Emphasis Route
 - On Focus Route
 - Completes Key Segment
- 15%
- Objective: Connect urbanizing centers and high growth areas to the trunk system. Criteria:
- On High Emphasis Route
 - On Focus Route
 - Completes Key Segment or Corridor
- 15%
- Objective: Connect urbanized areas, major metropolitan centers, and Gateways to the system. Criteria:
- On High Emphasis Route
 - On Focus Route
 - Completes Key Segment
 - Connects to a Gateway
 - Significant “through you” Improvement
 - Addresses larger travel conflicts between regional/local and interregional movement
- 15%/10%
- Objective: Improve level of service through Gateways and ensure connectivity to key commercial facilities. Criteria:
- Connects to a Gateway
 - Significant “through you” Improvement
 - Addresses larger travel conflicts between regional/local and interregional movement
- 15%/10%
- Objective: Preserve and improve intercity rail service. Criteria:
- Improve Service Reliability
 - Reduce Running Times
 - Reduce Per Passenger Farebox Subsidy
 - Protect States Rolling Stock Investment
 - Ensure Compliance with Appropriate Regulations
- 15%

VI. STATE HIGHWAYS OVERVIEW

This section of the Plan addresses the state highway system and Caltrans’ responsibilities for the system. The system is fundamentally important to the economy and well-being of the state and its population. It is fundamentally important

to the interregional, statewide, national, and international transportation of people and goods. This section of the Plan is more detailed than other sections due to the critical role of the state highway system in California.

It would cost about \$1 trillion to build the state highway system anew as it now exists. To protect and realize the maximum benefit from our investment in the highway system, we must continuously maintain and rehabilitate it. The State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) provides capital funding to accomplish this. Realizing optimum use of the system's existing capacity through operational strategies, integration of new technologies and improvements helps achieve maximum performance from the investment. Capacity additions and higher volume facilities for the interregional system are needed to accommodate current demand and future growth. Transportation service to, through, and within Gateways is necessary to benefit trade and commerce, the interregional movement of people and goods, and to support statewide goals.

The state highway system supports, directly and indirectly, the state's economy and its continuing growth. It is a strategic component of the state's economic health. California's climbing statewide personal income of \$760 billion per year, gross state product of greater than \$800 billion per year, and housing, commercial and industrial construction of greater than \$22 billion per year are supported by the state's highway network. California's foreign trade is approximately \$300 billion per year and value of exported goods is \$124 billion. California's position on the Pacific Rim and within the North American trade corridors are key factors for future growth and need for strategically planned improvements to the state highway system.

The state highways serve a diverse range of needs for the interregional movement of people and goods. Economic sectors as diverse as recreational travel and tourism, mining and manufacturing, and goods movement are supported and underlain by the state highways. Recreational travel and tourism account for approximately \$55 billion per year in total taxable transactions. In manufacturing, approximately two million people are employed with a payroll of about \$65 billion per year. The value added by manufacturing in California is significant--\$155 billion per year. Mining and timber production are contributors to the economy and jobs in the rural areas. Approximately 2.3 billion board feet of timber is produced per year. A large portion of the timber in raw and processed form is transported on state highways. The value of mining is about \$2 billion per year with much of the raw materials again transported on state highways.

VI.1. Caltrans' Primary Responsibilities

The people of California are the owners and users of the state highway system. The Legislature assigns responsibility for the system on behalf of its residents with Caltrans. Caltrans is, in many regards, a "trustee" of the state's highway system. As trustee, Caltrans is responsible for operations, maintenance, design, construction, and long-range planning for the system. Caltrans establishes standards and policies for the state highway system. Maintenance, rehabilitation, and operation of the system are the first priority for expenditure of state highway funds. As the trustee of the system, Caltrans maintains it, and administers the SHOPP for rehabilitation and operational improvements. Caltrans carries out its responsibilities in cooperation with regional and local agencies; however, Caltrans remains responsible for the system.

Five key aspects of the state highway system are addressed within the following portion of this section. They are: (1) fundamentals - what are the system components and why are they important, (2) the Interregional Road System (IRRS), (3) IRRS High Emphasis and Focus Routes, (4) Gateways, and (5) Improvements to the IRRS from 1990 to 1996.

VI.2. Fundamentals - Background That Frames The Plan

The state highway system comprises approximately 15,200 miles of roadway. Over half (9,500) of the route miles are "conventional highways". That means access from adjoining property is not restricted. Where access is restricted, a highway is either an "expressway" (intersections are not grade-separated) or "freeway" (intersections are grade-separated with interchange structures). Most conventional highway route miles are in rural areas and high growth areas (87 percent). Conventional highways provide reasonable service for most areas, especially for rural and lower volume routes. Passing and truck climbing lane improvements and improvements in alignment can typically provide a good level of service for the type and amount of travel. However, the significant growth of California's population in the past couple of decades, a trend which is expected to continue, creates a need for greater capacity on conventional routes in many high growth areas. Generally, this need is not triggered by interregional traffic demand and should be addressed in the context of community and regional planning.

There are, however, a limited number of state highway routes that remain a priority for planning and construction to expressway and freeway standards in order to accommodate current travel demand and anticipate ten-year demand. State Route 99 through the Central Valley is an example. Ten of the state's 37 urbanized areas surround Route 99 through the central and northern Central Valley. Much of the valley growth is expected to parallel the corridor. The freeway is complete from Bakersfield to Sacramento, with the exception of small portions in

Madera and Merced County. In the northern Central Valley, pieces of the freeway are in place but most remains unconstructed. The importance of identifying and completing a limited number of state highways to a freeway or expressway standard in the near term will be discussed under IRRS High Emphasis and Focus Routes.

The freeway system in the largest urbanized areas was almost entirely completed about two decades ago. Some gaps remain, but for the most part the urbanized freeway system is complete. (The term “complete” as used in this and following sections means that the system, as a complete continuous facility type, is complete and does NOT mean that there is adequate capacity on all freeway segments for current, near term or long range projected demand.) It was designed to accommodate projected population and traffic growth for the 1970’s and early 1980’s era. Current actual traffic volumes on most urban freeways far exceed those projected “design” volumes. Advances in traffic management and operational improvements (for example, metering and High Occupancy Vehicle Lane Networks) enable urban freeways to handle these higher traffic volumes. Regional efforts to manage congestion through transportation demand strategies, bus and guideway construction, and investments in rail service for metropolitan area trips have contributed to the continued high performance of the urban freeway system.

Urbanized areas account for about 50 percent of all freeway miles and about 60 percent of total freeway lane miles (2,000 freeway miles and 13,000 freeway lane miles respectively). The state highway system supports over 140 billion vehicle miles of travel per year, of which 63 percent is in urbanized areas. Within urbanized areas, 90 percent of the vehicle miles of travel is on freeways. The importance of the state’s freeway system to mobility of people and goods in urbanized areas and major metropolitan centers cannot be overstated. The freeway system in the metropolitan areas serves critical interstate, interregional, and international goods movement and provides access and connectivity to intermodal transfer facilities, sea and airports, and to freight distribution centers.

The urbanized system is essentially a “built” system. The current challenge is to continue to maximize capacity through continuing operational improvements and strategies, capacity additions where warranted and through continuing congestion management actions by regional and local agencies. New technologies hold considerable promise to optimize system capacity and operations. The most critical Gateways for international and interstate commerce, trade and goods movement and intermodal transfer are in the largest urbanized areas. The Gateways are dependent upon the freeway system for continuing reliable travel service levels, accessibility, and connectivity. The interstates are a focus in the Interregional Improvement Plan for transportation improvements in these Gateway areas.

VI.3. Interregional Road System

The Interregional Road System (IRRS) was identified in statute in 1989 as part of the Blueprint legislation. It is simply a subset of the existing 249 state highway routes. The IRRS that was identified in 1989 included 81 state highway routes, or portions of routes, that serve the interregional movement of people and goods. Most interstates were included and all major interregional routes, both conventional and expressway and freeway. Six additional routes have been added to the system since that time by locally sponsored legislation. There are currently 87 IRRS routes in statute.

The 1989 Blueprint specified that Caltrans Proposed State Transportation Plan (PSTIP) limit its improvement proposals to the IRRS and to the nonurbanized portions of the IRRS route, except under specific overriding conditions. A further requirement was that the improvement had to be included in the 1990 Interregional Road System Plan that Caltrans prepared and delivered to the Legislature as part of the Blueprint requirements. The IRRS Plan could only include projects outside of the urbanized areas. The Plan was prepared with the advice of the California Transportation Commission and in cooperation with regional agencies. It identified 278 state highway improvements totaling over \$3 billion. SB 45 removed the requirement that an improvement must be in the IRRS Plan. SB 45 requires that the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) include a specific minimum guarantee of funds to be programmed on IRRS routes in nonurbanized areas.

Due to the large number of routes and capacity improvements needed on the Interregional Road System, the 1990 IRRS Plan identified 13 of the 87 routes as being the most critical IRRS routes and identified them by the term "High Emphasis Routes". High Emphasis Routes were a priority for programming and construction to minimum facility standards in Caltrans PSTIP for the 1990-1996 State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs). The minimum facility standard for most routes was, and continues to be, freeway and expressway. Lower volume or mountainous routes typically have lesser standards of fully improved 32'-40' pavement and improved alignments. The term "high emphasis," and the priority for improvements to routes in that category, continue as a basis for common and understood usage between Caltrans and regional agencies. The IRRS and High Emphasis Routes are incorporated into both Caltrans system planning for long-range highway improvements and in most regional transportation plans and planning processes.

The original 13 High Emphasis Routes (or portions) were: Routes 14, 36, 44, 46, 58, 86, 99, 101, 111, 120, 152, 299, and 395. The interstates were included as High Emphasis, however, it was noted that for purposes of the 1990 Plan itself, that they were considered "completed" facilities and not a priority for programming improvements. They were not included in the original "count" of 13 High Emphasis routes. (Refer to High Emphasis Route Map.) The inclusion of interstates in the High Emphasis category was to highlight their critical importance to interregional travel and the state as a whole. Concentration of project funding on the noninterstates acknowledged the significantly underdeveloped and incomplete statewide freeway and expressway system and

population growth trends along the system. It also acknowledged the higher facility type (freeway) for the interstates and that the interstates were complete for near-term capacity demands. More travel growth could be accommodated on the nonurbanized interstates for the near term without a significant reduction in the level of service than on the other portions of the system of lower facility standards.

VI.4. High Emphasis And Focus Routes


The 1998 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan keeps the original 13 High Emphasis routes and adds an additional 21 routes to the category. There are 34 total High Emphasis routes in the Plan. In some cases, the High Emphasis route is a series of joined portions of routes that constitute a major logical transportation corridor. Route 299 and Route 20 are two examples of High Emphasis routes in the Plan that are comprised of major portions of the primary route but also include sub-portions of other routes. The mix of a primary corridor and portions of another is typically due to an existing adjacent route being a preferred alignment or an improved facility segment or may be due to the nature of travel or growth in the area. Route 299, for purposes of the Plan and the High Emphasis category, includes from west to east, Routes 299, 44, and 36. Route 20 includes Route 20 and portions of Route 29, 53, and 49. (Refer to High Emphasis Interregional Routes Map and Planning Guide/Technical Appendix.)

Inclusion of additional routes, or portions of routes in an overall transportation corridor, is based on the past eight years planning and programming experience with the legislative 1990 IRRS Plan and Caltrans continuing statewide system planning. These efforts have identified the need for some limited additional routes to be brought into the High Emphasis category and also to call out and name the interstates. Overall, the revisions to the High Emphasis category represent routes that have become of increasing interregional importance from a statewide perspective in the past several years. While the nonurbanized portions of the interstates continue for the most part to provide an adequate level of service now and projected for the nearer term, there are increasing examples statewide of recurrent congestion on key interstate goods movement corridors due to interregional travel conflicts between recreational, goods movement and other interregional trips. Interstate 15 in rural San Bernardino is an example of an interstate that is becoming increasingly congested. Interstate 5 in Tehama County is another example.

The term "Focus Routes" is a phrase specific to this Plan. Focus Routes are a subset of the 34 High Emphasis Routes. The routes represent 10 IRRS corridors that should be of the highest priority for completion to minimum facility standards in the 20-year period. Completion of the Focus Routes to minimum facility standards (for most routes freeway or expressway) will assure a statewide trunk system is in place and complete for higher volume interregional trip movements. Focus Routes will serve as a system of high volume primary arteries to which lower volume and facility standard state highway routes can connect for purposes of longer interregional trips and access into statewide Gateways. Timing for improvements will be based on a combination of

Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

High Emphasis Interregional Routes



qualitative and quantitative factors discussed later in the Plan (Section VIII). The routes, taken as a whole, constitute a "backbone" for additional capacity and complete facilities for the state. They balance north-south and east-west access and connectivity statewide. The Focus Routes assure rural connectivity for the north state and otherwise connect the fastest growing urbanized areas and urban centers to a trunk system. All Focus Routes are on the National Highway System (an exception is the S.R. 49 portion of the S.R. 20 corridor), Freeway and Expressway System, and are STAA Truck or Truck Terminal Routes. (Refer to the IRRS Focus Routes Map and to the Technical Appendix.)

Many High Emphasis Routes and Focus Routes are additionally part of the "Intermodal Corridors of Economic Significance" or ICES. The Intermodal Corridors of Economic Significance System is an interconnected network of freight distribution routes within California that provides direct access between major highways, seaports, airports, rail yards and national and international markets. The ICES routes are key routes within Gateway areas and of major statewide significance.


VI.4.1. Urbanized Areas and Relationship to High Emphasis and Focus Routes

The High Emphasis and Focus Routes meet the Plan objective of completing a trunk system to higher standard (expressway/freeway) connecting all urbanized areas. (Refer to map of urbanized areas and High Emphasis Routes.) The routes additionally connect some of the faster growing areas to the trunk system while ensuring rural connectivity and mobility is maintained. There are 37 urbanized areas in California as of the 1990 census. At least one additional area is anticipated to be designated urbanized in the 2000 census, Turlock. The High Emphasis Routes directly serve all but four of the 37 urbanized areas. Those not served have limited near term capacity for non peak or are within a shorter distance to a High Emphasis Route that is an Interstate or Focus Route. (urbanized areas of Antioch-Pittsburgh, Hemet- San Jacinto, Lompoc, and Napa). Focus Routes directly serve 27 of the state's urbanized areas. (Refer to map of urbanized areas and High Emphasis Routes.) Those not directly connected are otherwise served immediately by interstates or are in proximity to Focus Routes.

The Route 99 corridor stands out in the Central Valley for priority completion to freeway standards. Ten of the state's urbanized areas (27 percent) are served by Route 99. The urbanized areas essentially surround the route. With the 2000 census, Turlock will increase the number of urbanized areas on the Route. The portion from Bakersfield to the Routes 99/70 Y in Sutter County is paramount for early completion to freeway standard (and incremental lane additions) due to current and projected travel demand and interregional goods movement and connectivity. Continual and incremental progress towards completion to expressway/freeway standard from the Y to Yuba City - Marysville urbanized area and to the Chico urbanized area in Butte County is an important part of the focus concept. (The Focus Route from the Y to Chico is Route 70).


Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

High Emphasis Focus Routes



Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

High Emphasis Interregional Routes with Named Urbanized Areas



Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

High Emphasis
Focus Routes
with Named
Urbanized Areas

-  Focus Routes, Nonurbanized
-  High Emphasis Routes
-  Continuation Through Urbanized Areas
-  Urbanized Areas
-  Selected National Parks
-  Counties



Population projections for 2040 by the Department of Finance by county areas of highest projected growth (200 percent or greater and 100 percent to 199 percent) being in counties served by the High Emphasis and Focus Routes. Though projections are not disaggregated from county level, growth can be anticipated to be in valley areas, including new towns and around currently urbanized and urban areas in desert and mountain counties. (Refer to map of Projected Growth.

VI.5. Gateways

Gateways are principal centers of major state, national, or international trade and commerce, goods movement and intermodal transfer. They typically are the largest metropolitan centers in the state and the locations of the largest international air passenger and air cargo ports, seaports, intermodal transfer centers, and freight and goods movement distribution centers. Gateways are also key passage ways into and out of the state or into critical geographic areas of the state. Gateways are across state borders, international borders, or for example, into the Central Valley (via I-5 Grapevine near Bakersfield) or I-80 across the Sierra and on into the State of Nevada. A Gateway in some instances may be a single key state route that is a critical passageway into a major metropolitan center that has international, national and statewide significance. I-205 and I-580 from the San Joaquin Valley into the Bay Area are two examples of Gateways that are state highway routes. (Refer to Gateway Map.)


There are other Gateways beyond those identified on the map that serve industrial and manufacturing centers, are major recreational centers, or entrances into sub regions of the state. For purposes of the Plan, the Gateways have been limited to the fewest number possible that represent the largest centers of intermodal transportation activities and commerce and other key Gateways of statewide significance. Identification of facilities within Gateways on the Gateway map does not imply a priority or exclusion of other facilities within the Gateway area that are otherwise eligible for funding under the Interregional Improvement Program. The facilities named are those of larger national, statewide, or interregional importance.

VI.6. What's Been Programmed Or Built On The IRRS - 1990 To 1996

Forty-four of the original 278 projects identified in the 1990 IRRS Plan to the Legislature have been programmed in subsequent STIPs (1990-1996). Several have been constructed and are open to travel. The projects represent about \$1.1 billion of State Highway Account investment. Thirty-three of the projects are on High Emphasis routes and are major system improvements. These projects complete significant portions of the route to the minimum standard facility identified in the 1990 IRRS Plan. Route 395 along the eastern Sierra and Routes 111, 7, and 86 in Imperial Counties are particular examples of significant improvements made to the interregional system from the 1990 Plan. The programmed projects will nearly complete the facilities to minimum standard. In total, about 154 miles of lane additions to the interregional system were

Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

Projected Population Growth by County with Named Urbanized Areas




*Source: California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit

Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan

Transportation Gateways of Major* Statewide Significance

-  Gateway and Direction
-  Major International Airports
-  Major International Seaports
-  International Ports of Entry

Facilities and Routes identified in the Gateway have greater statewide transportation significance. Identification does not, however, imply a priority or exclusion of other facilities within the Gateway area.



programmed (primarily expressway lane miles) in addition to about 23 miles of passing lane and truck climbing lanes. Several regionally significant state highway bypasses were also programmed from the 1990 Plan. The Truckee Bypass on Route 267 in the Sierra (Tahoe area), the Mojave Bypass on Route 58, and Willitts Bypass on Route 101 are examples of major progress for improving the interregional system in the prior STIPs.

VII. PRIORITY CONSIDERATIONS FOR STATE HIGHWAYS

This section describes in more detail the basis for selecting certain corridors for priority planning and programming in nonurbanized areas, identifies the corridors, and discusses how the other state highways will be improved. It also describes the approach to improvements in Gateway areas and the importance of the Gateways themselves.

VII.1. High Emphasis IRRS Corridors

The highest priority for planning and programming for the Interregional Road System is on the ten Focus Routes discussed in the prior section. The routes themselves are named and described in detail later in this section. The goal is to make significant progress towards programming improvements to the routes in the near term so that the routes are complete to minimum facility standards by the end of the twenty year planning horizon. For longer and more complex routes it will not be possible to improve the entire route length to minimum facility standards during that time frame. For other routes on which significant progress was made in the past six years, few additional projects, or a single project, are needed to complete the route. Examples of routes with few remaining segments to improve in order to complete the entire route to minimum facility standard are Routes 111 and 7 in Imperial County and completion of Route 78, the Brawley Bypass (completes Route 86). Route 99 from Bakersfield to Sacramento is another example of a nearly complete freeway facility. Expressway sections remain only in Madera and Merced Counties.

In some limited instances, it may be necessary to move priorities within Focus Route segments or to another High Emphasis Route to address a significant unanticipated interregional travel problem of larger statewide or interregional importance. Each biennial Plan update will review the Focus Routes, other High Emphasis Routes, Gateways, and the state highway system as a whole to ensure that the Plan responds to major changes in interregional travel conditions in California. The goal of completing the Focus Routes to the minimum facility standard in the twenty-year period will remain a priority. Meeting that goal will require joint planning and sharing of transportation resources with regional agencies.

Completion of the Mexico Border Gateway Routes (Routes 7, 111, 78, 86, and Interstate 905) is a continuing priority. The past several years of STIP programming for Routes 7, 111, and 86 represent a considerable and important

investment for this area of the state and for interregional travel. Routes 111 and 7 are nearly complete and with completion of Route 78 (Brawley Bypass) Route 86 will also be complete. Early completion of these routes to minimum facility standards will ensure maximum return on the original state's investment. Interstate-905 requires significant additional funding and continued cooperative planning efforts at the state and regional levels. Its importance is shared for both international border Gateway traffic and regional traffic. Continued cooperative funding and planning efforts will ensure its completion.

Concept statements for each of the Focus Routes are included in the Plan. They identify an interregional mobility goal for each route, the facility standard to meet the concept, and strategies to develop the route. The strategy includes cooperative actions with regional and local agencies. The statements follow Section VIII. The routes in the Mexico Gateway are included on one Concept statement.

The routes are briefly described below. They are listed geographically from west (ocean) to east (Sierra) and from south to north (Bakersfield to Redding).

VII.2. Focus Routes--Nonurbanized

VII.2.1. Major North/South Routes

- Route 101 - Los Angeles to Oregon Border. Serves diverse travel demands throughout its length; major commute corridor through the Bay Area and other urbanized areas and major truck and life-line route for the coastal north state.
- Route 99 - Bakersfield to Tehama County. The corridor from Bakersfield to Route 70 in Sutter County, north of Sacramento, is a major goods movement corridor and increasingly a major commute corridor. It is the backbone for mobility and access in the rapidly growing Central Valley and into the Bay Area Gateway across the Altamont (Routes 205 and 580). The route is the primary state highway for eight of the nine urbanized areas in the Central Valley. It includes Route 70 from the Sutter 99/70 junction to Route 149 in Butte County for purposes of the Focus Route.
- Route 395 - San Bernardino to Oregon State Line. Serves both major rural recreational and tourist travel to the eastern Sierra and is a significant goods movement route for trucks from the eastern Sierra into California. It is the principle state route for residents of Inyo and Mono County. It includes Route 14 for purposes of the Focus Route.
- Mexico Gateway Routes - are considered a Focus Route (aggregation of routes with a common purpose) within the Plan. See discussion of Mexico Border Routes in prior section.

VII.2.2. Major East/West Routes

- Route 58 - A major noninterstate goods movement route for interregional through movement. Provides operational flexibility for coping with emergencies and an alternative interregional route to bypass Los Angeles Basin congestion. Links I-5 and Route 99 to I-15 and I-40 into Nevada and Arizona connecting with southwest and southern U.S. Also links with Routes 395 and 14 to provide connection to the eastern sierra region, Nevada, and north-west United States.
- Route 198 - Provides only direct east/west link between Route 99 and I-5 for the lower Central Valley from above Bakersfield to south of Merced, a distance of 140 miles. An alternative route for cross valley goods and people movement in the event of valley emergencies. Primary route to the national defense station (Lemoore Naval Air Station) and directly serves the high growth Visalia urbanized area. Connects from I-5 to Route 41 as an alternative for travel into the Fresno urbanized area and goods movement/transfer centers.
- Routes 41 and 46 - Links U.S. 101, I-5 and Route 99 for interregional through movement and provides operational flexibility for emergencies across multiple counties from coast to valley. A goods movement route from U.S. 101 to I-5 and across the valley to Route 99. Provides connection to the high growth Central Valley urbanized areas on Route 99.
- Routes 152 and 156 - Provides the only direct agricultural, goods movement, and recreational route south of the Bay Area to the coast. Links Route 99, I-5, and U.S. 101 to the urbanized Monterey Bay area and coastal recreational areas, agricultural centers and high growth valley centers. Only major east/west link between I-205 and Route 41 in the valley, a distance of 120 miles.
- Route 20 (29, 53, and 49) - Serves the major east/west interregional movement for people and goods across the northern Central Valley. Links U. S. 101, I-5, Route 99, Route 70, and I-80. Provides routing alternatives for emergencies in the north state. Serves recreational travel from the Sierra to the north coast. The north state “cross roads” or “hub” for agricultural and goods movement in the north valley and through the Yuba City/Marysville urbanized area for connections to Routes 99 and 70. Connects the high growth Route 49 corridor in Placer County to I-80.
- Route 299 (44 and 36) - Provides the only major east/west transportation facility in north state for people and goods movement and

lifeline connectivity. Links rural and small urban centers across the north state and trucking to U.S. 101,

-
- I-5, and U.S. 395 and to the Redding urbanized area. Provides emergency access and routing into and across north state. Serves north state recreation and tourism.

VII.2.3. Interstates And Other State Routes

The designated Interstate highways are the backbone of the state's transportation system. They carry the highest volumes of people and goods into, through, and around the urbanized areas and are critical to interstate, interregional and international travel, commerce and trade. In rural and nonurbanized areas they primarily serve critical interregional goods movement needs. In rural and slower growth areas, most Interstates have adequate near term capacity and are currently operating within a reasonable level of service. The level of service will decrease depending upon the rate of adjacent land development and changes in interregional goods movement demand. In the largest urbanized areas (Bay Area and Los Angeles), areas with extreme and extended peak interstate recreational travel (i.e., I-15 in San Bernardino and I-80 into the Sierra), and increasingly in the smaller urbanized areas or high growth areas (i.e., Redding and Red Bluff), capacity is not adequate for current peak demand, resulting in significant hours of congestion and delay.

For purposes of the Plan, the importance of the Interstates is recognized; however, the Interstates share importance with the need to develop undeveloped portions of the state highway system to serve current and projected growth (Focus Routes), and with other statewide system needs on the High Emphasis Routes. Interstates are included as a center piece within the Plan in the Gateways and most are in the High Emphasis Route categories. It is understood that capacity additions for interregional movement of people and goods will be needed. Capacity improvements on Interstates (as with all improvements) will be identified and planned in cooperation with regional agencies. Existing and future Interstate capacity must be managed through cooperative identification and implementation of traffic management strategies. Interstates are otherwise on the legislative IRRS (a limited number are not included for their entire length).

Other state routes that are IRRS routes and not High Emphasis, or that are not on the legislative IRRS, will be improved primarily with regional share dollars, local funds, and through the SHOPP. The state may partner with regional agencies on a route by route basis for selected route improvements, however, most investments will be on the High Emphasis and Focus Routes. Many of the non-High Emphasis IRRS routes are corridors on which rapid land development is

taking place. Many of the routes are two lane conventional. It is outside of the scope of this Plan and program strategy to address the statewide issues for improving the conventional system, as a whole, to higher standards. For purposes of new town development, larger site developments, or cumulative multi-county impacts along conventional routes, cities and counties are encouraged to consider a full range of financial alternatives, mobility strategies, and mitigations in the general plan process to address these critical issues. Local agencies are encouraged to work closely with Caltrans to develop voluntary access management plans to optimize operation of the conventional facility and ensure the safest possible travel conditions within the type of facility. Regional agencies are encouraged to comprehensively consider this issue in the regional planning process.

VII.3. Focus Route Concepts and Approach to Improvements

A one-page concept statement describing the interregional mobility goal for the route, facility standard to meet the concept, and strategy to develop the route has been developed for each of the Focus Routes. The statement is a plan of action for each route and involves cooperative and complimentary regional and local actions. Statements for each of the ten routes follows this subsection. The route order follows from north-south routes (ocean to Sierra) and continues with the east-west routes (south of state to top).

The route concepts follow this page.

U.S. 101 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - U.S. 101 runs north-south along the California coast. Between the Los Angeles area the San Francisco Bay area, it is a high capacity facility that provides a consistent high level of service through urban and rural communities. North of the Bay Area, it is generally a lower capacity facility that provides a moderate to high level of service and lifeline accessibility for rural communities and the interregional movement of people, goods, and recreational travel to the northwestern part of the state.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4-10 lane freeway from Los Angeles through the San Francisco Bay Area to Cloverdale, with intermediate 4 lane expressway segments from Goleta to Gilroy.
- 4 lane freeway/expressway from Cloverdale to north of Eureka.
- 2-4 lane expressway with passing lanes from north of Eureka to Oregon.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategy to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements in the north state, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and major regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decision making and providing alternative transportation infrastructure and modes for regional trips.
- Continuous improvement of U.S. 101 for increased interregional travel demand emphasizing goods movement, recreation and lifeline needs includes the following actions:
 - Begin converting expressway segments from Los Angeles to Cloverdale to freeway, and add lane capacity for increased interregional travel demand, emphasizing goods movement and interregional travel volumes;
 - Close freeway and expressway gaps north of Cloverdale.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- In the near term, improve existing facility at Prunedale; over the longer term, complete freeway bypass when warranted and with substantial local funding participation.

STATE ROUTE 99 AND 99/70 CORRIDOR “Y” TO SR 149 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 99 and SR 70 are high capacity north-south facilities that provide a consistent high level of service for interregional movement and connectivity of people and goods to and through the urban and rural areas of the central and north part of the state.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

4-8 lane freeway from south of Bakersfield to the SR 99/70 junction (“Y”).

- 4 lane freeway from SR 99/70 “Y” to Marysville on SR 70 and 4 lane conventional to Yuba City on SR 99. Route concept and future freeway alignment from Marysville/Yuba City north to Chico to be determined. Post 2020 concept of chosen corridor is 4 lane freeway.
- 4 lane expressway from the end of the Chico freeway to Corning (South Ave) in Tehama County. 2 lane conventional with passing lanes from Corning to Red Bluff.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state’s interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips.
- Cooperatively fund interchange construction to close expressway gaps at the earliest opportunity and prior to cumulative growth impacts or large impact local and regional developments. Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Continuous improvement of SR 99 to high capacity facility by these actions:
 - BAKERSFIELD TO 99/70 JUNCTION IN SUTTER COUNTY**
 - close all remaining expressway gaps south of the 99/70 junction;
 - add freeway lane capacity for increased interregional travel demand for goods movement and major interregional commute volumes.
 - 99/70 JUNCTION TO CHICO AND CHICO TO RED BLUFF**
 - construct 4 lane expressway segments on SR 70 south of Marysville - Stage 1; construct 4 lane conventional on SR 99 south of Yuba City;
 - close expressway gaps from Marysville to Chico - Stage 2 or earlier;
 - construct 4 lane expressway north of Chico to Corning.

U.S. 14/ 395 - CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Routes 14 and 395 are considered one corridor for purposes of this plan. It is one of the four major north-south corridors serving California. The corridor is a “gateway” with the State of Nevada. It is a 557 mile north/south rural facility, divided into two segments, one between Southern California and the Nevada State Line near Topaz Lake, and one from the Nevada State Line near Reno to the Oregon State Line north of Alturas. It provides a consistent high level of service and lifeline accessibility for rural communities and for interregional and interstate movement of people, goods, and recreational travel along the eastern slope of the Sierras. Eighty-five percent of trips are recreational oriented.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane expressway from I-15 in San Bernardino County to Lee Vining in Mono County north of Mammoth Lakes, and combination 4 lane conventional roadway, 4 lane expressway, and 2 lane fully improved conventional roadway with passing lanes Lee Vining to the Nevada State Line (south).
- 4 lane freeway and expressway from the Nevada State Line near Reno to State Route 36 at Susanville, 2 lane expressway from Susanville to Alturas, and 2 lane conventional roadway from Alturas to the Oregon State Line.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state’s interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Close conventional roadway and expressway gaps to facilitate recreational travel and goods movement.
- Provide adequate passing facilities on 40 foot roadway segments in mountain areas to facilitate the safe movement of recreational vehicles and trucks .
- Continuous improvement of U.S. 395 for increased interregional travel demand emphasizing goods movement, recreation, and lifeline needs includes the following actions:
 - close expressway and conventional gaps north of the SR 14 junction;
 - construct fully improved 2 lane conventional with passing lanes north of Lee Vining;
 - begin construction of 4 lane expressway segments south of SR 14 to I-15 and north of the Nevada State Line to State Route 36.

STATE ROUTES 7, 111, 78, & 86 and INTERSTATE 905
NAFTA GATEWAY - CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - Interstate 905 and portions of State Routes 7, 111, 78, and 86 together, comprise the significant North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) gateway providing a high level of service for the movement of international goods and passengers into and out of the international Ports of Entry (POE) with Mexico.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- For I-905: 6 lane freeway from the Mexican POE to I-805 in San Diego.

- For SR 7, 111, 78, and 86; 4 lane expressway from the Mexican POE to just north of the Riverside County Line. 4 lane freeway from the county line to Interstate 10 near Coachella.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.

- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips.

- Cooperatively identify and fund capacity improvements. Where regional growth is a factor, strongly encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.

- Continuous improvement of the NAFTA Corridors include these actions:
 - Complete the partially funded SR 7, a 4-lane expressway from Mexico to I-8.

 - Convert the remaining 2 lane conventional segments on SR 111 between I-8 and Brawley. This includes completing the partially funded SR 78/111 Brawley bypass. These actions will greatly reduce delays, improve safety, and improve the quality of life in Brawley.

 - Complete the unconstructed portion of I-905 to the Mexican border. This will replace the Otay Mesa Road (a city street) as the primary access to the POE, thereby, improving capacity and safety and reducing delays.

STATE ROUTE 58 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 58 is a high capacity, high level of service East-West facility that provides significant goods/freight movement connections between I-5 and SR 99 in the Central Valley, SR 14 linking, and I-15 and I-40 via Barstow. It connects (via SR 99 and I-5) to other regions in Central and Northern California, (via SRs 14 and 395) to the Eastern Sierra region and the SR 395 Gateway, via SR 14 and I-15 to urban Southern California, and (via I-15 and I-40) with Nevada, Arizona, and the Southern United States.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane expressway/freeway from I-5 to SR 99.
- 4 to 6 lane freeway from SR 99 to SR 14.
- 4 lane expressway from SR 14 east of Mojave to I-15.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips, especially in the Bakersfield and Barstow areas.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Provide continuous 4 lane expressway and freeway segments to facilitate the safe movement of trucks .
- Improving SR 58 to accommodate increased interregional travel, particularly goods movement volumes, requires the following actions:
 - Convert remaining 2 lane conventional roadway segments to 4 lane expressway or freeway between I-5 and SR 99 (including realignment) and in San Bernardino County;
 - Convert remaining 22 miles of expressway to freeway east of BakersfieldKern County, and complete bypass at Mojave.

STATE ROUTE 198 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 198 is an East-West interregional facility providing a high level of service for agricultural truck and passenger travel across the San Joaquin Valley between the junction of I-5 in Fresno County to SR 99 in Tulare County.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 2 lane conventional, fully improved, with passing lanes from I-5 to Lemoore Naval Air Station.
- 4 lane freeway/expressway from Lemoore Naval Air Station to SR 99.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Convert the 2 lane conventional roadway segment (approximately 10 mile in both Kings and Tulare counties) to a 4 lane expressway to improve safety and facilitate both agricultural goods movement and passenger travel.
- Convert 4 lane expressway segments between Lemoore Naval Air Station and SR 99 to 4 lane freeway.
- Fully improve the 18 mile 2 lane conventional segment and add passing lanes from I-5 to the Lemoore Naval Air Station. Passing lanes will improve safety and facilitate goods movement and recreational travel.
- Support wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips, especially in the fast growing Lemoore and Hanford areas.

STATE ROUTE 41 - CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 41 is an East-West interregional, primarily rural facility, providing a moderate level of service for truck, agricultural, passenger, and recreational travel, (via SR 46) from the Central Coast and U.S. 101 at Paso Robles, to I-5 and across the San Joaquin Valley to SR 99 at Fresno, with links to other regions via I-5 and SR 99.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 2 lane conventional, fully improved, with passing lanes from SR 46 to I-5.
- 2 lane expressway, with passing lanes, from Kettleman City just east of I-5 to just south of SR 198, south of Lemoore.
- 4 lane expressway from Lemoore to SR 99 at Fresno.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay, especially in the fast growing Lemoore and Fresno areas.
- Construct a series of passing lanes along the 27 mile 2 lane conventional segment between SR 46 and I-5 to improve safety and facilitate both goods movement and recreational travel.
- Construct passing lanes along the 22 mile 2 lane conventional segment between Kettleman City east of I-5 to just south of SR 198 near Lemoore to improve safety and facilitate both goods movement and recreational travel
- Provide a continuous 4 lane expressway from the Kings/Fresno County line to Fresno to reduce travel delay and improve safety.
 - Upgrade the 7 mile 2 lane expressway segment to 4 lane expressway east of the Kings/Fresno County line.
- Convert the 7 mile 2 lane conventional segment to 4 lane expressway south of Fresno.

STATE ROUTE 46 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 46 is an East-West interregional, primarily rural facility, providing a moderate level of service for truck, agricultural, passenger, and recreational travel, from the Central Coast and U.S. 101 at Paso Robles, to I-5 at Lost Hills, with links to other regions via I-5.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane freeway from U.S. 101 at Paso Robles to the future intersection of Dry Creek Road.
- 4 lane expressway from the future intersection of Dry Creek Road east of Paso Robles to I-5 in Kern County.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategies to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and regional trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay, especially in the fast growing Paso Robles area.
- Expand existing 2 lane expressway segments in San Luis Obispo County to a continuous 4 lane freeway/expressway from Paso Robles to the junction of SR 41 (east). This will improve safety and facilitate both goods movement and recreational travel.
- As near-term strategy, construct passing and truck climbing lanes between SR 41 and I-5 until a 4 lane expressway is built. Passing lanes will improve safety and facilitate goods movement and recreational travel. As long-term strategy, convert the existing 2 lane conventional roadway to 4 lane expressway from SR 41 to I-5 in Kern County.

STATE ROUTE 152 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 152 is an East-West rural interregional facility connecting the southern portion of the San Francisco Bay Area (junction SR 101 near Gilroy) to the Central Valley (SR 99 in Madera County), with linkage to Southern California via I- 5 and SR 99. SR 152 provides a moderate level of service for commercial truck travel, agricultural truck access to the Salinas and central valleys, and recreational travel to the Monterey Bay Area (via SR 101 and SR 156).

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane expressway from U.S. 101 at Gilroy in Santa Clara County to SR 99 in Madera County.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Convert the two remaining conventional roadway segments (an 11 mile 2 lane conventional segment just east of U.S. 101 and a 7-mile 4 lane conventional segment at Los Banos) to expressway to improve safety and facilitate the movement of goods and recreational travel. Where regional growth is a factor, encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Continue with the strategy of constructing passing lanes throughout the 11-mile 2 lane conventional segment just east of U.S. 101 until a 4 lane expressway can be built. Passing lanes will improve safety and facilitate goods movement and recreational travel.
- Construct the Los Banos bypass, an initial 2 lane expressway on 4 lane right-of-way. With significant development planned in the Los Banos area and the interregional significance of the route, this improvement is needed to achieve the route concept.
- Support wise local land use decisions, and provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for regional trips, especially in the fast growing Gilroy and Los Banos areas.

STATE ROUTE 156 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Route 156 is an East-West interregional facility connecting the Monterey Peninsula to U.S. 101 and SR 152. It extends from the junction of SR 1 near Castroville to U.S. 101, then, with a break in route, from the junction of U.S. 101 in San Benito County to SR 152 in Santa Clara County. SR 156 provides a moderate level of service for agricultural truck travel out of the Castroville/Monterey Bay/Salinas Valley/Hollister to the Central Valley, and for recreational travel to the Monterey Bay Area from points north and south via U.S. 101 and to other regions via I- 5 and SR 99.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane expressway from SR 1 at Castroville in Monterey County to SR 152 east of Hollister in San Benito County.

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Convert the 2 lane conventional roadway segments (approximately 7.9 miles) to 4 lane expressway between SR 1 and U.S. 101 and between San Juan Bautista and the recently complete Hollister bypass. This will improve safety, reduce delay and facilitate the movement of agricultural goods and recreational travel.
- Identify, prioritize, and fund improvements to convert the 2 lane expressway and conventional roadway (approximately 15.7 miles) to 4 lane expressway between U.S. 101 and SR 152. Identify timing of improvements to ensure that the state's interregional needs and regional lifeline and recreational needs are comprehensively planned and programmed.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional (primarily weekend recreational) and local trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decision-making and providing alternative transportation infrastructure and modes for local and sub area.

STATE ROUTES 20, 29, 53, 49 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Routes 20, 29, 53 and 49, for purposes of the Plan, are considered one corridor. It is a significant west-east mostly rural Northern California corridor from U.S. 101 in Mendocino County, through the Clear Lake area, across the Sacramento Valley, connecting to I-80 in the high Sierras and to I-80 via Route 49 in Auburn. The facility provides a moderate level of service and lifeline accessibility for interregional movement of people, goods, agriculture, and recreational travel across the northern part of the state.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 4 lane freeway/expressway for SR 20 (US 101 to Upper Lake), SR 29 (SR 20 at Upper Lake to SR 53 at Lower Lake), and SR 53 (SR 29 at Lower Lake to SR 20 near Clearlake Oaks).
- 2 lane conventional, fully improved, with passing and truck climbing lanes throughout most of the remainder of SR 20 east of SR 53 to I-80.
- 4 and 5 lane conventional (left turn lanes) for SR 49

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategy to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements in the north state, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and local trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and the provision of alternative transportation infrastructure for local and sub-area trips, especially in the Yuba City/Marysville and the Clear Lake areas.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Provide adequate passing facilities and truck climbing lanes on 40 foot roadway segments in mountainous and agricultural areas to reduce delays and improve passing opportunities for trucks, farm equipment, and recreational vehicles.
- Initial emphasis on 4 lane facilities to the east and west of Lower Lake on both SR 29 and SR 53 and on SR 49.

STATE ROUTE 299, 44, 36 CONCEPT

INTERREGIONAL MOBILITY GOAL - State Routes 299, 44, and 36 for purposes of the Plan are considered one corridor. The combined corridor is the northern-most significant west-east rural corridor in the state, traversing 191 miles. It comprises SR 299 from the junction of U.S. 101 in Humboldt County to I-5 in Shasta County, SR 44 from the junction of I-5 in Shasta County to SR 36 in Lassen County, and SR 36 from the junction of SR 44 in Lassen County to U.S. 395 in Lassen County. The corridor provides a moderate level of service and lifeline accessibility for interregional movement of people, goods, and recreational travel from the coast of Northern California to Susanville, where it connects to U.S. 395 near the Nevada State Line.

FACILITY STANDARD TO MEET CONCEPT

- 2 to 4 lane conventional roadway and expressway, fully improved, with passing and truck climbing lanes throughout most of the three route corridor.
- 4 lane expressway and freeway in and near the City of Redding for both SR 299 and SR 4

STRATEGY TO MEET CONCEPT

- Cooperatively identify and plan capacity improvement strategy to ensure that the state's interregional needs, including lifeline and recreational requirements, are comprehensively considered with regional needs.
- Manage future travel demand to maximize capacity for interregional and local trip volumes by supporting wise local land use decisions and providing alternative transportation infrastructure for local and sub area trips, especially in the growing Redding urbanized fringe areas.
- Encourage local agencies to share funding responsibilities where regional growth is a factor, to ensure timely construction and minimize travel delay.
- Provide adequate passing facilities and truck climbing lanes on fully improved 40-foot roadway segments in mountainous areas to reduce delays and improve passing opportunities necessitated by the terrain and the combined high number of trucks and recreational vehicles.
- Provide a 4-lane freeway segment on the existing 2 lane segment just east of Redding on SR 44 to Palocedro.

VII.4. Program Track - Improvements To Focus Routes

The Program Track is a starting point toward an ongoing strategic planning and programming process that will be refined with each biennial update of the Plan. This section currently includes only a Track for IRRS Focus Routes that will bring the route to the minimum facility standard in nonurbanized areas consistent with Plan objectives. Other categories may be added in future Plan updates through continued coordinated and cooperative discussions with regional and other agencies. Regional agencies and transportation partners will be part of the Plan and Program Track (Track) update process each biennial cycle.

The Track in this Plan is similar to the Action Element in the Regional Transportation Plans. It identifies, by route, the improvements needed to implement the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan objectives in the twenty-year period while prioritizing some improvements for nearer term programming. It does not assign an exact STIP year or STIP cycle. It also identifies improvements which are more complex or part of a corridor completion concept that should be considered for early environmental studies and project development to be ready for programming of right-of-way and construction in later years.

The Track is not a commitment to fund a project (in whole or partially) with Interregional Improvement Program funds, just as inclusion of a project in the Regional Transportation Plan is not a funding commitment or assignment of responsibility. It is an inventory of improvements needed to meet the route concept or route development objective and an initial prioritization into nearer and longer term time horizons. For purposes of the Focus Routes, it serves as an inventory of Project Study Report priorities to prepare projects for future programming.

The Track, however, is dissimilar to the Regional Plan (for this Plan cycle only) in that it does not identify the costs of the improvements. Most costs are otherwise available from a series of Caltrans and regional documents, including Caltrans Transportation System Development Program and Regional Transportation Plans and Programs. In future biennial updates of the Plan and Track we intend to move towards displaying costs by the SB 45 STIP categories. Planning level cost estimates will be used for improvements for which a Project Study Report has not been prepared and adjustments made when the scope, schedule, and cost is determined.

The Program Track for Focus Routes follows this page:

**INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM
(nonurbanized)**

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
U.S. 101	
Humboldt 101 P.M. 57.0/58.8 S.R. 101 to S.R 36 I/C	Humboldt P.M. 0.0/5.6 Close freeway gap
Mendocino 101 P.M. 5.7/9.2* Hopland Unit III - 4E	Humboldt 101 P.M. 54.3/57.0** Close Freeway Gap S. of SR 36 I/C
Mendocino 101 P.M. 9.2/13.0 Hopland Bypass 4E/F	Humboldt P.M. 80.8/84.7 Close freeway gap
Mendocino 101 P.M. 13.0/17.6 4C to 4E North Hopland	Humboldt 101 P.M. 114.0/118.2 2C/E to 4E
Mendocino 101 P.M. 43.5/51.3* Unit II Willits Bypass 2E to 4F	Marin/Sonoma 101 P.M. 22.8/27.6; 0.0/3.2** Convert to Freeway and widen
Monterey P.M. R91.5** Prunedale Bypass	Monterey 101 P.M. 82.5 Construct I/C
Monterey 101 P.M. 100/101.3 San Juan I/C	Santa Clara 101 P.M. 0.1/4.6 Convert 4E to 4F

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

**INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERNATIONAL ROAD SYSTEM
(nonurbanized)**

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 99	
(SR 70 in Sutter/ Butte Co. north of "Y" is Focus Route)	
Madera 99 P.M. 20.1/22.5*	Butte 70 P.M. 0.0/13.5**
Close Freeway Gap	4E Construct
Merced 99 P.M. 10.6/12.8*	Fresno 99 P.M. 1.0/7.1
Close Freeway Gap	4F to 6F
Merced 99 P.M. 23.8/26.8*	Kern 99 P.M. 29.9/36.5 & 49.4/57.8**
Close Freeway Gap	8F (2 Projects - North of Bakersfield)
Merced 99 P.M. 26.8/28.8*	Madera 99 P.M. 0.0/10.5
Close Freeway Gap	4F to 6F
Sutter 70 P.M. 0.2/5.0*	Merced 99 P.M. 0.0/4.9**
2C to 4E	Close Freeway Gap
Sutter 70 P.M. 5.0/8.3*	Merced 99 P.M. 4.9/10.6**
2E to 4E	Close Freeway Gap
Yuba/Butte 70 P.M. R8.3/25.8 & 0.0/13.5*	Merced 99 P.M. 28.8/32.3
Marysville Bypass - ED only	Close Freeway Gap
Requires further study	
Sutter/Yuba 65 Third Bridge (connects urbanized areas of Yuba City and Marysville)*	Sacramento 99 P.M. 35.4**
	I/C at Elverta Rd.
	San Joaquin 99 P.M. 6.7/12.0
	4F to 6F

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 99 (con't)	
	Sutter 99 P.M. 0.9**
	I/C at Riego Road
	Sutter 99 P.M. 0.1/5.7
	4E to 4F
	Sutter 99 P.M. 6.3/7.2
<u>SUTTER 99 - 99/70 Y TO YUBA CITY</u>	4E to 4F
Sutter 99 P.M. 8.7*	Tehama 99 P.M. 0.0/4.7
2C to 4C	Passing Lanes
Sutter 99 P.M. 12.9*	Tulare 99 P.M. 0.0/35.0
Passing lane	4F to 6F
Sutter 99 P.M. 16.8*	Tulare 99 P.M. 41.3/53.9
2C to 4C	4F to 6F
Sutter 99 P.M. 21.4*	
2C to 4C with left turn pockets	

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
U.S. 395	
(includes SR 14 in Kern and Los Angeles Co.)	
Inyo 395 P.M. 54.6/57.4*	Mono 395 P.M. 57.8/60.2
Lone Pine 4C (92 STIP project)	Conway Ranch 4C
Inyo 395 P.M. 64.5/71.2*	Mono 395 P.M. 116.9/120.1
Manzanar 4E (92 STIP project, increased cost)	Topaz High Point Relocation
Inyo 395 P.M. 70.3/76.3*	Kern 395 P.M. 0.0/29.3
Independence 4E	4E multiple units
Inyo 395 P.M. 30.8/36.4	Lassen 395 P.M. Various**
Olancho 4E	Passing Lanes, various locations
Inyo 395 P.M. 36.4/41.3	Mono 395 P.M. 65.9/70.0
Cartago 4E	N. Conway 4C
Inyo 395 P.M. 77.3/91.6	San Bernardino 395 P.M. 4.0/11.2
Aberdeen 4E	4E
Mono 395 P.M. 52.8/55.7	San Bernardino 395 P.M. 11.2/18.9
Mono Lake 40' with turnouts	4E
	San Bernardino 395 P.M. 18.9/46.0
	4E multiple units
	San Bernardino 395 P.M. 46.0/73.5
	4E multiple units

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 7/111/86/78 & 905	
Imperial 7 P.M. 1.2/6.7*	San Diego 905
New 4E	
Imperial 78/111 P.M. 7.2/15.7*	
4E Brawley Bypass	
Imperial 111 P.M. 10.9/13.1*	
2C to 4E	
Imperial 111 P.M. 13.1/22.1*	
2C to 4E	
San Diego 905 P.M. 5.7*	
(RW 6F)	
San Diego 905	
All projects are additionally within gateway areas for the Mexico International Gateway	

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 58	
San Bernardino 58 P.M. 0.0/ 12.9*	Kern 58 P.M. 77.0/ 86.5
4E	Auxiliary and truck climbing lanes
San Bernardino 58 P.M. 22.4/ 33.1*	Kern 58 P.M. 118.0/ 127.6
4E	Close gap 4E to 4F

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 198	
Kings 198 P.M. 21.5/28.5	Fresno 198 P.M. 26.8/42.0
2C to 4E	2C to 4E (Later cycles)
Tulare 198 P.M. 0.0/3.3	Kings 198 P.M. 0.0/2.8
2C to 4E	2C to 4E (later cycles)

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 198	
Kings 198 P.M. 21.5/28.5	Fresno 198 P.M. 26.8/42.0
2C to 4E	2C to 4E (Later cycles)
Tulare 198 P.M. 0.0/3.3	Kings 198 P.M. 0.0/2.8
2C to 4E	2C to 4E (later cycles)

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 41 & 46	
San Luis Obispo 46 P.M. 32.2/40.6*	Fresno 41 P.M. R0.0/R7.1
2C to 4E	2C/E to 4E
San Luis Obispo 46 P.M. 40.6/55.1	Fresno 41 P.M. 7.1/14.1
2C to 4E - multiple units	2C to 4E (later years)
San Luis Obispo 46 P.M. 51.0*	San Luis Obispo / Kern / Kings / Fresno 41
Lengthen EB & WB passing lanes	P.M. Various, Passing Lanes
San Luis Obispo 46 P.M. 56.4	Kern 46 P.M. 0.0/32.5
Truck lane near Cholame	2C to 4E - multiple units
	San Luis Obispo 46 P.M. 55.1/60.8
	SR 41 / SR 46 I/C

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 20 Corridor	
(Includes SR 29/53 & 49)	
Lake 29 P.M. 27.9/31.1	Nevada 20 P.M. 0.2/0.8 & 2.6/3.6
2C to 4E	Passing Lanes or Extensions
Lake 29 P.M. 31.2/36.4	Nevada 20 P.M. 25.5/26.3 & 39.6/41.2
Passing Lanes	Passing and truck climbing lanes
Placer/Nev 49 P.M. 11.2/11.4 & 0.0/2.2*	Yuba 20 P.M. 8.2/10.1
4C with continuous center turn lane	Passing Lane
Lake 53 P.M. 1.4/3.5	Lake 29 P.M. 23.9/27.9
Convert 4E to 4F	2C to 4E
	Lake 29 P.M. 30.6/40.9
	4E/F
	Nevada 49 P.M. 0.0/13.7
	4C/4E - multiple units

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

INTERREGIONAL IMPROVEMENT TRACK - INTERREGIONAL ROAD SYSTEM

(nonurbanized)

FOCUS ROUTES AND CORRIDORS

20 YEAR TIME HORIZON

NEARER TERM	LONGER TERM
Years 1998-2008	Years 2009-2020
1998-2004 STIPs	2006 and Future STIPs
SR 299 Corridor	
(includes SR 44 & 36)	
Shasta 299 P.M. 0.0/5.3	Lassen 44 P.M. 14.8/53.3
Realign/Widen	Passing lanes/various locations
Shasta 299 P.M. 5.3/6.5*	Trinity 299 P.M.11.1/57.7
Lower Buckhorn - Realign/Widen	Passing Lanes/Various, Continue Projects
Shasta 299 P.M. 6.5./7.4*	Trinity 299 P.M. 49.2/54.2
Lower Buckhorn - Realign/Widen	Weaverville Bypass (later years)
Trinity 299 P.M. 11.1/57.7	
Passing Lanes/Various Locations	
Trinity 299 P.M. 26.7*	
Passing lanes near Big Bar	
Trinity 299 P.M. 71.8/72.2	
Realign/Widen	

*1998 ITIP - may include ONLY ED, PA and ED, or full funding through construction - refer to ITIP

**Consideration for early programming of PA and ED in Nearer Term

VIII. GATEWAYS

Nine gateways of major statewide significance are identified in the Plan. The Gateways will be primary areas for consideration of funding in the 10 percent category of the Interregional Improvement Program. The Gateways include the two largest metropolitan centers in the state. Within these two Gateways are the largest seaports, international air passenger and cargo ports, intermodal transfer facilities and distribution centers in the state and among the larger national facilities. Within the metropolitan Gateways is the Gateway to the Pacific and Pacific Trade. The Gateways include the major interstate goods movement flow corridors into the state and from Mexico. The major freight rail corridors are included. (Refer to Gateway map.)

The Gateways are:

- Mexico - Includes the Ports of Entry and the key State Routes, Routes 111, 7, 86 and 78 and unconstructed I 905. The Gateway is the North American trade route(s) into the state and for interstate connections, including into the Los Angeles Basin.
- Arizona - Includes the key Interstate routes, I-8, 10, and 40. The interstates are critical gateways for goods movement, connectivity and access into the Los Angeles Gateway and Mexico Gateway.
- Southern Nevada I-15 into and through California - A vital gateway connecting interstate goods movement in the state and linking to the Los Angeles Gateway. Connects to Route 58, an important noninterstate goods movement corridor, and to U.S. 395.
- Los Angeles and Connections - This gateway is internationally and nationally significant. The state's two largest seaports and largest international airport are within the Gateway. The area contains the largest intermodal distribution and transfer facilities on the west coast and among the largest in the nation. The major urban freeways transport the largest volumes of goods and freight through the area and are among the highest volume freeways in the nation. The freight rail system is a vital component of the Gateway.
- Grapevine and Central Valley Connections - I-5 into the Central Valley. The Grapevine is a vital Gateway into the Central Valley for goods movement and for interstate and international transport for North American trade. Provides direct access and connectivity into the I-5 corridor and other Gateway areas. The Gateway includes Routes 99 and 58 for Central Valley Connections, both Focus Routes.

- Nevada and Eastern Sierra - U.S. 395 is the major entrance from the Eastern Sierra into the state for goods and people movement and for recreational travel and tourism. Provides connectivity to Routes 14, 6, and to other IRRS High Emphasis Routes.
- Nevada and Northern Sierra- I-80 provides access across the Sierra for major interstate goods movement and transport into the Sacramento and Bay areas and connectivity to other vital Gateways.
- Bay Area and Central Valley Connections - The northern metropolitan center and valley connections for commerce and trade, intermodal transfer, freight and goods movement, and distribution facilities. The Port of Oakland and two major International air passenger and cargo centers are within the Gateway. Key intermodal facilities and distribution centers are located in it and the heaviest traveled interstate freeways in the north state provide access into the Gateway and circulation and connectivity within. Interstate-205 from the Central Valley and 580 over the Altamont are vital to access from the valley and through the Gateway for freight movement. The freight rail system is a vital component.
- Oregon - The interstate Gateway is served by I-5, U.S. 97, U.S. 199, and U.S. 101. I-5 is vital, however, U.S. 97 is a preferred corridor for many interstate truckers from Weed to Oregon due to its lower elevation, snow closures on I-5 and direct access to Eugene. The only remaining portion of U.S. 97 in California to be improved is the bypass of the small town of Dorris. Once complete, the route will be a fully improved corridor for STAA trucks.


IX. FACTORS FOR TIMING AND SELECTION OF ITIP IMPROVEMENTS

IX.1. Factors for Improvements


The following chart (Factors and Timing for Project Selection) is a visual representation of qualitative and quantitative factors that will guide the selection and timing of improvements for the ITIP. The factors also framed much of the Plan itself and identification of Focus Routes and Gateways. The factors are commonly used and fairly uniformly understood within the transportation planning community. They are the basic factors for federal statewide and metropolitan planning and state regional planning. They are commonly used in Caltrans' system planning. The Intermodal Transportation Management System (ITMS) developed by Caltrans, with input from regional agencies, modal operators and other transportation providers, will also be used as a strategic analysis tool to evaluate larger state high and modal projects within a statewide, interregional, or larger regional framework. The ITMS is a macro level planning tool, however, it is a strong planning "screen level" tool for larger investment decisions.

Factors for Project Selection & Timing State Highway Improvements

FACTORS QUALITATIVE



FACTORS QUANTITATIVE



IX.2. Coordination of Regional and Local Plans and Programs

The basic planning principles and practices for statewide and regional planning remain unchanged under SB 45. Federal transportation planning laws and regulations also remain unchanged. The federal and state laws provide a continuing framework for cooperative and coordinated planning between metropolitan and regional agencies and Caltrans. The laws reiterate the primary responsibilities of local and regional agencies to manage congestion that is localized, regional, or in some cases metropolitan area wide. The laws reiterate the primary responsibility of the state to ensure interregional mobility and statewide perspective and to coordinate plans between metropolitan areas for trip movements of larger statewide interest. Of additional and continuing importance in transportation planning practice is consideration of County and City General Plans in Regional Transportation Plans and Caltrans planning.

Below are several of the most important key planning laws and regulations that should guide joint planning with regional and local agencies for purposes of the Plan and for purposes of implementing the Interregional Improvement Program. They are not exhaustive, but represent the key legal and regulatory framework for transportation planning that will need to be a focus to meet the challenges and opportunities provided to the state and regions with SB 45.

- Continuing, Cooperative, and Comprehensive Planning - Caltrans and metropolitan and regional agencies share responsibilities for the ongoing planning process. (23 USC, Section 134 and 135; GC Section 14529.12).
- Congestion Management Programs - Regional and local congestion management (Chapter 2.6 Congestion Management, Government Code Sections 65088.1-65089.10).
- Regional Transportation Plans - To include goods movement and ISTEA planning factors. (GC Section 65080)
- Metropolitan Plans - ISTEA planning factors. Includes specific consideration of: (1) international border crossings and access to ports, airports, intermodal transportation facilities, and major freight distribution routes, (2) methods to enhance the efficient movement of freight, and the need for connectivity of roads within the metropolitan areas with roads outside the metropolitan area. (23 USC, Section 134 {f} 7, 8, and 11.)
- Statewide Plans - ISTEA planning factors - Includes specific consideration of: (1) International border crossings and access to ports, airports, intermodal transportation facilities, major freight distribution routes, (2) transportation needs of nonmetropolitan areas, (3) connectivity between metropolitan areas with the state and with metropolitan areas in other states, (4) recreational travel and tourism, (5) methods to reduce congestion and to keep it from occurring where it does not now occur, and (6) coordination of transportation plans and programs developed for metropolitan areas of the state under 23 USC 234 and reconciliation of

plans and programs as needed to ensure connectivity within transportation systems. (23 USC, Section 135{c} 4, 5, 7, 8, and 12, and {d} 1).

- Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) - for urbanized areas over 200,000 population. Includes a congestion management system that provides effective management of new and existing transportation facilities and use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies. The TMA requirement under the responsibility of the designated Metropolitan Planning Agency. (23 USC 134{1}1,2, 3, 4.) Regulatory and specific requirements for the congestion management system - (23 CFR 500.109 {CMS} and 450.320).
- Metropolitan Investment Studies - for any major transportation investment using federal funds. Cooperative multimodal study with all planning partners having full involvement. (23 CFR 450.318.)

X. INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL

The state funds and oversees the operation of three intercity rail passenger routes in California - the Capitols running from San Jose/Oakland to Sacramento/Colfax, the San Joaquins running from the Bay Area to Bakersfield, and the San Diegans running from San Diego to Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo. All routes are supplemented by dedicated feeder bus service. Amtrak operates these rail services under contract with the state. Attached is a map of the state intercity passenger rail system, including the dedicated feeder bus system that supplements the state-supported service. A description of the characteristics of each route is below.

Amtrak also operates trains in California on four routes as part of their "basic national system" that does not receive state support. The Coast Starlight connects Los Angeles, the Bay Area, Sacramento, and Seattle. The California Zephyr connects the Bay Area, Denver and Chicago. The Southwest Chief connects Los Angeles and Chicago. The Sunset Limited connects Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Miami. Additionally, Amtrak supports 33 percent of the San Diegans running from San Diego to Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo.

Amtrak recently received a five-year reauthorization which included labor reform provisions which in turn allowed Amtrak access to \$2.3 billion in tax refunds to be used for rail capital projects. We anticipate an appropriate share of these funds will be used for projects in California. Amtrak has committed to operating without federal operating subsidies by 2002. We are expecting Amtrak to meet this goal, and that at least the existing level of Amtrak "basic national system" service (including the Amtrak share of the San Diegans) will continue to operate in California.


The central mission of the Rail Program is to, in partnership with others, take a leadership role in promoting safe, efficient, and cost effective intercity rail services that are fully integrated into the state's overall transportation system.

INTERREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIC PLAN

Intercity Passenger Rail and Feeder Bus Routes

State Supported Routes

Basic System Routes



San Diegan Route

Sunset Route

This intercity rail network should provide (1) an alternative to the state highway network, thus offering the traveling public an additional transportation choice, (2) relieve congestion on the existing highway network, and (3) contribute to improving air quality through a reduction in highway congestion and a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

The Rail Program also administers procurement of state-owned California Cars and locomotives, monitors and ensures compliance with car warranty provisions, and coordinates maintenance efforts between the car manufacturer and Amtrak.

Annual operational and financial goals for the three rail corridors are developed in the annual Corridor Strategic Business Plans.

X.1. Intercity Rail Performance Standards

The state has recently developed performance standards for each of its three routes. These standards are contained in the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency's December 31, 1997 Intercity Passenger Rail Act of 1996 Report to the State Legislature. A summary of this Report is included below.

The Report is required under Section 14031.8(f) of the Government Code which states: "Not later than December 31, 1997, the secretary shall establish a set of uniform performance standards for all corridors and operators to control cost and improve efficiency."

Three primary uniform performance standards and separate targets for each standard with respect to each of the corridors have been developed for federal Fiscal Years 1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-2000. Generally, the performance standards for 1997-98 and 1998-99 are based on the revenue, cost, loss and ridership projections embedded in the Amtrak contract and cost estimate for these years. The performance standards for 1999-2000 are based on the Caltrans estimate that, on all routes, ridership and revenue will increase by 5 percent, and costs by 3 percent over the prior year.

However, the farebox ratios for 1997-98 through 1999-2000 reflect targets that are slightly higher than the Amtrak projections for 1997-98 and 1998-99 or the Caltrans projection for 1999-2000 because aggressive marketing, rigorous cost control management, and stringent operations management can produce better results.

The following table shows actual state Fiscal Year 1996-97 performance and performance targets for federal Fiscal Years 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 for each corridor for the following performance standards: Route Ridership, Farebox Ratio, and On-time Performance.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

FOR THREE CALIFORNIA INTERCITY RAIL PASSENGER CORRIDORS				
	Actual SFY 96/7	FFY 97/8	FFY 98/9	FFY 99/00
<u>CAPITOL CORRIDOR</u>				
Route Ridership (000)	497	536	716	752
Farebox Return	28.9%	30.0%	31.0%	32.0%
On-Time Performance	70.0%	80.0%	90.0%	90.0%
<u>SAN JOAQUIN CORRIDOR</u>				
Route Ridership (000)	653	691	799	839
Farebox Return	40.0%	41.0%	42.0%	43.0%
On-Time Performance	58.0%	75.0%	80.0%	85.0%
<u>SAN DIEGAN CORRIDOR **</u>				
Route Ridership (000)	1,618	1,793	1,844	1,936
Farebox Return	37.4%	38.0%	41.4%	42.2%
On-Time Performance	75.0%	78.0%	80.0%	90.0%

** State portion only

The most significant influence on route ridership is additional service. On the San Diegans new service was added in 1997-98, with a projected 16 percent ridership increase. On the San Joaquins the fifth round trip (Bakersfield-Sacramento) is projected to be added in 1998-99, with a projected 15.6 percent ridership increase. On the Capitols the fifth and sixth trains are projected to be added in 1998-99, with a 33.6 percent ridership increase.

The most significant influence on the farebox ratio (total train and bus revenue divided by total train and bus cost) was the change in the cost basis in 1996-97. In 1995-96 Amtrak charged the state based on long-term avoidable loss. In 1996-97, and thereafter, Amtrak changed the cost basis to fully allocated loss. The significance of the change is that the state is charged for more of the costs attributed to a route's operation than previously. Thus, given the same financial performance of a route, the farebox ratio would fall under the new cost basis.

On-time performance is directly related to the major capital improvement projects on each route. On the San Joaquins, the major track and signal project between Stockton and Bakersfield is just nearing completion. This will allow the on-time performance to jump from 58 percent in 1996-97 to 75 percent in 1997-98. On the Capitols, the contract for the major track and signal project to be completed in early 1999 calls for 90 percent on-time performance upon the completion of the project. On the San Diegans, a major track and signal project is just commencing on the north end of the route which is projected to significantly improve on-time performance by 1999-2000.

X.2. INTERCITY RAIL ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

X.2.1. San Diegan Corridor

This is the most mature of the three corridors, and state participation began in 1976 with institution of a fourth daily round trip between San Diego and Los Angeles at a time when annual ridership on the route was 390,000.

At the present date, the route extends 351 rail miles between San Diego and San Luis Obispo and supports Amtrak service consisting of ten daily round trips between San Diego and Los Angeles, four round trips between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, and one daily round trip between Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo. Top speeds are currently 90 miles per hour on portions of the Los Angeles-Solana Beach segment and 79 miles per hour in other areas. In Fiscal Year 1996-97, the San Diegan Corridor carried 1.6 million passengers. Since that time, service frequency has been increased between Los Angeles and San Diego.

Travel patterns on the corridor are dispersed, with San Diego significantly outperforming Los Angeles as a traffic generator. Santa Barbara is also an extremely strong market, considering its size and frequency of service. South of Los Angeles, most northward trips have Los Angeles as a destination. North of Los Angeles, most southward trips have Orange County or San Diego stations as destinations.

Unlike other California corridors, bus feeder service has diminished to become a relatively minor part of the service, partially because train service has been increased as opportunities for train extensions occurred in the past ten years.

X.2.2. San Joaquin Corridor

This corridor is the “backbone” of the intercity rail system in California, providing a link between the Bay Area, Southern California, and intermediate points. The original San Joaquin corridor service, initiated in 1972, consisted of a single round trip between Oakland and Bakersfield and carried about 60,000 passengers annually until 1979. State participation created a feeder bus network that extended the corridor’s reach statewide, with guaranteed bus connections between Bakersfield and Southern California, with dedicated connections to Eureka, Redding, Las Vegas, Indio, and San Diego. In the past six years, track improvements have increased track capacity allowing an increase of frequency to four trains daily. This has produced a major increase in ridership--653,000 for Fiscal Year 1996-97.

Feeder buses are an extremely important feature of the service, with passengers originating or concluding their trip with a feeder bus producing the majority of train revenue. Southern California stations served via bus feeders are the largest revenue market, because of high yields per passenger. Fresno and Sacramento are the next two largest markets.

X.2.3. Capitol Corridor

The San Jose-Oakland-Sacramento-Roseville route is the newest corridor, and began service in December 1991. At present it has four round trips, three of which extend to San Jose. One of these trains extends to Roseville and Colfax (starting in January 1998). Ridership totaled 497,000 for Fiscal Year 1996-97, a strong performance for the level of service provided.

A major track work program is underway which will increase corridor speeds between Oakland and Sacramento and allow additional frequencies. The largest single traffic generator on the route is Sacramento, but about 40 percent of route revenue comes from persons transferring from the dedicated feeder bus service which is shared with the San Joaquins.

X.3. Intercity Passenger Rail Development Policy

The guiding policy for the state intercity rail system is to preserve and enhance the effectiveness of the current three corridor intercity rail system, including its dedicated feeder bus system. This system, as described above, provides access to most parts of the state - both urban and rural. The five main strategic goals for the Rail Program are as follows:

- Increase speeds and reduce running times on all routes, thus enhancing their efficiency and effectiveness as a transportation alternative. The goal is to incrementally upgrade speeds on all routes to the maximum that is operationally practicable and financially prudent. Such steps serve as incremental improvements leading towards high speed rail service.

- Increase capacity on all three routes consistent with support by adequate ridership demand, and operational feasibility made possible by the major capital projects which have either been completed, are currently in progress, or planned on each route. Capacity increasing projects would include new sidings and double track segments, and new stations and station expansions to allow for ridership growth.
- Improve reliability and on-time performance through track, signal and station projects, as well as improvements to rolling stock, and operational innovations such as advanced ticketing systems.
- Protect the state investment in rolling stock through careful monitoring of California Car warranty provisions and oversight of maintenance. Additionally, construction of modern maintenance facilities will further this goal.
- Comply with all federal and state safety and public facility requirements, including the upgrade of facilities to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and improvements to highway/railroad grade crossings on passenger routes.

X.4. Specific Plans For Each Rail Corridor

X.4.1. San Diegans

The specific goals for the San Diegans are to:

- The continuing increase in demand for both passenger - intercity and commuter, and freight services in the corridor, leaves a serious need for increased capacity. Increase capacity by implementing track and signal projects, including additional double tracking of line segments, sidings and upgrading or highway/rail crossings. Additionally, station expansions, including additional parking will allow needed additional passenger capacity.
- Improve on-time performance and reliability by completion of projects such as signal and track improvements between Moorpark and Santa Barbara.
- In the long-term institute hourly service between San Diego and Los Angeles. Currently ten daily round trips are operating between San Diego and Los Angeles. The Plan is to increase frequencies, as demand and funding allow, to approximately 14 round trips.
- Extend service to Sacramento via the Bay Area through a connection with the Capitols. On the north end of the route the long-

term plan is to evaluate the need for increases in frequencies south of San Luis Obispo as demand and funding allow.

X.4.2. San Joaquins

The specific goals for the San Joaquins are to:

- Increase frequencies from four to six trains a day, including direct train service to Sacramento. An increase from four to five trains is proposed for 1998-99. This fifth train would provide service from Bakersfield to Sacramento. The extension of the San Joaquins to Sacramento has long been planned and would constitute a major service enhancement. An increase from five to six trains a day would be implemented when demand merits and it is operationally feasible. Projects to increase capacity, including station projects, would be included in this goal.
- Increase maximum speeds up to 110 mph where track configuration and operational constraints allow. Currently more than \$140 million in capital projects are completed, underway or programmed; many of these projects will increase speeds. Caltrans is also working with the railroads that own the track the San Joaquins operate over to identify capital projects to increase speeds.
- Increase reliability through the improvement of the Oakland maintenance facility, by improving the ability to maintain the state's fleet of rail passenger equipment.

X.4.3. Capitols

The specific goals for the Capitols are to:

- The route was extended to Colfax on January 26, 1998. A future extension to Reno may also be possible.
- Increase frequencies to ten round trips a day. The long-range plan for this route has always been an increase to ten round trips. The state has an agreement with the Union Pacific railroad to provide \$56.8 million for a major capital improvement project to add capacity for up to a total of 16 intercity trains and to decrease running times. Fifth and sixth round trips are planned for 1998-99.
- Reduce running times and increase reliability. As is noted in the bullet above, the ongoing major capital improvement project will reduce running times and increase reliability. Station projects will also improve reliability by enhancing the passenger amenities needed to handle current passenger loads.

- Extend service to Los Angeles via the Coast Route and connecting with the San Diegans. This initiative is mentioned above under the San Diegan route.

XI. INTERREGIONAL MASS TRANSIT GUIDEWAYS

This portion of the Plan will be developed for the 2000 Interregional Strategic Plan (ITSP) update in cooperation with interregional rail operators, other modal operators, regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, the California Transportation Commission and other interested groups. It will also use the products from the ongoing Transportation System Performance Measures effort which is part of the 1998 California Transportation Plan update (products anticipated June 30, 1998).

XII. FREIGHT RAIL

This portion of the Plan will be developed for the 2000 Interregional Strategic Plan (ITSP) based on: 1) the products of the 1998 California Transportation Plan Update . . . Modules 1 and 2: Statewide Goods Movement Strategy and Transportation System Performance Measures (final products are expected June 30, 1998 for both modules), and (2) continuing input from the intermodal and freight movement industry, port operators, regional transportation agencies, county transportation commissions, the California Transportation Commission and other interested groups.

APPENDIX A

IRRS ROUTES LEGISLATIVE DESCRIPTION

(Streets and Highways Code, Sections 164.10-164.20)

For purposes of subdivision (e) of Section 164.3, the eligible interregional and intercounty routes include all of the following:

Route 1. *

Route 2, between the north urban limits of Los Angeles-Long Beach and Route 138.

Route 4, between the east urban limits of Antioch-Pittsburg and Route 89.

Route 5. *

Route 6. *

Route 7. *

Route 8. *

Route 9, between the north urban limits of Santa Cruz and the south urban limits of San Jose.

Route 10, between the east urban limits of San Bernardino-Riverside and the Arizona state line.

Route 12. *

Route 14. *

Route 15. *

Route 16, between the east urban limits of Sacramento and Route 49.

Route 17, between the north urban limits of Santa Cruz and the south urban limits of San Jose.

Route 18, between the north urban limits of San Bernardino-Riverside and Route 138.

Route 20. *

Route 25, between Route 146 and Route 101 in San Benito County.

Route 28. *

Route 29. *

Route 36, between Route 5 and Route 395.

Route 37, between the east urban limits of San Francisco-Oakland near Novato and the west urban limits of San Francisco-Oakland near Vallejo.

Route 38, between the east urban limits of San Bernardino-Riverside and Route 18 west of Big Bear Lake.

Route 40. *

Route 41, between Route 1 and Yosemite National Park.

Route 44, between the east urban limits of Redding and Route 36.

Route 46, between Route 1 and Route 99.

Route 49, between Route 41 and Route 89.

Route 50. *

Route 53. *

Route 58, between Route 5 and Route 15.

Route 62. *

Route 63, between the north urban limits of Visalia and Route 180.

Route 65, between the north urban limits of Bakersfield and Route 198 near Exeter, and between Route 80 and Route 99 near Yuba City.

Route 68. *

Route 70, between Route 99 north of Sacramento and Route 395.

Route 74. *

Route 78. *

Route 79, between Route 8 and Route 10.

Route 80. *

Route 86, between Route 111 in Brawley and Route 10.

Route 88. *

Route 89. *

Route 94, except within the urban limits of the County of San Diego.

Route 95, between Route 10 and the Nevada state line.

Route 97. *

Route 98, between Route 111 and Route 7.

Route 99, with routing to be determined via Route 70 or via Route 99 between Route 70 north of Sacramento and Route 149 north of Oroville.

Route 101. *

Route 108, between Route 120 at Yosemite Junction and Route 395.

Route 111, between the Mexico border near Calexico and Route 10 near Whitewater.

Route 113, between Route 80 and Route 5.

Route 116, between Route 1 and Route 12.

Route 120, between Route 5 and Route 395.

Route 126, between the east urban limits of Oxnard-Ventura-Thousand Oaks and Route 5.

Route 127. *

Route 128. *

Route 129, between Route 1 and Route 101.

Route 132, west of Route 99.

Route 138, between Route 5 and Route 18.

Route 139, between Route 299 and the Oregon state line.

Route 140, between the east urban limits of Merced and Yosemite National Park.

Route 146, between Route 101 and Pinnacles National Monument.

Route 149. *

Route 152, between Route 101 and Route 99.

Route 154. *

Route 156, between Route 1 and Route 152.

Route 160, between the north urban limits of Antioch-Pittsburg and the south urban limits of Sacramento.

Route 168, between the east urban limits of Fresno and Route 168 at Florence Lake Road, and between Route 168 near Lake Sabrina and Route 395.

Route 178, between the east urban limits of Bakersfield and Route 14.

Route 180, between the east urban limits of Fresno and Kings Canyon National Park.

Route 188. *

Route 190, between Route 65 and Route 127.

Route 198, between Route 5 and the Sequoia National Park.

Route 199. *

Route 203. *

Route 205. *

Route 207. *

Route 215. *

Route 243. *

Route 267. *

Route 299, between Route 101 and Route 89, and between Route 139 and Route 395.

Route 330, between the north urban limits of San Bernardino-Riverside and Route 18.

Route 371. *

Route 395. *

Route 505. *

Route 580. *

Route 680. *

Route 905, except within the urban limits of San Diego.