

# Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan

## Technical Memorandum 2b: Public Outreach - Survey No. 2 Report



**Metro**



Prepared for:

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
California Department of Transportation  
Orange County Transportation Authority  
Riverside County Transportation Commission  
San Bernardino Associated Governments  
Southern California Association of Governments  
Ventura County Transportation Commission  
San Diego Association of Governments**

Prepared by:

**Arellano Associates**

In association with:

**Wilbur Smith Associates  
The RNO Group  
Gill V. Hicks & Associates, Inc.  
George R. Fetty & Associates  
Economics & Politics, Inc.  
Jones & Stokes  
Urban Solutions, LLC  
Sharon Greene & Associates**



**April 30, 2008**

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1-1
2.0 SURVEY METHODOLOGY .....	2-1
3.0 SURVEY RESULTS .....	3-1
3.1 Number of Surveys.....	3-1
3.2 Survey Respondents.....	3-1
Breakdown by Category.....	3-2
4.0 MAJOR FINDINGS.....	4-1
4.1 Most Favored Goods Movement Projects and Strategies .....	4-2
4.2 Projects/Strategies Prioritization .....	4-5
4.3 Most Favored Highways for Improvement .....	4-7
4.4 Potential East-West Corridor Improvements .....	4-8
4.5 Sources of Funding.....	4-9
5.0 OTHER COMMENTS .....	5-1

Appendix

APPENDIX A .....	A-1
APPENDIX B .....	B-1
APPENDIX C .....	C-1
APPENDIX D .....	D-1

## **1.0 Introduction**

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to present the methodology and findings associated with Survey No. 2 of the Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP). The survey was developed and administered to key stakeholders in the MCGMAP seven-county study area, including Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Ventura and Imperial counties. The purpose of the survey was to obtain perceptions and opinions of goods movement projects and strategies. From the results of the survey, the MCGMAP technical team is able to validate and/or re-consider existing assumptions about key issues and problems as they relate to goods movement in the Southern California region.

## **2.0 Survey Methodology**

The MCGMAP Outreach Committee developed the Survey No. 2 instrument and cover letter for dissemination (Appendix A). The survey was comprised of 52 questions across eight pages and took about 15 to 20 minutes to complete. It included a range of goods movement topics, including port and rail related strategies, truck-related, highway-related, operational and technology, financial and policy, and environmental strategies related to improving goods movement. Each respondent was also asked to self-identify for documentation and future noticing purposes. However, all individual data results remain confidential. All surveys were distributed and received between December, 2006 and April, 2007.

Survey No. 2 was distributed to key stakeholders throughout the seven-county study area via each of the county transportation commissions (CTCs) and transportation agencies. These included:

- 1 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- 2 Orange County Transportation Authority
- 3 Riverside County Transportation Commission
- 4 San Bernardino Associated Governments
- 5 San Diego Associated Governments
- 6 Southern California Association of Governments
- 7 Ventura County Transportation Commission

Each CTC utilized its own method for distribution, which was either by direct mail or electronic mail. Some county distributions were targeted to their local jurisdictions while others were more expansive to also include existing in-house contact databases or other regional stakeholder lists. Predominantly, the targeted stakeholders included: local jurisdictions (staff and elected officials), business and community organizations, environmental groups and community activists.

In addition, the survey instrument was made available via “Zoomerang,” an online survey mechanism. This was coordinated by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). All those who received the survey by direct mail or e-mail had the option to complete the hard copy format or to visit the MCGMAP website and click on the link to the survey. Those survey results were then electronically submitted and downloaded by SCAG staff. All survey results, whether received by hard copy or electronically, were compiled in a master data spreadsheet. Final tabulations were completed by question and cross-tabulations were completed by question and by county.

## 3.0 Survey Respondents

### 3.1 NUMBER OF SURVEYS

A total of 138 surveys were received from all seven counties. The majority (68%) of surveys were completed online with the remaining batches received directly from the CTCs as follows:

Source	No. of Respondents	Percentage of Responses
Zoomerang (online system by SCAG)	94	68%
Riverside County Transportation Commission	17	12%
Orange County Transportation Authority	15	11%
Los Angeles County Metro	07	05%
San Bernardino Association of Governments	03	02%
Ventura County Transportation Commission	01	01%
San Diego Associated Governments	01	01%
<b>Total number of surveys received:</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 3.2 SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The surveys were received from a cross-section of respondents with the majority (41%) received from public agencies:

Source	No. of Respondents	Percentage of Responses
Public Agency	54	40%
Private Business	39	30%
Individual	30	22%
Organization	15	08%
<b>Total number of surveys received:</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100%</b>

**BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORY**

The following is the listing of the survey respondents further distributed by sub-category for public agencies, private business and organizations:

<b>Public Agency</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
Local Government	43	80%
County Government	05	09%
State Government	02	04%
Multi-County Special District	02	03%
Naval Institute	01	02%
Subregional Council of Government	01	02%
Federal Government	00	00%
<b>Total number of surveys received:</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Private Business</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
Warehouse/Distribution	07	18%
Logistics/3PL	05	13%
Consultants	05	13%
Rail	03	07%
Civil Engineering	03	07%
Trucking	03	07%
Maritime	03	07%
Industrial/Manufacturing	02	05%
Commercial Real Estate Developer/Owner	02	05%
Construction	01	03%
Automotive	01	03%
Musical Instrument & Electronics Importer	01	03%
Media	01	03%
Specialty Retail	01	03%
Heavy Duty Hybrid Electric Drive Systems	01	03%
Aviation	00	00%
<b>Total number of surveys received:</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Organization</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
Non-Profit	05	33%
Professional Association/Organization	03	20%
Community Based	03	20%
Issue Advocacy	01	07%
Other	03	20%
<b>Total number of surveys received:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 4.0 Major Findings

During the MCGMAP study, many goods movement projects and strategies were identified to address the goods movement challenge in Southern California. The Survey No. 2 instrument presented six main categories of good movement projects and strategies. **These six categories are used throughout this report to present survey results:**

1. Port/Rail-related
2. Truck-related
3. Highway-related
4. Operation & technology
5. Financial & policy
6. Environmental

## 4.1 MOST FAVORED GOODS MOVEMENT PROJECTS AND STRATEGIES

### Highly Supportive

Survey respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for a wide range of goods movement projects and strategies organized under each of the six main categories. **The following are the projects/strategies which received the highest level of support across all categories (in order of support):**

Category	Projects/Strategies with Highest Response In “Highly Supportive”	% Highly Supportive
Port/Rail-Related	More rail grade separations, where highways will go over or under rail tracks and traffic will not have to wait for trains	67%
Port/Rail-Related	Increase capacity of port and railyards by more efficient operations	60%
Operational & Technology	Operation and scheduling techniques to reduce delays at ports and intermodal facilities	56%
Operational & Technology	Increased use of advanced technology for vehicle management, routing and safety inspections	53%
Highway-Related	Improvements to freeway interchanges to reduce congestion into and out of industrial areas	48%
Port/Rail-Related	Additional near-dock rail close to ports to load containers directly to rail and reduce truck trips	46%
Operational & Technology	Expand seaport and border crossing hours further to increase efficiency and spread traffic	46%
Operational & Technology	Expand delivery hours at warehouses to increase efficiency and spread traffic	44%
Financial & Policy	Charge a fee on containers to pay for infrastructure improvements that facilitate freight movement	41%
Environmental	Invest in air quality improvements at the same time as infrastructure improvements	40%
Highway-Related	Add new freeway lanes for all traffic, both trucks and cars together	37%
Truck-Related	Dedicated truck lanes, which are freeway lanes for trucks only, separated by barriers from other lanes (with or without tolls)	36%
Highway-Related	New express toll lanes (like SR-91 express lanes/Fast Track) on other freeways, which reduce congestion for both cars and trucks	32%



Financial & Policy	Require new dedicated truck lane facilities to be totally user-financed through either container fees and/or tolls	31%
Truck-Related	In San Diego County only, allowing trucks on the barrier-separated high-occupancy vehicles (HOV) lanes in the off-peak periods (with or without tolls)	26%

The top four projects/strategies that received 53% or more of a “highly supportive” response pertain to the **port/rail and operational/technology categories**. This indicates that respondents feel that the most potential for improvements in the goods movement system in Southern California is centered on changes at the ports, the railroads and operational or technological improvements that would either increase capacity and/or improve efficiencies of the goods movement system.

**Supportive**

When reviewing the next tier of projects/strategies which received the second highest rating of “supportive,” **dedicated truck lanes** topped the list at 44%. (See table below.) Most of the remaining projects/strategies that received a “supportive” rating were from both the Port/Rail-Related and Environmental categories. Respondents still indicate a high level of support for port/rail-related ideas, but more than one environmental projects/strategies also appear on this secondary listing.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Projects/Strategies with Highest Response In “Supportive”</b>	<b>% Supportive</b>
Truck-Related	Dedicated truck lanes if significant impacts are avoided	44%
Port/Rail-Related	Other alternative technologies to move freight to intermodal facilities	43%
Port/Rail-Related	More intermodal facilities, where freight can be transferred between trains and trucks (existing facilities are at capacity)	41%
Environmental	The ports should negotiate with steamship operators to reduce pollutants through strict provisions in terminal leases	38%
Port/Rail-Related	New shuttle trains to move freight between ports and intermodal facilities	37%
Environmental	Local governments should require buffers between new residential development and heavily traveled freeways and rail lines	37%
Financial & Policy	Fund new dedicated truck lane facilities through a combination of public funds and user fees, if that is the only way they can be built	35%
Environmental	Local governments should require buffers between new industrial developments and new/existing residential areas	34%
Port/Rail-Related	Increase rail capacity by adding new track along existing rail lines	33%
Environmental	Invest in infrastructure improvements first, then focus on air quality improvements	28%
Environmental	Public funds should be used as an incentive to help truck operators to change over to cleaner engines	28%

### **No Support**

Finally, the project/strategy which received the highest rating of “No Support” was in reference to **Longer Combination Vehicles (LCVs)**. When asked if LCVs should be allowed on dedicated truck lanes (if legalized), the majority of the respondents (32%) indicated no support for this project/strategy.

The complete set of results for all six main categories of project/strategies is contained in Appendix B.

## 4.2 PROJECTS/STRATEGIES PRIORITIZATION

In addition to identifying their level of support for specific goods movement projects/strategies, survey respondents were also asked to prioritize each project/strategy. Respondents were asked to identify their top five priorities among the listing of projects/strategies presented in the survey as well as any other original ideas from the respondent. The following table represents a summary of the projects/strategies which received a priority response. The “#1 Priority” column is highlighted to indicate that these project/strategies were identified as the most important project/strategy by the listed number of respondents. **Of all goods movement projects/strategies, survey respondents chose increasing rail capacity and grade separations as the most important priorities.**

Project/Strategies	Number of Respondents				
	#1 Priority	#2 Priority	#3 Priority	#4 Priority	#5 Priority
<b>PORT/RAIL</b>					
Rail capacity	7	6	1	2	3
Grade separations	6	1	1	1	2
Shuttle train from port to inland facility	1		2	1	
Direct ship-to-rail improvements (operations at Ports)	1				
Near dock facility improvements			1	1	
Port/Rail improvements, in general		1	2	1	
(Improve) Gerald Desmond Bridget					1
<b>TRUCK-RELATED</b>					
Dedicated truck lanes	3	6	3		
Truck operations (hours on freeways)	2		2		
Truck improvements, in general	2	1			
Longer combination vehicles					1
<b>HIGHWAY-RELATED</b>					
Improve Interstate 710	2		1		
Widen/improve all freeways	2				
Improve State Route 60	1				
(Add) new Orange/Riverside County corridor	1				
Add mixed flow lanes	1	2	3		
Improve interchanges (all and specifically, 10/215/60 connections)	1	1	3	1	
Improve transit first	1				
Improve Interstate 10				1	
Improve Interstate 15 (through Corona & south)				1	
Improve Interstate 215		1			
Improve State Route 91		1	2		
Expand I-5 and I-805 in San Diego County		1			
(Add) new High Desert Corridor (15 to 395)		1			
Improve entire east-west system		1			
Full use of HOV lanes		1			
Add extra HOV lane on I-10 (Santa Monica)				1	

<b>OPERATIONAL &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>					
Increase port & warehouse operating hours	2	2	2		1
Transfer technology		1	1	2	
Require electric engines for rail		1			
Operational & technology, in general		1	1	2	1
<b>FINANCIAL &amp; POLICY</b>					
Container fees	3	1	1	1	1
User fees/toll lanes	1		1	2	1
Truck toll (I-710 to I-10, I-170 to I-5)	1	2			1
Financial & policy strategies, in general	1				1
Private sector/no new taxes			1	1	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>					
Invest in air quality improvements first, then focus on infrastructure improvements			1		
The ports should negotiate with steamship operators to reduce pollutants through strict provisions in terminal leases				1	
Local governments should require buffers between new industrial developments and new/existing residential areas					2
Incentives to encourage environmentally-friendly equipment and/or tax credits for infrastructure building					1
(Improve) air quality		1			

The complete listing of responses to this open-ended question is contained in Appendix C.

### 4.3 MOST FAVORED HIGHWAYS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From a listing of highways in the southern California region, the survey respondents were asked to select all highways which they believed **dedicated truck lanes** could be both feasible and beneficial. Additionally, respondents were asked to select those highways which they believed **additional mixed flow lanes** could be both feasible and beneficial. While the top five selected highways are listed below for both truck lanes and mixed flow lanes, **no highway received any significant level of support from survey respondents more so than any other highway.** If anything, this may indicate an equal need for improvement across all of these highways more so than any one highway being the most favored. The survey results were as follows:

<b>Selected Highways for Truck Lanes</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
1. Interstate 710 in LA County	71	6.25%
2. Interstate 10 in San Bernardino County	64	5.63%
3. Interstate 10 in Riverside County	63	5.55%
4. State Route 60 in LA County	58	5.11%
5. Interstate 10 in East LA County	57	5.02%

<b>Selected Highways for Mixed Flow Lanes</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
1. Interstate 5 in LA County	49	5.50%
2. Interstate 710 in LA County	43	4.83%
3. State Route 91 in Orange County*	39	4.38%
3. State Route 91 in Riverside County*	39	4.38%
4. State Route 60 in LA County*	37	4.15%
4. State Route 60 in San Bernardino County*	37	4.15%
5. Interstate 10 in East LA County	36	4.04%

\* Note: Two highways are listed in the same ranking since they received the same level of support.

Complete data results are included under Appendix D.

#### 4.4 POTENTIAL EAST–WEST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

Much of the goods movement traffic travels east-west between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to points farther east in the Inland Empire. Many of the freight trucks travel from these two ports on the I-710 (Long Beach Freeway) and then transfer to one of four east-west freeways to get to the Inland Empire and points beyond. Survey respondents were asked whether improvements, which would encourage truck traffic, should be made to one of the four east-west freeways *more* so than the other three. **Most (51%) felt that a freeway should be preferred for truck traffic over the others, but one single freeway was not clearly identified as the preferred freeway.** The highest ranked freeways were SR-91 and I-10, which both received 20% support, while the majority (40%) of respondents chose not to select a freeway at all (no response).

Improvement Preferences	No. of Respondents	Percentage of Responses
Yes, improve one of these the most	69	51%
No, improve all about the same	47	35%
No response	19	14%
Total	135	100%

East-West Corridor Freeways	No. of Respondents	Percentage of Responses
No response	55	40%
State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway)	27	20%
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway)	27	20%
State Route 60 (Pomona/Moreno Valley Freeway)	23	17%
Interstate 210 (Foothill Freeway)	04	03%
Total	136	100%

## **4.5 SOURCES OF FUNDING**

While survey respondents indicated their support (or lack of support) for a wide range of goods movement projects/strategies, an open question is how these improvements should be funded. Survey respondents were asked to select which sources of funding should be used to construct and initiate new goods movement projects and strategies. Respondents were able to select more than one funding source as a preferred funding source. The following table indicates that respondents generally have a flat distribution of support across most funding sources with the majority (27%) of all respondents choosing container fees as the most favorable.

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>No. of Respondents</b>	<b>Percentage of Responses</b>
Container Fees	64	27.00%
Tolls	46	20.00%
Taxes (gas, sales, other)	45	19.00%
Private Sector	41	18.00%
Public Bond Issue	36	15.00%
Other: Public/Private	1	0.50%
Other	1	0.50%
Total:	234	100.00%

## **5.0 OTHER COMMENTS**

The final questions of the survey were four open-ended questions for the respondents to provide any other issues and comments on goods movements and to also offer other individuals/organizations who should be included for future surveys. A total of 21 out of the 138 respondents provided the following direct comments, which are organized along the six main goods movement categories used for this survey:

### **Port/Rail-Related**

- Open up other Ports-Mexico/Seattle/other; distribute traffic. Better yet, have a "Buy American" program.
- Need a major rail terminal on Terminal Island for BNSF, UP, etc.
- Dollars should be prioritized on projects that increase the throughput capacity of rail traffic to inland intermodal facilities, to reduce overall truck trips on congested freeways. Overall investment may, thus, be reduced to increase goods movement capacity.
- Improve the productivity of the Long Beach and Los Angeles ports through better work rules in the LABA Contracts.
- If we don't improve the rail capacity, our traffic and smog will get worse due to increased truck traffic.
- Keep port activity in the United States.

### **Truck-Related**

- Favor separate truck lanes.
- Financial feasibility would depend on charging tolls and higher speeds to encourage use of dedicated truck lanes. Must provide for trucks to pass slower trucks on dedicated lanes. (#22)

### **Highway-Related**

- Strategy #28 must have a viable financing plan. Funding from private enterprise may be able to deliver projects earlier.

### **Operational & Technology**

- No truck movements during peak hours on congested freeways.
- Find out where all freight originates and then terminates within basin. Then use technology to reduce mileage driven.
- Fast lanes! Increase times!! Open Saturdays for more time!!



**Financial & Policy**

- SAFETEA-LU & state money should be distributed fairly.
- Maintain industry and jobs
- Tax incoming products accordingly. Rebuild rustbelt productivity.
- Continued coordination by BACA Transportation agencies in all six counties.
- Stop studying; do something.
- We should not be subsidizing the rest of the country's ability to buy cheap goods from China.
- Policies on right of way/eminant domain will likely have a huge, detrimental effect on Infrastructure improvement. Relaxing governmental requirements for public facilities.
- This is a national issue and it is sad that the politics in Washington favors the Bay Area and Central Valley.
- Do not use the local portion of gas tax, sales tax, etc. (#46)
- There have been a number of entities involved in goods movement over the past and many of the same stakeholders. We need to be more efficient about processes and stakeholders need to commit to solutions.
- Our issues are not going away if nothing is done. The problems just intensify.

**Environmental**

- Stricter control of truck pollutants.
- Invest in air quality improvements to mitigate significant environmental impacts from a project. (#36) Should be a relatively small percentage of total investment. Diverting more goods from trucks to trains may improve air quality.
- Do not use local agency funding. Use federal funds. (#39)

**APPENDIX A**

**Cover Letter and Survey Instrument**

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**COVER LETTER FOR SURVEY NO. 2 (As of 1-31-07)**

January 31, 2007

Dear Colleague:

The **Southern California Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan** has been under development since May, 2004. Your participation and many other key stakeholders in the region have been instrumental in the development and review of ideas and strategies to address this monumental issue facing our region. The movement of goods through Southern California, projected to increase dramatically over the next 20 years, is critical to the nation and provides significant economic benefits to the region. It also places disproportionate burdens on many communities and key transportation corridors.

The Action Plan is a joint effort of the region's transportation commissions (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority or METRO, Orange County Transportation Authority, Riverside County Transportation Commission, San Bernardino Associated Governments, San Diego Association of Governments and Ventura County Transportation Commission), Caltrans, and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). METRO is serving as the lead agency. The Action Plan will develop strategies and an implementation plan to support the efficient movement of goods together with effective environmental and community impact mitigation strategies. It is building on initiatives already underway.

Toward this end, enclosed is Survey No. 2, which is focused upon capturing your preferences and opinions about proposed goods movement strategies and projects. This survey is being distributed to local jurisdictions, stakeholder groups and private business in the entire SCAG region. The attached survey will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes of your time. This survey is intended to collect anecdotal information only and will not achieve results that are statistically significant.

We would appreciate your survey response by **February 28, 2007** so that the thoughts and observations of your organization can be adequately represented in documentation for the Action Plan. You can complete this survey by:

- 1 Completing it online at: [www.metro.net/mcgmap](http://www.metro.net/mcgmap)
- 2 Completing the hard copy and e-mail a PDF file to: **MCGMAP@ArellanoAssociates.com**
- 3 Completing the hard copy and faxing to: **(909) 628-5804**
- 4 Completing the hard copy and mailing to:

**MCGMAP**  
**c/o Arellano Associates**  
**4091 Riverside Drive, Suite 117**  
**Chino, CA 91710**

If you should have any questions about the survey, please contact Michelle Smith at METRO at (213) 922-

3057 or by e-mail at [SmithMi@metro.net](mailto:SmithMi@metro.net). [You may consider including your own contact information here.] You will receive updates on the Action Plan through your area’s council of governments or you may access the Action Plan website any time at [www.metro.net/mcgmap](http://www.metro.net/mcgmap) for ongoing information.

Thank you very much for your assistance on this important effort!

Sincerely,

[Insert your signature.]

[Title]

Southern California Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan  
SURVEY NO. 2

**Background**

Significant increases in goods movement – the movement of goods for sale, supplies, and products by truck, freight train, airplane, and cargo ship – are expected within the next 20 years in Southern California. With imports coming in at an all-time high through the seaports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and the Mexican border crossings, Southern California not only serves as the network by which we receive our own goods, but also as the network by which eastern regions and states throughout the country receive their goods. In order for so many products to be readily available on our grocery and retail shelves, so much of them come through our ports, are “transloaded” or transferred off ship containers into local warehouses and then are trucked to our local stores or routed to points beyond Southern California.

Since May 2004, a partnership of public agencies (listed in the box below) has been studying transportation challenges related to goods movement. The **Southern California Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan (MCGMAP)** will propose goods movement projects and strategies for six Southern California counties: Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange and San Diego. Technical review and stakeholder input has been steady and very helpful. We thank all who responded to Survey No. 1 in May 2006.

**Purpose of this Survey**

Based upon study work completed thus far, the MCGMAP team is now ready to propose goods movement regional strategies for public review and comment. **You are being asked for your opinions about these goods movement strategies with this Survey No. 2.** The attached survey will take about 10-15 minutes of your time.

*All personal contact information will be kept confidential unless you agree to let us add you to our mailing list for this project. Answers from all respondents will be combined, so no one will be able to identify you by your answers.*

Please complete the survey no later than **March 16, 2007** by:

- 5 Completing it online at: [www.metro.net/mcgmap](http://www.metro.net/mcgmap)
- 6 Completing the hard copy and e-mail a PDF file to: **MCGMAP@ArellanoAssociates.com**
- 7 Completing the hard copy and faxing to: **(909) 628-5804**
- 8 Completing the hard copy and mailing to:  
**MCGMAP**  
**c/o Arellano Associates**  
**4091 Riverside Drive, Suite 117**  
**Chino, CA 91710**

For additional project information, including dates, times and locations of stakeholder meetings in Southern California, please visit our **homepage** website [www.metro.net/mcgmap/](http://www.metro.net/mcgmap/) or e-mail us at [mcgmap@metro.net](mailto:mcgmap@metro.net).

*Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey!*

*A partnership of:  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ♦ Orange County Transportation Authority  
Riverside County Transportation Commission ♦ San Diego Association of Governments  
San Bernardino Associated Governments ♦ Ventura County Transportation Commission  
California Department of Transportation ♦ Southern California Association of Governments*

**Section 1: Individual, Public Agency or Organization Information**

**1. I am responding to this entire survey as a(n): (Check one only.)**

- Individual
- Representative of Public Agency (Federal, state, county or city, etc.)
- Representative of an Organization (Community-based, non-profit, professional association, issues advocacy, etc.).
- Private Business

**2. In which county are you? (Check all that apply to you or your organization.)**

- Los Angeles County
- Ventura County
- San Bernardino County
- Riverside County
- Orange County
- Imperial County
- San Diego County
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Would you like your name and contact information added to our mailing list for this project?  
 (Check one only.)**

- Yes (Please complete #4-10 below.)  
 No (Skip to Question #11 below.)

4.	Individual's Name			
5.	Agency, Organization or Business Name <i>(if applicable)</i>			
6.	Address			
7.	City			
8.	State			
9.	Zip Code			
10.	E-Mail			
11.	If <b>Individual</b> , please check County of residence:	Los Angeles Ventura San Bernardino	Riverside Orange Imperial	San Diego Other: _____ _____
		Local government	County government	State government
		Federal government	Other, please describe:	
		Community Based	Issue Advocacy	Non-Profit
		Professional Association	Other, please describe:	
14.	If <b>Private business</b> , Check one:	Rail Trucking Maritime	Aviation Industrial/Manufacturing Warehouse/Distribution	Logistics/3PL Other:

**Section 2: Goods Movement Projects and Strategies**

Many ideas have been suggested during the MCGMAP study that help address our goods movement challenge here in Southern California. Many project ideas and strategies have been identified. Ultimately, a mix of these ideas – rather than just one strategy – will be needed to improve our traffic flow and stem the negative impacts on our air quality, neighborhoods and overall environment. Of the following categories, please rate your level of support:

	<b>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business</b> <i>(Please check only one box per line.)</i>				
	<b>1 No Support</b>	<b>2 Little Support</b>	<b>3 Some Support</b>	<b>4 Supportive</b>	<b>5 Highly Supportive</b>
<b>PORT/RAIL-RELATED</b>					
15. Additional near-dock rail close to ports to load containers directly to rail and reduce truck trips					
16. More intermodal facilities, where freight can be transferred between trains and trucks (existing facilities are at capacity)					
17. New shuttle trains to move freight between ports and intermodal facilities					
18. Other alternative technologies to move freight to intermodal facilities					
19. Increase rail capacity by adding new track along existing rail lines					



20. More rail grade separations, where highways will go over or under rail tracks and traffic will not have to wait for trains					
21. Increase capacity of port and railyards by more efficient operations					
<b>TRUCK-RELATED</b>					
22. Dedicated truck lanes, which are freeway lanes for trucks only, separated by barriers from other lanes (with or without tolls)					
23. <u>In San Diego County only</u> , allowing trucks on the barrier-separated high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes in the off-peak periods (with or without tolls)					
24. Dedicated truck lanes only if significant impacts are avoided					
25. Allow Longer Combination Vehicles (LCVs), also known as “triple trailers,” on dedicated truck lanes if legalized (LCVs are trucks that are allowed to haul an added trailer)					
<b>HIGHWAY-RELATED</b>					
26. Improvements to freeway interchanges to reduce congestion into and out of industrial areas					
27. Add new freeway lanes for all traffic, both trucks and cars together					

28. New express toll lanes (like the SR-91 express lanes/"Fast Track") on other freeways, to reduce congestion for both cars and trucks					
<b>OPERATIONAL &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>					
29. Expand seaport and border crossing hours further to increase efficiency and spread traffic					
30. Expand delivery hours at warehouses to increase efficiency and spread traffic					
31. Increased use of advanced technology for vehicle management, routing and safety inspections					
32. Operational and scheduling techniques to reduce delays at ports and intermodal facilities					
<b>FINANCIAL &amp; POLICY</b>					
33. Charge a fee on containers to pay for infrastructure improvements that facilitate freight movement					
34. Require new dedicated truck lane facilities to be totally user-financed through either container fees and/or tolls					
35. Fund new dedicated truck lane facilities through a combination of public funds and user fees, if that is the only way they can be built					
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>					
36. Invest in air quality improvements at the same time as infrastructure improvements					

37. Invest in air quality improvements first, then focus on infrastructure improvements					
38. Invest in infrastructure improvements first, then focus on air quality improvements					
39. Public funds should be used as an incentive to help truck operators to change over to cleaner engines					
40. Public funds should be used as an incentive to help the railroads switch to cleaner engines					
41. Railroads and truckers should fund cleaner engines entirely on their own					
42. The ports should negotiate with steamship operators to reduce pollutants through strict provisions in terminal leases					
43. Local governments should require buffers between new industrial developments and new/existing residential areas					
44. Local governments should require buffers between new residential development and heavily traveled freeways and rail lines					

**Section 3: Specific Project Questions**

The following questions pertain to issues or projects which have drawn a high level of stakeholder attention during this **MCGMAP study**.

45. STEP 1: Check all highways on which you believe *dedicated truck lanes* could be both feasible and beneficial.

STEP 2: For those highways you have selected, please indicate your order of priority with “1” being the most important, “2” being the second most important, and so on.

STEP 3: Check all highways on which you believe *additional mixed flows lanes* could be both feasible and beneficial.

STEP 4: For those highways you have selected, please indicate your order of priority with “1” being the most important, “2” being the second most important, and so on.

	TRUCK LANES		MIXED FLOW LANES	
	Step 1:	Step 2:	Step 3:	Step 4:
	Truck Lane? (check all that apply)	Truck Lane Priority (number)	Mixed Flow? (check all that apply)	Mixed Flow Priority (number)
Interstate 5 (Golden State Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
Interstate 5 (Santa Ana Freeway) in Orange County				
Interstate 5 (San Diego Freeway) in San Diego Co. (to Mexico Border)				
Interstate 10 (Santa Monica Freeway) in West Los Angeles County				
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in East Los Angeles County				
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in San Bernardino County				
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in Riverside County				
Interstate 15 (Barstow/Mojave Freeway) in San Bernardino County				
Interstate 15 (Temecula Valley Freeway) in Riverside County				
Interstate 15 (Escondido Freeway) in San Diego County				

**MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2b – PUBLIC OUTREACH – SURVEY NO. 2 REPORT**

**APPENDIX A**

Interstate 110 (Harbor Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
Interstate 210 (Foothill Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 210 (Foothill Freeway) in San Bernardino County				
Interstate 215 (Barstow Freeway) in San Bernardino County				
Interstate 215 (Riverside/Escondido Freeway) in Riverside County				
Interstate 405 (San Diego Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
Interstate 605 (San Gabriel Valley River Freeway) in Los Angeles Co.				
Interstate 710 (Long Beach Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 57 (Orange Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 57 (Orange Freeway) in Orange County				
State Route 60 (Pomona Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 60 (Pomona Freeway) in San Bernardino County				
State Route 60 (Moreno Valley Freeway) in Riverside County				
State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway) in Orange County				
State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway) in Riverside County				
State Route 118 (Ronald Reagan Freeway) in Ventura County				
State Route 118 (Ronald Reagan Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 126 (Santa Paula Freeway) in Ventura County				
State Route 126 (Santa Paula Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
State Route 138 (Pearblossom Highway) in North Los Angeles County				
State Routes 905/11 (Otay Mesa Road) in San Diego County				

US Route 101 (Ventura Freeway) in Ventura County				
US Route 101 (Hollywood Freeway) in Los Angeles County				
US Route 395 (Eastern Sierra Highway) in San Bernardino County				
State Routes 86 and 111 in Imperial County (to Mexico border)				

46. For all goods movement improvement projects, what sources of funding should be used to construct new projects?

Sources of Funding	Check all that apply	What is your priority? (number)
Tolls		
Container fees		
Public bond issue		
Taxes (gas, sales, other)		
Private sector		
Other:		


47. Much of the goods movement traffic travels east-west between the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to points farther east. Many of these trucks travel from these two ports on the I-710 (Long Beach Freeway) and then transfer to one of four freeways to get to the Inland Empire and points beyond. They are:

- 1 State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway),
- 2 State Route 60 (Pomona/Moreno Valley Freeway),
- 3 Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway)
- 4 Interstate 210 (Foothill Freeway).

Do you think improvements, which would encourage truck traffic, should be made to one of these four east-west freeways *more so* than the others?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes, improve one of these the most  
*(Go to question #48.)*

\_\_\_\_\_ No, improve all about the same  
*(Go to question #49.)*



48. If yes, which one? (Check one only.)

- State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway) in Orange and Riverside Counties
- State Route 60 (Pomona/Moreno Valley Freeway) in Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Riverside Cos.
- Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties
- State Route 210 (Foothill Freeway) in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties

**Section 4: General Questions**

49. Of all the goods movement strategies presented here, or which you are aware, which five projects or strategies do you believe should absolutely be implemented in Southern California?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

**50. What projects or strategies, if any, should be added for consideration?**

---

---

**51. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about goods movement issues in Southern California?**

---

---

**52. Please suggest any other possible survey responders.**

---

---

*Thank you for your time in completing this important survey!*

Please visit our website for ongoing information and final steps on the Southern California Multi-County Goods Movement Action Plan.

[www.metro.net/mcgmap](http://www.metro.net/mcgmap)



**APPENDIX B**

**Survey Results:  
Goods Movement  
Strategies by Categor**

**LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR  
PROJECTS/STRATEGIES BY CATEGORY**

The following is the presentation of data results by category (majority result is **bolded**).

<b>PORT/RAIL-RELATED</b>	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	<b>No Support</b>		<b>Little Support</b>		<b>Some Support</b>		<b>Supportive</b>		<b>Highly Supportive</b>	
Additional near-dock rail close to ports to load containers directly to rail and reduce truck trips	10	7%	03	02%	14	10%	46	34%	<b>61</b>	<b>46%</b>
More intermodal facilities, where freight can be transferred between trains and trucks (existing facilities are at capacity)	06	05%	04	03%	18	14%	<b>55</b>	<b>41%</b>	50	38%
New shuttle trains to move freight between ports and intermodal facilities	11	08%	08	06%	22	16%	<b>49</b>	<b>37%</b>	44	33%
Other alternative technologies to move freight to intermodal facilities	07	05%	08	06%	30	23%	<b>56</b>	<b>43%</b>	30	23%
Increase rail capacity by adding new track along existing rail lines	13	10%	06	05%	27	20%	<b>44</b>	<b>33%</b>	43	32%
More rail grade separations, where highways will go over or under rail tracks and traffic will not have to wait for trains	03	02%	01	01%	11	08%	29	22%	<b>90</b>	<b>67%</b>
Increase capacity of port and railyards by more efficient operations	05	04%	05	04%	11	08%	33	25%	<b>80</b>	<b>60%</b>

**MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2b- PUBLIC OUTREACH – SURVEY NO. 2 REPORT**

APPENDIX B

TRUCK-RELATED	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	No Support		Little Support		Some Support		Supportive		Highly Supportive	
Dedicated truck lanes, which are freeway lanes for trucks only, separated by barriers from other lanes (with or without tolls)	05	04%	13	10%	21	16%	47	35%	48	36%
In San Diego County only, allowing trucks on the barrier-separated high-occupancy vehicles (HOV) lanes in the off-peak periods (with or without tolls)	11	14%	15	19%	14	18%	18	23%	20	26%
Dedicated truck lanes only if significant impacts are avoided	03	02%	13	10%	24	18%	58	44%	34	26%
Allow Longer Combination Vehicles (LCVs), also known as “triple trailers,” on dedicated truck lanes if legalized(LCVs are trucks that are allowed to haul an added trailer)	42	32%	26	20%	20	15%	27	20%	17	13%

HIGHWAY-RELATED	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	No Support		Little Support		Some Support		Supportive		Highly Supportive	
Improvements to freeway interchanges to reduce congestion into and out of industrial areas	02	01%	05	04%	10	07%	54	39%	66	48%
Add new freeway lanes for all traffic, both trucks and cars together	08	06%	10	07%	24	18%	43	32%	49	37%
New express toll lanes (like the SR-91 express lanes/Fast Track) on other freeways, reduce congestion for both cars and trucks	08	06%	18	14%	36	27%	29	22%	42	32%

<b>OPERATIONAL &amp; TECHNOLOGY</b>	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	<b>No Support</b>		<b>Little Support</b>		<b>Some Support</b>		<b>Supportive</b>		<b>Highly Supportive</b>	
Expand seaport and border crossing hours further to increase efficiency and spread traffic	05	04%	07	05%	16	12%	44	33%	<b>62</b>	<b>46%</b>
Expand delivery hours at warehouses to increase efficiency and spread traffic	05	04%	02	01%	19	14%	50	37%	<b>60</b>	<b>44%</b>
Increased use of advanced technology for vehicle management, routing and safety inspections	02	01%	03	02%	15	11%	43	32%	<b>72</b>	<b>53%</b>
Operation and scheduling techniques to reduce delays at ports and intermodal facilities	02	01%	06	04%	11	08%	41	30%	<b>76</b>	<b>56%</b>

<b>FINANCIAL &amp; POLICY</b>	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	<b>No Support</b>		<b>Little Support</b>		<b>Some Support</b>		<b>Supportive</b>		<b>Highly Supportive</b>	
Charge a fee on containers to pay for infrastructure improvements that facilitate freight movement	12	09%	12	09%	25	19%	31	23%	<b>55</b>	<b>41%</b>
Require new dedicated truck lane facilities to be totally user-financed through either container fees and/or tolls	15	11%	14	10%	29	22%	35	26%	<b>41</b>	<b>31%</b>
Fund new dedicated truck lane facilities through a combination of public funds and user fees, if that is the only way they can be built	14	10%	18	13%	24	18%	<b>47</b>	<b>35%</b>	24	18%

**MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2b- PUBLIC OUTREACH – SURVEY NO. 2 REPORT**

APPENDIX B

ENVIRONMENTAL	<i>Level of support from you, your agency, organization or business (Please check only one box per line.)</i>									
	No Support		Little Support		Some Support		Supportive		Highly Supportive	
Invest in air quality improvements at the same time as infrastructure improvements	02	01%	03	02%	27	20%	49	36%	<b>55</b>	<b>40%</b>
Invest in air quality improvements first, then focus on infrastructure improvements	25	19%	<b>37</b>	<b>27%</b>	36	27%	19	14%	18	13%
Invest in infrastructure improvements first, then focus on air quality improvements	21	16%	27	20%	33	24%	<b>38</b>	<b>28%</b>	16	12%
Public funds should be used as an incentive to help truck operators to change over to cleaner engines	19	14%	30	22%	32	24%	<b>38</b>	<b>28%</b>	17	13%
Public funds should be used as an incentive to help the railroads switch to cleaner engines	26	19%	<b>37</b>	<b>27%</b>	29	21%	28	21%	16	12%
Railroads and truckers should fund cleaner engines entirely on their own	13	10%	22	16%	<b>43</b>	<b>32%</b>	34	25%	23	17%
The ports should negotiate with steamship operators to reduce pollutants through strict provisions in terminal leases	02	01%	10	07%	30	22%	<b>51</b>	<b>38%</b>	42	31%
Local governments should require buffers between new industrial developments and new/existing residential areas	03	02%	14	10%	32	24%	<b>46</b>	<b>34%</b>	39	29%
Local governments should require buffers between new residential development and heavily traveled freeways and rail lines	05	04%	12	09%	28	21%	<b>49</b>	<b>37%</b>	38	29%

**APPENDIX C**

**Survey Results:  
Top Five Priorities of  
Goods Movement Projects/Strategies**

### **PRIORITY PROJECTS/STRATEGIES**

*The following are verbatim responses to this open-ended question sorted by project/strategy within each main category. Numbers in parentheses at the end of some projects/strategies listed below refer to the specific project/strategy as numbered in the survey instrument.*

**Q49: Of all the goods movement strategies presented here, or which you are aware, which five projects or strategies do you believe should absolutely be implemented in Southern California?**

<b>Priority #1</b>
--------------------

#### **Port/Rail Related**

- All projects with grade-separation; railroads crossings
- Rail Grade separations
- Grade separations
- Grade separations
- More Rail Grade separations
- Increase rail capacity by adding new track along existing rail lines (#19)
- Increased use at rail
- More intermodal facilities-SCLA intermodal yard (#16)
- More intermodal facilities for freight transfer
- Increase Roadway capacity by adding lanes even if right-of-way is needed.
- Southern California Intermodal Gateway-BNSF
- Rail Capacity increase with grade separation and double track in the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Rail Corridor
- Direct ship to rail improvements
- Shuttle train from Port to Intermodal Facility

#### **Truck-Related**

- More lanes
- Dedicated truck Lanes
- Truck lanes dedicated
- Trucks, Tractor-Trailers make basin deliveries only at night or around peak freeway hours
- Limit daytime travel on freeways by trucks
- Truck related
- Truck related

**Highway-Related**

- Improve I- 710
- Improvements on 710 for everyone (vehicles/trucks)
- I-60
- New Orange/Riverside County Corridor
- Improvements to freeway interchanges to reduce congestion into and out of industrial areas (#26)
- Freeway Improvements
- Improve and widen all freeways.
- Mixed flow lanes
- Transit first

**Operational & Technology**

- Longer operating hours at Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach
- Expand seaport and border crossing hours further to increase efficiency and spread traffic (#29)

**Financial & Policy**

- Container Fees for Funding
- Container Fees
- Container fees
- Truck only toll road 710 to 10
- Additional lanes paid via user fee, i.e., miles on the road
- Financial & Policy

**Environmental**

- None

<b>Priority # 2</b>
---------------------

**Port/Rail-Related**

- Increase capacity of port and railroads
- ICTF Improvements (UFRR)
- Additional Rail trails from both Ports to Inland Rail Heads.
- On dock rail expansion (LB/LA)
- Increase Rail capacity
- Add additional rail transit facilities.
- Rail separate crossing in Corona
- Port/rail-related



### **Truck-Related**

- Dedicated truck lanes only if significant impacts are avoided (#24)
- Dedicated truck lanes
- Truck lanes
- Dedicated truck lanes # 710
- Truck lanes or specific freeways
- Dedicated truck lanes
- Truck to rail trucker at edge of region
- Truck related

### **Highway-Related**

- Add new freeway lanes for all traffic, both trucks and cars together (#27)
- New Freeways- High Desert Corridor (I-15 to US 395) (#27)
- Add freeway lanes
- I-215
- Improve entire East/West system. Singling out one will lead to EIR that never gets done
- Upgrade interconnections between #10 #215 and 60
- Full use of HOV lanes at Real hours
- Improve Highway 91
- Expansion of the 5 & 805 in San Diego County

### **Operational & Technology**

- Increasing hours of operation & spreading traffic
- Expand delivery hours at warehouses to increase efficiency and spread traffic (#30)
- Require R/R to handle freight by electric engines so no pollution
- Transfer technology
- Operational & technology

### **Financial & Policy**

- Truck only toll road 710 to 5 North
- Tolls
- Charge of fee on containers to pay for infrastructure improvements that facilitate freight movement

### **Environmental**

- Air quality

<b>Priority # 3</b>
---------------------

**Port/Rail-Related**

- Shuttle trains - port to intermodal
- New shuttle trains to move freight
- Near dock facility improvements & additions
- Rail capacity improvements
- Grade separation
- Port/Rail-related
- Port/Rail-related

**Truck-Related**

- Dedicated truck lanes
- Dedicated truck lanes from ports to Inland Empire
- Construct special truck lanes on I-5 and I-605
- Truck deliveries within basin only made at night
- Trucks avoid rush hours

**Highway-Related**

- Add new freeway lanes
- Add new freeway lanes for all traffic
- Improvement to overall freeway capacity
- Improve freeway interchanges
- Interchange Improvements
- Improvements to freeway interchanges to reduce congestion into and out of industrial areas (#26)
- I-710 Freeway Improvements (Port to I-10 Freeway)
- I-91
- Improve SR 91 between I15 and SR 55

### **Operational & Technology**

- Longer warehouse hours
- Expand seaport hours & delivery hours at warehouses
- Increased use of advanced technology for vehicle management, routing and safety inspections (#31)
- Operations & Technology

### **Financial & Policy**

- New express toll lanes (like the SR91 express lanes/Fast Track) on other freeways, to reduce congestion for both cars and trucks (#28)
- Container pays
- Private sector

### **Environmental**

- Invest in air quality improvements first, then focus on infrastructure improvements (#37)

<b>Priority # 4</b>
---------------------

### **Port/Rail-Related**

- New rail lanes
- Adding double/triple track where feasible
- More rail separation, reduce wait for trains
- New shuttle trains to move freight between ports and intermodal facilities (#17)
- Additional near dock rail close to ports
- Efficiency at terminal

### **Truck-Related**

- None

### **Highway-Related**

- I-10
- Improve I-15 through Corona and southerly
- Add extra carpool lane on Santa Monica Freeway
- Improvements to freeway interchanges

**Operational & Technology**

- Operational and scheduling techniques to reduce delays at ports and intermodal facilities (#32)
- Use of advanced technology for routing & vehicle management
- Alternative technologies to move freight
- Operational & Technology

**Financial & Policy**

- Toll lanes
- Toll roads
- Container fees
- No new taxes

**Environmental**

- The ports should negotiate with steamship operators to reduce pollutants through strict provisions in terminal leases (#42)

<b>Priority # 5</b>
---------------------

**Port/Rail-Related**

- Grade separations
- New grade separations.
- Increase rail capacity by adding new track along existing rail lines (#19)
- Additional rail line going east
- Identify intermodal facilities and have operators bid for them
- Gerald Desmond Bridge

**Truck-Related**

- Longer combination vehicles

**Highway-Related**

- None

**Operational & Technology**

- Operational and scheduling technologies to reduce delays
- Expand delivery hours at warehouses

**Financial & Policy**

- User-financed truck lanes
- Dedicated truck lanes totally financed by container fees or tolls.
- Container fees
- Governmental

**Environmental**

- Local governments should require buffers between new industrial developments and new/existing residential areas (#43)
- Buffers to Industry
- Incentives to encourage environmentally friendly equipment and/or tax credits for infrastructure building

**APPENDIX D**

**Survey Results:  
Most Favored Highways  
for Improvement**

**MOST FAVORED HIGHWAYS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The following questions pertain to issues or projects which have drawn high level of stakeholder attention during this MCGMAP study. Respondents were asked to select all highways they believed dedicated truck lanes and/or **additional** mixed flow lanes would be both feasible and beneficial.

<b>HIGHWAY</b> <i>(In alphabetical and numerical order)</i>	<b>TRUCK LANES</b>				<b>MIXED FLOW LANES</b>			
	<b>Step 1:</b>		<b>Step 2:</b>		<b>Step 3:</b>		<b>Step 4:</b>	
	<b>Truck Lane (check all that apply)</b>		<b>Truck Lane Priority (number)</b>		<b>Mixed Flow (check all that apply)</b>		<b>Mixed Flow Priority (number)</b>	
Interstate 5 (Golden State Freeway) in Los Angeles County	52	05%	#5 #14	15% 50%	49	05%	#1 #7 #10 #14	11% 17% 13% 33%
Interstate 5 (Santa Ana Freeway) in Orange County	48	04%	#8 #15	13% 100%	33	04%	#4 #8	17% 14%
Interstate 5 (San Diego Freeway) in San Diego County (to Mexico Border)	45	04%	#16	100%	33	04%	#5 #9 #15	18% 17% 50%
Interstate 10 (Santa Monica Freeway) in West Los Angeles County	29	03%	#2	07%	34	04%	#4 #10 #16	17% 13% 50%
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in East Los Angeles County	57	05%	#13 #14	50% 50%	36	04%	#12 #14	20% 33%
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in San Bernardino County	64	06%	#4 #7 #8 #13	21% 13% 13% 50%	34	04%	#4 #12 #15	17% 20% 50%
Interstate 10 (San Bernardino Freeway) in Riverside County	63	06%	#6 #8 #12	18% 13% 33%	29	03%	#16	50%
Interstate 15 (Barstow/Mojave Freeway) in San Bernardino County	54	05%	#8 #9 #11	13% 22% 40%	34	04%	#9	17%
Interstate 15 (Temecula Valley Freeway) in Riverside County	44	04%	#7 #10	13% 50%	30	03%	#6 #8	22% 14%
Interstate 15 (Escondido Freeway) in San Diego County	33	03%	#6 #12	18% 33%	22	02%	#7 #10 #13	17% 13% 25%
Interstate 110 (Harbor Freeway) in Los Angeles County	36	03%	#5 #7	15% 13%	18	02%	#10	13%

**MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2b- PUBLIC OUTREACH – SURVEY NO. 2 REPORT**

**APPENDIX D**

Interstate 210 (Foothill Freeway) in Los Angeles County	22	02%	#7	13%		16	02%	#1 #3	04% 07%
State Route 210 (Foothill Freeway) in San Bernardino County	22	02%	#3 #8	14% 13%		16	02%	#2	09%
Interstate 215 (Barstow Freeway) in San Bernardino County	21	02%	#5	15%		25	03%	#7 #17	17% 100%
Interstate 215 (Riverside/Escondido Freeway) in Riverside County	22	02%	#6 #7	18% 13%		20	02%	#7 #8 #14	17% 14% 33%
Interstate 405 (San Diego Freeway) in Los Angeles County	27	02%	#8	13%		32	04%	#8	14%
Interstate 605 (San Gabriel Valley River Freeway) in Los Angeles County	32	03%	#1	02%		22	02%	#9	17%
Interstate 710 (Long Beach Freeway) in Los Angeles County	71	06%	#1	09%		43	05%	#13	25%
State Route 57 (Orange Freeway) in Los Angeles County	24	02%	#7	13%		26	03%	#8 #10	14% 13%
State Route 57 (Orange Freeway) in Orange County	26	02%	#1 #2	02% 03%		28	03%	#7 #10 #12 #13	17% 13% 20% 25%
State Route 60 (Pomona Freeway) in Los Angeles County	58	05%	#5	15%		37	04%	#7 #9	17% 17%
State Route 60 (Pomona Freeway) in San Bernardino County	55	05%	#2 #7	15% 13%		37	04%	#7 #8 #10	17% 14% 13%
State Route 60 (Moreno Valley Freeway) in Riverside County	46	04%	#3 #8	14% 13%		33	04%	#8 #9 #10	14% 17% 13%
State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway) in Orange County	44	04%	#1	09%		39	04%	#2	27%
State Route 91 (Artesia/Riverside Freeway) in Riverside County	42	04%	#7	13%		39	04%	#3	29%
State Route 118 (Ronald Reagan Freeway) in Ventura County	05	0.44%	#1	01%		07	01%	#1	04%
State Route 118 (Ronald Reagan Freeway) in Los Angeles County	04	0.35%	#1	01%		08	01%	#1	04%
State Route 126 (Santa Paula Freeway) in Ventura County	05	0.44%	#1	01%		09	01%	#1	04%
State Route 126 (Santa Paula Freeway) in Los Angeles County	04	00%	#1	01%		08	01%	#1	04%



**MULTI-COUNTY GOODS MOVEMENT ACTION PLAN**  
**TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM 2b- PUBLIC OUTREACH – SURVEY NO. 2 REPORT**

**APPENDIX D**

State Route 138 (Pearblossom Highway) in North Los Angeles Co.	09	01%	#1 #2	01% 03%		09	01%	None	
State Routes 905/11 (Otay Mesa Road) in San Diego County	11	01%	#1	02%		06	01%	None	
US Route 101 (Ventura Freeway) in Ventura County	18	02%	#1 #11	01% 20%		23	03%	#13	25%
US Route 101 (Hollywood Freeway) in Los Angeles County	19	02%	#1 #11	01% 20%		34	04%	#12	20%
US Route 395 (Eastern Sierra Highway) in San Bernardino County	11	01%	#3	10%		11	01%	#9 #12	17% 20%
State Routes 86 and 111 in Imperial County (to Mexico border)	11	01%	#8 #12	13% 33%		09	01%	#1 #5	04% 09%
None	02	00%	None			02	00%	None	