

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

*When you have completed your comments please email this form to Tom Petrosino at tmp@iteris.com.*

Reviewer Name Michelle Kirkhoff			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909.884.8276	Email address mkirkhoff@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:	Disposition of Comment*:	
1	2.2	4	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph “.and San Diego), bordering two more rural counties (Kern and Inyo) and including...”	1	
2	2.2	4	Table 2.2-1: Can we call it “Incorporated Cities of the Inland Empire) and note below: “There are many more communities contained within the counties, too numerous to identify.” To address Mike McCoys question at the workshop. Also, please carry the header over to the next page. Another suggestion, instead of having two columns with Western Riverside and San Bernardino Area, can we instead have one column that is “Western Riverside” and another “Western San Bernardino”? IN SB, would be Montclair, Big Bear Lake, Chino, Ontario, Chino Hills, Colton, Fontana, Grand Terrace, Highland, Loma Linda, Rancho Cuc, Redlands Rialto, SB, Upland and Yucaipa.	1	
3	2.2	5	Project Map; can we identify on the map the bordering areas, such as Kern, Inyo, Nevada and AZ? I think it helps to show perspective, as we show imperial, SD, LA and Orange.	1	
4	2.3	7	Last paragraph, can we say “Developed project flyers for ...” as I think you guys did more than one; next line “. . . comment by stakeholders by e-mail and fax upon request.” And add: “Presentation at RCTC and SANBAG transportation technical advisory committees, which includes City and county staff.”	1	
5	3.2	8	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence add “. . . throughout the Inland Empire and other implementing agencies (airports, national forest, and etc..).	1	
6	3.3.2-2	13	TANN row – delete in its entirety or make it somehow generic to all the traffic website, private or otherwise	1	
7	3.3.3	14	Can we be consistent and add the acronym after title of each section, like (CMS) – spell out CCTV	1	
8	Map	16	In SB valley, its kind of confusing, you show the 10 freeway, then above a dark line, then two dark lines above that. I’m assuming one is route 66; I would suggest above the 10, to only have one line/freeway, and that is the 210 which starts in LA county and continues to Sierra in Fontana; delete everything else	1	

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

Reviewer Name Michelle Kirkhoff			Representing SANBAG	Phone # 909.884.8276	Email address mkirkhoff@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:	Disposition of Comment*:	
9	3.3.5	25	2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet, change to “MTA’s Transit Trip Planning database and software” and then below “RidePro Regional Rideshare database and software”	1	
10	3.3.5	26	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to the last sentence change to “The primary system currently in operation and supported by the CTCs and transit operators, is the LACMTA’s Transit Trip Planner. The Inland Empire ....” I prefer no mention of SCAG’s Transtar, as it’s future is uncertain and there are disputes over its funding, assets and continuation. The transit agencies are not supporting it any longer, only the MTA product.	1	
11		52	Bob Wirts felt that the following Cts functions should be clarified; the first at the bottom of page 52 should clarify after the title: System: CTs D8 Signal Operations on Freeways, Ramps and Conventional Highways; he also felt that on page 53, 2 <sup>nd</sup> section, bullets 8, 11 and 12 should be in this section; his other comment under the 11 <sup>th</sup> bullet is “needs to be refined”; not sure if Mohammed could clarify?	1	
12		General	Is there a write-up on the current SANBAG signal synch system, as well as the control centers that will be operating those systems? I see a write-up in Appendix G, is this the only reference? Please let me know and where else it could be included in the current inventory.	1	
13	8.2	79	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence add: “... the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations ...”	1	
14	8.2	79	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – SANBAG and RCTC are not MPOs, so instead say “CTCs”, then put MPO after SCAG,	1	
15	8.2.1	80	2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet, change to “The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which is a short term plan that is amended quarterly, and updated annual for programming purposes.”	1	
16	8.2.1	80	2 <sup>nd</sup> to the last paragraph, should reference the RTIP not TIP	1	
17	8.2.1-1	81	Far right should just say RTIP	1	
18	8.2.4	83	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence, should add “..Caltrans Planning and Operations.” Last sentence, perhaps say “This leadership role could also rotate...”	1	

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address
Michelle Kirkhoff			SANBAG	909.884.8276	mkirkhoff@sanbag.ca.gov
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
19	8.2.6	84	Add "Depending upon the outcome of the SCAG Regional Architecture efforts, the Turbo Architecture databases from each of the sub regions could become and appendix...."		1
20	8.2.7	84	Somewhere in here add per our discussion "Each county has a Technical Advisory Committee, comprised of the Cities, County staff, as well as other ITS stakeholders. These monthly meetings are an ideal place to remind agencies of the architecture, and for the TACs to be a point of contact to discuss ITS architecture updates and processes."		1
21	8.4.2	86	RCTC nor SANBAG have a Long Range plan; I would delete that reference and just refer to the RTP.		1
22		General	Could we include a map that shows where the IE is located within CA?		1

Reviewer Name			Representing	Phone #	Email address
Cindy Peterson			Omnitrans	909-379-7211	Cindy.Peterson@omnitrans.org
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
1			The Report should include, or refer to in some way, the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects upon which Omnitrans is beginning to actively work.		1
2		63/64	There is no mention of our onboard digital audio/video systems already in place in the fixed route vehicles and which we may want to add to paratransit in the future.		1

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

Reviewer Name Chalap Sadam			Representing City of Montclair	Phone # (714) 992-2990	Email address chalap@albertgrover.com
Comment #:	Section:	Page:	Comment:		Disposition of Comment*:
1	Appendix G		<p><b>San Bernardino County Projects: SB-3</b> <u>Add the following:</u></p> <p>System monitoring is presently funded for 3 years after deployment of new coordination timing plans. Monitoring of each of the four Tiers will terminate at different points in time. For continued signal timing coordination effectiveness, the following three items will require future funding obligations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continued monitoring of coordination timing by professional traffic engineering staff.</li> <li>2. Complete retiming of the coordination plans will be required every two years to account for area growth and changing traffic patterns.</li> <li>3. Valley-wide enhancement of the traffic signal communication network, which presently consists of telephone, hardwire and various wireless interconnect types. Future system operation/monitoring efficiency will require more uniform interconnect specifically designed for higher speed communication mandated by the operation of approximately 1,200 traffic signals upon completion of Tier1 1,2,3 &amp; 4.</li> </ol>		1
2	Appendix G		<p><b>San Bernardino County Projects:</b> <u>Add the following new project:</u></p> <p><b>Traffic Operations Center (TOC):</b> This project will implement the installation of two TOCs in San Bernardino Valley to monitor coordination timing.</p> <p>Participating agencies include SANBAG, various San Bernardino Valley cities, San Bernardino County and Caltrans.</p>		1

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

<b>Reviewer Name</b> Mohammed Bendelhoum, P.E.			<b>Representing</b> Caltrans D-8	<b>Phone #</b> (909) 383 6452	<b>Email address</b> Mohammed_Bendelhoum@dot.ca.gov
<b>Comment #:</b>	<b>Section:</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Disposition of Comment*:</b>	
1		1-2	Project background: I do not think that this detailed background is necessary.	2	
2		9	Overview O.C. seems to be so much more advanced where the Inland Empire is basically a rural region in comparison: not a true statement.	1	
3			If you would mention the on going effort to design/build a collocated TMC with CHP/SANBAG/RCTC in order to meet the needs of rapid expansion/urbanization in the I.E. it would tie in some loose ends in the panning /strategic vision D8 has.	1	

<b>Reviewer Name</b> Various comments from Workshop #5			<b>Representing</b> Various stakeholders	<b>Phone #</b> N/A	<b>Email address</b> N/A
<b>Comment #:</b>	<b>Section:</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Disposition of Comment*:</b>	
1			TSP projects may be more regional as opposed to county level	1	
2			CT requires that local agencies maintain the pre-empt equipment in the CT cabinet.	1	
3			Fire departments are specifying equipment for pre-empt and asking CT to deal with it.	1	
4			Include in agency agreements something about a policy or disclaimer for traveler info release to ISPs.	1	
5			Revise maintenance section to note a lead agency (mention "volunteerism does not spontaneously occur").	1	
6			Expand the definition of Local Police and Sheriff Departments to include Community College PD, Military PD, Federal PD, State Corrections Facility PD, etc.	4 – The law enforcement/public safety agencies that have a primary duty in transportation management and traffic incident management are currently accounted for in the architecture. The other referenced law enforcement agencies can be added to the architecture, as appropriate in a future update to the architecture.	

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

<b>Reviewer Name</b> Various comments from Workshop #5			<b>Representing</b> Various stakeholders	<b>Phone #</b> N/A	<b>Email address</b> N/A
<b>Comment #:</b>	<b>Section:</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>		<b>Disposition of Comment*:</b>
			<i>Various other comments were received informally in the course of telephone conversations with various project stakeholders. Other, more formal comments were also received via fax from a few stakeholders. These comments are being incorporated into the various chapters as appropriate.</i>		1

<b>Reviewer Name</b> Lawrence Tai			<b>Representing</b> Riverside County Transp. Dept	<b>Phone #</b> (909) 955-6816	<b>Email address</b> ltai@co.riverside.ca.us
<b>Comment #:</b>	<b>Section:</b>	<b>Page:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>		<b>Disposition of Comment*:</b>
1	1.0	1	It will be helpful to include an Executive Summary, especially with emphasis on the purpose of the Plan, how it should be used and what it takes to maintain it.		1
2	2.0	4	Put Table 2.2-1 onto one page. Can the two columns under “Western Riverside and San Bernardino Area” be divided into one column for Western Riverside County cities, and one column for Western San Bernardino County cities?		1
3	2.3	7	Will the PAC continue to exist after this project is completed? Will the PAC play a role in the maintenance of the Plan?		1
4	3.0	8	Was the “Coachella Valley Traffic Signal Synchronization Project” considered as a reference document for ITS inventory within the Inland Empire?		2 – Although multiple attempts were made to obtain documentation of that project, we became aware that there was no existing project documentation that was readily available.
5	3.3.2 3.3.3	10 14	For Table 3.3.2-1 under System: what exactly does Automated Signal Timing Adjustments for highway-rail intersections do? Is “limited service” during preemption period considered in this category?		1 – It is more accurate to refer to that capability as Rail Preemption – preemption of traffic signals that are in close proximity to highway rail intersections.
6	3.3.2	11	Table 3.3.2-2 under Traffic Signal System - Suggest to modify the wording to include “ ... The majority of traffic signals are operated as isolated intersections or small coordinated systems. For coordinated systems, they are often operated by, .....”		1
7	Appd. G	IE-4	Include Counties so that if need be, these agencies can be included in future Traffic Signal Interconnect projects.		1

\*Comment Disposition Key

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)

**Inland Empire Regional ITS Architecture  
Stakeholder Comment Form  
Draft Final Report**

L:\programs\J99-0495 - Inland Empire Reg ITS Arch\doc\DRAFT FINAL REPORT\comments and disposition\Draft Final Report - disposition of comments (v4).doc

**\*Comment Disposition Key**

1=comment incorporated 2=general statement 3=to be addressed by future task 4=comment not incorporated (with explanation)