



# Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023-2043



Prepared for the  
**Inyo County Local Transportation  
Commission**



Prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



Inyo County  
*Regional Transportation Plan*  
*2023*

*Prepared for*

Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
168 N. Edwards Street  
Independence, CA 93526

*Prepared by*

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Ste. C  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
530-583-4053

*November 21, 2023*

*This page intentionally blank*





## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides a coordinated, 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within the region. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is required by California law to adopt and submit an approved RTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) every four years. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) assists with plan preparation and reviews draft documents for compliance and consistency. The RTP must be consistent with other planning guidance in the region such as adopted general plans, airport plans, bicycle plans, and public transit plans.

### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

The ICLTC solicited public comment from a wide variety of groups, including the public, resource management agencies administering public lands, transit operators, truck traffic generators, transportation advocacy groups, tribal governments, and all surrounding counties. An online community survey was made available to the public using SurveyMonkey. Two pop up workshops were held in Bishop and Lone Pine to solicit input. A public workshop focused on non-motorized transportation needs was held in Tecopa that solicited feedback via survey and public comment. Survey and public outreach results are presented in Appendix C. The Draft RTP was presented at an ICLTC meeting that was open to the public and stakeholders and the public alike were invited to attend and comment on the Draft RTP.

### REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

Environmental documentation for an RTP is required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The ICLTC has preliminarily determined that the Inyo County 2023 RTP will not result in significant impacts. For the prior RTP update a Negative Declaration was adopted. Therefore, an Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration was prepared and is being circulated with this Draft RTP.

### REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Inyo County is located in the easternmost portion of central California and generally spans the southeastern length of Sierra Nevada Mountains between Bishop on the north and just north of Walker Pass on the south. The county is bordered by the State of Nevada to the east, Mono County to the north, and San Bernardino and Kern Counties to the south. Although Tulare and Fresno Counties technically border Inyo County to the west, the Sierra Nevada Mountains form a geographic barrier to surface transportation. The only incorporated city is the City of Bishop. Census designated places include Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, and Shoshone.

### DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMICS

According to the 2020 US Census, Inyo County has a total population of 19,016. This is a 2.5 percent increase from the 2010 Census recorded population for Inyo County and 6.3 percent greater than the



1980 census. Of the 2020 total, 3,819 people live in the City of Bishop. Overall, the Inyo County population has had a low growth rate over the past 40 years.

The California DOF estimates that by 2045, the Inyo County population will be 17,204, representing a 9.5 decrease in total county population from 2020. Just over 23 percent of the population in Inyo County was age 65 and older in 2020 (American Community Survey), however the percentage of the total Inyo County population aged 65 and older is projected to increase significantly from 29.8 percent in 2025 to 34.7 percent in 2045. The growth of the elderly population is an important consideration in terms of public transit needs.

According to the 2017-2021 American Community Survey, the largest employment industries in Inyo County are educational services, health care and social assistance, public administration, and arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services. Major employers include the land management agencies, school districts, hospitals, Inyo County, and City of Los Angeles. Recreation and tourism draw a significant number of people to the region each year.

## **CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

As required by the guidelines, this version of the RTP is consistent with other local and regional planning documents. Transportation capital improvement projects listed in these plans have been incorporated into the Action Element of the RTP. These documents include: Inyo County General Plan Circulation Element (2001), City of Bishop General Plan Mobility Element (2012), Inyo County Active Transportation Plan (2015), Eastern Sierra Transportation Agency Short-Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2021), Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed Use Overlay (2021), Bishop Paiute Reservation Long Range Transportation Improvement Plan (2013), Fort Independence Indian Reservation Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment (2023), Olancho Cartago Corridor Study (2020), Caltrans Adaptation Priorities Report (2021), and California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2050 (2021).

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM**

The Inyo County regional roadway network is comprised of over 3,500 miles of streets, roads and highways. The roadway network includes paved and dirt roadways owned by the National Park Service (NPS), US Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Seven state highways serve Inyo County: US 395, US 6, State Route (SR) 127, SR 136, SR 168, SR 178, and SR 190. US 395 is a designated Alternative Fuel Corridor.

### **Roadways and Bridges**

The highest Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume in Inyo County in 2020 (the latest year for which data was available) was observed in Bishop along US 395 at the intersection with South Street (15,800 vehicles per day). Generally, traffic volumes on US 395 in the Bishop area have increased over the past eight years, although volumes have decreased slightly at a few locations over the same time period, suggesting a possible change in traffic patterns. US 395 traffic volumes have increased near other communities such as Lone Pine, Independence and Pine Creek Road (north of Bishop). Traffic volumes



have increased in some of the recreational areas, such as SR 168 at South Lake Road, US 395 at the junction with SR 190 (providing access to Death Valley National Park).

When we look at peak month Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes on the state routes in the County between 2011 and 2020, SR 190 in Death Valley National Park saw the greatest increases across the board, with the intersection with Beatty Cutoff Rd seeing a 89.5 percent increase and Death Valley Junction at SR 127 seeing a 64.7 percent increase.

Caltrans has designated a Level of Service (LOS) “C” as the concept LOS for Inyo County state highway segments. The only highway section currently operating or projected to operate below the concept LOS of “C” is the Olancho – Cartago section of US 395. This area currently operates at LOS D. After construction of the proposed four lane highway project, LOS is anticipated to improve to “A” on this roadway segment and all assessed Caltrans roadway sections will be operating above the concept LOS.

In 2022, the average PCI of Inyo County was 58.8 (fair). This represents a 3.2-point decrease from 2017. In 2022, 34 percent of Inyo County roadways had a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 11.9 percent had a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed). The average PCI for City of Bishop roadways in 2022 was 52.5, which falls into the “poor” category. This represents a 5.5 percent decrease since 2016 and a 3.5 percent decrease since 2019. In 2022, 24 percent of City roadways had a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 10 percent of roadways had a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed). A detailed list of roadway PCI for Inyo County and City of Bishop can be found in Appendix D.

The most recent California Public Road Data (2019) indicates that a total of 1.775 million daily vehicle-miles were traveled on roadways in Inyo County (including City of Bishop, Inyo County, State Highways, and U.S. Forest Service roads). It is reasonable to expect that VMT in Inyo County will increase at a slower rate than the nationwide average due to lack of population growth and more likely be dependent on the level of visitor traffic.

Automobile, bicycle and pedestrian accident data was reviewed from California Highway Patrol’s Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) and Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) databases for 2018-2020. The US 395 corridor had the greatest concentration of injury crashes overall. High concentrations of severe injury crashes occurred east of Tecopa and north of Stovepipe Wells on Scotty’s Castle Road. The US 395 corridor has had a history of accidents, particularly in the section that remains a two-lane highway.

Of the 33 bridges owned by Inyo County, 14 have a sufficiency rating below 80 in 2023. The County-owned bridges with sufficiency ratings of 50 or below are Bell Access Road at Oak Creek, Whitney Portal Road at Lone Pine Creek, Whitney Portal Road at Los Angeles Aqueduct, and Walker Creek Road at Los Angeles Aqueduct.

In Inyo County, roadways are the most used transportation facility. A significant investment in roadway maintenance and repair will be required over the next 20 years.



## **Transit Services**

Eastern Sierra Transit Authority provides public transit services for Inyo County, Mono County, City of Bishop and Town of Mammoth Lakes. Public transit service consists of a variety of demand-response, fixed route, deviated fixed route, and intercity connections. As the RTP includes capital improvement projects, public transit needs for this plan focus on infrastructure needs and vehicle replacement.

## **Non-Motorized Facilities**

Existing non-motorized facilities and identified needs are well documented in the Inyo County Active Transportation Plan. Bicycle facilities are concentrated in the City of Bishop, although facilities also exist in Wilkerson, Death Valley, and Tecopa. Sidewalks are generally limited to those streets within a block of US 395 and along US 395 through the center of Inyo County communities. The RTP identifies numerous non-motorized facility needs, such as shoulder widening, continuous sidewalks, and safer crosswalks.

## **Aviation Facilities**

There are seven publicly operated airports in Inyo County and six private air strips: Bishop Airport, Independence, Lone Pine, and Shoshone Airports which are operated by Inyo County; Trona Airport which is operated by the Searles Valley Community Services Council; and Stovepipe Wells and Furnace Creek airports which are owned and operated by the National Park Service. There is also a public backcountry dirt airstrip in Saline Valley in Death Valley National Park. The Bishop Airport is the only airport in Inyo County which can accommodate regularly scheduled commercial freight and passenger service.

## **Goods Movement**

A combination of State Highways and County roads serve as the primary network for goods movement in Inyo County, with US 395 serving as a primary route for trucking through the County. Adequate maintenance and efficient operation of this roadway network is critical to the continued economic vitality of the County, as well as for the safety of the public. In Inyo County, goods movement is focused on trucking. The highest truck traffic volumes in 2020 were observed on US 395 near the community of Big Pine (1,468 trucks per day). Truck traffic has increased slightly over the ten-year period between 2010 and 2020 on US 395 and US 6 and on SR 168 and SR 190 at Death Valley Junction.

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS**

The ICLTC proposes the following general regional transportation goals:

- Goal 1:** Safety—Provide a safe and secure transportation system for all users.
- Goal 2:** Climate—Increase resilience of the transportation system to climate change.
- Goal 3:** Infrastructure—Maintain a high-quality transportation system.
- Goal 4:** Equity—Ensure that all communities have access to transportation facilities throughout the County.



**Goal 5:** Accessibility/Mobility—Improve multimodal connectivity and access.

**Goal 6:** Quality of Life/Public Health—Enable vibrant and healthy communities.

**Goal 7:** Environment—Enhance environmental health and reduce negative transportation impacts.

**Goal 8:** Economic Vitality—Promote economic stability and investment.

Inyo County adheres to these goals as demonstrated in the RTP capital improvement project lists. Additionally, these goals reflect existing conditions in the county.

## **TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AND SECURITY/EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

The policy element of this RTP includes safety goals and objectives that comply with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Transportation improvement projects that specifically address safety for all types of transportation modes are included in the project list tables.

## **TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS**

As a method of developing responses to the transportation needs and issues discussed in the earlier portions of this document, this RTP includes a list of transportation system improvements for each mode of transportation applicable to Inyo County. This RTP lists both financially constrained and financially unconstrained improvements. Financially constrained projects are funded over the short- and long-term periods as demonstrated in the Financial Element. The unconstrained project list is considered a “wish list” of projects that would provide benefit to the region but will unlikely receive funding over the next 20 years unless new funding sources become available.

Proposed transportation improvement projects are categorized by funded status, transportation mode, project type and community location. The RTP improvement projects are consistent with those included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

## **TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAMS**

The Financial Element describes numerous federal, state, and local funding sources and programs that are available to the ICLTC for transportation programs. Unfortunately, many of these funding sources are discretionary and allocated on a competitive basis and are therefore very difficult to predict. The primary state transportation funding source is fuel tax revenues which have been decreasing over time accounting for inflation and as vehicles have become more efficient. This RTP is based on a very conservative outlook on transportation funding over the next 20 years and includes a large financially unconstrained or “wish list” project list.

As part of the Financial Element, roadway, bridge, aviation, and transit revenues were forecasted over the next 20 years by using a variety of methods. The first five years of RTP projects are fiscally constrained. However, for the mid-term and long-term periods, there is a significant shortfall in recurring revenues. Additionally, this figure does not include long-term projects with unknown project costs. Specific implementation dates for projects will depend on actual revenue available.



*This page intentionally left blank.*



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|                                                       |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Chapter 1: Introduction and RTP Overview .....</b> | <b>1</b>      |
| Plan Development Requirements and Process .....       | 2             |
| Participation and Consultation Process .....          | 2             |
| Summary of Community Input.....                       | 11            |
| Social Equity and Environmental Considerations .....  | 13            |
| Report Organization .....                             | 14            |
| Coordination with other Plans and Studies .....       | 15            |
| <br><b>Chapter 2: Existing Conditions .....</b>       | <br><b>17</b> |
| Regional Characteristics.....                         | 17            |
| Population Characteristics .....                      | 17            |
| Commute Patterns .....                                | 22            |
| Native American Tribes .....                          | 26            |
| Public Health and Equity .....                        | 26            |
| Transportation and Land Use Integration .....         | 27            |
| Southern Inyo County .....                            | 28            |
| <br><b>Chapter 3: Planning Documents .....</b>        | <br><b>31</b> |
| Existing Planning Documents .....                     | 31            |
| <br><b>Chapter 4: Modal Discussion .....</b>          | <br><b>37</b> |
| Roadway Transportation System Description .....       | 37            |
| Summary of Roadway and Bridge Needs .....             | 57            |
| Transit Services .....                                | 61            |
| Non-motorized Facilities .....                        | 67            |
| Aviation .....                                        | 77            |
| Goods Movement .....                                  | 80            |
| Transportation System Operations and Management.....  | 84            |
| Air Quality .....                                     | 85            |
| <br><b>Chapter 5: Policy Element .....</b>            | <br><b>87</b> |
| ICLTC Goal Setting .....                              | 87            |
| <br><b>Chapter 6: Action Element.....</b>             | <br><b>97</b> |
| Plan Assumptions .....                                | 97            |
| Transportation Safety .....                           | 98            |
| Transportation Security/Emergency Preparedness .....  | 99            |
| Climate Considerations .....                          | 100           |
| Transportation System Improvements .....              | 102           |
| Environmental Mitigation .....                        | 140           |

|                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Chapter 7: Financial Element</b> | <b>143</b> |
| Transportation Funding Sources      | 143        |
| Transit Improvement Funding         | 155        |
| Aviation                            | 158        |
| Projected Revenues                  | 159        |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                  |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1: Participation Process During RTP Development                                            | 4   |
| Table 2: Inyo County Median Household Income                                                     | 13  |
| Table 3: Inyo County Population Projections                                                      | 19  |
| Table 4: Inyo County 2020 Demographics                                                           | 20  |
| Table 5: Inyo County Commute Patterns                                                            | 24  |
| Table 6: Inyo County Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes on State Highways                      | 42  |
| Table 7: Inyo County Peak Month Average Daily Traffic Volumes on State Highways                  | 44  |
| Table 8: Traffic Counts in Death Valley National Park                                            | 45  |
| Table 9: Inyo County State Highway Peak Hour Roadway Level of Service                            | 47  |
| Table 10: Truck Traffic on Inyo County State Highways                                            | 81  |
| Table 11: RTP Program Level Performance Measures                                                 | 103 |
| Table 12: Recently Completed Transportation Improvement Projects in Inyo County                  | 107 |
| Table 13: Caltrans District 9 Completed SHOPP Transportation Improvement Projects in Inyo County | 107 |
| Table 14: Caltrans District 9 Projects in Inyo County (SHOPP Projects)                           | 109 |
| Table 15: Caltrans District 9 Projects in Inyo County (SHOPP Minor Projects)                     | 110 |
| Table 16: Inyo County Top Priority Funded Regional Roadway Projects                              | 111 |
| Table 17a: Inyo County Roadway Maintenance Projects                                              | 112 |
| Table 17b: Inyo County Roadway Maintenance Projects                                              | 113 |
| Table 18a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 114 |
| Table 18b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 115 |
| Table 19a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 116 |
| Table 19b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 117 |
| Table 20: Inyo County Regional Highway Bridge Program Projects                                   | 118 |
| Table 21: Inyo County Regional Culvert Projects                                                  | 118 |
| Table 22a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 119 |
| Table 22b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects                                                 | 120 |
| Table 23: Inyo County Regional Public Transit Projects                                           | 121 |
| Table 24: Inyo County Active Transportation Funded Projects                                      | 122 |
| Table 25a: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 123 |
| Table 25b: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 124 |
| Table 25c: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 125 |
| Table 25d: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 126 |
| Table 25e: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 127 |
| Table 25f: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                   | 128 |

|                                                                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 26a: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects.....                           | 129 |
| Table 26b: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects.....                           | 130 |
| Table 26c: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects.....                           | 131 |
| Table 26d: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects.....                           | 132 |
| Table 26e: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects.....                           | 133 |
| Table 26f: Inyo County Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects .....                          | 134 |
| Table 27: Inyo County Regional Airport Capital Improvement Projects – Short-term .....        | 136 |
| Table 28: Inyo County Regional Airport Capital Improvement Projects – Long-term .....         | 149 |
| Table 29: RTP Forecast Revenue Summary .....                                                  | 160 |
| Table 30: Short-term Regional Improvement Projects – Revenue to Expenditures Comparison ..... | 162 |
| Table 31: Mid-term Regional Improvement Projects – Revenue to Expenditures Comparison .....   | 162 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1: Inyo County Site and Location Map.....                   | 18 |
| Figure 2: Inyo County Historical Population Trends .....           | 19 |
| Figure 3: Inyo County Population Projections by Age Group .....    | 20 |
| Figure 4: Existing Percentage of Population by Ethnicity.....      | 21 |
| Figure 5: Inyo County Census Tracts.....                           | 23 |
| Figure 6: Southern Inyo County .....                               | 29 |
| Figure 7: 2022 Traffic Volumes Inyo County .....                   | 43 |
| Figure 8: 2013 Bishop Area Traffic Volumes.....                    | 49 |
| Figure 9: Inyo County EV Charging Stations .....                   | 52 |
| Figure 10: Injury Crashes in Inyo County .....                     | 54 |
| Figure 11: Bishop Area Injury Crashes .....                        | 55 |
| Figure 12: Southern Inyo County Crashes .....                      | 59 |
| Figure 13: ESTA Transit Services and Activity Centers .....        | 62 |
| Figure 14: Bishop Area Existing Non-motorized Facilities.....      | 69 |
| Figure 15: Inyo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes.....         | 71 |
| Figure 16: Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes in the Bishop Area ..... | 72 |

### *APPENDIX A: AGENCY NOTIFICATION AND CORRESPONDENCE*

### *APPENDIX B: PUBLIC/STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT*

### *APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUMMARY*

### *APPENDIX D: PAVEMENT CONDITIONS INDEX*

### *APPENDIX E: COLLISION HISTORY FOR INYO COUNTY*

### *APPENDIX F: A SIMPLIFIED OVERVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING*

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## ACRONYMS AND TERMS

---

AADT – Annual Average Daily Traffic  
ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act  
ADT – Average Daily Traffic  
AHSC – Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities  
AIP – Airport Improvement Program  
ATP – Active Transportation Plan  
BIA – Bureau of Indian Affairs  
BLM – Bureau of Land Management  
CARB – California Air Resources Board  
CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act  
CIP – Capital Improvement Program  
COSA – Conservation and Open Space Area  
CTC – California Transportation Commission  
CTP – California Transportation Plan  
DAR – Dial-A-Ride  
DOF – Department of Finance  
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency  
ESTA – Eastern Sierra Transit Authority  
EV – Electric Vehicle  
FAA – Federal Aviation Administration  
FAST Act – Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act  
FHA – Federal Highway Administration  
FLAP – Federal Lands Access Program  
FTA – Federal Transit Administration  
GBUAPCD – Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District  
GHG – Greenhouse Gas Emissions  
HBP – Highway Bridge Program  
HSIP – Highway Safety Improvement Program  
ICLTC – Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
ICT – Innovative Clean Transit  
IIJA - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act  
INFRA – Infrastructure for Rebuilding America  
ITIP – Interregional Transportation Improvement Program  
ITSP – Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan  
JPA – Joint Powers Authority  
KCOG – Kern Council of Governments  
LADWP – Los Angeles Department of Water and Power  
LCTOP – Low Carbon Transit Operations Program  
LORP – Lower Owens River Project  
LOS – Level of Service  
LTC – Local Transportation Commission

LTF – Local Transportation Fund  
MCLTC – Mono County Local Transportation Commission  
MHI – Median Household Income  
MOU – Memorandums of Understanding  
NEVI – National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure  
NHPP – National Highway Performance Program  
NPS – National Park Service  
NVUM – National Visitor Use Monitoring  
PCI – Pavement Condition Index  
PMP – Pavement Management Program  
RAISE – Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity  
REAP – Regional Early Action Planning  
RMRA – Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account  
RTAP – Rural Transit Assistance Program  
RTIP – Regional Transportation Improvement Program  
RTP – Regional Transportation Plan  
RTPA – Regional Transportation Planning Agency  
SB 1 – California Senate Bill 1  
SBCTA – San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
SHOPP – State Highway Operation and Protection Program  
SHSP – Strategic Highway Safety Plan  
SS4A – Safe Streets and Roads for All  
SSTAC – Social Services Transportation Advisory Council  
STA – State Transit Assistance  
STAA – Surface Transportation Assistance Act  
STBGP – Surface Transportation Block Grant Program  
STRAHNET – Strategic Highway Corridor Network  
SWITRS – Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System  
TCR – Transportation Concept Report  
TDA – Transportation Development Act  
TIMS – Transportation Injury Mapping System  
TIRCP – Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program  
TTP – Tribal Transportation Program  
USFS – United States Forest Service  
VMT – Vehicle Miles Traveled  
ZEV – Zero-Emissions Vehicle





## Chapter 1

# INTRODUCTION AND RTP OVERVIEW

---

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the region, the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is required by California law to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) at least every five years. The RTP for the Inyo region was last updated in 2019. ICLTC chose to update the RTP every four years so that the City of Bishop and County of Inyo will only be required to update the Housing Element to their respective General Plan once every eight years. The Housing Element was last updated in 2021. The region is defined as geographic Inyo County, California. Broad in scope, the purpose of the plan is to provide a transportation vision for the region, supported by goals, for 10- and 20-year planning horizons. This is accomplished by identifying transportation-related needs and issues on a regional level, reaffirming the region's goals, objectives, and policies, developing a list of improvements to the transportation system that meet the identified needs, and prioritizing these improvements to create a financially constrained plan.



The Inyo County regional transportation system includes many types of transportation modes: roadways, public transit, bicycle paths, pedestrian facilities, airports, rail, and other strategies to improve the flow and safety of the regional transportation system. The improvement projects identified in the RTP are capital projects or long-term investment projects that develop, improve, or maintain physical elements of the transportation system. RTP projects can range in size and scope from bike paths to a divided highway on a state highway to the purchase of new transit buses to installing fences at an airport. The RTP is only the first step in the actual construction of large capital transportation improvement projects in Inyo County. After a project has been identified in the RTP as a transportation need that is consistent with adopted goals and policies, additional engineering and environmental analysis, as well as public input, is required before the specific project is implemented.

This RTP document first presents an explanation of the regional transportation planning process, followed by information on the state of the region, including the local government entities as well as the Native American tribal governments. Regional issues, needs, and problems are identified within the existing conditions section and summarized in the Modal Discussion. Related goals, objectives, and policies are provided in the policy element. Appropriate solutions and actions are next discussed by transportation mode in the action element in the form of improvement project lists over the short- and long-term planning horizons. Finally, a discussion of finances is included that considers a comparison of costs and revenues.

This RTP intends to provide the region with a coordinated transportation system and be a guideline for decision-makers over the RTP plan period. A Draft RTP has been circulated for public review and comment available on the Internet along with an accompanying environmental document, in accordance



with CEQA guidelines. All appendices in the RTP are incorporated herein by reference. Acronyms and terms used in this RTP are listed and defined on page v.

## PLAN DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESS

### State Planning Requirements

State regional transportation planning requirements have evolved over the years. A brief history of the laws that have shaped the RTP process and requirements is presented below:

- The Transportation Development Act of 1971 (SB 325) resulted in the formation of the ICLTC as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) to administer and allocate funds provided by the Act.
- Assembly Bill 69, enacted in 1972, created Caltrans and established requirements for the preparation and administration of State and Regional Transportation Plans. Under this law, each RTPA is required to prepare and adopt an RTP with coordinated and balanced transportation systems consistent with regional needs and goals.
- In 1997, the Transportation Funding Act (SB 45) mandated major reforms impacting many areas of transportation planning, funding, and development. This sweeping legislation overhauled the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), providing for greater “regional choice,” with 75 percent of the program’s funds to be divided by formula among the regions. Periodically, each RTPA selects projects to be funded from its STIP share and lists them in its Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Every RTIP adopted by a local agency must be consistent with its RTP.
- California Government Code 14522 requires that the CTC develop RTP Guidelines to facilitate the preparation, consistency, and utilization of RTPs throughout the state. The most recent update to the RTP Guidelines was completed in 2017. The next update to the Guidelines is underway but will not likely be completed before this RTP is adopted.

## PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

The planning of the regional transportation system is accomplished through the coordination of various governmental agencies, advisory committees, and public input. The organizational structure and composition of the ICLTC and advisory groups involved in the development of the RTP are as follows:

- The ICLTC, serving as the RTPA, includes three appointed representatives from the City of Bishop and three appointed representatives from the County of Inyo. The Caltrans District 9 Director is a non-voting ex-officio member of the LTC. The ICLTC is staffed by an Executive Director, Executive Secretary, and other Inyo County or City of Bishop staff as necessary.
- The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) is a transit-specific advisory committee established by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). In Inyo County, the Council meets annually to discuss unmet transit needs, particularly those of the disadvantaged.



- Caltrans is responsible for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the State Highway System and that portion of the Interstate Highway System within California. Enacted in 1972, Assembly Bill 69 set down the basic framework for Caltrans. Headquartered in Sacramento, Caltrans has twelve district offices throughout the state. Inyo County is located in District 9, with offices in Bishop. District 9 staff members serve as liaisons to the ICLTC.

## Public and Stakeholder Involvement

A public involvement program is required for each RTP and is intended to provide a reasonable opportunity for citizens, private and public transit and freight operators, tribal governments, and other interested parties to participate early in the process. ICLTC RTP Public Involvement Procedures were originally developed for the 2009 RTP and are presented in Appendix B. These procedures are consistent with the 2017 RTP Guidelines. The 2023 RTP update on public and stakeholder involvement included context-sensitive solutions. A summary of public and stakeholder outreach for the 2023 Inyo RTP update is summarized below.

In accordance with the ICLTC Public Involvement Procedures, the entities listed below were contacted for information, sent a link to the online survey, and invited to the public hearing:


- Tribal Entities
- Adjacent County RTPAs
- Local, State, and Federal Resource Agencies
- Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
- Chambers of Commerce
- Truck Traffic Generators
- Public Transit Operators
- Private Transportation Operators
- Human Service Agencies
- Transportation Related Advocacy Groups

Appendices A and B present correspondence with agencies/stakeholders contacted. Table 1 below lists specific events in the participation/consultation process of this RTP.

## Tribal Governments

There are five Native American tribal governments located in geographic Inyo County:

- Big Pine Paiute Tribe
- Bishop Paiute Tribe
- Fort Independence Tribe
- Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe
- Timbisha Shoshone Tribe



**Table 1: Participation Process During RTP Development**

| Participant                                                                                                                                                                         | Activity                                                 | Date                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Project Advisory Committee</b>                                                                                                                                                   | Project Kick-off Meeting                                 | August 24, 2022              |
| <b>Tribal Governments</b><br>(NAHC, Benton Paiute, Big Pine Paiute, Bishop Paiute, Fort Independence, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone, Timbisha Shoshone)                                 | Contacted Requesting Input and Sent Survey               | December 2022 - April 2023   |
| <b>Natural Resource Agencies</b><br>(BLM, USFS, NPS, CA Fish & Game, WQCB, APCD, LADWP)                                                                                             | Contacted Requesting Input and Sent Survey               | December 2022 - April 2023   |
| <b>Private Sector</b><br>Truck traffic generators (FW Aggregates, Inc. and Crystal Geyser), private transportation operators (Sierra Shuttle Service and East Side Shuttle Service) | Contacted Requesting Input                               | 12/1/2022                    |
| <b>Adjacent RTPAs</b><br>Mono LTC, Kern COG, SBCTA, Nye County                                                                                                                      | Contacted Requesting Input                               | December 2022 - April 2023   |
| <b>Public and Human Service Transportation Operators</b><br>ESTA, IMHA, ESAAA                                                                                                       | Contacted Requesting Input and Invite to Public Workshop | December 2022                |
| <b>Survey Distribution</b><br>Transportation Advocacy Groups, Human Service Agencies, Medical Services, Natural Resource Agencies, Tribes, Local Agency Staff                       | Sent Survey                                              | December 2022 - January 2023 |
| <b>Public Hearing</b><br>Draft RTP and Proposed Negative Declaration                                                                                                                | ICLTC Meeting                                            | September 2023               |

The ICLTC encourages input from Native American Tribes on transportation-related planning issues regularly, including through the Inyo County Social Service Technical Advisory Committee (SSTAC) unmet transit needs process. For this RTP update, representatives from each tribal entity were contacted and emailed a link to the 2019 RTP, a formal request for input, and the link to the online survey. Multiple requests for input were made via email and phone. Tribes were also personally invited to the public hearing of the Draft Plan.

Additionally, per AB 52, a formal request was made to the Native American Heritage Commission for a Tribal Consultation List. Each tribal entity was contacted via email to invite input on the update.

The Bishop Paiute Tribe has provided a copy of its 2019 Transportation Sustainability Plan. The Bishop Reservation Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Plan (2007) and the Bishop Reservation Long Range Transportation Plan (2007) were also reviewed as part of this process. The Fort Independence Tribe provided copies of 20th 19 and 2023 transportation safety assessments which were reviewed. Other tribal entities did not provide input. A discussion on tribal transportation needs for each transportation



facility type can be found in Chapter 2. Coordination with tribal representatives continued throughout the RTP process.

## **Affected Regional Transportation Planning Agencies**

An important part of the RTP consultation process is to contact RTPAs in adjacent counties that may be affected by the Inyo RTP. Inyo County borders Mono County to the north and Kern County and San Bernardino County to the south. Western Inyo County borders Fresno and Tulare County but there are no transportation links between these counties, as this is the Sierra Nevada crest. To the east, Inyo County borders Esmeralda, Nye, and a tiny portion of Clark County in Nevada. In terms of inter-county transportation connections to Nevada, Nye County has the only direct connection to Inyo County. The ICLTC, Mono County Local Transportation Commission (MCLTC), Kern Council of Governments (KCOG), and San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) have entered into multiple Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) to leverage Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds for top priority projects along the US 395 and State Route 14 corridors from Interstate 15 to the Mono County/Nevada State line and including State Route 120 in Mono County. The top priority MOU project is the Olancho to Cartago 4-lane project. The tri-county MOU between Kern, San Bernardino, and Inyo Counties that leveraged funds for the 4-lane project was not renewed, however MOU commitments to future projects will be honored. All four adjacent counties were contacted for input in this RTP update. All four have responded, as discussed below.

### ***Kern Council of Governments***

Kern County and Inyo County are connected by both a shared border and a shared reliance on US 395 as a major highway that provides access to services for rural communities, goods movement, and economic investment. KCOG staff indicated the importance of working collaboratively with Inyo County and Caltrans to maintain and improve US 395 to meet current and future demands. KCOG staff suggests that traffic and freight movement may increase on 395 as KCOG prepares for an influx of international logistic centers and manufacturing to Kern County and the region. This will undoubtedly impact Inyo County as US 395 is a vital link between Bakersfield and the Los Angeles Metro Area with the Reno/Sparks area. KCOG staff also identified the importance of planning for alternative fueling facilities along the US 395 corridor. KCOG would like to continue working with Inyo County on mutually beneficial projects in the region.

### ***Mono County***

Mono County representatives state that the two counties and RTPAs have had a long-standing history of productive teamwork and hope that the two counties continue their transportation planning relationship for roadways, public transit, and non-motorized facilities. Mono County offered the following input going forward:

- Collaborate on improvements and planning efforts on roads of common interest.



- Participate in the Eastern California Transportation Planning Partnership and continue multi-county MOUs for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) programming purposes and other state and federal funding sources.
- Share information on local initiatives, such as the ATV Adventure Trails, and address related signage concerns near the county boundary.
- Consider complementary opportunities for scenic highway and scenic byway planning for Highway 395.
- Support common efforts to highlight and enhance community Main Streets situated along state highways, including recommendations from the Eastern Sierra Corridor Enhancement Plan.
- Address transit matters, such as recent transit plans and audits.
- Investigate participation in YARTS.
- Link our trail and bikeway plans, such as the Towns the Trails planning effort.
- Address common regional transportation environmental issues, such as sage grouse, frogs and toads, and deer migration routes.
- Work with Caltrans on common planning studies, such as the origin and destination studies.
- Support Digital 395 and last-mile provider infrastructure coordination.

### ***San Bernardino County Transportation Authority***

San Bernardino and Inyo County share a geographic border and US 395 passes through both counties and links them, providing similar access to freight, tourism, and services to both counties. The SBCTA recognizes this linkage and shared importance and is appreciative of past support from ICLTC for SBCTA's capital improvement efforts along the US 395 highway corridor. SBCTA recently completed the first phase of a multistage project to widen a significant portion of US 395 within San Bernardino County. This project, The US 395 Freight Mobility and Safety Project, will be in progress for much of the planning period.

SBCTA staff also highlight the development of a high-speed rail system that will connect Rancho Cucamonga on the west side of San Bernardino County and the greater Los Angeles Metro Area to Las Vegas to the east. As the rail line would cross US 395, this development will bring multimodal transportation opportunities to the US 395 corridor. SBCTA hopes that this will provide Inyo County residents with improved ease of access to the Los Angeles Metro in the long term.

### ***Nye County***

Nye County, Nevada, and Inyo County share a geographically remote border on the eastern side of Death Valley National Park. Both Inyo and Nye Counties see high numbers of visitors traveling from the Las Vegas Metro to Death Valley National Park and beyond to US 395 via Old Spanish Trail Highway/Tecopa Road, SR 178/SR 372, and State Line Road/Bell Vista Road and from US 95 to Death Valley National Park and beyond via SR 127/373 and Daylight Pass Road/SR 374. Nye County owns and maintains both Bell





Vista Ave and Tecopa Road. While little development is possible or planned along the Inyo/Nye border, the Spring Mountain Racetrack in Pahrump is expanding with the goal of becoming the largest racetrack in the world. This could lead to increased traffic through Inyo County.

Nye County staff indicated that the county is undertaking a FLAP project in 2024 to rehabilitate 21 miles of Bell Vista Ave from the California/Inyo County border to SR 160. Staff asked that Inyo County consider widening the shoulders of or adding bike lanes to State Line Road (turns into Bell Vista Ave) to increase safety for bicyclists. This route is one of the most direct routes for cyclists traveling from Las Vegas to DVNP and sees frequent bicycle traffic. Staff also suggested that the rehabilitation of Old Spanish Trail/Tecopa Road could and should be pursued as a joint project between Inyo, Nye, and Clark Counties as it passes through all three counties and is in terrible condition.

## Environmental Agency Consultation

The 2017 RTP Guidelines identify that the RTP shall reflect consultation with resource and permit agencies to ensure early coordination with environmental resource protection and management plans. The following natural resource agencies/landholders were contacted for input. Relevant resource maps or plans were compared to this RTP. Copies of all correspondence can be found in Appendix A.

- Inyo National Forest
- Bureau of Land Management
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- California Office of Historic Preservation
- Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Death Valley National Park
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
- Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District
- China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station
- Bureau of Reclamation

Findings and input from environmental agencies are summarized below.

### *Inyo National Forest*

Inyo National Forest encompasses a significant proportion of the Eastern Sierra Nevada Mountains along with the White Mountains and a portion of the Inyo Mountains in Inyo County. Inyo National Forest was contacted multiple times to solicit input on the RTP process as well as emailed a link to the online survey directly, however, forest representatives did not respond. In the past, the issue of limited parking at popular trailheads (such as Whitney Portal), as well as the need for increased connectivity between trailheads and Inyo County communities, has been raised. The Inyo National Forest Alternative Transportation Study and Whitney Portal Alternative Transportation Study were also reviewed. The Land Management Plan for Inyo National Forest was updated in late 2019 and includes the following goal:



- Seek to increase summer transportation systems to connect people to nature, improve personal health, and increase access for underserved communities, minorities, and urban youth.

### ***Bureau of Land Management***

A significant amount of land in the Owens Valley corridor is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Bishop and Ridgecrest offices. Specific points of interest include the Alabama Hills, Fossil Falls, Tungsten Hills, Inyo Mountains, Panamint Valley, Amargosa River Canyon, and the Volcanic Tableland. BLM land is popular for rock climbing and hiking as well as OHV use. For previous RTP updates, BLM representatives provided input concerning Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects.

The BLM's Facility Asset Management database hosts a complete inventory of trails and facilities along with their current condition. Facility condition assessments are conducted on a regular schedule and determine where BLM directs federally appropriated maintenance and engineering funds. The BLM is always open to input from various user groups such as mountain bikers, climbers, and OHV users as to how to improve recreational transportation facilities. Funding from federal and state transportation grant programs is always helpful in accomplishing recreation objectives on public land. Many of the identified potential projects in the ATP on BLM land would qualify for grant funding.

The Alabama Hills National Scenic Area attracts a wide variety of users from movie buffs to climbers. The 2021 Alabama Hills Management Plan was reviewed as part of the planning process and potential active transportation projects were included in the ATP project tables.

### ***Bureau of Reclamation***

The Bureau of Reclamation did not have any comments on the RTP update. Although the Bureau of Reclamation owns and manages dams, power plants, and projects throughout California, they are not responsible for any infrastructure located in Inyo County.

### ***Death Valley National Park***

National Park Service (NPS) holdings in Inyo County include Death Valley National Park and the Manzanar Historic Site. Death Valley National Park encompasses over 3,000,000 acres and receives around 1,000,000 visitors per year. Many of the park roads, both paved and unpaved, were built in the 1930's and therefore are narrow and winding. Two airports are located within the park: Furnace Creek Airport and Stovepipe Wells Airport. There is also a dirt airstrip located at Saline Valley.

Death Valley National Park provided detailed input to both the development of this RTP and the Active Transportation Plan. Specific issues as noted by NPS staff are outlined in the modal discussion section under their respective transportation facility.



## ***Owens Valley Area and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)***

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is the primary landowner in the Owens Valley in Inyo County with over 310,497 acres. The Owens Valley Land Management Plan (OVLMP) 2010 provides management direction for resources on all City of Los Angeles-owned lands in Inyo County, California, excluding the Lower Owens River Project (LORP) area. Much of LADWP land is available for public day use and/or is leased to other entities such as the City of Bishop or ranchers. Bicycling, hiking, and OHV use are permitted on existing trails except where posted. The OVLMP identifies modifying the location and intensity of recreational activities to meet environmental and land use goals. Recreational impacts pertinent to this RTP are associated with roads, OHV use, parking areas, and stream bank access.

The Lower Owens River Project (LORP) was identified in a 1991 EIR as mitigation for impacts related to groundwater pumping by LADWP from 1970 to 1990. The primary goal of the project was to release water to the lower Owens River and to restore the ecosystem while providing for sustainable recreation, livestock grazing, agriculture, and other activities. The LORP area includes 77,656 acres near Lone Pine and Independence and includes nearly 62 miles of river. The return of water flow in the Lower Owens River has enhanced recreational opportunities for both residents and visitors. The Lower Owens River Project Recreation Use Plan was drafted to minimize conflicts between recreation users, resource conservationists, water providers, and ranchers.

The LORP Recreation Use Plan proposes several projects which are relevant to this RTP:

- Lower Owens River Trail – A multi-use trail for motorized and non-motorized users along almost the entire length of the river in the project area using established roads and trails. Some of the USFS roads will require maintenance and grading.
- Kiosks and Staging Areas – Six locations including kiosk, gravel driveway, and parking area.
- Directional Signage – Along US 395 at LORP gateway locations to direct users to the appropriate staging areas.
- Other hiking, and biking trails, and signage throughout the interior of the project area.

LADWP provided detailed comments during this RTP update, a complete copy of which can be found in Appendix A. LADWP comments can be summarized as follows:

- A concerted effort to address the lack of roadway connectivity in Bishop would create alternative routes for vehicle travel and truck traffic. The development of alternative routes would alleviate congestion and improve mobility.
- The plan to install a pedestrian signal where the North Sierra Highway crosses the LADWP B-1 Drain adversely impacts LADWP operations. LADWP is concerned that the negative impacts outweigh the benefits of the plan in its current form and would like alternatives to be considered.
- The Dixon Lane Bridge should be prioritized for replacement.



As Inyo County and the various entities consider improvement projects, the LADWP land management plan and other strategic documents should be taken into consideration. This RTP contains a policy to address LADWP's concerns around the lack of roadway connectivity in Bishop.

### ***Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District***

A description of air quality conditions and how they relate to regional transportation is included in the Air Quality Section of Chapter 2.

### ***Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board***

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board responded to the proposed Negative Declaration circulated along with the 2015 RTP encouraging the ICLTC to take this opportunity to promote proper watershed management, support Low Impact Development, and reduce the effects of hydromodification in the region. The Water Board recommended becoming an active stakeholder in the development of watershed management plans in the region as well as minimizing surface runoff during project construction through Low Impact Development strategies. Stormwater management, such as the implementation of swales or vegetated infiltration basins, is an important consideration along roadways and applicable to this RTP. Hydromodification is the alteration of the natural flow of water through the landscape. It was recommended that guidelines be developed for reducing hydromodification when implementing transportation improvements. It was also noted that many activities included as a part of the various transportation improvement projects such as streambed alteration or land disturbance may require permits from the state and/or regional water quality boards.

The Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board has not provided input on this RTP update at the time of writing.

### ***California Department of Fish and Wildlife***

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife did not have any comments specific to this RTP update, however, the California State Wildlife Action Plan was reviewed as part of the planning process. The goals of the State Wildlife Action Plan as they relate to transportation include:

- Encourage interagency partnerships to maximize available funding.
- Promote wildlife habitat linkages.
- Maintain and improve habitat health throughout the state.

### ***Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake***

The Naval Air Weapons Station (NAWS) at China Lake is the single largest landholding of the US Navy, covering 1.1 million acres. NAWS China Lake was contacted for input, however none was received.



## **Public Transit Operators**

Inyo County is served by the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA), and various human service transportation providers. ESTA provides public transit connections from as far south as Lancaster in Los Angeles County and north to Sparks in Nevada. ESTA staff were included in the stakeholder outreach process along with representatives of transportation providers for disabled or disadvantaged residents such as the Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped and Eastern Sierra Area Agency for the Aging. Public transit regional transportation needs and issues are outlined in the modal discussion section of Chapter 3.

## **Private Sector**

An important user of the regional transportation system is the private sector. In Inyo County, this includes businesses that generate a significant amount of truck traffic on Inyo County highways as well as private transportation providers.

## **Truck Traffic Generators**

Goods movement is an important part of the regional transportation system as well as the economic vitality of the region. Most freight movement in and through Inyo County is done by truck and generates a significant amount of truck traffic on Inyo County roadways. There is one beverage distributor that generates roughly 100 - 300 trucks per day in Inyo County, all on US 395. Crystal Geyser Alpine Spring Water, as well as FW Aggregates, Inc. a large sand and gravel supplier, were contacted for input during this plan update, but no comments were received.

## **Private Transportation Operators**

Inyo County has multiple private transportation providers who offer shuttle services to/from the many trailheads in the region and Inyo County communities. These shuttle services, mostly single-operator outfits, were contacted individually as well as included in the community survey outreach effort. Private Transportation operators contacted included Sierra Shuttle Service and East Side Shuttle Service. One operator identified pedestrian safety along the US 395 corridor, especially in Lone Pine, as an issue of concern and suggested the need for public transit service on the weekend in Inyo County, especially during the summer, to provide transportation between trailheads and County communities and the Bishop Airport.

## **SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INPUT**

An important objective for this RTP update is to obtain input on the transportation planning process from a wide variety of Inyo residents. For this reason, a public outreach program was conducted starting early in the RTP process.



## Online Community Survey

An eight-question community survey was developed and posted online and was available in both English and Spanish. A direct link to the survey was emailed to a wide variety of groups for further distribution including the Project Advisory Committee, Native American Tribes, County Health and Human Services, Superintendent of Schools, bicycle advocacy groups, recreation groups, disabled advocacy groups, private transportation providers, Chamber of Commerce, natural resource agencies, LTC commissioners and medical facilities. Additionally, notice of availability of the survey was advertised in local news outlets, on social media, and by partner agencies. A total of 238 responses were received. Appendix C presents detailed results of the responses to the survey along with the distribution list and advertising materials. Below is a summary of input:

- A little over half of respondents live in the Bishop Area, followed by Big Pine, Lone Pine, and Independence. Under 10 percent of respondents live elsewhere in the County and only a few live outside the County.
- The majority of respondents work in the Bishop Area. Several of the respondents were retired.
- Respondents use a personal car for the vast majority of trips, followed by walking, biking, and using the bus. Almost half of the respondents walk some or all the time, one-quarter bike some or all the time, and 6 percent take the bus some or all the time.
- When asked to allocate \$100 to transportation improvements, on average, respondents spent the most on maintaining and reconstructing existing streets and roads, followed by improving and expanding pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Respondents were not concerned about building new or expanding existing roadways.
- Out of a variety of transportation issues, respondents are the most concerned about unsafe intersections on state highways and not enough or insufficient crosswalks and sidewalks. Many specifically identified US 395 intersections within community centers as a safety concern.
- Speeding is a top issue for the general public and County officials. High-speed traffic on US 395 passes through multiple small Inyo County communities and conflicts between speeding vehicles and pedestrians pose safety concerns.
- When asked what would encourage them to walk and bike more, respondents highlighted separated bike paths and increased safety for children walking and biking to school. Many respondents spoke about improving and expanding bike paths and bike lanes and improving crosswalks. There are high levels of concern about the safety of crossing US 395, even when designated crosswalks already exist.

## Pop-up Workshops

Two pop-up workshops were conducted in Bishop and Lone Pine to further capture public input. Appendix C presents a detailed summary of the pop-up workshops along with any comments received. As part of these efforts, community members were asked to allocate \$100 among five types of transportation improvements: roads, airports, bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, and public transit. In





Bishop, the largest percentage of funds were allocated to bicycle facilities (32 percent of the total) while in Lone Pine, the largest percentage of funds were allocated to roads (42 percent). Pedestrian facilities ranked second for both Bishop and Lone Pine participants, making up 26 percent and 23 percent of the total, respectively.

## Tecopa Active Transportation Workshop

Lastly, ICLTC staff conducted an in-person outreach workshop in Tecopa along with distributing a survey to gather input specifically on active transportation needs in the southeastern portion of the county. The survey results found that respondents (the majority of which were from Tecopa or the surrounding communities) identified new separated bike paths and lanes on roadways as their top priority bicycle and pedestrian improvements. A detailed summary of the survey results is presented in Appendix C.

## SOCIAL EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Both state and federal laws require that regions plan for and implement transportation system improvements that will benefit all residents. Transportation improvements should not have a disproportionate adverse impact on low-income or other under-represented groups. Examples relevant to the RTP include access to transportation, displacement and gentrification, transportation affordability, and jobs/housing fit.

Table 2 shows that the Median Household Income (MHI) for Inyo County was \$60,925 in 2021, according to the American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates, well below the statewide MHI of \$84,097. MHI of Census Tract 1 (East of Bishop), Census Tract 4 (City of Bishop), Census Tract 5 (Big Pine, and Independence), and Census Tract 8 (Lone Pine, Furnace Creek, Valley Wells, Tecopa, and Shoshone), was less than 80 percent of statewide MHI. This income threshold is commonly used to identify communities as disadvantaged, including by the 2023 ATP Guidelines. Unless otherwise specified, the RTP uses the criteria as outlined in the 2023 ATP Guidelines to identify disadvantaged communities.

**Table 2: Inyo County Median Household Income**

| Area                                                                                     | Median Household Income <sup>(1)</sup> | % of Statewide Median |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Statewide</i>                                                                         | <i>\$84,097</i>                        | <i>--</i>             |
| Census Tract 1 - Inyo County East of Bishop                                              | \$53,506                               | <b>63.6%</b>          |
| Census Tract 2 - Inyo County West of Bishop                                              | \$81,250                               | 96.6%                 |
| Census Tract 3 - West Bishop                                                             | \$98,281                               | 116.9%                |
| Census Tract 4 - City of Bishop                                                          | \$67,188                               | <b>79.9%</b>          |
| Census Tract 5 - Big Pine, Independence                                                  | \$50,694                               | <b>60.3%</b>          |
| Census Tract 8 - Lone Pine, Shoshone, Valley Wells, Furnace Creek                        | \$48,373                               | <b>57.5%</b>          |
| Note 1: Median household income in the past 12 months in 2021 inflation-adjusted dollars |                                        |                       |
| <b>Bold</b> indicated Census Tract meets Disadvantaged Community criteria by income      |                                        |                       |
| Source: 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates                                  |                                        |                       |



Approximately 10.8 percent of Inyo residents were living in poverty for at least a 12-month period, according to the 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. This is slightly lower than the statewide poverty rate of 12.3 percent during that period. Poverty rates by city are available for the same period and demonstrate that the City of Bishop had a lower poverty rate than either the county or state estimate at 6.5 percent. Approximately 23 percent of the Inyo County population is Hispanic, while 10.7 percent are Native American, 1.6 percent are Asian, and less than one percent are African American. The reader should note that the incorporated City of Bishop represented a smaller total number of households than the unincorporated areas of Bishop (West Bishop and East and West of Bishop).

The Action Element of this RTP does not include new roadways or bypass projects that would displace underrepresented groups or decrease access to transportation. The Action Element includes capital improvement projects which will increase mobility for residents with no vehicle available to them such as maintaining a safe and reliable public transit fleet and expanding the bicycle and pedestrian facilities network. Public outreach for the RTP considered social equity factors. Direct links and notifications of the community survey were sent to leaders of social service programs, disabled advocacy organizations, and tribes. Additionally, the Inyo County Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan was reviewed during the development of this RTP to ensure that this document is consistent with the goals of the Coordinated Plan and addresses the mobility needs of the low-income and elderly population.

## REPORT ORGANIZATION

RTPs are long-range documents that guide the organized development of all modes of transportation within the area. State and federal requirements prescribe that, for approval, RTPs must include the following elements:

- The Modal Discussion addresses the needs and future vision for each transportation mode separately. In Inyo County, this includes state highways, local streets and roads, public transit, active transportation facilities, goods movement, aviation facilities, and recreational trails.
- The Policy Element summarizes the transportation issues in the region, identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both a short- and long-range framework, and maintains internal consistency with the financial element fund estimates.
- The Action Element identifies plans to address the needs and issues of each transportation mode in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies outlined in the policy element.
- The Financial Element identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the action element. The intent is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities.



## COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLANS AND STUDIES

The RTP Guidelines recommend that the circulation elements of the general plans within a region are consistent with the RTPs in the region. The goals, policies, and objectives of this RTP are consistent with the goals outlined in the Transportation and Circulation Elements of both the Inyo County General Plan and the City of Bishop General Plan. The primary goals and objectives of these foundational plans, as well as those of other important documents that have been incorporated into the RTP, are outlined in Chapter 3. Information for the state highway system was developed in coordination with Caltrans District 9. Transportation Concept Reports for all state highways were used as a reference for existing and future transportation conditions.



*This page intentionally left blank*



## Chapter 2

# EXISTING CONDITIONS

### REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Inyo County is in the easternmost portion of central California (as shown in Figure 1) and generally spans the length of the Sierra Nevada Mountains between Bishop on the north and almost Walker Pass on the south. The county is bordered by the State of Nevada to the east, Mono County to the north, and San Bernardino and Kern Counties to the south. Although Tulare and Fresno Counties technically border Inyo County to the west, the Sierra Nevada Mountains form a geographic barrier to surface transportation. Inyo County's landscape includes the low desert of Death Valley, the high desert of the Owens Valley, and the dramatic escarpment of the eastern High Sierra, including Mt. Whitney at an elevation of 14,505 feet. The City of Bishop is the only incorporated city in the county. Other communities include Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, and Shoshone.



US 395 is the primary roadway for the majority of the county's population and runs north to south connecting the county with Mono County and the urban areas of Reno, Nevada to the north and the greater Los Angeles area to the south. There is no state highway in the study area that crosses the Sierra west to destinations in the California Central Valley. Other highways providing access east through Death Valley National Park toward Nevada are SR 190, SR 168, SR 178, Stateline Road, and Daylight Pass Road. SR 127 provides a regional north and south route in the eastern portion of the County and provides access between I-15 and US 95 in Nevada.

Roughly 98 percent of the land in Inyo County is held by public agencies such as the US Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, State of California, and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Limited by public lands and geography, the developed areas of the County consist largely of small communities along the US 395 corridor. Tourism and recreation are the major industries. Approximately 3 million people visit the Eastern Sierra annually.


### POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS


The following section reviews historical and current population trends and demographics within Inyo County. This information is followed by an overview of general population projections into 2043. The data used in this section was collected from the US Census and the California Department of Finance (DOF).

#### Historical Trends and Existing Population

According to the 2020 US Census, Inyo County has a total population of 19,016. This is a 2.5 percent increase from the 2010 Census recorded population for Inyo County and 6.3 percent greater than the 1980 Census (Figure 2). Of the 2020 total, 3,819 people lived in the City of Bishop. Overall, the Inyo County population has had a low growth rate over the past 40 years.







## Population Trends and Projections

The California Department of Finance (DOF) provides population projections for California cities and counties. The California DOF estimates that the Inyo County population will decrease annually over the next 22 years. By 2045, the Inyo County population is forecast to be 17,204, representing a 9.5 decrease in total county population from 2020. This is a change from the 2019 CA DOF projections that pointed to a .02 percent rate of population increase annually through 2037. It is important to note that the DOF projections typically struggle with population estimates for Inyo County, likely because of the lack of privately owned land and unusual geographical constraints.

Even as the total Inyo County population is forecast to decrease, the number of Inyo County individuals aged 65 and older will increase from 4,699 in 2020 to 5,967 in 2045 or by roughly 27 percent (CA DOF). As shown in Table 3, the percentage of the total Inyo County population aged 65 and older is projected to increase significantly from 29.8 percent in 2025 to 34.7 percent in 2045.


**Table 3: Inyo County Population Projections**

| Year | Total Population |           |          | Age 65 + |           |          | Age 85 + |           |          |
|------|------------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
|      | Total            | # Persons | Annual % | Total    | # Persons | Annual % | Total    | # Persons | Annual % |
| 2025 | 18,055           | -961      | -1.71%   | 5,382    | 683       | 4.63%    | 627      | 106       | 6.37%    |
| 2035 | 17,864           | -156      | -0.17%   | 6,035    | 151       | 0.51%    | 984      | 266       | 11.08%   |
| 2045 | 17,204           | -348      | -0.40%   | 5,967    | -44       | -0.15%   | 1,606    | 284       | 6.70%    |

Source: CA Department of Finance, 2021  
Note 1: 2020 Total Population sourced from 2020 US Census



The comparison between projected change in total population and individuals aged 65+ and 85+ is shown in Figure 3. Just over 23 percent of the population in Inyo County was age 65 and older in 2020 (American Community Survey). The population of individuals aged 85 and older is projected to increase by 208 percent by 2045, from 3.5 percent of the total county population in 2025 to 9.3 in 2045. This marked projected growth of the elderly population is an important consideration in terms of public transit needs, as elderly individuals tend to use public transit at a higher rate than the general population.




## Demographics

Table 4 and Figure 4 present demographic characteristics for Inyo County according to the 2020 US Census. According to this data, the predominant ethnicity is White (61.8 percent), followed by Hispanic (23.1 percent), and American Indian (13 percent). Table 4 also shows that, according to the 2021 American Community Survey 5-year estimates, roughly 3.3 percent of the County spoke English less than “very well”.

| Table 4: Inyo County 2020 Demographics                                     |        |        |          |       |                     |                    |       |                |                                                          |                                       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|----------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                                                                            | Race   |        |          |       |                     |                    |       |                | Speak English<br>Less Than<br>"Very Well" <sup>(1)</sup> | Age 65<br>and<br>Above <sup>(1)</sup> |
|                                                                            | Total  | White  | Hispanic | Asian | African<br>American | American<br>Indian | Other | Multi-<br>race |                                                          |                                       |
| Number of Persons                                                          | 19,016 | 11,752 | 4,399    | 282   | 97                  | 2,473              | 2,284 | 2,128          | 598                                                      | 4,358                                 |
| % of Population                                                            | --     | 61.8%  | 23.1%    | 1.5%  | 0.5%                | 13.0%              | 12.0% | 11.2%          | 3.3%                                                     | 24.3%                                 |
| Source: US Census 2020 Census.                                             |        |        |          |       |                     |                    |       |                |                                                          |                                       |
| Note 1: Source: US Census American Community Survey 2021 5-Year Estimates. |        |        |          |       |                     |                    |       |                |                                                          |                                       |





## Housing

The 2020 Census showed a total of 9,469 housing units in Inyo County. This represents a loss of nine housing units from 2010. Approximately 1,423 units, or 15 percent, are considered vacant. According to the 2021 Inyo County Housing Element Update, the county has one 33-unit assisted housing project in Lone Pine, CA.

## Employment

According to the 2021 American Community Survey, the largest employment industries in Inyo County are educational services, health care and social assistance, public administration, and arts/entertainment/recreation/accommodation/food services. Major employers include land management agencies, school districts, hospitals, Inyo County, and the City of Los Angeles.

The California Employment Development Department estimates that there were 7,750 employed individuals living in Inyo County in 2021. During the same year, the unemployment rate in Inyo (not adjusted seasonally) was 5.9 percent. This is a decrease from the 2013 unemployment level (8.8 percent). Inyo County's unemployment rate is slightly lower than the California statewide average, which was 7.3 percent for the same period in 2021. It is important to note that unemployment rates were impacted significantly by the COVID-19 pandemic and it is likely that 2021 rates and any comparisons to those rates are atypical. The 2021 Caltrans Long-Term Socio-Economic Forecast for Inyo County projects that the unemployment rate will fall to 3.5 percent by 2025.

The Caltrans Long-Term Socio-Economic Forecast for Inyo County projects that, between 2020 and 2025, the number of jobs in Inyo County is expected to grow by 1.5 percent annually, with most increases



occurring in leisure, wholesale and retail trade, and health and education. The County recently began permitting retail cannabis businesses which may alter business make-up slightly. According to the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, Inyo County averaged \$1,286,126 in total taxable cannabis sales for the last quarter of 2021 and the second and third quarters of 2022. The City of Bishop has also begun the process of issuing retail cannabis permits.

Relating economic conditions to transportation needs, an efficient and safe roadway and bicycle network will encourage leisure, tourism, and recreational travel as well as provide safe and efficient travel routes for general goods movement.

## **Income**

Table 2 presents 2021 median household income by census tract for Inyo County along with the percentage of the statewide median income. Figure 5 shows the geographic boundaries of Census Tracts in Inyo County. As of 2021, the median household income for Census Tract 1 (Inyo County east of Bishop), Census Tract 4 (which includes the City of Bishop area), Census Tract 5 (Big Pine and Independence), and Census Tract 8 (which extends from Lone Pine across Death Valley to Shoshone) was less than 80 percent of the statewide median income, which qualifies the tract as a disadvantaged community. According to the Caltrans Long-Term Socio-Economic Forecast for Inyo County, average per capita income is currently below the California state average and is projected to remain so over the 20-year planning period.


## **COMMUTE PATTERNS**

The US Census Bureau's Center for Economic Studies Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics dataset offers the most recent commute pattern data statistics (2019). This data reflects all persons reporting their work location, regardless of how often they commute. Because of this, this data source can be misleading in that it includes persons who report to their work location infrequently or telecommute. However, it is the best commute data available for Inyo County.


## **Inyo County Residents and Workforce**


Table 5 shows that 51.8 percent of employed people who live in Inyo County also work in the County. 805 Inyo County residents (9.9 percent of residents) travel north to Mono County to work, while another 336 (5.2 percent of workers within Inyo County) travel from Mono County to work in Inyo County.

There are around 291 Inyo County residents who commute to Kern County (3.6 percent). As there are no roadways traveling directly from Inyo County to Fresno County, it is likely that the 403 Inyo residents working in Fresno County (5 percent) work for a land management agency with a corporate address in Fresno. A fair number of Kern County (235) and San Bernardino County (132) residents travel to Inyo County for work.



**Figure 5**  
**Inyo County Census Tracts**





**Table 5: Inyo County Commute Patterns**

| # Persons % of Total                                                                      |       |       | # Persons % of Total                                     |       |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Census Place of Employment for Inyo County Residents</b>                               |       |       | <b>Census Place of Residence for Inyo County Workers</b> |       |       |
| Bishop, CA                                                                                | 2,408 | 29.6% | Bishop city, CA                                          | 1,026 | 16.0% |
| Mammoth Lakes, CA                                                                         | 623   | 7.7%  | West Bishop CDP, CA                                      | 740   | 11.5% |
| Lone Pine CDP, CA                                                                         | 243   | 3.0%  | Dixon Lane-Meadow Creek CDP, CA                          | 713   | 11.1% |
| Fresno City, CA                                                                           | 237   | 2.9%  | Big Pine CDP, CA                                         | 278   | 4.3%  |
| West Bishop CDP, CA                                                                       | 204   | 2.5%  | Lone Pine CDP, CA                                        | 248   | 3.9%  |
| Independence CDP, CA                                                                      | 183   | 2.2%  | Pahrump CDP, NV                                          | 175   | 2.7%  |
| Big Pine CDP, CA                                                                          | 139   | 1.7%  | Independence CDP, CA                                     | 129   | 2.0%  |
| Dixon Lane-Meadow Creek CDP, CA                                                           | 139   | 1.7%  | Wilkerson CDP, CA                                        | 120   | 1.9%  |
| Bakersfield City, CA                                                                      | 127   | 1.6%  | Round Valley CDP, CA                                     | 97    | 1.5%  |
| Sacramento, CA                                                                            | 127   | 1.6%  | Ridgecrest city, CA                                      | 83    | 1.3%  |
| All Other Locations                                                                       | 3,705 | 45.5% | All Other Locations                                      | 2,816 | 43.8% |
| <i>Total Number of Persons</i>                                                            | 8,135 |       | <i>Total Number of Persons</i>                           | 6,425 |       |
| <b>County of Employment for Inyo County Residents</b>                                     |       |       | <b>County of Residence for Inyo County Workers</b>       |       |       |
| Inyo County, CA                                                                           | 4,216 | 51.8% | Inyo County, CA                                          | 4,216 | 65.6% |
| Mono County, CA                                                                           | 805   | 9.9%  | Mono County, CA                                          | 336   | 5.2%  |
| Fresno County, CA                                                                         | 403   | 5.0%  | Kern County, CA                                          | 235   | 3.7%  |
| Kern County, CA                                                                           | 291   | 3.6%  | Nye County, NV                                           | 198   | 3.1%  |
| Sacramento County, CA                                                                     | 229   | 2.8%  | Clark County, NV                                         | 141   | 2.2%  |
| Santa Clara County, CA                                                                    | 212   | 2.6%  | San Bernardino County, CA                                | 132   | 2.1%  |
| Tulare County, CA                                                                         | 180   | 2.2%  | Los Angeles County, CA                                   | 124   | 1.9%  |
| Monterey County, CA                                                                       | 140   | 1.7%  | Fresno County, CA                                        | 121   | 1.9%  |
| San Joaquin County, CA                                                                    | 130   | 1.6%  | Tulare County, CA                                        | 92    | 1.4%  |
| Washoe County, NV                                                                         | 119   | 1.5%  | Riverside County, CA                                     | 63    | 1.0%  |
| All Other Locations                                                                       | 1,410 | 17.3% | All Other Locations                                      | 767   | 11.9% |
| <i>Total Number of Persons</i>                                                            | 8,135 |       | <i>Total Number of Persons</i>                           | 6,425 |       |
| Source: LEHD On the Map - Work and Home Destination Analysis, 20. CDP = Census Data Place |       |       |                                                          |       |       |

The City of Bishop is the most common census place of employment for Inyo County residents (2,408 or 29.6 percent of all residents). If the census places of Dixon-Lane/Meadow Creek and West Bishop are included, a total of 2,751 Inyo County residents (33.8 percent) work in the Bishop area. Another 623 (7.7 percent) work in Mammoth Lakes and 243 (3 percent) work in Lone Pine. The largest concentration of Inyo County employees live in the Bishop area (2,479 or 38.6 percent of workers). Other concentrations of Inyo County employees, yet much smaller, live in Big Pine (278), Lone Pine (248), and Pahrump, Nevada (175). Lone Pine is the most common work location for residents of the Death Valley Census County Division (CCD) (45 residents or 31 percent), followed by Bishop (6 residents or 4 percent) and





Independence (5 residents or 3 percent). The largest concentration of Death Valley employees lives in Lone Pine CDP (17 percent), followed by Pahrump (15 percent) and Las Vegas (8 percent). Commute pattern data does not exist for Furnace Creek CDP. Commute patterns shown by the US Census Bureau's Center for Economic Studies Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics dataset have not changed significantly in the last 8 years.

The 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates conducted by the US Census Bureau provide additional commute data for Inyo County, including means of transportation to work and travel times. According to the survey, 69.3 percent of workers drove alone, 11.9 percent carpoolled, 6.9 percent worked from home, 5.9 percent walked, 0.3 percent used public transportation, 4.1 percent bicycled and 1.6 percent used taxicab or other means. This represents a slight decrease in the proportion of residents who carpoolled and an increase in the percentage of residents who worked from home. There was a slight decrease in the proportion of residents who walked, used public transit, or bicycled. The 2017-2021 American Community Survey data show that average commute times are significantly shorter for Inyo County workers than the California average as a whole. The mean travel time to work in Inyo County was 15.5 minutes, compared to an average travel time of 29.5 minutes for California. The City of Bishop is relatively compact and, therefore, has a higher proportion of bicycle commuters (10.7 percent) and those that walk to work (9.7 percent).

## Visitor Statistics and Travel Patterns

Inyo County and the surrounding region see a high number of visitors that impact the regional transportation system but are not reflected in the US Census data. Death Valley National Park alone served on average 1,041,538 visitors annually between 2000 – 2019. SR 190 transects the Park as it runs from Olancho to the intersection of SR 127 at Death Valley Junction, north of Shoshone. SR 178 connects Ridgecrest to the Park while Nevada State Routes 267, 374, 372, 178, and 373 provide access to the park from the east. Old Spanish Trail connects Charleston View and Tecopa and is considered a scenic alternative for park visitors coming from Las Vegas. This route has caused truck issues as the roadway is narrow, curvy, and not designed for truck traffic. Daylight Pass and Stateline Roads, both part of the County's Maintained Mileage System, connect Death Valley National Park to Nevada. The pavement on Stateline Road is presently deteriorating, however, the Stateline Road Reconstruction Project will reconstruct the 5.2-mile road between SR 127 and the Nevada state border. This project has a planned completion of 2028.

According to 2016 National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) surveys conducted on the Inyo National Forest, there were roughly 2.3 million total estimated national forest visits. The surveys also indicated that the most popular activities within the National Forest were: viewing natural features (45 percent), hiking/walking (44 percent), and relaxing (34 percent). It is worth noting that 23 percent of respondents included "driving for pleasure" as one of their activities in the National Forest. This underscores the importance of maintaining good roadways leading to and within the National Forest system. US 395 is the primary roadway of travel for summer visitors along with SR 168, SR 190 (Death Valley), and other County roadways that access trailheads and recreation destinations. Examples include Whitney Portal Rd, Onion Valley Rd, South Lake Road, and Glacier Lodge Rd. As many of the trailhead access roads pass through



small rural Inyo County communities and are utilized by residents, it is important to consider the safety and traffic impacts of recreational use on trailhead access roads. This will require ongoing collaboration between the County of Inyo and land management agencies, such as the US Forest Service and BLM.

During the winter months, Mammoth Mountain Ski Area attracts around 1.4 million skier visits annually. The majority travel on US 395 from the greater Los Angeles area. Heavier traffic volumes occur on US 395 during peak periods as a result.

The 2020 US 395 Origin and Destination Survey found that 74% of surveyed travelers entering the Inyo and Mono Counties region described recreation as the main purpose of their trip. Due to the rural nature of the region and mountainous topography, the automobile is the primary mode of transportation for both residents and visitors. This is not anticipated to change over the planning period.

## **NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES**

Five tribal governments own land within the boundary of Inyo County. A brief description of each entity follows. A more detailed discussion of transportation needs on reservation land is included as part of the transportation needs discussion for each entity.

- Bishop Paiute Tribe – The tribe is located in the western portion of Bishop. The tribe operates the Paiute Palace gaming property and gas station on North Sierra Highway (US 395) in Bishop. The tribe currently has around 2,000 enrolled members.
- Big Pine Paiute Tribe – The reservation is roughly 300 acres located in the community of Big Pine. Roughly two-thirds of the tribe’s 600 members live on the reservation.
- Fort Independence Tribe – Fort Independence consists of about 560 acres adjacent to Oak Creek in Independence. About half of the 136 tribal members live on site. The Tribe operates a 50-site RV campground, Winnedumah Wins Casino, and Fort Independence Travel Plaza.
- Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone Tribe - The Tribe has a population of approximately 350 residents and consists of 240 acres of land near the community of Lone Pine.
- Timbisha Shoshone Tribe – The Tribe’s reservation, Death Valley Indian Community, is located within Death Valley National Park near Furnace Creek. Roughly 50 members live in the community however many members spend the summers in Lone Pine.

## **PUBLIC HEALTH AND EQUITY**

Appropriate transportation improvement projects can have a positive impact on public health. As such, public health and health equity should be factored into regional transportation improvement decision-making. Improvements to existing bicycle paths and sidewalks will increase the safety and appeal of the facility, thereby encouraging more users. New facilities provide a safe active transportation alternative to driving. Roadway or streetscape improvements that slow down vehicle traffic will also make residents feel more comfortable walking or biking. In a modern society with computers and cell phones, providing opportunities for people to walk or bike is becoming increasingly important for public health.



A variety of health statistics for the Bishop Area and Inyo County gathered from kidsdata.org and the community demonstrate that Inyo ranks below the statewide average for certain health statistics.

- In 2019, 41.7 percent of 9<sup>th</sup> graders in Inyo County (including Bishop Unified School district) were considered obese. This is slightly above the statewide average.
- In 2019, 23.3 percent of 9th graders in Inyo County met fitness standards. This represents a 4.7 percent increase since 2015. Statewide, 33 percent did in 2019, a 4.6 percent decrease from 2015. While Inyo County still falls below statewide percentages, the trend in Inyo County is positive.
- When making transportation funding decisions, decision-makers should consider how each project impacts public health and include public health organizations in public outreach efforts. For this RTP process, the community survey was emailed directly to public health organizations such as the Toiyabe Indian Health Project, local hospitals, and County Health and Human Services Department. Active Transportation projects listed in this RTP will help to boost fitness levels and overall health for Inyo County residents.

## TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE INTEGRATION

The County has adopted the following Vision Statement: The Vision of the Inyo County Government for its public is to provide responsive decision-making while supporting cultural and historical values, the natural environment, and rural quality of life. Coordinating land use changes and growth with transportation planning is one of the most important considerations in modern planning. A new transportation facility to an outlying area can have the effect of increasing land use by providing convenient transportation. This can have negative effects on the environment and the regional transportation system. Additionally, it is important to consider transportation needs (roadways, bicycle paths, and public transit) before approving and constructing a new development.

In Inyo County, development is generally limited to areas within the borders of already developed communities, as a high proportion of other land in Inyo County is owned by public agencies. Less than two percent of land in the county is under private ownership. At this time there is no significant growth expected in the county over the next 20 years. The southeastern portion of the county may see development pressure in the future as growth spills over from Nevada, though water availability in this portion of the County is limited. Over the next 20 years, there may also be an increase in solar facilities in the county. The Inyo County 2021 Housing Element Update identifies the need for infrastructure development to promote housing development in rural Inyo County.

The potential for future development within the City of Bishop is also limited as LADWP owns 99.6 percent of all buildable parcels within city limits. The Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed Use Overlay, adopted in early 2023, may facilitate development within city limits and has the potential to impact transportation systems in the City. Additionally, the City of Bishop has acquired property to develop a 72-unit affordable housing project and the project is currently waiting on state funding.



## SOUTHERN INYO COUNTY

The southern portion of Inyo County, shown in Figure 6, is inclusive of the communities of Lone Pine, Olancha, Furnace Creek, Shoshone, and Tecopa and Death Valley National Park. Southern Inyo County can be defined by the geographic boundaries of Census Tract 8, which represents 67 percent of the total County area and approximately 17 percent of the total population. Due, in part, to a much lower population density than Northern Inyo County, Southern Inyo has a unique set of transportation conditions and needs that are addressed here.

### Population Characteristics

According to the 2020 US census, Census Tract 8 had a total population of 3,335. Approximately 7.6 percent of the population was between the ages of 10 and 17 and 24.9 percent was aged 65 or greater, according to the 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. An estimated 16.3 percent of the census tract population had a disability, which is slightly higher than in the county as a whole.

### Income

The Median Household Income (MHI) of Census Tract 8 was \$48,373, according to the 2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. This represents the lowest MHI of Inyo County census tracts and only 57 percent of the statewide MHI, compared to 72.4 percent of the statewide MHI for the county as a whole. This figure qualifies Census Tract 8 as a disadvantaged community per 2023 ATP standards, as the MHI falls well below the threshold of 80 percent of statewide MHI, and as an Area of Persistent Poverty by the US Department of Transportation (DOT). Census Tract 8 qualifies as disadvantaged per the Justice40 Initiative screening criteria.


### Commute Patterns

The US Census Bureau's Center for Economic Studies Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics dataset also offers the most recent commute pattern data statistics (2019) for census tracts within Inyo County. The commute patterns for residents of Census Tract 8 are similar to those seen throughout the County in that residents traveled to a variety of communities to work. The highest percentage of residents (26.2 percent) worked in Lone Pine, CA. This is in contrast to Inyo County as a whole, where the top employment location for Inyo County residents was Bishop, CA. Four of the top ten employment locations for Tract 8 residents were outside of Inyo County (which was also true countywide).

On average, Tract 8 residents traveled farther to get to work than residents countywide. 66.3 percent of Tract 8 residents traveled more than 50 miles compared to 42.9 percent countywide. Approximately 19.8 percent of Tract 8 residents had a commute of fewer than 10 miles, compared with 40.7 percent countywide.

These data show that residents living in Southern Inyo County are highly dependent on the system of roadways that connects these communities to work, school, and services and stresses the importance of roadway maintenance.







*This page intentionally left blank.*



## Chapter 3

# PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Below is a summary of the most relevant existing plans and studies to date that have been taken into consideration during the RTP planning process.

### EXISTING PLANNING DOCUMENTS

#### Inyo County General Plan Circulation Element (2001)



The Inyo County General Plan Circulation Element provides structure in decision-making as it relates to the countywide transportation system consisting of roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and aviation modes of travel. The Circulation Element covers the movement of people and goods and identifies goals, policies, and implementation measures.

The document identifies major goals as they relate to transportation, including the following:

- A transportation system that is safe, efficient, and comfortable, which meets the needs of people and goods and enhances the lifestyle of the County's residents.
- Improved capacity on state highways and routes within and surrounding Inyo County.
- Maintain a system of scenic routes that will preserve and enhance the quality of life for present and future generations.
- Provide safe, effective, economically feasible, and efficient public transportation in Inyo County that reduces the dependence on privately owned vehicles, and meets the identified transportation needs of the County, with emphasis on service to the transportation disadvantaged.
- Encourage and promote greater use of non-motorized means of personal transportation within the region.
- Encourage and pursue railroad facilities within the region.
- Enhance airports in the County to meet changing needs and demands.
- Provide for the parking needs of local residents, visitors, and tourists.

The document also identifies specific critical issues as they relate to general circulation, roadway transportation, public transit, airports, and non-motorized transportation, including the following:

- Completion of expansion of US 395 to four lanes throughout the County.
- Avoiding the need for bypasses around communities within the Owens Valley along US 395.
- Providing an improved connection into Death Valley from Big Pine.



- Public transportation services between communities in the County.
- Adequate medical transportation within the County and to treatment centers located outside the County.
- Improved bicycle and pedestrian access within and between communities, and between activity points (i.e., parks, campgrounds, etc.).
- Reestablishment of rail service in Inyo County.
- Establishment of a business park at Bishop Airport.
- Expansion of services and facilities at County-owned and operated facilities (near communities of Bishop, Independence, Lone Pine, and Shoshone).

### **City of Bishop General Plan Mobility Element (2012)**

The Mobility Element of the City of Bishop General Plan outlines goals and implementation strategies for transportation within and around the city by car, bike, walking, public transportation, and air. The Mobility Element will:

- Coordinate transportation systems with planned land uses.
- Promote the safe and efficient transport of goods and the safe and effective movement of all populations.
- Make efficient use of existing transportation facilities.
- Protect environmental quality and promote the wise and equitable use of economic and natural resources.

### **Inyo County Active Transportation Plan (2015)**

The Inyo County Active Transportation Plan (ATP) encourages alternative modes of transportation by providing a concise framework through which federal and state funding can be leveraged. Specific goals of the ATP include:

- Increase the number of trips made by walking and biking.
- Increase safety for non-motorized transportation users.
- Enhance public health and reduce levels of childhood obesity.
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities share equally in program benefits.

This document evaluates existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure within Inyo County and identifies high-priority improvement projects.

The 2015 ATP acts as an update to the 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, with the goal of providing a comprehensive assessment of existing bicycle facilities and infrastructure in Inyo County, obstacles to higher levels of bicycle travel, and strategies to increase bicycle use. The ATP was updated concurrently with this RTP Update.



## **Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed Use Overlay (2022)**

The Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed-Use Overlay is intended to strategically guide the development of the Bishop downtown area to promote higher density mixed-use development, non-motorized modes of transportation (such as cycling and walking), and to maintain town character. The Plan and Overlay outlines three major goal areas:

- Growth Management and Housing: to allow and encourage a broader range of uses downtown, with a specific emphasis on affordable housing and higher-density residential development.
- Mobility Enhancements: to create opportunities for and encourage alternative modes of transportation (pedestrian and bicycle) within the downtown.
- Downtown Character: to ensure that future development downtown maintains the authentic character of the City.
- A range of implementation strategies are provided that address administrative oversight, housing development, mobility for non-motorized transportation, and funding. Identified implementation strategies include:
  - Improve and expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities along the priority corridors identified in this plan.
  - Coordinate with Caltrans District 9 to provide enhanced active transportation facilities along Caltrans-owned rights-of-way.

## **Eastern Sierra Transportation Agency Short-Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2021)**

Formally two separate documents, the now combined Eastern Sierra Transportation Agency Short-Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan serve as a comprehensive guide to public transportation in the Inyo and Mono County region.

The purpose of the Eastern Sierra Transportation Agency Short-Range Transit Plan is to guide the Eastern Sierra Transportation Agency (ESTA) towards improved efficiency and mobility for residents. The plan evaluates ESTA against performance standards and goals set out in the 2016 Short Range Transit Plan, creates public input opportunities, and provides recommendations for the transit system for the next five years.

The Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan provides a framework for coordination between Inyo and Mono Counties, and public, private, non-profit, and tribal transit operators to best utilize federal and state funding to provide transportation services to Inyo and Mono counties that increase access to public transportation for underserved communities.

The following capital improvements and service changes are recommended:

- Expanded 395 Reno and Lancaster days of service
- Start Lone Pine to Independence service at 7 AM instead of 6 AM



- Provide weekend Lone Pine and Mammoth Express service
- Earlier morning service from Bishop to Lone Pine and Big Pine
- Weekly on-call service to Los Angeles
- Expand trailhead transit access
- Bishop microtransit service
- Earlier weekend morning and later Sunday Bishop DAR service
- Accommodating additional bikes on transit vehicles
- Mammoth Mobility Hub
- Bishop transit facility improvements

### **Bishop Paiute Reservation Long Range Transportation Improvement Plan (2013)**

The Bishop Paiute Reservation Long Range Transportation Improvement Plan serves as a framework for transportation improvement projects on the Bishop Paiute Reservation adjacent to downtown Bishop. The following potential projects to enhance the transportation system on the reservation are identified in the Plan:

- Winuba North extension
- Winuba South extension
- Construction of interior roads
- Upgraded street lighting
- Creation of walking and biking trails and sidewalks
- Improvement of off-street parking options

### **Fort Independence Indian Reservation Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment (2023)**

The 2023 Fort Independence Indian Reservation Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment is the most recent of two tribal transportation safety assessments that have been performed for the Tribe within four years. The Assessment identifies the following four focus areas to address safety and mobility concerns as identified through the assessment process:

- Pedestrian-bicycle network including US 395 under crossing between Travel Plaza and West Dusty Lane
- Miller Lane intersection safety improvements
- Domestic water complex protection against errant vehicles
- Access to the Town of Independence with the development of Class I path.





## **Olancha Cartago Corridor Study (2020)**

The Olancha Cartago Corridor Study provides a vision and implementation strategies for the US 395 corridor that runs between Olancha and Cartago once the realignment of the highway is complete. This Study focuses on economic development and promoting recreation and tourism along the corridor. The study identifies six priority projects:

- Cartago amenities
- Cartago Loop Trail
- Northern Gateway to 190 Trail
- 190 Junction amenities
- 190 to Haiwee Multi-Use Trail
- Southern segment art and amenities

## **Caltrans Adaptation Priorities Report – District 9 (2021)**

The Caltrans Adaptation Priorities Report identifies and prioritizes transportation-related infrastructure elements in District 9 (including Inyo County) that are vulnerable to future impacts from climate change. This report will guide the prioritization of focused infrastructure climate-impact assessments in the future.

The report evaluates bridges, roadway surfaces, and culverts (large and small) as key pieces of a regional transportation system and highlights those that should be a priority to focus on. Priority is determined based on a combination of factors including, the timing of climate-related impacts, their severity, the current condition of the structure being assessed, the scale of impact on the public if affected, and the presence or absence of alternatives if necessary.

## **California Transportation Plan 2050 (2021)**

The California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2050 provides a long-term vision for the transportation system in California, to have a resilient, safe, accessible, and equitable transportation system throughout the state. This, in turn, will further racial and environmental justice and access to public health, and promote livable, diverse communities.

As the roadmap for implementing this vision, the CTP 2050 set forth the following goals:

- Safety—Provide a safe and secure transportation system.
- Climate—Achieve statewide GHG emissions reduction targets and increase resilience to climate change.
- Equity—Eliminate transportation burdens for low-income communities, communities of color, people with disabilities, and other disadvantaged groups.
- Accessibility—Improve multi-modal mobility and access to destinations for all users.
- Quality of Life and Public Health—Enable vibrant and healthy communities.



- Economy—Support a vibrant resilient economy.
- Environment—Enhance environmental health and reduce negative transportation impacts.
- Infrastructure—Maintain a high-quality resilient transportation system.
- The CTP 2050 provides recommendations that collectively address the goals of the plan. These recommendations include:
  - Expand equitable access to jobs, goods, services, and education through the expansion of safe, convenient, resilient, and diverse modes of transportation.
  - Strategically plan for sustainable investment in the transportation system while maintaining the state of current infrastructure and providing for efficient land use and natural resource protection.
  - Support Zero-Emissions Vehicles (ZEVs) and infrastructure and connected and autonomous vehicles.





## Chapter 4

# MODAL DISCUSSION

### ROADWAY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

The Inyo County regional roadway network is comprised of over 3,500 miles of streets, roads, and highways. The roadway network includes paved and dirt roadways owned by the National Park Service (NPS), US Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) jurisdiction, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).



According to the 2020 California Public Road Data, there were 2,162 miles of maintained roads in Inyo County.

### State Highways

The Caltrans District 9 state highways transecting Inyo County are described below.

**US 395** – This state highway is the major north–south roadway connecting Inyo County to Mono County and Reno, Nevada in Washoe County to the north and the Los Angeles Basin to the south. Most Inyo communities are located on or near US 395. These include Bishop, Big Pine, Independence, and Lone Pine. US 395 is designated as a Principal Arterial and is part of the National Highway System. Recreational traffic and goods movement are currently and will continue to be the major sources of traffic on the highway. US 395 is designated as a High Priority Interregional Highway in the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). According to the Transportation Concept Report, the concept for the US 395 corridor includes a four-lane expressway and a four-lane conventional roadway from the San Bernardino/Kern County line to Lee Vining in Mono County. Currently, only a 10-mile section of US 395 between the communities of Olancha and Cartago remains a two-lane highway. Upgrading this section of highway to a four-lane expressway is funded and has begun construction. Traffic volumes on US 395 are affected more by recreational traffic rather than commute traffic.

For the majority of the route, there is no bikeway designation. The only bike lanes that exist on US 395 are within the communities of Bishop and Bridgeport. A bicycle right turn pocket was added at the intersection with Lower Rock Creek Road in 2022. Sidewalks exist within the major communities along the US 395 corridor (Bishop, Big Pine, Lone Pine, and Independence). Outside of the communities, there are no pedestrian facilities, linking destinations.

US 395 is part of the STAA legal truck network meaning that trucks with approved kingpin-to-rear-axle dimensions can safely travel the route. STAA truck dimensions are the typical size for trucks traveling interstate. US 395 is also part of the American Society of State Highway and Transportation Officials (ASSHTO) and Adventure Cycling's proposed designated bike route USBR 85 traveling from the Canadian border to the Mexican border.



**US 6** – Highway 6 is classified as a rural minor arterial and travels from US 395 in Bishop, through Mono County to Nevada. The highway also intersects with SR 120 in Mono County. It is a two-lane highway that provides important connections to employment, goods, and services in Bishop for residents in the Benton and Chalfant areas of Mono County. Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) offers a lifeline route between Benton and Bishop on US 6 two times a week. US 6 can be an alternative route to US 395 between Bishop and Mammoth Lakes when SR 120 is open between Benton and US 395. This minor arterial serves commuters, goods movement, agriculture, and recreational day use. As part of the Strategic Highway Corridor Network (STRAHNET), US 6 is part of a highway network that provides defense access, continuity, and emergency capabilities to military bases for defense purposes.

There are no bicycle facilities along Highway 6 and shoulder width varies from 4 to 8 feet with wider shoulders in and around Bishop, Chalfant, and Benton. There are no sidewalks except for the first 400 feet in Bishop.

US 6 is part of the national STAA network. Most of the freight on US 6 flows between southern California, northern Nevada, and Idaho. Caltrans and the City of Bishop are continuing to explore ideas to improve the irregular US 6, US 395, and Wye Road intersection. Recent commercial development and informal truck parking on the north end of the intersection along the shoulders contribute to high traffic through the irregular intersection. Plans by Inyo County to construct a County courthouse and court services may further complicate the intersection and contribute to critical safety issues for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists alike.

**SR 127** – SR 127 connects I15 in San Bernardino County to Nevada. This two-lane rural minor arterial travels through the Inyo County community of Shoshone and intersects SR 190 at Death Valley Junction. The route travels through the small communities of Baker, Shoshone, and Tecopa and serves local and interregional traffic, good movement, and access to recreation. The highway is very rural and does not include traveler services for up to distances of 57 miles.

As little growth is expected in this area, the concept for SR 127 is to continue maintenance efforts and widen shoulders. SR 127 is a STAA Terminal Access Route as it provides access to Death Valley and natural resources. There are essentially no bicycle and pedestrian facilities along this route.

**SR 136** – SR 136 begins/ends at US 395 south of Lone Pine and travels along the north side of Owens Lake until it intersects with SR 190. The road is a two-lane rural minor arterial that provides access to the historic sites of Dolomite, Swansea, and Keeler and is a gateway to Death Valley. Only California Legal size trucks are allowed in this facility. The Eastern Sierra Interagency Visitor Center, where all Mt. Whitney wilderness permits must be obtained, is located at the intersection of US 395 and SR 136. There are no bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the shoulders are not more than one foot wide. The TCR recommends shoulder widening and rumble strips when the facility is scheduled for rehabilitation. Lower Owens River Project (LORP) improvements may necessitate increased recreational signage in the future.

**SR 168** – The SR 168 segment west of Bishop travels between the popular high-elevation recreation area around Lake Sabrina and US 395 in Bishop. During the winter months, only the section between Aspendell and Bishop is plowed. This section of roadway is two lanes with grades up to 6 – 8 percent and classified



as a rural major collector. Near Bishop, the two-lane facility includes a two-way left turn lane and is a designated bicycle route. The section from Sabrina Road to Meadow Lane is designated as a state scenic highway and a section of eastern SR 168 is part of the National Forest Scenic Byway. After a break in the highway, SR 168 continues east from US 395 from the community of Big Pine. This section is classified as a rural minor arterial and provides access to the Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest before continuing to Mono County.

Future potential projects include a “road diet” in the City of Bishop, creating a continuous sidewalk network, widening shoulders, and improving ADA access. Caltrans is in the planning phases of the Manor Market Complete Streets Project, which will create sidewalks and pedestrian facilities on SR 168 between West Meadow Lane to Barlow Lane. To reduce congestion on SR 168 in central Bishop, there are concepts to increase travel options through the city by constructing new local roads and increasing road connectivity.

**SR 178** – Located in the southeastern portion of the county, the Inyo County section of SR 178 travels between the eastern boundary of Death Valley at Badwater Road through Shoshone to Pahrump, Nevada. The segment between Death Valley and SR 127 is part of the STRAHNET network and is classified as a rural major collector. Only California Legal trucks are allowed to travel on SR 178 within Inyo County. There are no bicycle or pedestrian facilities along the roadway in Inyo County.

**SR 190** – SR 190 travels along the south side of Owens Lake near Olancho and terminates at Death Valley Junction with SR 127. This highway is the gateway to Death Valley and is classified as a rural minor arterial. As such, the facility is subject to extreme environments such as flooding and heat which have direct impacts on pavement conditions. The majority of the facility is part of the California Legal Truck network and the section from the junction with SR 136 to Panamint Valley Road is California Legal Advisory. SR 190 within Death Valley National Park is designated a state scenic byway and a national scenic byway. The facility is Death Valley National Park’s only continuously paved west-to-east thoroughfare. It also provides lifeline accessibility for rural communities in and near DVNP to emergency services in Owens Valley. SR 190 has limited or no shoulders making safety for non-motorized users a concern.

## Other Regionally Important Roads

A significant percentage of interregional travelers to and through Death Valley National Park (DVNP) use one or more roads that are not on the State Highway system. These roads include Stateline Road, Panamint Valley Road, Old Spanish Trail Highway, Trona – Wildrose Road (part of the Inyo County Maintained Mileage System and partially maintained by NPS), and Badwater Road, Scotty’s Castle Road, and Daylight Pass Road (maintained by DVNP). These routes are part of the interregional network through the County.

There are several State Highways and county-maintained roads that provide access for residents and travelers to small communities and recreational areas in the Sierra Nevada. These include Pine Creek Road, SR 168, South Lake Road, Sabrina Road, Glacier Lodge Road, Onion Valley Road, Whitney Portal Road, Horseshoe Meadows Road, and Nine Mile Canyon Road. Nine Mile Canyon Road is unique in Inyo



County in that it is the only road inside of Inyo County that crosses the Sierra crest and provides access to communities on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada. Paved roads elsewhere in the County that also provide access to recreation destinations include White Mountain Road and Death Valley Road. The condition of these roads is important to the economy of communities throughout Inyo County.

## **Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan**

The 2022 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan identifies 11 Strategic Interregional Corridors throughout California, which have a high volume of freight movement and significant recreation tourism. US 395 through Inyo County has been identified as a Priority Interregional Highway. Key improvements identified by the plan for US 395 and US 14 (in neighboring Kern County) focus on multimodal system-wide improvements such as the expansion of zero-emission vehicle (ZEV) charging and fueling infrastructure, intercity bus service, and transit access options. The Plan also identified safety and reducing VMTs produced by freight movement.

The 2022 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is a program of projects funded through the state gas tax. The ITIP has three simple objectives:

1. Improve state highways.
2. Improve the intercity passenger rail system.
3. Improve interregional movement of people, vehicles, and goods.

The primary purpose of the ICLTC entering into MOUs with adjacent counties on US 395 and SR 14 had been to access ITIP funds. The existing tri-county MOU between Inyo, Kern, and San Bernardino counties was not renewed.

The Olancho-Cartago 4-lane Project (which is currently under construction) was part of the 2020 ITIP. No Inyo County projects were identified in the 2022 ITIP, however, Inyo County is in support of regional projects already underway, such as the Freeman Gulch Widening Project, Segment 2 (in adjacent Kern County), the goal of which is to improve safety along the corridor.

## **Off-Highway Vehicles**

As a rural county, Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs) are common, being used for recreation and as a means of transportation between rural communities and recreation areas. While the majority of OHV use occurs on land not owned by the County of Inyo, County-maintained roadways provide vital connections for OHV users between recreation areas and communities. Ongoing maintenance and improvement of these roadways is important to ensuring OHV safety and encouraging sustainable combined-use transportation.

In 2015, the County of Inyo, in cooperation with CHP, approved a pilot program to designate seven roadway sections of less than ten miles as combined-use, allowing OHVs. This program was implemented in accordance with Assembly Bill 628 (2011) and underwent an environmental review process. The pilot program is still currently in effect at time of writing. The results of the pilot program will be presented to the County of Inyo Board of Supervisors in December 2023, at which time a determination to continue



the program will be made. If the Board of Supervisors makes the decision to not continue the program, it will end in 2025.


## Traffic Volumes

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) is defined as the total volume of traffic (sum of both directions) over the year divided by 365 days. The Caltrans traffic count year is from October 1 through September 30. Traffic counting is generally performed by electronic counting instruments, moved to consistent locations throughout the state in a program of continuous traffic count sampling. The resulting counts are adjusted to reflect an estimate of annual average daily traffic by compensating for seasonal fluctuation, weekly variation, and other variables that may be present. AADT is used to present a statewide picture of traffic flow, evaluate traffic trends, compute accident rates, plan and design highways, and other purposes.

The highest AADT volume in Inyo County in 2020 (the latest year for which data was available) was observed in Bishop along US 395 at the intersection with South Street (15,800), as shown in Table 6 and Figure 7. The lowest traffic volumes occurred on SR 190 in Olancho at the junction with US 395 (160).

Table 6 presents historic AADT data for state highways in the county from 2011 through 2020. Generally, traffic volumes on US 395 in the Bishop area have increased over the past eight years; although traffic volumes have decreased slightly at a few locations over the same period, suggesting a possible change in traffic patterns. Over the same eight-year period, US 395 traffic volumes have increased near other communities such as Lone Pine, Independence, and Pine Creek Road (north of Bishop). Traffic volumes have increased in some of the recreational areas, such as SR 168 at South Lake Road, US 395 at the junction with SR 190 (providing access to Death Valley National Park), and near the Death Valley Junction at SR 127 and SR 178. Traffic volumes through the National Park on SR 190 are mixed with increases in traffic at Death Valley Junction and Furnace Creek Ranch. Traffic volumes did not increase throughout the county between 2017-2020, however, with a few exceptions. SR 168 at South Lake Road, US 395 at Big Pine, US 395 at Pine Creek Road, US 395 at South Street in Bishop, and SR 190 at Furnace Creek Road are notable exceptions.



Table 7 presents the peak month Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes on the state routes in the County between 2011 and 2020. This data is reflective of traffic activity in the peak month of the year (typically July), which is impacted to a relatively high degree by recreational traffic. Peak month traffic volumes follow a similar trend to AADT volumes. SR 190 in Death Valley National Park saw the greatest increases across the board in peak month ADT from 2011 to 2020, with the intersection with Beatty Cutoff Rd seeing an 89.5 percent increase and Death Valley Junction at SR 127 seeing a 64.7 percent increase. US 395 saw sizable increases in peak month ADT as well. The peak month data indicates an overall significant increase in recreational/tourist traffic. The average annual increase of peak month traffic volumes is greater than the average annual increase of AADT volumes on both SR 190 and US 395.




**Table 6: Inyo County Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes on State Highways  
2011 - 2020**

|                                      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  | Change: 2011 - 2020 |        |          |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--|---------------------|--------|----------|
| Highway / Counter Location           | 2011   | 2013   | 2014   | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   |  | #                   | %      | Annual % |
| US 6 at:                             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Jct. US 395                          | 3,610  | 3,550  | 3,500  | 3,250  | 3,700  | 3,800  | 3,800  | 4,000  | 3,800  |  | 190                 | 5.3%   | 0.7%     |
| Silver Canyon Rd                     | 1,900  | 2,100  | 2,100  | 2,255  | 2,400  | 2,600  | 2,600  | 2,600  | 2,600  |  | 700                 | 36.8%  | 4.6%     |
| SR 127 at:                           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Old Spanish Trail                    | 700    | 700    | 700    | 670    | 730    | 720    | 720    | 840    | -      |  | -                   | -      | -        |
| Shoshone, South Jct SR 178           | 850    | 790    | 790    | 860    | 820    | 990    | 990    | 970    | 740    |  | -110                | -12.9% | -1.6%    |
| Shoshone, North Jct SR 178           | 280    | 280    | 280    | 310    | 440    | 390    | 390    | 390    | 390    |  | 110                 | 39.3%  | 4.9%     |
| South of Stateline Rd                | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  | 1,170  |  | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Jct. SR 190                          | 590    | 580    | 630    | 660    | 730    | 730    | 730    | 900    | 700    |  | 110                 | 18.6%  | 2.3%     |
| Nevada State Line                    | 590    | 560    | 600    | 620    | 670    | 750    | 750    | 870    | 680    |  | 90                  | 15.3%  | 1.9%     |
| SR 136 at:                           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Jct. US 395                          | 540    | 540    | 610    | 710    | 770    | 730    | 730    | 650    | 430    |  | -110                | -20.4% | -2.5%    |
| Jct. SR 190                          | 430    | 430    | 490    | 530    | 580    | 520    | 520    | 530    | 280    |  | -150                | -34.9% | -4.4%    |
| SR 168 at:                           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| South Lake Rd                        | 550    | 550    | 550    | 530    | 680    | 700    | 700    | 700    | 850    |  | 300                 | 54.5%  | 6.8%     |
| Otey Road                            | 1,230  | 1,210  | 1,210  | 1,210  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  |  | -30                 | -2.4%  | -0.3%    |
| Brockman Lane                        | 6,300  | 6,250  | 6,250  | 6,330  | 6,600  | 6,700  | 6,700  | 7,100  | 6,500  |  | 200                 | 3.2%   | 0.4%     |
| Jct. US 395                          | 8,000  | 7,700  | 7,650  | 7,690  | 8,200  | 7,850  | 7,850  | 7,700  | 7,100  |  | -900                | -11.3% | -1.4%    |
| Inyo/Mono County Line                | 160    | 170    | 170    | 170    | 170    | 170    | 170    | 170    | 180    |  | 20                  | 12.5%  | 1.6%     |
| SR 178                               |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Death Valley, South Boundary         | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    | 250    |  | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Nevada State Line                    | 820    | 780    | 790    | 840    | 880    | 950    | 950    | 1,010  | 830    |  | 10                  | 1.2%   | 0.2%     |
| SR 190                               |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Olancha, Jct. US 395                 | 230    | 240    | 240    | 240    | 240    | 240    | 240    | 240    | 160    |  | -70                 | -30.4% | -3.8%    |
| Jct SR 136                           | 520    | 540    | 615    | 640    | 740    | 650    | 650    | 650    | 320    |  | -200                | -38.5% | -4.8%    |
| Stovepipe Wells                      | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    | 900    |  | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Scotty's Castle Rd                   | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    | 810    |  | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Beatty Cutoff Rd                     | 950    | 920    | 920    | 1,050  | 1,030  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,160  | 700    |  | -250                | -26.3% | -3.3%    |
| Furnace Creek Ranch                  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,200  |  | 150                 | 14.3%  | 1.8%     |
| Bad Water Rd                         | 1,000  | 1,000  | 1,270  | 1,270  | 1,270  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 870    |  | -130                | -13.0% | -1.6%    |
| Death Valley Jct, SR 127             | 850    | 860    | 905    | 980    | 1,450  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,350  | 900    |  | 50                  | 5.9%   | 0.7%     |
| US 395 at:                           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |
| Jct. SR 190                          | 5,600  | 5,500  | 5,500  | 5,800  | 6,700  | 6,950  | 6,950  | 7,100  | 6,500  |  | 900                 | 16.1%  | 2.0%     |
| Jct. SR 136                          | 6,600  | 6,500  | 6,650  | 7,030  | 7,800  | 8,000  | 8,000  | 8,000  | 7,100  |  | 500                 | 7.6%   | 0.9%     |
| Lone Pine, Whitney Portal Rd         | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,500  | 6,600  |  | 100                 | 1.5%   | 0.2%     |
| Pangborn Lane                        | 6,000  | 6,000  | 5,900  | 6,200  | 7,000  | 7,350  | 7,350  | 7,600  | 6,600  |  | 600                 | 10.0%  | 1.3%     |
| Independence, Market St              | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,250  | 6,250  | 7,300  | 7,650  | 7,650  | 7,800  | 6,650  |  | 350                 | 5.6%   | 0.7%     |
| Independence, Maintenance Station    | 6,050  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  | 6,300  |  | 250                 | 4.1%   | 0.5%     |
| Big Pine, SR 168 Northeast           | 7,800  | 7,700  | 7,700  | 7,700  | 7,700  | 9,400  | 9,400  | 9,400  | 8,200  |  | 400                 | 5.1%   | 0.6%     |
| Bishop, South Street                 | 12,650 | 12,400 | 12,400 | 12,400 | 12,400 | 12,400 | 12,400 | 15,800 | 15,800 |  | 3,150               | 24.9%  | 3.1%     |
| Bishop, SR 168 West                  | 15,200 | 14,900 | 14,800 | 15,100 | 15,600 | 15,900 | 15,900 | 15,900 | 14,550 |  | -650                | -4.3%  | -0.5%    |
| Jct. US 6                            | 13,200 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 |  | -100                | -0.8%  | -0.1%    |
| Bishop Bike Path                     | 13,200 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 | 13,100 |  | -100                | -0.8%  | -0.1%    |
| Ed Powers Rd                         | 7,350  | 7,300  | 7,350  | 7,400  | 7,800  | 7,700  | 7,700  | 9,100  | 7,900  |  | 550                 | 7.5%   | 0.9%     |
| Pine Creek Rd                        | 6,550  | 6,550  | 6,550  | 6,550  | 6,550  | 7,300  | 7,300  | 7,300  | 8,100  |  | 1,550               | 23.7%  | 3.0%     |
| Source: Caltrans Traffic Counts 2020 |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |  |                     |        |          |







**TABLE 7: Inyo County Peak Month Average Daily Traffic Volumes on State Highways  
2011 - 2020**

| Highway / Counter Location        | 2011   | 2013   | 2014   | 2015   | 2016   | 2017   | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | Change: 2011 - 2020 |        |          |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|--------|----------|
|                                   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | #                   | %      | Annual % |
| US 6 at:                          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Jct. US 395                       | 3,800  | 4,050  | 3,650  | 3,650  | 4,000  | 4,000  | 4,150  | 4,200  | 4,100  | 300                 | 7.9%   | 1.0%     |
| Silver Canyon Rd                  | 2,000  | 2,400  | 2,250  | 2,350  | 4,750  | 2,550  | 2,600  | 2,450  | 2,400  | 400                 | 20.0%  | 2.5%     |
| SR 127 at:                        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Old Spanish Trail                 | 950    | 950    | 900    | 850    | 1,300  | 1,050  | 970    | 1,050  | -      | 100                 | 10.5%  | 1.3%     |
| Shoshone, South Jct SR 178        | 1,100  | 940    | 940    | 1,050  | 1,200  | 1,250  | 1,200  | 1,350  | 1,000  | -100                | -9.1%  | -1.1%    |
| Shoshone, North Jct SR 178        | 450    | 380    | 380    | 370    | 940    | 520    | 480    | 480    | 480    | 30                  | 6.7%   | 0.8%     |
| South of Stateline Rd             | 1,500  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 1,550  | 50                  | 3.3%   | 0.4%     |
| Jct. SR 190                       | 640    | 640    | 720    | 940    | 940    | 930    | 960    | 1,050  | 1,000  | 360                 | 56.3%  | 7.0%     |
| Nevada State Line                 | 640    | 560    | 600    | 690    | 880    | 900    | 940    | 1,100  | 940    | 300                 | 46.9%  | 5.9%     |
| SR 136 at:                        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Jct. US 395                       | 800    | 880    | 1,050  | 970    | 1,150  | 1,100  | 860    | 950    | 800    | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Jct. SR 190                       | 680    | 770    | 490    | 840    | 960    | 880    | 760    | 890    | 670    | -10                 | -1.5%  | -0.2%    |
| SR 168 at:                        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| South Lake Rd                     | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,050  | 1,100  | 1,300  | 1,200  | 1,350  | 1,350  | 1,650  | 600                 | 57.1%  | 7.1%     |
| Otey Road                         | 6,800  | 6,900  | 1,600  | 1,600  | 1,600  | 1,600  | 1,600  | 1,600  | 1,600  | -5,200              | -76.5% | -9.6%    |
| Brockman Lane                     | 6,800  | 6,900  | 6,900  | 6,700  | 7,400  | 7,400  | 7,500  | 7,800  | 7,600  | 800                 | 11.8%  | 1.5%     |
| Jct. US 395                       | 8,300  | 8,200  | 8,100  | 8,100  | 12,200 | 8,400  | 8,200  | 8,200  | 8,300  | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Inyo/Mono County Line             | 270    | 290    | 290    | 290    | 290    | 290    | 290    | 290    | 240    | -30                 | -11.1% | -1.4%    |
| SR 178                            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Death Valley, South Boundary      | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 400    | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Nevada State Line                 | 820    | 1,050  | 1,000  | 970    | 1,100  | 1,050  | 1,150  | 1,300  | 1,300  | 480                 | 58.5%  | 7.3%     |
| SR 190                            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Olancho, Jct. US 395              | 230    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 170    | -60                 | -26.1% | -3.3%    |
| Jct SR 136                        | 520    | 1,000  | 900    | 960    | 1,050  | 1,000  | 1,000  | 1,050  | 770    | 250                 | 48.1%  | 6.0%     |
| Stovepipe Wells                   | 900    | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 300                 | 33.3%  | 4.2%     |
| Scotty's Castle Rd                | 810    | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 1,250  | 440                 | 54.3%  | 6.8%     |
| Beatty Cutoff Rd                  | 950    | 1,300  | 1,300  | 1,300  | 1,300  | 1,650  | 1,600  | 1,550  | 1,800  | 850                 | 89.5%  | 11.2%    |
| Furnace Creek Ranch               | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,500  | 1,800  | 300                 | 20.0%  | 2.5%     |
| Bad Water Rd                      | 1,000  | 1,200  | 1,750  | 1,750  | 1,750  | 1,800  | 1,800  | 1,800  | 1,500  | 500                 | 50.0%  | 6.3%     |
| Death Valley Jct, SR 127          | 850    | 1,250  | 1,200  | 1,200  | 2,550  | 1,500  | 1,550  | 1,600  | 1,400  | 550                 | 64.7%  | 8.1%     |
| US 395 at:                        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |
| Jct. SR 190                       | 7,300  | 7,400  | 7,500  | 8,100  | 8,800  | 8,800  | 8,800  | 9,000  | 10,200 | 2,900               | 39.7%  | 5.0%     |
| Jct. SR 136                       | 8,600  | 8,900  | 9,500  | 9,600  | 10,600 | 9,900  | 10,200 | 10,700 | 10,900 | 2,300               | 26.7%  | 3.3%     |
| Lone Pine, Whitney Portal Rd      | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 10,200 | 1,700               | 20.0%  | 2.5%     |
| Pangborn Lane                     | 7,800  | 8,000  | 8,200  | 8,600  | 9,400  | 9,400  | 9,400  | 9,700  | 10,200 | 2,400               | 30.8%  | 3.8%     |
| Independence, Market St           | 8,200  | 8,400  | 8,500  | 8,500  | 9,700  | 9,600  | 9,700  | 10,000 | 10,500 | 2,300               | 28.0%  | 3.5%     |
| Independence, Maintenance Station | 7,700  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 8,400  | 700                 | 9.1%   | 1.1%     |
| Big Pine, SR 168 Northeast        | 9,600  | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,500 | 10,800 | 10,800 | 10,800 | 12,300 | 2,700               | 28.1%  | 3.5%     |
| Bishop, South Street              | 14,900 | 14,800 | 14,800 | 14,800 | 14,800 | 14,800 | 14,800 | 18,200 | 18,200 | 3,300               | 22.1%  | 2.8%     |
| Bishop, SR 168 West               | 17,500 | 17,400 | 17,800 | 17,800 | 18,400 | 18,300 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,600 | 1,100               | 6.3%   | 0.8%     |
| Jct. US 6                         | 15,400 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | 15,300 | -100                | -0.6%  | -0.1%    |
| Bishop Bike Path                  | 15,400 | 15,300 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 15,400 | 0                   | 0.0%   | 0.0%     |
| Ed Powers Rd                      | 9,600  | 9,400  | 9,700  | 9,300  | 10,800 | 10,900 | 11,000 | 11,400 | 11,800 | 2,200               | 22.9%  | 2.9%     |
| Pine Creek Rd                     | 9,100  | 8,900  | 8,900  | 8,900  | 8,900  | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 11,100 | 2,000               | 22.0%  | 2.7%     |
| Source: Caltrans Traffic Counts   |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |                     |        |          |





Death Valley National Park tracks visitor use statistics such as traffic counts in the park. As shown, in Table 8, traffic counts collected in 2011 and 2021 demonstrate a net increase in vehicle traffic in the park, with the most significant average annual percent increase being on Big Pine Road (Death Valley Road) (69.4%). This mostly unpaved road travels from SR 168 to Big Pine and Ashford Road at the south end of the park and is advertised as a scenic off-road route. In terms of total traffic volumes, Ryan (an old mining camp southeast of Furnace Creek) and Townes Pass (on SR 190) had the greatest traffic volumes in 2021 (172,480 and 117,338, respectively).

**TABLE 8: Traffic Counts in Death Valley National Park**

| Count Location                                           | Annual Total |         | Change 2011 - 2021 |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|
|                                                          | 2011         | 2021    | Total              | Average Annual % |
| Ashford Road                                             | 18,805       | 14,661  | -4,144             | -2.2%            |
| Big Pine Road (Death Valley Rd)                          | 345          | 2,740   | 2,395              | 69.4%            |
| Ryan                                                     | 136,061      | 172,480 | 36,419             | 2.7%             |
| Townes Pass                                              | 123,665      | 117,338 | -6,327             | -0.5%            |
| Wildrose                                                 | 3,408        | 6,107   | 2,699              | 7.9%             |
| Source: NPS Visitor Use Statistics, Traffic Counts, 2022 |              |         |                    |                  |


Inyo National Forest has collected traffic data at popular trailheads. According to trailhead traffic counts conducted in 2011, the estimated ADT at the popular South Lake Trailhead is roughly 179 cars per day. Along Bishop Creek Road estimated ADT was 232 vehicles per day and 372 along Whitney Portal Road.

## Level of Service

The concept of Level of Service (LOS) is used to rate a roadway segment's traffic flow characteristics. LOS serves as an indicator of roadway performance, ranging from LOS A (best conditions) to LOS F (worst conditions), and assists in determining where roadway capacity needs to be improved. LOS of rural highways is largely determined by roadway geometry factors, such as grades, vertical and horizontal curves, and the presence of passing opportunities. In mountainous topography and particularly through canyons, roadway LOS can be relatively low, even absent substantial traffic volumes.

In general, the various levels of service are defined as follows for uninterrupted flow facilities:

- LOS A represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.
- LOS B is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort




and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.

- LOS C is in the range of stable flow but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
- LOS D represents a high-density but stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
- LOS E represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
- LOS F is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable; vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, and then be required to stop cyclically. Level of Service F is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow that causes failure.

Previously, LOS was the key concept used to measure the impacts of new developments on traffic and congestion under the California Environmental Quality Act. In 2020, Vehicle Miles Travel (VMTs) replaced LOS as the measure of project transportation impacts, as it was deemed a more appropriate assessment of GHG emissions, among other things. Despite this regulatory change, LOS is still being used as a measure of roadway performance for non-environmental impact assessments.

## Inyo County Roadway LOS

Caltrans Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs) provide current and projected future conditions of transportation routes and include both existing and future LOS estimates. Caltrans has designated a LOS "C" as the concept LOS for Inyo County state highway segments. Existing and future LOS estimates for certain state highway segments are presented in Table 9.



**TABLE 9: Inyo County State Highway Peak Hour Roadway Level of Service**

| Roadway Segment                               | Base Year <sup>(1)</sup> |          | Concept<br>LOS | Horizon Year <sup>(1)</sup> |     |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----|
|                                               | AADT                     | LOS      |                | AADT                        | LOS |
| <b>US 6</b>                                   |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| US 395 to Dixon Lane                          | 3,550                    | B        | B              | 4,900                       | B   |
| <b>SR 127</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| Jct SR 178 East to Jct SR 178 West (Shoshone) | 940                      | B        | C              | 818                         | B   |
| Jct SR 190                                    | 790                      | B        | C              | 739                         | B   |
| <b>SR 136</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| Jct US 395 to Jct. 190                        | 495                      | A        | C              | 671                         | A   |
| <b>SR 168</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| West of Bishop                                | 1,210                    | A        | C              | 1,517                       | B   |
| Meadow Lane to Sunland Drive                  | 6,300                    | A        | C              | 4,685                       | A   |
| Sunland Drive to US 395                       | 7,690                    | A        | C              | 6,258                       | A   |
| Big Pine                                      | 470                      | A        | C              | 382                         | A   |
| <b>SR 178</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| Shoshone to Nevada State Line                 | 785                      | A        | C              | 880                         | A   |
| <b>SR 190</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| Olancho to SR 136                             | 275                      | A        | C              | 410                         | A   |
| SR 136 to Death Valley Park Boundary          | 500                      | A        | C              | 820                         | A   |
| Death Valley to Borax Mill Road               | 840                      | B        | C              | 1,260                       | B   |
| Borax Mill Road to Badwater                   | 1,120                    | B        | C              | 1,600                       | C   |
| Badwater to Park Boundary                     | 1,000                    | B        | C              | 1,350                       | B   |
| Park Boundary to Death Valley Junction        | 850                      | A        | C              | 1,150                       | B   |
| <b>US 395</b>                                 |                          |          |                |                             |     |
| Kern County Line to South of Olancho          | 5,600                    | A        | C              | 6,190                       | A   |
| Olancho - Cartago                             | 5,600                    | <b>D</b> | C              | 6,190                       | A   |
| South of Lone Pine                            | 5,710                    | A        | C              | 6,300                       | A   |
| Through Lone Pine                             | 6,510                    | A        | C              | 7,190                       | A   |
| Lone Pine to Independence                     | 6,160                    | A        | C              | 6,800                       | A   |
| Through Independence                          | 6,210                    | A        | C              | 6,860                       | A   |
| Independence to Big Pine                      | 6,100                    | A        | C              | 6,740                       | A   |
| Through Big Pine                              | 6,100                    | A        | C              | 6,740                       | A   |
| Big Pine to Bishop                            | 9,420                    | A        | C              | 10,410                      | A   |
| Through Bishop                                | 12,700                   | A        | C              | 14,040                      | A   |
| Bishop to Mono County Line                    | 8,440                    | A        | C              | 9,520                       | A   |

Source: Transportation Concept Reports (TCR)

Note 1: Base Year and Horizon Year vary per TCR but are generally between 2010 and 2035 respectively.



The base year and horizon year for each highway vary, depending on when the TCR was updated but generally represent 2013 and 2033, respectively. Caltrans has not updated TCRs for Inyo County since the 2019 RTP. Given that there is no regional demand model for the County, LOS provided by TCRs represents the most current data available.

Table 9 demonstrates that the only highway section currently operating or projected to operate below the concept LOS of “C” is the Olancho – Cartago section of US 395. This area currently operates at LOS D. After construction of the proposed four-lane highway project, LOS is anticipated to improve to “A” on this roadway segment and all assessed Caltrans roadway sections will be operating above the concept LOS.

## **Traffic Volume and Level of Service Forecasts**



Table 9 also presents an overview of future traffic conditions for each state highway’s horizon year according to the TCR. The LOS forecast does not cover the entire 20-year planning period, however, it serves as the most current data available.

Future volumes on US 395 are not anticipated to increase by more than one percent annually through 2033. Traffic volumes are anticipated to decrease slightly on some state highways (SR 168 and SR 127). SR 190 in Death Valley National Park is forecast to have the largest growth in traffic over the planning period (3.2 percent increase annually from 500 to 820 near the southwestern park boundary). As such, LOS on Inyo County state highways is projected to remain at or above concept LOS “C” at the end of the horizon period (2030-2035), assuming the Olancho – Cartago four-lane project is constructed. Without project completion, LOS on that section of roadway will remain at LOS “D”.

## **County and City Roadways**

Inyo County maintains roughly 1,137 miles of roadway. Generally, traffic conditions are not congested on Inyo County Roadways as the state highways act as the primary routes of travel. The county roadway with the greatest traffic volumes (up to 2,000) is Barlow Lane which runs north/south and provides access to the Dixon-Lane Meadow Creek neighborhood, the Bishop Paiute Tribe, and a large residential area south of West Line Street in the Bishop region. Barlow Lane can also be used as a “cut-through” route to avoid traffic on US 395 in central Bishop.

The City of Bishop maintains roughly 18 miles of roadways. The most recent available traffic count data for the City of Bishop roadways from 2013 are displayed in Figure 8. As shown, the highest ADT traffic volumes were recorded on East Line Street just east of the intersection with US 395 (4,781 and 4,265). East Line Street turns into Poleta Road which provides the only paved access to the Bishop Airport. The next largest traffic volumes were recorded on Home Street near the intersection of West Line Street (4,132 and 3,700). Home Street provides access to all public schools in Bishop. The higher level of traffic on these primary roadways emphasizes the need for alternative options through Bishop, particularly to the airport, and for increased non-motorized travel safety to schools.





The City of Bishop General Plan Mobility Element (2012) identifies three opportunity areas. Opportunity areas have traffic issues that could also involve land use and business enhancements. The areas are as follows:

- Wye Road – Intersection issues complicated by the proximity of Kmart/Vons and land ownership by LADWP.
- Horace Albright Ave. (previously Park Street) – Operational issues occur at the intersection with US 395 at the commercial property, particularly during special events at the park. Two bicycle/auto and one pedestrian/auto accident have occurred here over a four-year period. Possible improvements include realigning the intersection to the north or extending Bruce Street to Main Street.
- Grove – Pine – Realigning either East and West Pine or East Pine and Grove Street to create an alternative east–west travel to Line Street would improve traffic operations. However, there are land use constraints.

## Pavement Conditions

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a measure of roadway pavement condition and ranges in scale from 0 to 100, where a new road has a PCI of 100 and a failed road of less than 10. The County of Inyo and the City of Bishop hired an outside consultant to analyze roadway pavement conditions and prioritize pavement projects. Original pavement conditions data for Inyo County and the City of Bishop were collected in 2009 by an outside consultant using the MicroPaver system. Each year following, roughly one-third of roadways have been surveyed to update the PCI for Inyo County. Since 2019, Inyo County has maintained the Pavement Management Program (PMP) in-house. In 2022, the County performed the first complete update of the total pavement network. A detailed list of roadway PCI for Inyo County and the City of Bishop can be found in Appendix D. An overview of the most recent PCI report is included here.

In 2022, the average PCI of Inyo County was 58.8 (fair). This represents a 3.2-point decrease from 2017. In 2022, 34 percent of Inyo County roadways had a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 11.9 percent had a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed). The proportion of roadways in the good to excellent category has slightly decreased over the past five years. The proportion of roadways in the “poor to failed” category has also increased slightly, indicating that there is insufficient funding for roadway rehabilitation and maintenance projects in Inyo County.

The 2021 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment reports that the average weighted PCI in Inyo County in 2020 also fell within the “fair” range.

The City of Bishop’s Pavement Management Program was also originally developed in 2009 but completely updated in 2013 and 2016 by an outside consultant. In 2022, which represents the most recent PCI data available, the City’s Pavement Management Program (PMP) was maintained in-house by Inyo County for the first time. The average PCI for City of Bishop roadways in 2022 was 52.5, which falls into the “poor” category. This represents a 5.5 percent decrease since 2016 and a 3.5 percent decrease





since 2019. In 2022, 24 percent of City roadways had a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 10 percent of roadways had a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed). This represents a significant 8.5 percent increase in the roadways rated very poor to failed since 2016. The sharp decrease in overall PCI and the significant increase in very poor to failed roadways points to a lack of sufficient funding for roadway maintenance and repair within the City of Bishop.

The 2021 District 9 Caltrans Adaptation Priorities Report identifies 49 roadway segments in Inyo County that are maintained by Caltrans and are vulnerable to future temperature changes due to climate change that can affect pavement performance. According to the report, 15 of the 18 Priority 1 roadway segments are in Inyo County, with US 395 having the highest priority score due to high traffic volume.

## Vehicle-Miles of Travel

The number of Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMTs) is a performance measure typically estimated using travel demand models for a specific region. In rural counties, such as Inyo County, which do not have their own travel demand models, VMT measurement can be challenging but can still be approximated.



In a 2022 analysis done for Inyo County as part of the most recent Housing Element update, the average daily VMT in Inyo County was estimated to be 1.004 million in total or 36.4 per service population (residents plus persons employed in the county) in 2020. This figure is projected to increase to 39.5 by 2040. The most recent California Public Road Data (2019) provides a similar overall estimate for the County, indicating that a total of 1.775 million daily vehicle-miles were traveled on roadways in Inyo County (including the City of Bishop, Inyo County, State Highways, and US Forest Service roads).

According to the US Energy Information Administration 2022 Annual Energy Outlook, VMT is estimated to increase 26 percent between 2019 and 2050 throughout the US. Given the projected decline in population for the next 20 years, it is reasonable to expect that VMT in Inyo County will increase at a slower rate than the nationwide average and more likely be dependent on the level of visitor traffic.

## Zero-Emission Vehicles

The number of electric vehicles and low-emission and zero-emission vehicles is expected to increase significantly during the 20-year planning period. There are currently 15 public electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in Inyo County, 12 of which are universal and not proprietary (US Department of Energy). Figure 9 shows that EV charging stations are predominantly along the US 395 corridor and two are inside Death Valley National Park. There is no hydrogen fueling infrastructure in Inyo County. The 2021 National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program provides a funding framework for developing designated Alternative Fuel Corridors, a network of EV charging stations throughout the US that ensures reliable and equitable access to EV charging facilities. The 2022 California Deployment Plan for the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program identified US 395 as an Alternative Fuel Corridor. Implementation of state and federal Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) policies and the related increase in the number of EVs and ZEVs will increase the demand for EV charging facilities in Inyo County.







Regulatory standards for federally funded EV charging infrastructure were finalized in 2023 and are outlined in the Build America, Buy America Act. These regulations, in part, establish standards for charger reliability and accepted methods of payment and mandate the inclusion of Combined Charging System (CCS) connectors on proprietary chargers.

The California Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) regulation (2019) requires that 25% of new vehicles purchased by the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) are ZEV in 2026 and 100% starting in 2029. The ICT also requires ESTA to develop and submit a Zero-Emission Bus Rollout Plan to the California Air Resources Board. The Eastern Sierra Transit Authority Electrification Feasibility Study is currently underway and is projected to be completed in 2023.

Providing and expanding access to EV charging facilities and ZEV infrastructure on state highways and local roadways alike throughout Inyo County is a priority.

## **Traffic Collisions**

Automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian accident data was reviewed from California Highway Patrol's Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) and Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) databases. Results are displayed graphically in Figures 10 and 11. As shown in Figure 10, multiple fatal crashes occurred along US 395 near Olancho/Cartago southwards, on SR 190 in Death Valley, and in the Shoshone/Tecopa area between 2018-2020. The prevalence of fatalities in these corridors was also true for 2016-2017. The US 395 corridor had the greatest concentration of injury crashes overall. High concentrations of severe injury crashes occurred east of Tecopa and north of Stovepipe Wells on Scotty's Castle Road. The US 395 corridor has had a history of accidents, particularly in the section that remains a two-lane highway. Caltrans produced an informative graphic demonstrating the high number of accidents over ten years on the US 395 two-lane highway section near the intersection of SR 190 in Olancho. This graphic is presented as Appendix E. The Olancho-Cartago 4-Lane Project aims to reduce accidents in this section by transitioning the highway to four lanes.

Figure 11 shows injury crashes in the Bishop area from 2018 through 2020.

According to SWITRS data, in Inyo County, there were 318 injury crashes between 2018-2020. 60 injury crashes involved a motorcycle, nine that involved a bicycle, and four that involved a pedestrian. There were no fatality crashes that involved motorcycles, bicycles, or pedestrians in Inyo County during this time period. In Inyo County, there were 0.17 injury collisions per million annual vehicle miles traveled in 2019 and 0.01 fatalities per million annual vehicle miles traveled. This compares to .57 injury collisions per million annual vehicle miles traveled and 0.1 fatalities per million annual vehicle miles traveled statewide in 2019.

## ***Inyo County Local Roadway Safety Plan***

The 2022 Inyo County Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) analyzed traffic collision data for the period between 2011 and 2020 and found that almost half of all traffic collisions in unincorporated Inyo County result from improper turning (47 percent), followed by unsafe speed (14 percent), and driving under the influence (13 percent). In the City of Bishop, traffic collisions result from improper turning (23 percent), unsafe starting or backing (19 percent), and auto right-of-way conflicts (16 percent).









Figure 10  
Injury Crashes in Inyo County  
2018-2020







The LRSP found that the following roadway segments throughout the County had a concentrated crash history over the study period:

- Trona Wildrose Road, from the Kern County Line to Panamint Valley Road
- Panamint Valley Road, from Trona Wildrose Road to SR 190
- Old Spanish Trail Highway, over Emigrant Pass
- Daylight Pass Road, over Daylight Pass (NOT County maintained)
- Scotty's Castle Road, from SR 190 to Ubehebe Crater Road (NOT County maintained)
- Whitney Portal Road, from US 395 to a point 1.9 miles to the west.
- East Line Street / Poleta Road from US 395 to a point 4.8 miles to the east (at the start of the north-south alignment).

### ***Speed Reduction***

Speeding is a top safety concern among the general public and County officials as it creates or exacerbates conflicts between high-speed traffic on primary roadways and slow-moving local traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians. On US 395, in particular, heavy traffic volumes traveling at high rates of speed pass through community centers. There is widespread concern that traffic does not observe posted speed limits and speeding creates significant safety concerns. The County of Inyo is considering conducting traffic studies in strategic locations and will continue to discuss concerns around speeding with Caltrans and CHP during the planning period.

### **Bridges**

Inyo County has 67 bridges in total (Federal Highway Administration, 2022), 33 of which are owned by the County of Inyo. A bridge rating considers the condition of the deck, superstructure, substructure, and culvert and falls into one of three categories: good, fair, or poor. As of 2022, 43 were rated "good", 22 were rated "fair", and 2 were rated "poor".

To qualify for federal funding assistance through the Highway Bridge Program (HBP), a bridge must have a sufficiency rating of 80 or below. A bridge's sufficiency rating is determined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) and considers structural condition and level of service. As of 2018, 23 of the bridges in Inyo County had a rating of 80 or below. Bell Access Road at Oak Creek and Cottonwood Gates at the Los Angeles Aqueduct account for the two bridges rated poor in the National Bridge Inventory. None of the State Routes and US Highways are rated poor, 7 are rated fair, and 23 are rated good.

Of the bridges owned by Inyo County, 14 have a sufficiency rating below 80 in 2023. The County-owned bridges with sufficiency ratings of 50 or below are:

- Bell Access Road at Oak Creek – 38.7
- Whitney Portal Road at Lone Pine Creek – 49.5
- Whitney Portal Road at Los Angeles Aqueduct – 55.2
- Walker Creek Road at Los Angeles Aqueduct – 50.0





## Roadway Easements

Roadway easements are common throughout Inyo County that enable the County of Inyo to maintain and improve roads that are owned by another state or federal land management agency, with agreements with LADWP being the most common. Although easements have proven to be mutually beneficial in Inyo County, land management under an easement can be especially complicated and requires extensive interagency collaboration. Projects being conducted within an easement can have extended time requirements for the permitting phase.

The County of Inyo is actively engaging with the USFS as part of a multi-agency effort to improve road and recreational access. ESCOG is working to secure grant funding for trailhead infrastructure improvements.

## SUMMARY OF ROADWAY AND BRIDGE NEEDS

### State Highways

The completion of the US 395 Olancha-Cartago 4-lane Project is the top priority project for state highways in the region. The high level of accidents over the past ten years due to unsafe passing confirms the need to widen US 395 in the Olancha to Cartago area from two to four lanes. This is the only section of the state highway that does not currently meet the Caltrans concept LOS “C”.

The increased frequency of flooding on state highways has highlighted the need for improvements that lead to better drainage and improved resilience of roadways to flood impacts.

### Inyo County

Pavement Management Program reports indicate that 11.9 percent of Inyo County Roadways were in very poor condition or failing in 2022. The backlog of roadway maintenance is a high-priority issue. A significant number of roadways in the County are in such a condition where complete reconstruction is required. The 2021 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment calculates the 10-year pavement needs in Inyo County at \$353 million. County roads serve as part of a regional travel network and provide access to critical facilities and a variety of recreational destinations on National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management land. Safety improvements on high-speed rural roads are a significant need.

In Inyo County, connectivity between communities and recreational opportunities is also an important need. Hiking, fishing, backpacking, rock climbing, skiing, etc. are the primary draws to Inyo County. As visitor numbers increase with growing nearby populations, it will become increasingly important to maintain safe county roadway connections between the communities and trailheads.

According to survey results, there is widespread community support for the maintenance and repair of existing streets and roads. The general public is also highly concerned about crosswalk safety and speeding through the communities along the US 395 corridor (Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, and Bishop) and is supportive of expanding pedestrian and bicycle facilities.



## Southern Inyo County

The state highways and county roads serve to connect many small communities, with the US 395 corridor to the west, and the Greater Las Vegas metropolitan area to the Southeast. Commute patterns and public input show that these roadways serve as a lifeline for residents to get to work, school, and everyday necessities. These roads are also used by public transit services, such as ESTA buses, school buses, and mobile healthcare services. Lastly, this roadway system is used by visitors to the region, providing economic benefits. It is important that these roadways, covering a large geographic area, are maintained and improved.

In the Shoshone and Tecopa area, vehicle collision data from the California Highway Patrol's SWITRS and TIMS databases show a concentration of severe injury accidents and two fatalities between 2018-2020, shown in Figure 12. There were five severe injury crashes on Old Spanish Highway between SR 127 and the Nevada State border and one on SR 127 between Old Spanish Highway and Shoshone. Both fatalities occurred in proximity to Tecopa and Shoshone on SR 127 and SR 178, respectively.

Including Death Valley Junction, the Southeast corner of the County from the Nevada State border to Badwater Road had 20 severe injury accidents and four fatalities between 2018 and 2020 (Figure 12).

## Bishop Area

Pavement Management Program reports indicate that 10 percent of the City of Bishop Roadways were in very poor condition or failing in 2022 and 50 percent were in poor condition, making roadway rehabilitation and maintenance a high-priority issue. Several proposed projects included in the Action Element aim to address needed repair and rehabilitation on Bishop roadways.


Another pertinent issue is the lack of connectivity. The Bishop roadway network includes many dead-end streets or streets that are not continuous across US 395. Therefore, a significant amount of local traffic travels on US 395. Traffic congestion could be reduced and overall safety on US 395 could be increased if there were continuous alternatives to US 395. Additionally, very few streets are continuous in the east-west direction across US 395. The City of Bishop General Plan Mobility Element 2012 update identifies several potential future local streets and opportunity corridors. An opportunity corridor is a route that is of strategic importance in terms of connectivity but there are currently right-of-way and other constraints. These future streets and opportunity corridors are only conceptual at this time.

## Tribal Roadway Issues/Needs

Tribal transportation needs have been well documented through various transportation planning efforts such as RTP updates and the Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan. These needs and issues are summarized below.

- Bishop Paiute Tribe – Concerning roadways, the reservation lacks connectivity. Dead-end streets pose turnaround challenges for the ESTA DAR. The Tribe is proposing to extend Winuba Lane to connect better to the state highways. The reservation also identifies a need for more sidewalks, bike lanes, and off-street parking.







- Big Pine Paiute Tribe – Speeding is an issue throughout the reservation. There is also a need for more formal roads. The intersection of US 395 and Butcher Lane, where a new travel center is planned, needs improvements as well as the intersection of US 395 and Sepsey Lane, which is not an authorized intersection.
- Fort Independence – There is a need for improvements at the US 395 and Miller Lane intersection and for a safe way to cross US 395. A grade-separated under or overpass has been discussed.
- Lone Pine Reservation – Vehicles use Zucco Road as a shortcut to the landfill. There is a need for a left-turn pocket off of US 395 southbound onto Teya Road.

## Death Valley National Park

The lack of a suitable shoulder along SR 190 in the park creates a safety concern as a high number of cyclists utilize this road for touring and residents utilize it to access employment and services by foot and bicycle in and around Furnace Creek, often after dark. Park officials note that residents of Cow Creek would like to be able to bike to Furnace Creek. Another concern is the conflict between vehicle and freight traffic and athletic events, such as the Death Valley Marathon and Badwater 135, when SR 190 sees significantly heightened non-motorized use for special events. North Highway, Beatty Cutoff Road, Mud Canyon Road, and Badwater Road also see heightened bicycle traffic during annual sanctioned events within the Park.

National Park staff have indicated there appears to be an increase in the number of truck accidents on SR 190 near Townes Pass. A fair amount of through truck traffic occurs in the corridor but they must contend with sharp downhill curves over two mountain passes. Truck brake failure can lead to serious accidents.

Flooding is also a major concern for SR 190 and roadways in Death Valley National Park. The closure of SR 190 significantly impacts mobility for residents, tourists, and freight.

Transportation needs for SR 190 are drainage improvements, curve realignments, shoulder widening, scenic pullouts, and EV charging facilities. DVNP staff identified a need for more visitor-use facilities in the park, such as restrooms, rest areas, and parking areas. Long lines and traffic congestion tend to occur at the few restroom facilities in the park.

## Inyo County Local Roadway Safety Plan

The 2022 LRSP provides recommendations for high-priority roadway improvements throughout the County to improve roadway safety cost-effectively. The following recommendations were based on extensive data analysis and public input:

- Old Spanish Trail Highway – Flashing Bench Advance Curve Warning and Chevron signs at 10 separate sharp curves in the Emigrant Pass Area.
- Panamint Valley Road/Trona-Wildrose Road – Edge line striping between SR 190 and San Bernardino County Line.



- East Line Street/Poleta Road – Edge line striping in Bishop, speed feedback signs at strategic locations, neckdown.
- Poleta Road/Airport Road study – Detailed study of Poleta Road/Airport Road to identify safety-related intersection improvements.

## Bridges

As identified, 23 bridges have a sufficiency rating of 80 or less, which makes these facilities eligible for federal funding. Replacement and continued maintenance of Inyo County and City of Bishop bridges are essential to the safety of the regional transportation system. The East Line Street Bridge is a top priority for the City of Bishop as this facility is 40 years old, will reach the end of its useful life in less than 5 years, and does not meet seismic standards. This project is currently in the environmental and design phase and has a planned completion date in 2024.

The 2021 District 9 Caltrans Adaptation Priorities Report identifies 13 bridges in Inyo County that are maintained by Caltrans and are particularly vulnerable to future flooding associated with climate change. Three bridges in Inyo County rank as Priority 1 due to a combination of past flood impacts, topographic exposure, high traffic volumes, and travel impacts if damaged: Lower McNally Canal on US 6, Cottonwood Creek, and Five Mile Canyon on 395 Northbound.

## TRANSIT SERVICES

Public transit services provide mobility to Inyo County residents, including access to important medical, recreational, social, educational, and economic services and opportunities, many of which require travel outside of the County. Providing effective and efficient public transit in Inyo County to meet these needs is a challenge due to a low population density, rugged geography, and limited funding. A discussion of public transit operators in Inyo County follows.

### Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA)

ESTA was formed through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) between Inyo County, Mono County, the City of Bishop, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes in 2006. Public transit service consists of a variety of demand-response, fixed route, deviated fixed route, and intercity connections to multiple communities in both Inyo and Mono Counties, as well as connection routes to intercity transportation services in urban areas, such as Reno and Carson City, Nevada. The service is operated out of facilities in Bishop, Mammoth Lakes, Lone Pine, Walker, and Tecopa. Maintenance is contracted with outside vendors throughout the region. The services are described below and displayed graphically in Figure 13.

### Intercity Routes

- Lone Pine to Reno/Sparks (395 North) – ESTA provides connections to the national intercity bus network and the international airport in Reno, Nevada with one round trip between Lone Pine and Reno, Monday through Saturday. Communities on US 395 served along the way include Independence, Big Pine, Bishop, Crowley Lake, Mammoth, Lee Vining, Bridgeport,







Figure 13  
ESTA Transit Services and Activity Centers





- Walker, Coleville, Gardnerville, and Carson City. Service is also available to Coleville, Aberdeen, Tom's Place, and June Lake with a reservation 24 hours prior.
- Mammoth Lakes to Lancaster (395 South) – Intercity connections to the Metrolink station in Lancaster (which provides service to the Los Angeles metro area) are provided Monday through Friday. This route serves the communities of Mammoth Lakes, Crowley Lake, Bishop, Big Pine, Independence, Lone Pine, Inyokern, Mojave, and Lancaster. Service is also available to Coso Junction, Olancho, Pearsonville, Aberdeen, and Tom's Place with a reservation 24 hours prior.

### ***Town to Town Routes***

- Mammoth Express – This route operates four round trips between Bishop and Mammoth Lakes Monday through Friday and one round trip on Saturday and Sunday. Schedules are designed to accommodate morning and evening commuters plus weekday mid-day round trips. Stops are also made in Tom's Place, Crowley Lake, and the Bishop Airport.
- Lone Pine Express – This route travels between Lone Pine and Bishop four times a day Monday through Friday. Schedules are designed to accommodate commuters living in Bishop and working at county offices in Independence as well as southern Inyo County residents working in Bishop. Mid-day runs allow flexibility for commuters and passengers in need of social, medical, shopping, and lifeline services. This route stops at Independence, Big Pine, and the Bishop Airport. Stops are available in Aberdeen and Wilkerson with 24-hour notice.
- Benton – Bishop – Lifeline service is provided along SR 6 on Tuesdays and Fridays with a stop in Hamill Valley. Service is also available to Chalfant with a reservation 24 hours prior.
- Walker – Mammoth Lakes – This service operates on Tuesdays by reservation only.
- Bridgeport – Carson City – This route operates on Wednesdays, running between Bridgeport and Carson City, with stops in Walker, Gardnerville, and Coleville. This route requires a reservation 24 hours prior.

### ***Dial-A-Ride Services***

- Lone Pine DAR – General public DAR service is provided in Lone Pine between 7:30 AM and 3:30 PM Monday through Friday. Service to and from the Keeler area is available on Tuesdays between 8:00 AM and 3:00 PM, but trips must be scheduled the Monday prior.
- Mammoth Lakes DAR – General public DAR service is available Monday through Friday between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM. ADA Complementary Paratransit service is available outside these hours when a fixed route is operating.
- Walker Area DAR – General public DAR service is provided in the Walker, Coleville, Topaz, and Holbrook Junction areas Monday through Friday between 8:00 AM and 4:00 PM. Service to Gardnerville is available on Wednesday.



- Bishop DAR - General public DAR service is available from 7:00 AM to 6:30 PM Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 2:00 AM on Friday, 8:30 AM to 2:00 AM on Saturday, and 8:00 AM to 1:00 PM on Sunday. During the daytime hours, boarding checkpoints have been established at various locations and times. Passengers boarding at checkpoints receive a \$1 discount on the fare.
- In total, all ESTA services carried over 1.1 million one-way passenger trips in FY 2018-19. ESTA operated a total of 944,357 vehicle miles and 58,340 vehicle hours. As of 2022, the ESTA vehicle fleet included 54 vehicles, including the Reds Meadow Shuttles and vehicles owned by the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

### **Inyo-Mono Association for the Handicapped (IMAH)**

IMAH provides a group of programs and services for adults aged 18 and older who are developmentally disabled and live in Inyo and Mono Counties. IMAH provides transportation for clients to and from programs, as well as to work. IMAH operates a fleet of ten vehicles. Three of the vehicles were purchased with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds and the majority of them are wheelchair accessible. Most IMAH clients live in Mammoth, Benton, and Lone Pine and require transportation to the IMAH center in Bishop. IMAH operates roughly 650 miles per day for a total operating cost of around \$130,000 per year.

### **Toiyabe Indian Health Project**

The Toiyabe Indian Health Project is a consortium of seven federally recognized tribes and two Indian communities that provides a variety of healthcare services, including dialysis, preventative health, mental health, and dental care. There are three clinics located in the region: Bishop Clinic, Lone Pine Clinic, and Bridgeport Clinic, plus a Dialysis Center located in Bishop. Some transportation is provided for tribal members without access to a vehicle for medical appointments and dialysis.

### **Eastern Sierra Area Agency for the Aging (ESAAA)**

In Inyo County, ESAAA provides a variety of services for older adults aged 60 and up in both Inyo and Mono Counties. Inyo County Health and Human Services administers several programs including an Assisted Transportation and Transportation Program. This program provides bus passes for seniors and rides to individuals who are physically or logistically unable to use regular public transportation to access essential services such as medical appointments, grocery shopping, pharmacies, and daycare. These individuals can get assistance from the driver to find out-of-town medical facilities, purchase and carry groceries into the house, enter and exit the vehicle, etc. Staff provide long-distance medical trips as far as Reno and Lancaster, as well as local regularly scheduled errand/shopping trips. ESAAA Site Coordinators assess individuals, plan trips and maintain records. In FY 17/18, roughly 7,400 one-way trips were provided. In addition to providing transportation, Inyo County HHS (ESAAA) spends roughly \$12,000 on bus passes each year for clients. Generally, clients travel on the Lone Pine to Bishop route or use local DAR services in Lone Pine and Bishop.



## Big Pine Education Center

The Big Pine Education Center provides support services for youth including academic support for K-12 students; workshops on family formation and “out of wedlock” pregnancy; and transportation for youth sporting activities in Bishop. The program uses one 12 – 15 passenger van to transport students to Bishop Park and the Barlow Gym.

## Northern Inyo Hospital CAREshuttle

Northern Inyo Healthcare District offers non-emergency medical transportation to/from medical appointments when ESTA or other transportation cannot be found. There is no cost to use this service and the CAREshuttle offers door-to-door service within a 60-mile radius of the city of Bishop, reaching from Mammoth Lakes to Lone Pine. The CAREshuttle is also transporting residents in Goldfield and Tonopah, NV who are seeking care at the District. The CAREshuttle uses wheelchair-accessible and passenger vans and is partially supported by volunteer drivers. Since its start in 2016, the shuttle has made an estimated 8,000 trips totaling 250,000 miles, with an average of around 200 transports a month.

## Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Strategies

The Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2022) identified a variety of transit needs for older adults, low-income residents, and individuals with disabilities. High-priority strategies to address these needs which relate to capital improvements include:

- Consider acquiring a public transit vehicle to be shared among all human resource agencies - To ensure safety and continued mobility for residents, vehicles used for public transport should be replaced according to the FTA useful life guidelines. Operating costs increase significantly for vehicles that are operated beyond the recommended life span. Most human service agencies that provide transportation for clients cannot share their current vehicles due to insurance or other requirements; however, if a new vehicle is purchased through a joint grant, then the additional vehicle could be shared. The shared vehicle could be used as a primary or backup vehicle depending on the level of use. A shared vehicle would limit duplication of resources while meeting capital needs for the region.
- Construct a shared transit operations and maintenance facility - Shared transit operations and maintenance facilities, particularly in Bishop and Mammoth have been identified as beneficial capital investments that could be shared between various agencies to reduce overall vehicle storage and maintenance costs of the region’s transit fleet. A shared transit facility will provide a safe and secure location for vehicle storage and staging and would provide an opportunity to increase efficiency by performing vehicle maintenance in-house. Both Yosemite Area Regional Transit (YARTS) and IMAH indicated an interest in sharing a new vehicle maintenance facility with ESTA.





## Public Transit Ridership Projections

Although the total Inyo County population is expected to decrease from 2020 to 2045, the population will age over the current twenty-year planning period. Table 3 above presents the population forecast by age group from the CA Department of Finance. From 2025 to 2045, the percentage of the Inyo County population that is age 65 and older is expected to increase from 29.8 to 34.7 percent. The percentage of the total population that is aged 85 and older (those most likely to not drive) is expected to increase from 3.5 to 9.3 percent. In addition to increased transit demand from elderly residents, there also may be increased demand for public transit to Inyo County's many recreational destinations if visitor numbers continue to increase.

## ESTA Short Range Transit Plan Elements

Service plan elements in the 2022 ESTA Short Range Transit Plan and Coordinated Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan included:

- Increasing 395 service between Bishop and Reno to year-round 7 days a week
- Increasing 395 service between Bishop and Lancaster to 7 days a week in the summer
- Providing weekend Mammoth Express service
- Starting the Lone Pine Express service 10 minutes earlier in the morning
- Eliminating Bridgeport to Carson City service
- Offering Walker to Mammoth Lakes DAR and reducing Walker DAR to 2 days a week
- Enhance Mammoth Lakes Summer and Winter Evening Service
- Bishop Microtransit service
- Earlier Saturday service for Bishop DAR
- The plan identified additional transit service improvements to be considered over the longer term:
  - Weekend US 395 Reno and Lancaster service in additional seasons
  - Expand Mammoth services, particularly in the off-season
  - Additional capital improvements identified:
    - Purchase of over-the-road coaches for the US 395 service
    - Purchase of larger vehicles and trollies for Mammoth Lakes Purple Route, Lakes Basin, and Night trolley services
    - Development of a transit center in Mammoth Lakes
    - Improvement of key bus stops and the Bishop Transit Operations Facility
    - On-going fleet replacement



## Transit Capital Needs and Issues

In terms of regional transportation capital improvement projects, public input during the 2022 ESTA Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) planning process identified the need for improved shelters at bus stops. A safe and complete network of sidewalks and bicycle paths is also important for first-mile/last-mile connectivity. Public input and planning efforts as a part of the SRTP also indicated a long-term need for a public transit maintenance facility in Bishop at the Bishop Airport and a regional public transit hub. The Town of Mammoth Lakes is currently in the planning phase of building a regional mobility hub in Mammoth Lakes that would serve ESTA.

The ESTA SRTP states that ESTA plans to replace 33 fleet vehicles by 2027, however, the remaining fleet vehicles are aging and will need to be replaced. Additionally, the California Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) regulation (2019) requires that 25% of new vehicles purchased by ESTA are ZEV in 2026 and 100% starting in 2029. In addition to purchasing more expensive electric vehicles, the infrastructure to support an electric vehicle fleet will be required over the planning period. This will include charging stations at the yard as well as along the routes, as ESTA operates high-mileage routes. One benefit of fleet electrification will be decreased maintenance.

Another factor that will further increase the need for public transit is the 2021 upgrade of the Bishop Airport to accommodate commercial flights. This may increase the demand for public transit trips from Bishop to the resort town of Mammoth Lakes and, potentially, to Death Valley National Park. Even as the airport increases its connection to public transit, there is concern that coach buses, in particular, leaving the Bishop Airport cannot turn onto US 395 at East Line Street and are using the nearby neighborhood streets instead. Unintended higher traffic volumes, particularly of large buses, highlight the continued need for complete pedestrian and bike corridors in and around Bishop.

## Tribal Transit Needs

On the Bishop Paiute Reservation, a relatively high number of residents do not possess a driver's license and therefore are reliant on public transit and non-motorized travel. Previous studies have indicated a need for bus shelters at common pick-up/drop-off locations on the reservation. The Big Pine Paiute Tribe recently secured grant funding through the Clean Mobility Options voucher program for the installation of two bus shelters as well as EV charging stations and an EV transit shuttle bus. The bus stops will be integrated into an existing ESTA transit route. Previous planning efforts have identified that residents of Lone Pine would like to see increased public transit service and residents of Fort Independence would like public transit available for students attending after-school programs.

## NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES

Bicycle and pedestrian facility needs have been well documented in Inyo County and community outreach conducted as part of this planning effort shows widespread strong support for the expansion of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the County. The Inyo County Active Transportation Plan (2015) included an update to the Inyo County Collaborative Bikeway Plan. The Bishop Paiute Tribe updated their Transit and Transportation Improvements Plan in 2013 which also identifies improvements



needed for walking and bicycling. Public input for this RTP update emphasized the need for non-motorized facility improvements. The non-motorized facility needs to encompass a wide variety of transportation improvements designed to provide safety and greater mobility for bicyclists, pedestrians, skateboards, etc. For pedestrians, this includes sidewalks, crosswalks, push-button signals, and curb ramps.

Bicycle facilities are separated into four categories:

- Class I (Bike Path) – Provides a completely separated right-of-way for bicyclists and pedestrians with cross flow by vehicles minimized.
- Class II (Bike Lane) – Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- Class III (Bike Route) – A signed route along a street or highway that provides a shared use with other vehicles.
- Class IV (Separated Bikeway) – A bikeway separated from vehicles using grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible barriers, or on-street parking.

Smaller projects such as bike racks, signage, and education programs are also considered non-motorized transportation improvements.

Existing non-motorized facilities in the City of Bishop (Figure 14) and Inyo County consist of the following:

### ***Bishop Area***

#### **Class I**

- Sierra St. Path - 0.4 miles from the end of Sierra Street northward to US 395.
- South Barlow Lane - 0.5 miles south of SR 168 along Barlow Lane.
- Seibu to School Bike Path – 0.26 miles from the west end of Keough Street to the Bishop Paiute Reservation and Bishop Elementary School.
- Pine to Park Path – Connects Pine Street to City Park, Hanby, and Spruce.

#### **Class II or III**

- Hanby Avenue – 0.2 miles between Spruce Street and Pine Street.
- Spruce Street – 0.3 miles between East Yaney Street and Hanby Avenue.
- North Barlow Lane and Saniger Lane run 0.9 miles from US 395 north to Juniper Street.
- SR 168 - 2.8 miles between Home Street and Red Hill Road.
- US 395 – 2.7 miles between Elm Street (southbound), City Park (northbound) and Brockman Lane.
- Sunland Drive from US 395 to SR 168.
- Ed Powers Road from US 395 to SR 168.





Figure 14  
Bishop Area Existing Non-motorized Facilities





## ***Wilkerson***

- Class II or III facility follows Gerkin Road between Sunland Drive and Sierra Bonita Street.

## ***Death Valley***

- Class I facility - 1.3 miles along SR 190 from the Furnace Creek Visitor Center to Harmony Borax Works.

## ***Tecopa***

- Class II or III – Tecopa Hot Springs Road (2.7 miles) from Old Spanish Trail Highway to Tecopa Hot Springs Resort.

Sidewalks are generally limited to those streets within a block of US 395 and along US 395 through the center of Inyo County communities. As shown in Figure 14, the City of Bishop has constructed sidewalks along many of the streets within the incorporated portion of Bishop. The City of Bishop recently completed the Spruce, Yaney, Hanby Sidewalk project, which utilized an Active Transportation Program grant to extend sidewalks, improve pedestrian facilities, and extend the class II bike path in the area of Spruce Street and Hanby Avenue in and adjacent to the City Park. The City of Bishop is currently in the design phase for the Downtown Bishop PARKways Green Alley Design - Whitney Alley project, which will include the development of pedestrian facilities and green space in the heart of downtown. The recently completed Seibu to School Path Project provides a safe connection for pedestrians and bicyclists between the Bishop Paiute Tribal Land, Bishop Elementary School, and previously existing Keough Street sidewalks. There is also an extensive network of sidewalks in the Meadow Creek subdivision. Crosswalks exist along US 395 in the communities of Bishop, Lone Pine, Big Pine, and Independence.


Cycling for recreational and utilitarian purposes is common on many Inyo County state highways and local roadways, particularly in the Round Valley area, Millpond area, and Bishop. Several bicycle and foot races occur annually on Inyo County roadways, significantly increasing non-motorized traffic on county roadways. Additionally, US Bicycle Route 85 (USBR85), which would pass through Inyo County on county-maintained roadways, is currently under development and is anticipated to become an official route in the US Bicycle Route System during the planning period. This official designation may increase bicycle traffic along the route.



## **Bicycle/Pedestrian Related Crashes**

Figure 15 displays bicycle and pedestrian injury crashes in Inyo County between 2016 and 2020. Although the vast majority of crashes have been in the Bishop area, bicycle crashes have occurred east of Shoshone and east of Big Pine. Pedestrian crashes outside of Bishop occurred in Shoshone and Big Pine.

Figure 16 displays bicycle and pedestrian injury crashes in the Bishop area from 2016 to 2020. These accidents are generally focused on the US 395 and SR 168 corridors.











## Projections of Bicycle/Pedestrian Activities

It is difficult to project demand for bicycle facilities in rural areas as there is little existing survey data available. Demand for future bicycle facilities was projected in the Inyo County Active Transportation Plan based on census data and bicycle facility studies conducted across the country. The 2021 American Community Survey identifies the following travel-to-work mode statistics:

- Inyo County – Bicycle (4.1%), walk (5.9%)
- City of Bishop – Bicycle (10.7%), walk (9.7%)

Applying these proportions to the estimated 2017 employed residents equates to roughly 177,320 annual bicycle commute trips and 249,600 annual walk commute trips in Inyo County as a whole. The Inyo County Active Transportation Plan estimates that with full plan implementation, bicycle mode share will increase by 50 percent and the walk mode share will increase by 15.0 percent. This would increase annual bicycle commute trips to 265,980 and annual walk commute trips to 287,040 for Inyo County as a whole. It is also important to note that Census data only tracks travel to work trips. With a more continuous non-motorized network, Inyo County residents are more likely to walk or bike to school, for recreation, everyday errands, or social engagements.

## Non-Motorized Facility Needs


Due to the high proportion of land owned by public agencies, Inyo County communities are rather compact, lending the communities to being “walkable” or “bikeable” communities.

The Caltrans District 9 Active Transportation Plan (2021) identifies sections of state highways that have pedestrian trip potential due to proximity to town centers. US 395 through Bishop, US 6 north of Wye Rd, and SR 168 from US 395 west to Shepard Road all have medium pedestrian trip potential and US 395 through Big Pine has medium and high potential. This plan includes widespread public and agency-identified needs related to cycling and walking infrastructure throughout Inyo County.

The Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed Use Overlay (2022) identifies the potential that the City of Bishop has to develop and promote a walkable and bikeable downtown, due in part to its already compact nature and public support.

This Bishop-specific plan, along with the Inyo County Collaborative Bicycle Plan, Inyo County Active Transportation Plan, Tribal Transportation Plans, and various other public input processes have identified obstacles and needs for non-motorized travel safety and continuity. These issues are summarized below.

- Pavement conditions – Poor pavement conditions, particularly near the shoulders, pose safety issues for cyclists and increase the danger of vehicle/cyclist collisions.
- Inadequate roadway shoulders – As in most rural areas with two-lane highways and roads, the shoulder is not always wide enough for bicycle travel without requiring passing vehicles to cross the double yellow line. Roadway sections where this is particularly important for safety and connectivity reasons are:



- SR 168 to Cerro Coso Community College
  - Red Hill Road between SR 168 and Ed Powers Rd
  - Ed Powers Rd between SR 168 and US 395
  - SR 178 accessing Death Valley National Park
  - SR 190 within Death Valley National Park
  - Line Street (SR 168 in Bishop)
- Public comments repeatedly identified that even where bike lanes are present, such as US 395 through downtown Bishop, they are not wide enough or contain hazards, such as storm drains and potholes. Many cyclists do not feel safe traveling on US 395 (Main Street). Widening shoulders is challenging as there are high costs, environmental concerns, and physical constraints but is essential to bicycle safety, particularly as cycling is a growing form of transportation in Inyo County.
- Continuous Sidewalks and Bicycle Facilities –In Bishop, bicycle facilities are limited to US 395, SR 168, and discontinuous Class I paths at the west end of Sierra Street, along S. Barlow Lane, between the west end of Keough St. and the Bishop Paiute Reservation and between Pine Street and the City Park. Additionally, skateboarding is prohibited on Main Street in Bishop, although it is a popular mode of travel for youth. In Big Pine, there is only one north-south alternative to US 395 on the west side of town. Where east-west crossings of US 395 exist, sidewalks or bike lanes do not continue past the first block.
- A well-maintained, connected sidewalk network is important for all pedestrian safety, especially for children, and reduces conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists on roadway shoulders. Areas of concern are Pine St., Grove St., and Elm St. and in the Dixon Lane – Meadow Creek neighborhood. The community of Lone Pine also lacks continuous sidewalks, particularly around the post office. Inyo County was recently successful in obtaining an Active Transportation Program grant to improve and extend sidewalks in Lone Pine. The 2022 Inyo County RTIP identifies the Lone Pine Sidewalk ADA ATP grant project as a priority for funding. The Towns to Trails project, currently only in its conceptual phase, would create a continuous multi-use trail that runs parallel to US 395 from Alpine County to the north to Olancho to the south. This trail may connect existing motorized and non-motorized trails and connect communities to recreation destinations. Inyo County has secured grant funding for the planning phase.
- Safe Routes to Schools – Children traveling to school face discontinuous pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout Inyo County communities. In Bishop, children traveling from the east side of US 395 need safe crosswalks at US 395, particularly at E. Pine Street and E. Line Street. Traffic volumes on Home Street in Bishop, which provides access to all public schools in Bishop, are larger than most other city streets (Figure 5) and residents are concerned about speeding. Responses to the community survey expressed concern about the safety of the US 395 crossing in front of the schools in Big Pine. A similar situation exists in Lone Pine. As part of Inyo County Active Transportation Plan outreach efforts, school district staff repeatedly expressed concern



about the safety of children crossing US 395 as well. Staff indicated that improvements to existing crosswalks, such as flashing lights, are needed.

- Crossing US 395 – US 395 bisects and acts as the Main Street in many Inyo County communities. Many of the intersecting roadways in Bishop and Big Pine do not cross the highway, making east-west travel discontinuous and travel on US 395 mandatory. Safe crossings are still a serious concern on US 395 in Inyo County communities according to input received through the 2023 RTP and ATP update community survey. Despite crosswalks existing in some places, many identified them as insufficient and that vehicles do not stop or slow down. Crossing US 395, specifically in Big Pine, is a major concern for the community as the school is located on US 395 and travel to the community park requires this crossing.
- Animals – Cyclists in the Bishop area have had confrontations with dogs. According to surveys conducted as part of the Collaborative Bikeway Plan, many parents will not let their children walk to school because of dogs.
- Connectivity to Public Transit (multimodal)– An important part of constructing facilities that encourage safe non-motorized use is to ensure that there is connectivity between bicycle facilities/sidewalks and public transit. It may also be helpful to place bike racks at bus stops. Construction of sidewalks and curb cuts near bus stops is important for transit passengers with disabilities.
- Maintenance – After a bicycle or pedestrian facility is constructed it is important to maintain the facility or roadway, free of gravel and foliage that inhibit bicycle travel. Certain types of pavement treatments such as chip sealing provide a rough surface for bicyclists. Insufficient maintenance of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities is a concern, according to the 2023 community survey.
- Signage and Education – Many residents are unaware of the bicycle and pedestrian facilities that exist in the Bishop area. As the area also receives a high number of visitors, an important regional transportation need is to create better awareness of facilities and safe routes. This could be done through signage, pavement markings, and education. Although as noted in the public input process, too many signs can decrease the value of signage pavement treatments may be useful.
- Connections to Recreation – Inyo County recreation trailheads are often located several miles from communities which can be used as gateways or supply stops for visiting hikers, climbers, etc. Better non-motorized facility connections would increase tourism and recreation opportunities for residents with no access to a vehicle. Towns to Trails, identified in the Inyo County Active Transportation Plan, is an example. This proposed trail concept would connect communities from north to south and increase access to recreational opportunities.
- Bishop is another example where a multitude of recreational opportunities exist outside of the community with no complete bicycle or pedestrian facilities connections.



- LORP – There is abundant opportunity for recreation-oriented non-motorized trail projects in the LORP area. The Lower Owens River Recreation Use Plan (2013) identified the following key issues:
  - Tule growth and management
  - Public information and outreach
  - Access, signage, and wayfinding
  - Recreation on privately-held lands
  - Environmental education and stewardship
  - Economic development
  - The interface between ranching and recreation uses
  - Protection of cultural resources
  - Recreation operations and management
- Equestrian Travel – When designing and planning for non-motorized travel, equestrian travel should be considered.
- Electric bicycle commuting – E-bikes are growing in popularity, especially as a means for commuting or conducting everyday errands. As discussed throughout this document, communities in Inyo County, particularly Bishop, are centralized and lend themselves well to bicycling for short trips. To encourage more bicycling and increase safety, Inyo County should implement equitable charging stations in communities as well as separate bike lanes that are legal for electric bicycles.
- Class I Bike Paths – Bike paths that are separate and protected from vehicle traffic should be considered when planning for bicycle facilities. Community survey responses highlighted a concern for cyclist safety with Class II or III bike lanes and almost half of respondents identified that separated non-motorized paths would encourage them to walk and bike more.
- Bishop Paiute - As the Bishop Paiute Reservation is located adjacent to the City of Bishop and between two state highways, walking and biking to work, school, and services is a possibility. Challenges arise because most of the roadway shoulders are soft dirt or overgrown with vegetation, making walking or biking more difficult. The recent development of the Seibu to School Path, connecting the Reservation to the schools just east of tribal lands, is a first step to creating a network of safe non-motorized paths on and from the Reservation. There are also a series of trails in the Conservation and Open Space Area (COSA) in the southeastern portion of the reservation which do not currently connect to West Line Street. There are few sidewalks on the reservation. There is a need for connectivity to existing sidewalks on the northern and southern boundaries of the reservation, particularly on Barlow Lane near Diaz, as the majority of tribal services are located there.
- The Bishop Paiute Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment 2017 identified school-age children walking to a bus stop with little signage or sidewalks to provide safety, lack of lighting, and the lack of connectivity of the sidewalk network as top safety issues.



- Big Pine/Big Pine Paiute – There are no bicycle facilities on the Big Pine Reservation. There is a need to improve connectivity and create a safe bicycling/walking alternative to US 395 between Big Pine and the Reservation.
- Fort Independence/Independence – A safer non-motorized connection is also needed between the Fort Independence Reservation and the community of Independence. Many motorists speed through the community and fail to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk.
- Lone Pine – The same issues occur in Lone Pine. Non-motorized travel south of downtown is particularly unsafe due to a higher speed limit and motorists failing to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalk. Off the highway, there is a lack of continuous sidewalks on the county roads, although this will be addressed with funding from an Active Transportation Program grant during this planning period.
- Inyo National Forest – The distance on roadways with no bicycle and pedestrian facilities may discourage alternative transportation to Inyo National Forest trailheads. Depending on the level of the rider, steep grades, and narrow shoulders are also a deterrent.
- Death Valley National Park – The state highways and county roadways traveling through the park have little to no shoulders yet see a high number of cyclists due to the roadway being very scenic and relatively flat. As cycling through the park is becoming more popular, safety concerns increase. Encouraging non-motorized travel through and within a National Park meets state goals of reducing GHG emissions and encouraging active transportation. There are, however, environmental challenges with constructing separated Class I facilities. Death Valley National Park has developed a list of potential non-motorized facility projects that would increase safety for users and encourage new users. These are included in the Action Element (Table 23-24).

Specific comments from the RTP public meetings and the community survey are presented in Appendix B. Community survey respondents identified improved and expanded bicycle routes and paths as one of the top three priorities for transportation improvements.

## AVIATION

There are seven publicly operated airports in Inyo County and six private airstrips. As shown in Figure 1, these are the Bishop Airport, Independence, Lone Pine, and Shoshone Airports which are operated by Inyo County. Trona Airport is operated by the Searles Valley Community Services Council and Stovepipe Wells and Furnace Creek airports are owned and operated by the National Park Service. There is also a public backcountry dirt airstrip in Saline Valley in Death Valley National Park. The Bishop Airport is the only airport in Inyo County that can accommodate regularly scheduled commercial freight and passenger service. Bishop Airport provides seasonal daily commercial flights to Denver, CO, and San Francisco, CA.

### ***Bishop Airport***

The Bishop Airport is located roughly two miles east of the City of Bishop. The airport is located on LADWP land which was granted to Inyo County as a perpetual easement. The airport includes fueling



facilities but no control tower. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) collects a variety of data for individual airports. As of August 2022, 38 fixed-wing aircraft and 1 ultra-light were based at the airport. For the twelve months ending August 2022, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 12,500, including 800 military operations. There are three runways, two dedicated helipads, and several hangars located at the airport. The terminal building, expanded in 2021 to accommodate a TSA checkpoint and passenger waiting areas for commercial flights, also houses the administrative offices for ESTA, as well as a restaurant. As of 2021, FedEx Ground and the Inyo County Sheriff's Department also maintained facilities at the airport. Commercial flights began in 2021, making the Bishop Airport the only Inyo County airport that provides commercial passenger service. The Bishop Airport Master Plan will be updated, beginning in 2024. The Bishop Airport Layout Plan was approved in May 2019. With commercial passenger service at the Bishop Airport, establishing consistent shuttle service between Bishop and Mammoth and potentially other visitor destinations is important to making commercial service a success. Currently, ESTA DAR services and private shuttle companies serve to provide transit services to the airport. There is also a rental car fleet located at the airport, however, supply is limited. The Airport Master Record (2022) notes that no local taxi services are available and that DAR service is limited on Sundays. The FAA is requiring that Inyo County develop a transportation plan that includes elements such as a shuttle service to Mammoth and greater rental car availability.

### ***Independence Airport***

The Independence Airport lies just north of the community of Independence on the east side of US 395. This general aviation airport is not on the National Plan of Airport Integrated Systems (NPAIS), making the airport ineligible for most FAA funding. No fueling facilities are available and only two aircraft are based there. For the twelve months ending June 2022, annual operations totaled 3,000 operations. Most of this activity is generated by the US Forest Service at the helitack base for fire suppression activities. The Airport Master Record (2022) identifies that one of the runways is closed for public use due to deteriorated and unsafe surfaces and the other has faded surface markings.

### ***Lone Pine Airport***

The Lone Pine Airport is located south of town, east of US 395. The airport has two runways and one helipad. Fueling facilities are available and five fixed-wing aircraft are based at this airport. For the twelve months ending June 2022, annual operations totaled 8,600 operations.

### ***Shoshone Maury Sorrells Airport***

The Shoshone Maury Sorrells Airport is located just east of SR 127, south of SR 178. No services are available at this non-NPAIS airport and no aircraft are based there. Only 700 operations occur annually. The runway was slurry sealed and restriped in 2018.

### ***Stovepipe Wells Airport***

Owned and operated by the National Park Service, the Stovepipe Wells Airport is located within Death Valley National Park off of SR 190 near Stovepipe Wells Village. The airport is not on the NPAIS, has no





facilities, and no aircraft based there. According to the FAA, roughly 1,000 aircraft operations occur annually. The Airport Master Record (2022) notes that the pavement on the runway is heaving and extremely rough.

### ***Furnace Creek Airport***

Owned and operated by the National Park Service, the Furnace Creek Airport is located within Death Valley National Park off SR 190 near Furnace Creek. The airport is not on the NPAIS, has no facilities, and has three aircraft based there. As there are no automated data loggers at either NPS airport, the exact number of landings is not known. For the twelve months ending June 2022, the FAA reports that annual operations totaled 10,500. Park officials observe significantly lower operational numbers and pilot logbook data show that between 2015 and 2019, an average of 279 people landed at Furnace Creek and Stovepipe Wells combined. The Airport Master Record (2022) notes that the pavement on the runway is heaving, extremely rough, and potentially damaging to aircraft.

### ***Trona Airport***

The Trona Airport is located north of the community of Trona off Trona Wildrose Road. The airport is owned by the BLM and operated by the Searles Valley Community Services Center. There are no facilities and no fixed-wing aircraft based there, although four ultra-lights are based at the airport. The airport estimates roughly 4,500 take-offs and landings annually.

### ***Aviation Projections***

It is expected that annual operations will continue to increase at the Bishop Airport due to the commercial passenger service that began in 2021. The Passenger Traffic Study for the Bishop Airport conducted by Wadell and Leigh/Fischer in 2017 forecasted enplaned passengers for 2017 through 2037, assuming commercial airline service. From 2020 to 2037, enplaned passengers are forecast to increase an average of 3.7% per year with faster growth between 2020 and 2025 (an average increase of 5.5% per year). The study also estimates that commercial airline departures will increase to 369 by 2037. Total aircraft operations will increase from 26,000 in 2017 to 28,000 in 2037. It is interesting to note that between 2019 and 2022, annual operations decreased from 26,000 to 12,500, in part, due to a drop in military operations from 3,000 to 800. Annual military operations are unknown for the next 20 years.

Both airports in Death Valley National Park, Furnace Creek, and Stovepipe Wells, require significant and immediate repair to maintain viability. An assessment done by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics identified Furnace Creek as needing a new road base to stabilize the runway and *The Stovepipe Wells Developed Areas Plan* states that the airstrip needs “significant investment to meet safety standards.” The last maintenance performed at either paved airstrip was in 2004. Park officials expressed concern over the lack of funding and resources needed to maintain airstrips for safe aviation. The Park is strongly considering closing one of the paved airstrips or converting one to gravel due to lack of funding to maintain both safely, proximity between the two, and low combined level of use. The Park plans to perform a detailed analysis of the airstrips within this planning period.



## GOODS MOVEMENT

The RTP Guidelines state that RTPAs must plan for the movement of goods in the same way they plan for the movement of people to support population growth and economic development. Developing strategies for improving the regional movement of goods can have positive impacts, such as job creation, a reduction in land use conflicts, and a decrease in air pollution.

A combination of State Highways and County roads serve as the primary network for goods movement in Inyo County, with US 395 serving as a primary route for trucking through the County. Adequate maintenance and efficient operation of this roadway network is critical to the continued economic vitality of the County, as well as for the safety of the public. In Inyo County, goods movement is focused on trucking. According to the 2019 Eastern Sierra Corridor Freight Study, the majority of trucks on US 395 highway are based in Southern California. The majority of northbound trucks are destined for Nevada.

Typical goods movement issues in rural counties include potential conflicts between non-motorized travelers, trucks, and recreational vehicle traffic. A lack of shoulders and passing opportunities on many state highways presents a safety concern in Inyo County for multiple user groups. Within Inyo County, it is common that large agricultural and livestock haulers are required to turn onto major highways and state routes without sufficient acceleration lanes. This can cause safety issues for both the haulers and other vehicles on the roadway, especially where steep grades or minimal sight distance exists. An example of this is the intersection of Warm Springs Road and US 395.

All of these factors can negatively impact goods movement through the County. Several businesses in Inyo County that generate truck traffic were contacted for input. These included mining and bottling operations. So far, no input has been received.

### Truck Routes

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA), passed in 1982, sets forth specific dimension requirements for trucks related to the overall length, length of semitrailer, and length from the King Pin to Rear Axle (KPRA). Per the act, there are various levels of truck routes where different vehicle dimensions are allowed. Roadway limitations (such as sub-standard curves, absence of shoulders, and narrow lanes) affect the different designations. An STAA-sized truck may only travel on state highways categorized as STAA National Highway Network or Terminal Access routes. STAA truck dimensions have been the trucking standard for 20 years and major trucking companies use STAA trucks in their fleet. US 395 and US 6 are part of the National STAA network while SR 127 is part of the Terminal Access STAA network. All other state highways in Inyo County are designated California Legal or California Legal Advisory routes. STAA-sized trucks are not allowed on these highways.

As US 395 is also the main street through several Inyo County communities, truck traffic, and associated impacts have been an ongoing issue. For the City of Bishop, STAA trucks leaving US 395 negatively impact the City's roadways and is a concern. The City does not have a designated truck route.



## Truck Traffic Volumes

Table 10 presents the most recent data regarding truck activity on the state highways (Caltrans Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic on the California State Highway System, 2010-2020). The highest truck traffic volumes in 2020 were observed on US 395 near the community of Big Pine (1,468 trucks per day), followed by US 395 north of SR 136 in Lone Pine (1,179 trucks per day) and US 395 at Ed Powers Rd (1,105 trucks per day). This is a reflection of the high level of regional goods movement along US 395 between Southern California and Nevada. The proportion of all traffic consisting of trucks was highest on SR 127 south of Stateline Road and US 6 at Silver Canyon Road where trucks represent over 37 percent and 32 percent of all traffic, respectively.

| TABLE 10: Truck Traffic on Inyo County State Highways |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Highway                                               |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         | Total  | Average | Percent |
|                                                       | 2010  | 2013  | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  | Change: | Annual | Trucks  |         |
| US 6 at:                                              |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| Jct. US 395                                           | 426   | 426   | 420   | 390   | 444   | 456   | 456   | 480   | 456   | 30      | 0.7%   | 12.0%   |         |
| Silver Canyon Road                                    | 437   | 644   | 644   | 693   | 708   | 853   | 924   | 754   | 738   | 301     | 5.4%   | 32.1%   |         |
| SR 127                                                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| Shoshone, South of Jct SR 178 East                    | 110   | 100   | 100   | 109   | 109   | 122   | 122   | 127   | 102   | -8      | -0.8%  | 11.6%   |         |
| South of Stateline Road                               | 91    | 87    | 87    | 74    | 117   | 123   | 122   | 120   | 102   | 11      | 1.1%   | 37.1%   |         |
| South of Jct SR 190                                   | 251   | 251   | 258   | 271   | 363   | 300   | 300   | 351   | 266   | 15      | 0.6%   | 21.5%   |         |
| North of Jct SR 190                                   | 82    | 79    | 86    | 91    | 100   | 100   | 100   | 123   | 96    | 14      | 1.6%   | 13.7%   |         |
| SR 168 at:                                            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| South Lake Rd                                         | 10    | 13    | 13    | 12    | 16    | 16    | 16    | 16    | 20    | 10      | 7.2%   | 5.0%    |         |
| Otey Rd                                               | 34    | 36    | 36    | 36    | 218   | 222   | 222   | 232   | 230   | 196     | 21.1%  | 16.4%   |         |
| East of Brockman Lane                                 | 294   | 248   | 250   | 250   | 250   | 250   | 250   | 250   | 250   | -44     | -1.6%  | 4.0%    |         |
| West of Brockman Lane                                 | 254   | 288   | 288   | 291   | 375   | 380   | 381   | 749   | 686   | 432     | 10.4%  | 10.6%   |         |
| West of Jct US 395                                    | 440   | 414   | 409   | 412   | 441   | 422   | 421   | 413   | 381   | -59     | -1.4%  | 5.4%    |         |
| South Jct US 395                                      | 43    | 52    | 52    | 53    | 53    | 53    | 54    | 123   | 102   | 59      | 9.0%   | 23.2%   |         |
| SR 190 at:                                            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| Olancha, Jct. US 395                                  | 44    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 35    | 23    | -21     | -6.3%  | 14.4%   |         |
| West of Jct SR 136                                    | 4     | 4     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 6     | 6     | 5     | 3     | -1      | -2.8%  | 1.8%    |         |
| Furnace Creek Ranch                                   | 41    | 41    | 41    | 41    | 41    | 41    | 41    | 41    | 47    | 6       | 1.4%   | 3.9%    |         |
| Death Valley Junction, Jct. SR 127                    | 61    | 62    | 65    | 70    | 115   | 99    | 99    | 209   | 139   | 78      | 8.6%   | 15.4%   |         |
| SR 178 at:                                            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| Death Valley Monument, South Boundary                 | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 15    | 0       | 0.0%   | 6.0%    |         |
| West of Jct. SR 127                                   | 14    | 14    | 14    | 10    | 8     | 10    | 9     | 9     | 8     | -6      | -5.4%  | 5.7%    |         |
| East of Jct SR 127                                    | 77    | 72    | 72    | 76    | 75    | 87    | 87    | 90    | 71    | -6      | -0.8%  | 9.1%    |         |
| Nevada State Line                                     | 76    | 69    | 70    | 72    | 78    | 86    | 85    | 90    | 74    | -2      | -0.3%  | 8.9%    |         |
| US 395 at:                                            |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |
| South of Jct. SR 190                                  | 684   | 660   | 660   | 696   | 816   | 852   | 852   | 864   | 780   | 96      | 1.3%   | 12.0%   |         |
| North of Jct SR 190                                   | 513   | 479   | 479   | 505   | 582   | 605   | 605   | 618   | 566   | 53      | 1.0%   | 8.7%    |         |
| South of Jct SR 136                                   | 666   | 626   | 660   | 674   | 770   | 787   | 787   | 787   | 715   | 49      | 0.7%   | 11.0%   |         |
| North of Jct SR 136                                   | 1,154 | 1,079 | 1,103 | 1,167 | 1,295 | 1,328 | 1,328 | 1,328 | 1,179 | 25      | 0.2%   | 16.6%   |         |
| Big Pine, South of Jct. SR 168                        | 875   | 1,210 | 1,210 | 1,468 | 1,468 | 1,468 | 1,468 | 1,468 | 1,468 | 593     | 5.3%   | 23.7%   |         |
| Big Pine, North of Jct. SR 168                        | 1,161 | 847   | 847   | 847   | 847   | 1,034 | 1,034 | 1,034 | 902   | -259    | -2.5%  | 11.0%   |         |
| Bishop, Jct SR 168                                    | 930   | 893   | 888   | 907   | 936   | 954   | 954   | 954   | 873   | -57     | -0.6%  | 6.0%    |         |
| South of Jct. US 6                                    | 485   | 470   | 474   | 474   | 511   | 511   | 510   | 516   | 465   | -20     | -0.4%  | 3.0%    |         |
| North of Jct. US 6                                    | 728   | 709   | 709   | 709   | 709   | 709   | 709   | 709   | 709   | -19     | -0.3%  | 5.4%    |         |
| Ed Powers Rd                                          | 774   | 969   | 975   | 1,036 | 1,022 | 1,237 | 1,105 | 1,128 | 1,105 | 331     | 3.6%   | 14.0%   |         |
| Source: Caltrans Truck AADT, 2020                     |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |         |        |         |         |



A review of historical truck traffic on Inyo state highways shows that truck traffic has increased slightly over the ten years between 2010 and 2020 on US 395 and US 6. Truck traffic has also increased on SR 168 and SR 190 at Death Valley Junction. The largest decrease in truck traffic during the ten years was observed on US 395 near Big Pine north of SR 168 junction (259 fewer trucks per day).

## Rail Facilities

There is no passenger or freight rail service in Inyo County. There are several rail corridors in the County where the tracks have been removed. The limited rail facilities are used for recreational purposes or historic interest. It is anticipated that freight or passenger rail facilities will not expand in Inyo County over the next 20 years.

## Intermodal Transportation

Intermodal transportation is the movement of products using multiple forms of transportation such as trucking and rail. In Inyo County, most goods travel through the region but do not begin or end there. The Bishop Airport does not see much cargo transportation and there is no freight rail service. Therefore, intermodal transportation does not apply to Inyo County.

## Goods Movement Issues

In 2007, Caltrans conducted the Bishop Area Access and Circulation Feasibility Study to improve circulation and safety for all travel modes in downtown Bishop, facilitate access to the Bishop Airport, and accommodate commercial truck traffic while keeping services in Bishop visible to through traffic. The idea of a truck bypass around downtown Bishop has been studied since the 1960s and remains a possibility for the future. Several issues have led to a desire to reroute truck traffic around the Bishop downtown corridor:

- Truck traffic volumes on US 395 between SR 168 and US 6 have seen a 3 to 43 percent increase between 2006 and 2020 for a total increase in annual average truck traffic of around 132 trucks per day over the fourteen years. However, truck volumes through downtown Bishop on US 395 were still 372 trucks per day lower on average than truck volumes on US 395 near Big Pine.
- Truck traffic may continue to increase in the future due to the growth of warehousing and manufacturing in the Reno/Carson City area and the growth of e-commerce.
- The relatively higher traffic volumes along US 395/Main Street create an uncomfortable environment for bicyclists and pedestrians, particularly school children.
- The sharp turning radius at the corner of US 395 and Line Street is another concern. It is difficult for trucks and vehicles pulling trailers to make a left turn off of US 395 onto East Line Street without using a portion of westbound East Line Street.
- There is a concentration of bicycle/pedestrian accidents along the US 395 corridor in downtown Bishop.



- In most cities, local traffic is naturally diverted to side streets during times of high congestion. In Bishop, however, there are only three north–south through corridors for vehicles with US 395/Main Street being the primary corridor. SR 168/Line Street is the primary east–west corridor although South Street and Yaney Street also make the connection. All other east–west streets in Bishop end in a “T” intersection.
- Another issue associated with goods movement in Inyo County is overnight truck parking in the communities. Residents complain of idling engines, and trash on the shoulders of the state highways where trucks park. There is a need for more designated truck parking near US 395 corridor communities. The zone in Inyo County with the greatest truck parking need is near the intersection of US 6 and US 395 in Bishop. Strategies to address the truck parking issue are outlined in the Eastern California Freight Study which is discussed on the following pages.

The Bishop Area Access and Circulation Feasibility Study recommended the following:

- Driveway and sidewalk improvements along North Sierra Highway/US 395.
- Improvements to the Wye Road/US 395/US6 junction.
- Two-lane with four-lane right-of-way eastern truck route from south of Bishop to the US 6/Wye Road junction.
- Extension of Sierra Street to See Vee Lane.
- Extension of See Vee Lane north to Choctaw Drive to provide a new entrance for the Highlands Mobile Home Park.
- The addition of a new “B Street” which would parallel Main Street. The extension of Jay Street and Wye Street to B Street.
- Provide parallel streets to Main Streets on the West and East of Main Street.
- Align East/West city street connections.
- The construction of a truck bypass in Bishop still has traction among residents. Previous surveys indicate that downtown business owners are generally opposed to a bypass for fear that interregional traffic will no longer stop in Bishop for services. However, the community survey conducted for this RTP update found that unprompted, 12 percent of respondents identified a truck bypass as a top priority for transportation improvements. As truck traffic in the vicinity of Bishop on US 395 has increased over the past ten years, it is feasible that a truck bypass will continue to gain support.
- The Eastern Sierra Freight Corridor Study (2019) had the following recommendations in Inyo County:
  - Entice investment for private truck stops.
  - Encourage expansion of the Ft. Independence Travel Plaza.
  - Study the feasibility of a truck route that connects to an expanded Bishop Airport, and bypasses much of US 6 and US 395 through Bishop. Consider including a low-cost truck parking lot along the route, possibly near the airport.



- Implement a truck parking availability system at all rest areas, and advance notification of adverse highway conditions.
- Allow trucks to park at weigh stations and vehicle chain-up areas when not in use.
- Expand the parking time limit at rest areas beyond 8 hours.
- Add 30-50 new truck parking spaces to the Division Creek Rest Area.
- Add 22 new truck parking spaces to the Coso Junction Rest Area.

## Goods Movement Projections

Although truck traffic volumes have decreased in some locations in Inyo County, it is anticipated that trucking will remain the primary form of goods movement over the next 20 years. As improvements are made to the regional STAA network, and as warehousing grows in the Reno/Carson City area and at the World Logistics Center in Moreno Valley, future truck volumes may increase. Goods movement will remain an important factor to consider when programming roadway improvements on US 395 and US 6. As goods movement-related technology such as low and zero-emission vehicles progresses, Inyo County will need to consider how the infrastructure can best meet the needs of goods movement along US 395.

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT

The RTP Guidelines require that an RTP addresses operational and management strategies to improve the performance of the regional transportation system by reducing congestion and maximizing the safety and mobility of people and goods. Reducing traffic congestion can be addressed in two ways: Transportation System Management (TSM) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM). TSM focuses on reducing traffic congestion by improving the performance efficiency, safety, and capacity of the transportation system. Examples include High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, facility design treatments, freeway management, traffic incident management, traffic signal coordination, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). TDM addresses traffic congestion by reducing travel demand rather than increasing transportation capacity and focuses on alternatives such as ride-sharing, flextime work schedules, increased transit usage, walking, and bicycling.

Travel Demand Management (TDM) is more relevant to Inyo County. TDM incorporates decisions made at home before persons leave the house. If residents know that there is a safe and easy method of getting to their destination without their private vehicle, they are more likely to choose alternate modes. One TDM strategy that applies to Inyo County is:

- Rideshare Programs – Rideshare databases and websites are a good method of matching commuters and thereby reducing the number of vehicles on the road. ESTA administers a small vanpool program between Mammoth Lakes and Bishop. Employees in Death Valley National Park utilize a vanpool from both Pahrump and Beatty daily.





Other TDM strategies that could help reduce traffic congestion and improve the performance of the regional transportation system include the encouragement of alternative modes of transportation by linking bicycle and pedestrian facilities to key bus stops and providing support facilities such as bike racks and lockers at shopping centers and bus stops so that bicyclists feel safe leaving their bicycle unattended. This includes charging stations for electric bicycles.

## **Future of Transportation and New Technology**

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) are advanced technology solutions designed to increase safety and improve the reliability of the transportation system. Examples of ITS used on rural state highways include Closed Circuit TV (CCTV) stations, Highway Advisory Radio (HAR), Changeable Message Signs (CMS), Extinguishable Message Signs (EMS), and Road Weather Information Stations (RWIS). These tools provide motorists with real-time information regarding weather, road conditions, road work, road closures, diversions, or expected delays so that they can adjust their routes accordingly.

The future of transportation is likely to include autonomous vehicles. A component of autonomous vehicles and new technology to ensure safer roadways is the idea of “connected vehicles” or technology that allows vehicles to talk to each other. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is considering a requirement to mandate vehicle-to-vehicle communication using Dedicated Short-Range Communications (DSRC) for light-duty passenger car fleets. At this time, it is unknown if the technology will only be installed on vehicles or will require DSRC radios and roadside processors as part of the roadway infrastructure. No requirements for RTPA’s have been set but this type of technology should be considered as part of future transportation planning.

## **AIR QUALITY**

Air quality is a significant consideration in planning for and evaluation of transportation systems. Both state and federal laws contain significant regulations concerning the impact of transportation projects on air quality. Control of mobile source emissions such as vehicular air pollution is the responsibility of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). CARB divides California into air basins and adopts standards of quality for each air basin. Inyo County is part of the Great Basin Valley Air Basin with air quality managed by the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (GBUAPCD). GBUAPCD enforces federal, state, and local air quality regulations including issuing permits for stationary sources of air pollution. Transportation projects are additionally subject to District Rules 400-Ringelmann Hart; Rule 401 Fugitive Dust and Rule 402-Nuisance.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established standards for air pollutants that affect public health and welfare. Likewise, CARB established state standards that are lower than the federal standards. The six criteria pollutants are Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Particulate Matter (PM), Lead (Pb), and Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). Federal regulations require that RTPs in nonattainment or maintenance areas must conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). A SIP is a collection of regulations and documents used by a state, territory, or local air district to reduce air



pollution in areas that do not meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards or NAAQS. Inyo County is considered “in attainment” or unclassified for every federal air quality standard.

However, the Owens Valley PM<sub>10</sub> (10 microns or smaller) Planning Area is a federal PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area. GBUAPCD prepared a SIP in 2016 for the Owens Valley PM<sub>10</sub> Planning Area to provide a plan and a control strategy to implement control measures on additional areas of Owens Lake to attain the federal air quality standards. The 2016 SIP determined that the transportation-related emissions were determined not to be a significant source of particulate matter.

As for state standards, Inyo County is not in attainment for Ozone and PM-10. Local data collected by the GBUAPC indicates that PM 10 and PM 2.5 levels are “good” in Inyo County.



## Chapter 5

### POLICY ELEMENT

The purpose of the Policy Element of the RTP is to provide guidance to regional transportation decision-makers and promote consistency among state, regional, and local agencies. California statutes, Government Code Section 65080 (b), states that the Policy Element must:

- Describe transportation issues in the region,
- Identify and quantify regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons, and
- Maintain internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.



Transportation issues and needs in the Inyo region are discussed in the Modal Element. Below are goals, objectives, and policies to assist in setting transportation priorities.

### ICLTC GOAL SETTING

An important element of the RTP process is the development of valid and appropriate goals, objectives, and policies. The RTP guidelines define goals, objectives, and policies as follows.

- A **goal** is general and characterized by a sense of timelessness. It is something desirable to work toward, the result for which effort is directed.
- An **objective** is a measurable point to be attained. Objectives are capable of being quantified and realistically attained considering probable funding and political constraints. Objectives represent levels of achievement in the movement toward a goal.
- A **policy** is a direction statement that guides decisions with specific actions.

The RTP goals, objectives, and policies were developed to ensure that Inyo LTC can maintain the regional transportation system within the financial constraints of state, federal, and local funding sources over both the short-term and long-term planning periods. The Policy Element is consistent with the Financial Element of the RTP. The following RTP goals, objectives, and policies are consistent with the *Inyo County General Plan* and the *City of Bishop General Plan*. The following are also consistent with the *California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2050*.

The CTP 2050 identifies the following transportation vision for California: A safe, resilient, and universally accessible transportation system that supports vibrant communities, advances racial and economic justice, and improves public and environmental health.

CTP is the state's roadmap for implementing this vision. More specifically, the CTP 2050 set forth the following goals:



1. **Safety**—Provide a safe and secure transportation system.
2. **Climate**—Achieve statewide GHG emissions reduction targets and increase resilience to climate change.
3. **Equity**—Eliminate transportation burdens for low-income communities, communities of color, people with disabilities, and other disadvantaged groups.
4. **Accessibility**—Improve multi-modal mobility and access to destinations for all users.
5. **Quality of Life and Public Health**—Enable vibrant and healthy communities.
6. **Economy**—Support a vibrant resilient economy.
7. **Environment**—Enhance environmental health and reduce negative transportation impacts.
8. **Infrastructure**—Maintain a high-quality resilient transportation system.

The comprehensive goals, objectives, and policies that have been developed for this RTP meet the needs of the region and are consistent with the regional vision and priorities for action. These objectives are intended to guide the development of a transportation system that is balanced, and multi-modal, and will maintain and improve the quality of life for residents and visitors of Inyo County. For this RTP update the Policy Element was revised to better reflect the goals of CTP 2050.

## Goals, Objectives, and Policies

### ***Goal 1: Safety—Provide a safe and secure transportation system for all users.***

**Objective 1A:** Secure funding to improve safety on State highways and local roadways.

**Policy 1.1**—Coordinate with Caltrans to fund safety improvement projects that meet the goals of the *California Strategic Highway Safety Plan*.

**Policy 1.2**—Coordinate with local agencies to maintain updated safety data through special studies or systemic safety analyses necessary to identify safety issues and secure funding.

**Policy 1.3**—Pursue all types of federal and state discretionary funding, such as the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP).

**Objective 1B:** Develop and retrofit transportation facilities and corridors to improve safety.

**Policy 1.4**—Provide support to identify, prioritize, and eliminate conditions on local and regional roadways that currently or may pose a safety risk in coordination with Caltrans and local jurisdictions.

**Policy 1.5**—Evaluate accident data along the State Highways and local roadways at least annually to identify trends and areas of concern.

**Policy 1.6**—Work with Caltrans on planning for shoulder improvements to reduce conflicts between goods movement, vehicles, and non-motorized users on state highways.

**Policy 1.7**—Facilitate safer truck transportation and truck parking and ease the impact of truck traffic on residential areas.

**Policy 1.8**—Utilize existing strategic safety assessments and plans to identify critical needs, such as the *Inyo County Local Road Safety Plan*, and support future safety assessments.



*Policy 1.9*—Support the national “Towards Zero Deaths” vision for a reduction in fatalities on the highway system.

**Objective 1C:** Reduce the number of bicycle and pedestrian-related injuries and fatalities.

*Policy 1.10*—Regularly review the number of bicycle and pedestrian-related collisions to identify and implement priority projects identified in this plan.

*Policy 1.11*—Evaluate bicycle and pedestrian crash data when assessing the impact of a potential roadway project on safety.

*Policy 1.12*—Work with Caltrans to enhance pedestrian facilities and crosswalks along State highways as needed to improve safety and provide connectivity between commercial areas, residential areas, recreational areas, schools, and the transit system.

*Policy 1.13*—Utilize Complete Streets strategies to improve safety and increase the use of active modes of transportation.

*Policy 1.14*—Support Safe Routes to Schools projects that increase the safety and numbers of students walking and biking to school.

## ***Goal 2: Climate—Increase the resilience of the transportation system to climate change.***

**Objective 2A:** Pursue projects that improve the resiliency of the transportation system to extreme weather events.

*Policy 2.1*—Coordinate with Caltrans and local jurisdictions to identify transportation infrastructure that is most vulnerable to impacts of severe weather events such as culverts, bridges, and roadways located in a flood zone.

**Objective 2B:** Prepare for multi-hazard emergency evacuation/response.

*Policy 2.2*—Coordinate with ESTA to ensure readiness in the event of emergency evacuation.

*Policy 2.3*—Coordinate with local agencies and first responders to reduce hazard impacts in accordance with the *Inyo County Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan*.

**Objective 2C:** Support statewide goals for the reduction of GHG emissions.

*Policy 2.4*—Invest in alternative fueling technology infrastructure.

*Policy 2.5*—Support the development of US 395 as an Alternative Fuels Corridor.

*Policy 2.6*—Seek out funding opportunities to deploy public electric vehicle charging stations along state and local roadways.

*Policy 2.7*—Prepare for the transition of the public transit agency vehicle fleet to ZEVs in accordance with CARB ICT guidance.

*Policy 2.8*—Reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 30 percent over the planning period.



### ***Goal 3: Infrastructure—Maintain a high-quality transportation system.***

**Objective 3A:** Maintain streets, roads, and highways at a safe and acceptable level.

*Policy 3.1*—Keep the Pavement Management Program up to date and improve the average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for county roadways.

**Objective 3B:** Maximize State and Federal Funds.

*Policy 3.2*—Enter into Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with adjacent counties to pursue mutually beneficial roadway improvement projects and leverage federal and state funding.

*Policy 3.3*—Ensure that transportation investments, including active transportation projects, use ranking and selection criteria proposed as part of this plan.

**Objective 3C:** Provide proper levels of road maintenance to avoid unnecessary vehicle wear and reduce the need for costlier rehabilitation in the future.

*Policy 3.4*—Utilize the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to prioritize maintenance projects for the short term and identify available funding sources.

*Policy 3.5*—Evaluate the impact of heavy truck traffic has pavement conditions and maintenance costs.

**Objective 3D:** Pursue improvements along the US 395 corridor.

*Policy 3.6*—Provide a 4-lane facility for US 395 and CA 14 between Southern California population centers and Inyo County.

*Policy 3.7*—Enter into MOUs with Mono County, Kern Council of Governments, and San Bernardino Associated Governments to provide funding for safety and roadway improvements on US 395 in Mono County.

**Objective 3E:** Ensure adequate capacity on State Routes (SR).

*Policy 3.8*—Increase capacity of SRs as needed to maintain concept LOS.

**Objective 3F:** Ensure the existence of a safe, reliable, and fiscally responsible public transit agency in Inyo County.

*Policy 3.9*—Support ESTA in all aspects of operations and capital improvements by the *ESTA Short Range Transit Plan*.

**Objective 3G:** Maintain, preserve, and enhance the existing airports and airstrips within the county.

*Policy 3.10*—Seek all available funding sources for airport maintenance and enhancement.

*Policy 3.11*—Promote land use compatibility with the surrounding environment for each airport.

*Policy 3.12*—Encourage and foster effective and efficient use of existing airport facilities.

*Policy 3.13*—Maintain and improve commercial usage at and around the Bishop Airport.

*Policy 3.14*—Maintain and expand passenger air service at the Bishop Airport.





**Objective 3H:** Support comprehensive transportation planning.

*Policy 3.15*—Strive for roadway improvements that do not increase VMTs or include mitigation strategies and support state GHG emission reduction goals.

*Policy 3.16*—Recognize the relationship between the RTP, the *Inyo County General Plan*, and the *City of Bishop General Plan* and strive to accomplish the aims and purposes of these plans.

*Policy 3.17*—Continually plan, prioritize, design, and develop a comprehensive transportation system in cooperative partnership between the county, city, state officials, the Local Transportation Commission, the Inyo County Planning Commission, City of Bishop Planning Commission, public and private groups, Inyo County Tribal Governments, and other interested entities.

***Goal 4: Equity—Ensure that all communities have access to transportation facilities throughout the County.***

**Objective 4A:** Ensure equitable access to public transit services.

*Policy 4.1*—Support and promote accessibility in public transportation to the maximum extent practicable, including continued support of special service vans that provide a high level of service to low-mobility groups.

*Policy 4.2*—Continue to conduct outreach to disadvantaged communities to understand areas for improvement in public transit services.

*Policy 4.3*—Identify transit facilities, such as bus shelters, staging areas, base stations, transit hubs, etc., and potential funding sources.

**Objective 4B:** Support public transit services, both existing services and future services that are identified by the established “unmet transit needs” process.

*Policy 4.4*—Encourage and support the use of public transportation grants from state and federal programs to the maximum extent possible.

*Policy 4.5*—Promote public transit to raise awareness, encourage ridership, and create an understanding of how to use transit systems.

*Policy 4.6*—Cooperatively develop long-range plans with transit operators that provide guidance and assistance in determining capital and operating requirements.

**Objective 4C:** Ensure that non-motorized facilities are accessible to all users.

*Policy 4.7*—Develop new non-motorized facilities in compliance with ADA requirements.

*Policy 4.8*—Consider ADA requirements when rehabilitating, repairing, or extending existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

*Policy 4.9*—Gather community input whenever feasible before designing and implementing changes to non-motorized facilities.



**Objective 4D:** Support tribal governments in the improvement of transportation facilities on and connecting to tribal land.

*Policy 4.10*—Jointly pursue grant funding where feasible to capitalize on funding, resources, and expertise.

*Policy 4.11*—Conduct outreach to and engage with tribal entities during transportation planning efforts.

**Objective 4E:** Utilize open and equitable processes to scope, prioritize, fund, and construct transportation projects.

*Policy 4.12*—Incorporate public outreach as a fundamental component of the transportation planning and decision-making process, encouraging input from all interested and affected groups and individuals.

*Policy 4.13*—Include, in project analysis, the identification and mitigation of all impacts on all affected segments of the population, particularly disadvantaged communities.

*Policy 4.14*—Design transportation facilities to meet the needs of all users including older adults, children, and people with disabilities.

### ***Goal 5: Accessibility/Mobility—Improve multimodal connectivity and access.***

**Objective 5A:** Prioritize connectivity between existing facilities where feasible.

*Policy 5.1*—Increase north/south connectivity of roadways, bike paths, and sidewalks within the City of Bishop to create an alternative to US 395.

*Policy 5.2*—Pursue grant funding to connect and extend existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities within and to community centers.

**Objective 5B:** Promote multimodal connections.

*Policy 5.3*—Encourage intermodal transfer of both passengers and freight at airports.

*Policy 5.4*—Provide for the development of multimodal facilities at airports where appropriate.

*Policy 5.5*—Promote multimodal connections between communities and recreation destinations.

*Policy 5.6*—Support public and private shuttles between communities and trailheads.

*Policy 5.7*—Raise public awareness of ESTA services and rideshare opportunities through media and promotional events.

**Objective 5C:** Support interregional multimodal transportation.

*Policy 5.8*—Encourage interregional and intercity bus lines to provide more attractively scheduled service into and within Inyo County.

*Policy 5.9*—Develop regional active transportation corridors.

*Policy 5.10*—Stay informed of multimodal transportation planning efforts of adjacent counties.



## **Goal 6: Quality of Life/Public Health—Enable vibrant and healthy communities.**

**Objective 6A:** Encourage the development of non-motorized facilities that will be convenient to use, easy to access, continuous, safe, and integrated into a multimodal transportation network in support of *Toward an Active California*.

*Policy 6.1*—Develop non-motorized facilities that serve as many segments of the population as possible.

*Policy 6.2*—Consider non-motorized modes of transportation in planning processes.

*Policy 6.3*—Plan for and provide a continuous and easily accessible bikeway system within the region, including connections to recreation destinations.

*Policy 6.4*—Promote projects that close gaps in community pedestrian networks, particularly along Safe Routes to School and between residential and commercial areas.

*Policy 6.5*—Plan for the increase in electric bicycles for commuting in Inyo County, including the need for charging infrastructure.

*Policy 6.6*—Introduce and promote education, encouragement, and outreach programs for bicycle and pedestrian travel.

**Objective 6B:** Enhance opportunities for safe bicycle and pedestrian travel on and across state highways and local roadways.

*Policy 6.7*—Encourage the inclusion of bicycle facilities on roadways during rehabilitation projects where feasible.

*Policy 6.8*—Pursue discretionary grant-funding programs for implementing the bicycle and pedestrian improvements listed in this plan.

**Objective 6C:** Improve livability and health in the County through thoughtful land use and transportation decisions.

*Policy 6.9*—Assist local jurisdictions in taking a regional approach to land use decisions and developing a road network that supports the RTP goals and state goals.

*Policy 6.10*—Encourage all County entities to actively participate in the RTP update process.

*Policy 6.11*—Establish formal agreements and acquire the appropriate right-of-way from the City of Los Angeles to implement transportation facilities on LADWP property in Inyo County as needed.

*Policy 6.12*—Address liability issues and potential impacts to resources and operations that may result from using LADWP right-of-way for public transportation facilities.

*Policy 6.13*—Support the revitalization of downtown Bishop in accordance with the *Downtown Bishop Specific Plan and Mixed-Use Overlay*.

**Objective 6D:** Reduce the negative impacts of heavy truck traffic within communities.

*Policy 6.14*—Implement traffic calming measures along US 395 within community centers.



*Policy 6.15*—Encourage overnight truck parking outside of densely populated community centers.

*Policy 6.14*—Explore future options to divert truck traffic around residential and commercial districts of communities.

### ***Goal 7: Environment—Enhance environmental health and reduce negative transportation impacts.***

**Objective 7A:** Consider all types of environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts, as part of the transportation project selection process.

*Policy 7.1*—Work with the project implementing agency to ensure that transportation projects will meet environmental quality standards set by Federal, State, and Local Resource agencies.

*Policy 7.2*—Coordinate with the project implementing agency to determine the impact of the project on biological resources, hydrology, geology, cultural resources, and air quality before construction.

*Policy 7.3*—Mitigate any environmental impacts according to natural resource agency standards.

**Objective 7B:** Promote transportation policies and projects that support a sustainable environment and positively contribute to meeting statewide global warming emissions targets set in the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32).

*Policy 7.4*—Coordinate with federal and state agencies and local air management districts on matters related to the air quality conformity process specified in the latest federal clean air requirements and legislation for transportation projects (transportation-related).

*Policy 7.5*—Consider alternative transportation technologies, such as Zero Emission Vehicles and bike share programs.

*Policy 7.6*—Coordinate with local and neighboring jurisdictions to identify mutually beneficial programs, projects, or partnership opportunities aimed at reducing or offsetting regionally produced GHG emissions.

*Policy 7.7*—Develop a Zero Emission Vehicle Readiness Plan for the Inyo County region in cooperation with Caltrans and neighboring jurisdictions.

**Objective 7C:** Reduce the demand for travel by single-occupant vehicles through transportation demand management and transportation system management techniques.

*Policy 7.8*—Increase the mode share for public transit and non-motorized travel through operational improvements and construction of bicycle, pedestrian, and park-and-ride facilities.

*Policy 7.9*—Support public awareness of ESTA to increase the mode share for public transit.

*Policy 7.10*—Encourage compact and infill development in accordance with the *Inyo County Housing Element* to minimize the construction of new roads and encourage walkable communities.

*Policy 7.11*—Encourage local land use planning and community design that minimizes dependence on long-distance, single-occupant vehicle commute trips and encourages active transportation.



**Objective 7D:** Improve the resiliency of transportation infrastructure to severe weather events.

*Policy 7.12*—Pursue funding for improvement projects that enhance the climate resiliency of the transportation system.

*Policy 7.13*—Utilize existing and future plans, including Community Wildfire Protection Plans and climate adaptation plans, to identify high-priority transportation improvement projects.

*Policy 7.14*—Mitigate impacts of severe weather events by maintaining the condition of transportation infrastructure and facilitating necessary maintenance, repair, and replacement.

### ***Goal 8: Economic Vitality—Promote economic stability and investment.***

**Objective 8A:** Develop a transportation system that is financially constrained.

*Policy 8.1*—Ensure that the allocation of transportation funding dollars maximizes the “highest and best use” for interregional and local projects.

*Policy 8.2*—Give priority to transportation projects designed to improve the efficiency, safety, and quality of existing facilities.

*Policy 8.3*—Consider long-term maintenance costs for any new transportation infrastructure.

**Objective 8B:** Consider transportation during the review of projects to ensure that transportation needs are addressed during the planning phase of development.

*Policy 8.4*—Ensure proper access is planned to residential, commercial, and industrial areas.

*Policy 8.5*—Evaluate public transit access and availability for all residential and commercial projects.

*Policy 8.6*—If transportation improvements are required as part of a new development, require the developer to share the cost of the improvements.

*Policy 8.7*—Require development proposals to provide adequate parking allocations for the intended uses.

**Objective 8C:** Provide for the parking needs of residents and visitors.

*Policy 8.8*—Provide adequate and convenient parking in the commercial core of Inyo County communities.

*Policy 8.9*—Plan and develop easily accessed park-and-ride facilities and rest areas along major roadways.

**Objective 8D:** Support the development or improvement of transportation facilities that provide alternative transportation connections between recreation destinations and communities.

*Policy 8.10*—Recognize the economic impact of investing in access to recreation destinations.

**Objective 8E:** Promote commercial passenger air service at the Bishop Airport.

*Policy 8.11*—Ensure that accurate and reliable information is available to the public, stakeholders, and adjacent counties.



*Policy 8.12*—Support expansion of passenger air service and facilities at Bishop Airport where feasible.

**Objective 8F:** Facilitate the development of vibrant economic centers.

*Policy 8.13*—Address noise, traffic, and safety impacts of high levels of truck traffic within the community core.

*Policy 8.14*—Pursue active transportation funding to expand pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and multimodal connections.





## Chapter 6

# ACTION ELEMENT

This chapter presents a plan to address the needs and issues of all transportation modes, in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies outlined in the Policy Element. It is within the Action Element that projects and programs are prioritized as short- or long-term improvements, consistent with the identified needs and policies. These plans are based on the existing conditions, forecasts for future conditions, and transportation needs discussed in the Existing Conditions Section and Policy Element and are consistent with the Financial Element.



### PLAN ASSUMPTIONS

In addition to the data discussed above, it is necessary to base the Action Element on a series of planning assumptions, as presented below:

- Environmental Conditions – No change is assumed in attainment status for air or water quality affecting transportation projects.
- Travel Mode – The private automobile will remain the primary mode of transportation for residents and visitors. Over the 20-year planning period, autonomous vehicles may begin to become more common. Public transportation will remain a vital service for the elderly, low-income, and people with mobility limitations. Bicycle and pedestrian travel will increase modestly as facilities are improved, for both recreational and utility purposes.
- Changes in Truck Traffic – Due to economic activity in the Reno/Carson City area and along the US 395/6 corridor and the increase of e-commerce, truck traffic may increase slightly during the planning period.
- Transit Service – Future planning efforts will lead to the expansion of transit services in Inyo County. Public transportation will continue to be a vital service for the elderly, low-income, and persons with mobility limitations. Replacing vehicles, equipment, and facilities is necessary to maintain the transit system, and is an important element in providing safe, friendly, and reliable service.
- Population Growth – The population of Inyo County is forecast to decrease at the rate estimated by the California Department of Finance, averaging approximately 0.2 percent annually.
- Recreation/Visitor Use – Recreation/visitor use at National Forest trailheads and in Death Valley National Park is likely to increase over the 20-year planning period impacting traffic



levels on Inyo County roadways, forest roads, bicycle paths, and parking areas. US 395 will also likely see an increase in traffic due to increased skier traffic to the Mammoth Mountain Ski Area. Tourism will continue to drive the economy.

- Air Travel – Commercial air service to the Bishop Airport may lead to an increase in traffic in and around the City of Bishop and on US 395.
- Limited Development – Inyo County will continue to maintain its rural atmosphere. Limited major commercial development is anticipated in the county.
- Planning Requirements – New state and federal requirements concerning climate change and GHG emissions will continue to shape the planning process in the future. This includes building the infrastructure for a zero-emission public transit fleet and supporting the designation of the US 395 corridor as an Alternative Fuels Corridor. This RTP is a dynamic document that will be updated as requirements change.
- Fuel Consumption – Per the US Energy Information Administration, motor gasoline consumption will decrease by 0.8 percent, and diesel fuel consumption in the transportation sector is projected to decrease by only 0.4 percent by 2050. Hydrogen fuel consumption is projected to increase by 5.2 percent and electricity is projected to increase by 9.7 percent by 2050.
- Cost Estimates – Inflation will continue at a rate consistent with the growth of the Consumer Price Index over the previous 20 years. Fuel tax revenues will remain relatively flat over the short-term planning period and begin to decline over the long term.

## TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

Addressing transportation safety in a regional planning document can improve health, financial, and quality of life issues for travelers. To this end, California has developed a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP), with the goal of this Plan being “Toward Zero Deaths” by using the 5Es: Education, Enforcement, Engineering, Emergency Response, and Emerging Technologies. The SHSP was first published in 2006 and was last updated in 2022. The 2020-2024 SHSP identifies the following High Priority and Focus Challenge Areas:

- |                                                   |                         |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| • Active Transportation: Pedestrians & Bicyclists | • Distracted Driving    |
| • Impaired Driving                                | • Driver Licensing      |
| • Intersections                                   | • Emergency Response    |
| • Lane Departures                                 | • Emerging Technologies |
| • Speed Management                                | • Motorcyclists         |
| • Aggressive Driving                              | • Occupant Protection   |
| • Aging Drivers                                   | • Work Zones            |
| • Commercial Vehicles                             | • Young Drivers         |



The policy element of this RTP includes safety goals and objectives that comply with the SHSP. Transportation improvement projects that specifically address safety for all types of transportation modes are included in the project list tables in this chapter. Transportation safety is a main concern for roadways and non-motorized transportation facilities in the Inyo region.

## TRANSPORTATION SECURITY/EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Transportation security/emergency preparedness is another important element in the RTP. Separate from transportation safety, transportation security/emergency preparedness addresses issues associated with large-scale evacuation due to a natural disaster such as wildfire or flood. Emergency preparedness involves many aspects including training/education, planning appropriate responses to possible emergencies, and most importantly communication and coordination.

As this region is rural and not densely populated, it is not likely that Inyo County would be the focus of a terrorist attack. Forced evacuation due to a natural disaster such as wildfire is the most likely scenario. Identifying evacuation routes and other methods of evacuation is pertinent to the scope of the RTP. The principal arterial traversing Inyo County is US 395 which acts as the primary evacuation route for many Inyo County communities, such as Bishop, Big Pine, Independence, and Lone Pine. US 6 is a secondary evacuation route for Bishop area residents. SR 168 is the primary evacuation route for the community of Aspendell. SR 190 is an important highway as it traverses the county in an east–west direction and would be the primary evacuation route for Death Valley National Park. SR 127 and 178 are important evacuation routes for the southeastern communities of Shoshone and Tecopa.

The Inyo County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (2017) identifies the following ten hazards that could potentially impact Inyo County:

- Avalanche
- Dam or Aqueduct Failure
- Disease/Pest Management
- Drought
- Flood
- Geologic Hazards
- Hazardous Materials
- Seismic Hazards
- Severe Weather
- Wildfire

The plan includes strategies to reduce the impacts of the identified hazards on community members and critical infrastructure. The strategies will improve communication between the community and government officials as well as strive to lessen the impact of the hazards. The implementation of ITS projects such as Road Weather and Information Systems (RWIS), Changeable Message Signs (CMS), and Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) can assist with maintaining a steady flow of traffic on these state highways while keeping evacuees informed. In the event of a natural disaster, ESTA vehicles should be made available to transport evacuees (particularly those with disabilities). Additionally, ambulances stationed in the various communities could be called upon for assistance in the transportation of special needs residents. The publicly operated airports in Inyo County are available for emergency evacuation.



The County of Inyo and several individual communities have a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that addresses transportation needs related to wildfire response and evacuation. Maintaining roadway and pavement conditions is extremely important to enabling access to outlying neighborhoods by first responders and safe and efficient evacuation by residents. The City of Bishop is in the process of developing a CWPP for the City.

The best preventative measures with respect to this document for an emergency evacuation or extreme weather events would be to continue to implement projects in the RTP that strengthen bridges/culverts and upgrade roadways, airport facilities, and public transit.

## **CLIMATE CONSIDERATIONS**

Global climate change is an important issue that is closely related to transportation. Climate change is caused by the release of greenhouse gases (GHGs) such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride into the atmosphere; these gases trap heat and increase temperatures near the earth's surface. Motorized vehicles emit carbon dioxide and are large contributors to GHG emissions. In fact, according to the CARB GHG Inventory for 2016, transportation accounts for roughly 41 percent of total GHG emissions in California. Forecasted, long-term consequences of climate change range from a rise in the sea level to a significant loss of the Sierra snowpack and more extreme weather events. As identified in the RTP Guidelines, statewide legislation and executive orders encourage local and regional planning agencies to consider the following as top priorities.

### **Reduction of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions**

The State of California continues to set ambitious targets for the reduction of GHG emissions through AB 32 (2006) and SB 32 (2016). Even though ICLTC is not required by SB 375 (2008) to address regional GHG targets in the RTP and prepare sustainable community strategies, this RTP voluntarily outlines strategies to reduce GHG emissions. The RTP identifies improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities that will encourage residents and visitors to use alternatives to private vehicles for transportation, thereby helping to reduce GHG emissions. Expanding charging infrastructure for ZEVs will also support a reduction in GHG emissions.

Given the importance of the consideration of climate change in transportation planning, this RTP outlines the following strategies to reduce GHG emissions:

- Continue to Prioritize Regional Transportation System Maintenance over Expansion—One GHG reduction strategy that is repeatedly identified in legislation and policy documents is to reduce VMT by implementing smart growth strategies, which concentrate land use expansion in urbanized cores where public transportation is available and increase the “walkability” of communities. Community and stakeholder input makes it clear that maintaining the existing transportation instead of increasing the capacity of the regional transportation system is a top priority for the region.



- Implement Active Transportation Project Improvements—Encouraging residents and visitors to walk or bike for short-distance trips is another common strategy to reduce GHG emissions. Discussion with ICLTC and results of public outreach efforts show widespread support for improvements and expansion of active transportation facilities throughout the County.
- Implement Transit System Improvements—Although there is limited funding available for public transit in Inyo County, the need for transit has been demonstrated. Continuing to support and improve public transit service by replacing aged vehicles and improvements to passenger facilities would make the transit system more visible and thereby encourage non-regular riders or visitors to utilize the bus system.

## Transportation Electrification

It is expected that the number of ZEVs will increase significantly in Inyo County during the planning period. A transition to ZEVs and the presence of sufficient infrastructure to support ZEVs within the County could provide public health, environmental, and quality of life benefits for Inyo County residents. A reduction in fossil fuel emissions will benefit air quality within the County, especially along highway corridors with high vehicle and truck traffic. The long-term transition to ZEV passenger and freight traffic may reduce traffic noise within community centers and adjacent residential areas. And expansion of ZEV infrastructure will support statewide policy and the designation of US 395 as an Alternative Fuel Corridor, discussed further in Chapter 4.

Providing and expanding access to EV charging facilities and ZEV infrastructure on state highways and local roadways alike throughout Inyo County is a priority. The County of Inyo is actively pursuing grant funding to develop a zero-emission vehicle readiness plan to effectively support ZEVs and EVs in the future. The County of Inyo will continue to explore opportunities to support the mandated transition to ZEVs within the state.

## Climate Resilience

Severe weather events resulting from climate change are expected to occur more frequently over the planning period and increase in severity. RTPAs, such as ICLTC, can increase the resilience of the transportation system to these events and reduce the severity of their impacts by addressing vulnerabilities in the current system and planning for changing conditions over the long term. The climate resilience efforts of ICLTC will build on existing planning efforts by Caltrans and in accordance with CTP 2050.

To best support climate goals laid out in the Policy Element of the RTP, ICLTC has identified multiple transportation improvement projects that are necessary to increase the resilience of the transportation system to climate-related impacts, including the entirety of Table 21. In the face of already limited funding for planning and improvement projects, ICLTC plans to actively pursue grant funding for climate resiliency planning to maximize the efficiency of spending and preparedness.



## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

As a method of developing responses to the transportation needs and issues discussed in the earlier portions of this document, this RTP includes a list of transportation system improvements for each mode of transportation applicable to Inyo County. This RTP lists both financially constrained and financially unconstrained improvements. Financially constrained projects are funded over the short- and long-term periods as demonstrated in the Financial Element. The unconstrained project list is considered a “wish list” of projects that would provide benefit to the region, but that will be unlikely to receive funding over the next 20 years unless new funding sources become available.

### Performance Measures

Specific performance measures are used to consider the cost-effectiveness of proposed projects. According to the RTP guidelines, performance measures outlined in the RTP should set the context for judging the effectiveness of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) as a program. More detailed project-specific performance measures used to quantitatively evaluate the benefit of a transportation improvement project should be addressed every two years in the region’s RTIP.


Performance targets are numeric goals established to enable the quantifiable assessment of performance measures. Performance monitoring indicators or metrics include field data such as VMT, mode share, accident rates, etc. Table 11 presents performance measures and performance targets for the Inyo County region along with the current performance of the regional transportation system. These performance measures build on performance measures identified in the *2017 Inyo County RTP*, the *2017 RTP Guidelines*, the *2022 Inyo County RTIP*, and the *Performance Monitoring Indicators Study* conducted by the Rural Counties Task Force. Generally, performance targets in Table 11 are based on performance levels for similar rural counties.

### *Mobility/Accessibility (M/A)*

The *Performance Measures for Rural Transportation Systems Guidebook* defines mobility as “the ease or difficulty of traveling from an origin to a destination.” Accessibility is defined as “the opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.”

**VMT Per Capita:** Measuring levels of congestion and delay on roadways has long been used as a tool for evaluating performance and the need for transportation improvement projects. Congestion measured in terms of LOS was considered an “impact” in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Historically, agencies would increase the capacity of the transportation system to correct the problem. This only leads to more cars on the roadway and increased GHG emissions.





**TABLE 11: RTP Program Level Performance Measures**

| Performance Measure                                | Current System Performance | Projected/Target System Performance    | Data Source                                                      |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Mobility and Accessibility (M/A)</b>            |                            |                                        |                                                                  |
| VMT Per Capita                                     | 34,073                     | 23,851                                 | CA Public Road Data, US Census                                   |
| <b>Safety and Security (S)</b>                     |                            |                                        |                                                                  |
| Injury Crashes per Capita                          | 0.005                      | Reduction in injury crashes per capita | American Community Survey, SWITRS                                |
| Injury Crashes per VMT                             | 0.18                       | Reduction in injury crashes per VMT    | Caltrans, California Highway Patrol, SWITRS, CA Public Road Data |
| <b>Transportation System Investment (TSI)</b>      |                            |                                        |                                                                  |
| Pavement Condition Index (PCI) 0 - 100             | 58.8                       | 70                                     | 2022 Pavement Management Report                                  |
| Distressed Lane-miles by Jurisdiction              | 36.887 (8.7%)              | Reduction in distressed lane-miles     | Inyo County RTIP                                                 |
| Percent of Transit Fleet Past Useful Lifespan      | 25.9%                      | 10%                                    | 2022 ESTA SRTP                                                   |
| <b>Environmental and Health Sustainability (E)</b> |                            |                                        |                                                                  |
| Mode Share/Split (%)                               | --                         | --                                     | American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, ATP                  |
| Drive Alone                                        | 69.2                       | < 69.2                                 |                                                                  |
| Carpool                                            | 13.7                       | < 13.7                                 |                                                                  |
| Transit                                            | 0.8                        | < 0.8                                  |                                                                  |
| Bike/walk                                          | 4.4/6.2                    | 6.6/7.1                                |                                                                  |
| <b>Economic Sustainability</b>                     |                            |                                        |                                                                  |
| Miles of Class I Bike Path                         | 2.5                        | Increase in mileage                    | ATP                                                              |

SB 743 changed the way that congestion should be mitigated through the CEQA environmental process. Congestion in terms of LOS can no longer be considered a significant impact resulting from a development project which is subject to CEQA review. Now, through the CEQA process, it must be determined how the project will impact VMT. The goal is to reduce the amount of driving instead of increasing it. Methods of reducing VMT include increasing transit options, facilitating biking and walking, changing development patterns and charging for parking. VMT per capita is an accepted performance measure for determining a transportation project's impact on congestion.

SB 743 changed the way that congestion should be mitigated through the CEQA environmental process. Congestion in terms of LOS can no longer be considered a significant impact resulting from a development project which is subject to CEQA review. Now, through the CEQA process, it must be determined how the project will impact VMT. The goal is to reduce the amount of driving instead of increasing it. Methods of reducing VMT include increasing transit options, facilitating biking and walking,



changing development patterns and charging for parking. VMT per capita is an accepted performance measure for determining a transportation project's impact on congestion.

**Current Baseline Performance:** Inyo County does not have a travel demand model that estimates VMT. However, VMT estimates are available through the Highway Performance Monitoring System California Public Road Data. Unfortunately, this data source does not always seem accurate for rural counties. Nevertheless, according to this data, VMT per capita in Inyo County is 34,073. This figure, almost four times the statewide VMT per capita, may be a result of a small population combined with high levels of highway traffic along US 395 and various state routes.

**Performance Target:** Reducing VMT per capita is consistent with statewide goals. The most recent guidance from CARB calls for a reduction of VMT per capita by 30 percent by 2045.

### ***Safety and Security (S)***

Safety plays a large role in the consideration of transportation projects in the Inyo region. A reduction in the number of crashes per capita and per VMT is a good quantitative measure of the impact of a project on regional safety. Most RTP projects will increase safety, including Inyo County's top-priority roadway projects. Also, the expansion of the regional non-motorized facility network will reduce vehicle/bicycle/pedestrian conflicts and roadway rehabilitation will provide a smoother and safer driving surface. Widening the shoulders of state highways and county roadways would improve safety for both non-motorized and motorized users of the regional transportation system. Bridge replacement projects also address safety concerns. Collision data can be easily obtained from the California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) and the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS). Data including the total number of crashes, type of crash, and location of crash is available. As such, a variety of performance measures can be calculated.

**Injury Crashes per Capita:** This performance measure evaluates the number of injury crashes (of any severity level) against the Inyo County population.

**Current Baseline Performance:** In 2020, injury crashes totaled 0.005 per capita. There were 102 injury crashes. There were .0004 fatalities per capita with a total of eight fatalities.

**Performance Target:** "Toward Zero Deaths" is the national vision for the highway system. This is the idea that one fatality is too many, but achieving zero fatalities may be impossible. In the spirit of this vision, the safety performance targets represent a lower level of injury crashes than the baseline.

**Injury Crashes per VMT:** The Highway Performance Monitoring System California Public Road Data provides estimates of VMT for each county in the state. By applying VMT data to collision data, we can estimate the number of injury crashes per million VMT.

**Current Baseline Performance:** In 2020, there was 0.18 injury crash per million VMT.

**Performance Target:** In a similar vein to injury crashes per capita, the goal is to have a reduction in the injury crash rate per VMT.



## ***Transportation System Investment (TSI)***

Maintaining regional roadways in satisfactory condition is a top priority for the region. By performing routine roadway maintenance, Inyo County will reduce the need for larger roadway rehabilitation projects in the future. Transportation System investment also applies to public transit infrastructure. An increase in available funding for roadway maintenance is reflected in the project tables, specifically, those projects funded by RMRA funding and identified in the Capital Improvement Plan for Inyo County.

**Pavement Conditions Index (PCI):** PCI is a standard measure of pavement condition for individual roadway segments throughout the county. Taken individually, roadway PCI can highlight maintenance priorities for the region; taken wholistically, average PCI for the entire county can highlight trends in how well the available maintenance funding matches the necessary pavement maintenance. Inyo County and the City of Bishop last updated their Pavement Management Programs in 2022.

**Current Baseline Performance:** In 2022, the average PCI of Inyo County was 58.8 (fair), with 34 percent of Inyo County roadways having a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 11.9 percent having a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed). The average PCI for City of Bishop roadways in 2022 was 52.5 (poor), with 24 percent of City roadways having a PCI of greater than 70 (good to excellent) and 10 percent having a PCI of 0 to 25 (very poor to failed).

**Performance Target:** It is the goal of this RTP to facilitate roadway maintenance projects that increase the average PCI of Inyo County and the City of Bishop roadways to 70 or higher (a rating of good to excellent), a reasonable and widely used threshold. It is important to note that if the PCI is 80 or below, Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds must be used to maintain existing roadways. If the PCI rises to 81, RMRA funds may be used for other types of projects, such as bike paths and EV charging stations.

**Distressed Lane-miles by Jurisdiction:** Distressed lane-miles is a performance measure used by Caltrans to identify roadway sections with poor pavement condition. Distressed lane-miles should be monitored tri-annually and this performance measure has a high level of accuracy.

**Current Baseline Performance:** The Inyo 2022 RTIP has identified that there are 36.887 distressed lane miles in the County, equating to 8.7 percent of lane miles.

**Performance Target:** To support the reduction in distressed lane miles in Inyo County.

**Percent of Transit Fleet Past Useful Lifespan:** Maintenance costs tend to increase (sometimes drastically) when a fleet vehicle is kept in service beyond its useful life and reliability can decrease as that vehicle ages. To maintain a reliable transit service and to moderate maintenance costs over the long term, evaluating the percentage of the fleet that is operating at or past its useful life is a useful performance standard for public transit. This performance measure can be determined by using ESTA vehicle inventory data.

**Current Baseline Performance:** ESTA, the public transit service provider in Inyo County, indicated in 2022 that 56 percent of its active fleet vehicles would be past their useful lifespan by 2023.



Performance Target: The goal is to enable ESTA to operate a fleet where 10 percent or less of vehicles are past their useful lifespan.

### ***Environmental and Health Sustainability (E)***

The state of California has established environmental goals to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions to 40 percent and 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2030 and 2050, respectively. Vehicle emissions are a significant contributor to GHG emissions.

**Mode Share/Split:** One way to measure a change in vehicle emissions is by looking at mode share/split. Capital improvement projects that make walking and bicycling safer and more convenient will increase the walk/bike mode split and decrease vehicle emissions. Encouraging more active transportation through transportation improvement projects also meets state public health objectives as these types of non-motorized facility projects also have the additional benefit of improving overall public health. Mode share data is available through the US Census Bureau, although it may have reduced accuracy in smaller counties.

**Current Baseline Performance:** According to the 2021 American Community Survey, 4.1 percent of Inyo County residents bike commute, and 5.9 percent walk to work.

**Performance Target:** The ATP projects that if all proposed ATP projects are completed, the mode split will increase to 6.6 percent of residents bicycling to work and 7.1 percent walking.

### ***Economic Sustainability (ES)***

Inyo County has a multitude of outdoor visitor attractions and recreation opportunities. A safe, well-maintained, and efficient transportation infrastructure is a key component to attracting visitors which provides important revenue for the region. The regional transportation system must also be able to absorb the impact of seasonal influxes of visitors and associated traffic.


**Miles of Class I Bike Path:** Recreation is already a significant economic input in Inyo County and providing walkable communities increases the appeal of a community. It can be hard to quantify the impact that transportation improvement has on economic sustainability, however, Class I bike paths encourage recreational tourism and active transportation. Therefore, an increase in the miles of Class I bike paths may correlate with an increase in economic sustainability in the County.

**Current Baseline Performance:** Currently, there are 2.5 miles of Class I paths in Inyo County.

**Performance Target:** Increasing the miles of Class I bike paths will increase economic sustainability.

### ***Recently Completed Projects***

Since the last RTP update, ICLTC has completed several transportation improvement projects ranging from roadway and airport runway rehabilitation to constructing bicycle lanes and new sidewalks. These accomplishments are listed in Table 12.



**TABLE 12: Recently Completed Transportation Improvement Projects in Inyo County**

| Lead Agency | Project Description                    | Construct Year | Funding Source      |
|-------------|----------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| County      | South Lake Road FLAP                   | 2020           | FLAP                |
| County      | North Round Valley Road Bridge         | 2023           | HBP                 |
| County      | Sunland Indian Reservation Road        | 2022           | RMRA                |
| County      | Goodale Road -- Independence           | 2022           | RMRA                |
| County      | Homewood Canyon Road                   | 2022           | RMRA                |
| County      | Cactus Flat Road Repair                | 2023           | RMRA                |
| County      | Knight Manor Micro Fiber Slurry Seal   | 2023           | RMRA                |
| County      | Grandview Micro Fiber Slurry Seal      | 2023           | RMRA                |
| City        | Spruce, Hanby, Yaney Sidewalks         | 2020           | ATP                 |
| City        | Seibu to School Path                   | 2020           | City of Bishop/TE   |
| City        | West Jay Street Extension              | 2019           | City of Bishop      |
| City        | Horace Albright Park Path Improvements | 2022           | City of Bishop/RMRA |

Source: Inyo County and City of Bishop

Table 13 presents Caltrans completed State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects since 2019. Completed projects include pavement rehabilitation, a raised median, and culvert projects.

**TABLE 13: Caltrans District 9 Recently Completed SHOPP Transportation Improvement Projects in Inyo County**

| Project Name                 | Work Description                                                                                                                | Funding Source |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Inyo Digouts                 | Repave US 395 in Bishop and near Little Lake                                                                                    | SHOPP          |
| Keoughs N/B Thin Blanket     | US 395 thin blanket with digouts from Warm Springs Rd to .3 miles north of Reynolds Rd                                          | SHOPP          |
| Westgard Shoulder Protection | SR 168 from White Mountain Rd to 4.8 miles east                                                                                 | SHOPP          |
| Furnace Creek Thin Blanket   | SR 190 between Furnace Creek and 3.6 miles east of Dante's View Rd                                                              | SHOPP          |
| Shoshone Drainage Project    | SR 178 east of Shoshone                                                                                                         | SHOPP          |
| Towne Pass Curves Project    | SR 190 near Towne Pass                                                                                                          | SHOPP          |
| SR 127 Pavement (CAPM)       | Near Shoshone, from 4.6 miles north of Rte 178 W to 7.6 miles south of Rte 190; from .3 miles south of Rte 190 to NV State Line | SHOPP          |
| Bishop Raised Median         | Bishop, at Main St and Park St and Main St and Church St                                                                        | SHOPP          |

Source: Caltrans 2023



## Proposed Projects

Proposed transportation improvement projects are listed in Tables 14 - 28. Projects are categorized by transportation facility and funding source. Each project is linked to one of the performance measures described above. The following improvement projects are consistent with those included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Improvements to address both short-term (10 years) and long-term (20 years) transportation needs are included in this RTP. Transportation improvement projects are classified into one of the following priority categories:

- Priority 1 projects are considered fully fundable during the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Plan five-year cycle.
- Priority 2 projects are considered fully fundable during the first ten years of the RTP (by 2033).
- Priority 3 projects are considered fundable given current revenue projections over the long term (11-20 years) or by 2043.
- Financially Unconstrained - The unconstrained project list is considered a “wish list” of projects that would benefit the region but will unlikely receive funding over the next 20 years unless new funding sources become available.

Determining the exact construction costs of transportation projects is difficult, especially for long-term projects. Over recent years, construction prices have increased substantially, however, it is expected that cost increases will slow in the long term. To produce a realistic view of the Inyo region’s transportation improvement costs, the cost estimates in the ensuing tables have been adjusted for inflation. A projected annual rate of inflation of 3 percent was applied to mid-term RTP projects and a rate of 2 percent was applied to long-term projects, reflecting the average annual rate of change of the Consumer Price Index from 2002 to 2022 and taking into consideration the significantly higher inflation rate between 2019 and 2023. Many of the projects in the following transportation improvement tables do not have construction years specified. Therefore, short-term project costs with unknown construction dates were adjusted to represent 5 years of inflation, mid-term project costs were adjusted to represent 10 years of inflation, and long-term projects were adjusted to represent 20 years of inflation.

### ***Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Projects***

Caltrans SHOPP projects (Table 14) are identified in the fiscally constrained SHOPP Plan for Inyo County and include a variety of safety, capacity enhancement, and system preservation projects on state highways. Projects are anticipated to total nearly \$188 million over the next ten years.





**TABLE 14: Caltrans District 9 Projects in Inyo County**

SHOPP Projects

| Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Route   | Back Post Mile | Ahead Post Mile | Project Location                                                                              | Total Project Cost | Program - Status     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Lone Pine Sidewalk and ADA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 395     | 56.8           | 58.3            | Lone Pine from Teya Road to East Lubken Avenue                                                | \$6,042            | SHOPP - PS&E and R/W |
| Meadow Farms ADA Improvements                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 395     | 117.3          | 117.9           | Near Bishop from N. See Vee Ln to N. Barlow Ln                                                | \$25,009           | SHOPP - PS&E and R/W |
| Lone Pine roadway rehab and ADA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 395     | 57.9           | 59              | Lone Pine from Locust St to north of Pangborne Ln                                             | \$12,421           | SHOPP - PA & ED      |
| Manzanar Pavement and ADA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 395     | 65             | 76              | Near Independence from 3 miles south of Manzanar Reward Rd to .3 miles north of Shabbell Lane | \$53,674           | SHOPP - PS&E and R/W |
| Bishop Pavement and ADA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 395/168 | 114.9/17.6     | 117.8/18.3      | Bishop: Main St from Jay St to Barlow Ln, Rte 168 from Pioneer Ln to 395 (Main St)            | \$25,209           | SHOPP - PA & ED      |
| Fish Springs Pavement and ADA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 395     | 91.6           | 100.8           | Near Big Pine, from 1.3 miles south of Fish Springs Rd to Rte 168                             | \$40,815           | SHOPP - PS&E and R/W |
| SR 168 West Pavement                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 168     | 0              | 17.5            | West of Bishop from the eastern end of the SR to .2 miles east of N. See Vee Ln               | \$12,440           | SHOPP - PID          |
| Golf Course 2-Way Left Turn Lane II                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 395     | 114.4          | 114.9           | South of Bishop near the Bishop Country Club                                                  | \$1,225            | SHOPP - CON          |
| Schober Lane 2-Way Left Turn Lane                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 395     | 114            | 114.9           | South of Bishop near the Bishop Country Club                                                  | \$1,200            | SHOPP - PA & ED      |
| Manor Market Complete Streets                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 168     | 16             | 16.8            | West of Bishop from Desiderata Ln to Barlow Ln                                                | \$10,095           | SHOPP - PID          |
| <b>Total Cost</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |         |                |                 |                                                                                               | <b>\$188,130</b>   |                      |
| <p>Note: PID = Project Initiation Document, PA &amp; ED = Project Approval and Environmental Documentation, PS&amp;E and R/W = Plans, Specifications, and Estimate and Right of Way, CON = Construction</p> <p>Source: Caltrans District 9 Quarterly Report (Jan-Mar 2023)</p> |         |                |                 |                                                                                               |                    |                      |



**TABLE 15: Caltrans District 9 Projects in Inyo County**

**SHOPP Minor Projects**

| Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Route | Back Post Mile | Ahead Post Mile | Project Location                                          | Total Project Cost (\$1,000s) | Program - Status |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Bike and Ped Improvements                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 168   | 17.6           | 17.8            | Bishop, from Pioneer Ln to Sunland Dr                     | \$920                         | CON              |
| Haiwee Creek S/B Shoulder                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 395   | 22.8           | 23              | S/B 395 between Haiwee Creek and 2nd Los Angeles Aqueduct | \$333                         | CON              |
| Install Equipment Canopy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 395   | 73.85          |                 | Independence Maintenance Station                          | \$5,700                       | PS&E/RW          |
| Towne Pass Bump                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 190   | 66.1           | 66.2            | 8.3 miles east of Panamint Valley Rd                      | NA                            | PS&E/RW          |
| Travertine Drainage Restoration Project                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 190   | 111.8          | 112.7           | .1 miles east to 1 mile east of Badwater Rd               | \$388                         | PS&E/RW          |
| D9 Lab Building                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 395   | 115.025        |                 | Bishop at Caltrans D9 Office 200 ft north of W Jay St     | \$11,436                      | PS&E/RW          |
| <b>Total Cost</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |       |                |                 |                                                           | <b>\$18,777</b>               |                  |
| <p>Note: PID = Project Initiation Document, PA &amp; ED = Project Approval and Environmental Documentation, PS&amp;E and R/W = Plans, Specifications, and Estimate and Right of Way, CON = Construction</p> <p>Source: Caltrans District 9 Quarterly Report (Jan-Mar 2023)</p> |       |                |                 |                                                           |                               |                  |



**TABLE 16: Inyo County Top Priority Funded Regional Roadway**  
Currently Programmed Projects in RTIP or Grant Funded

| Priority <sup>1)</sup>            | Route                                                        | Specific Location                                                                                                       | Proposed Project Description                                                                | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source     | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>                     |                                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                             |                |                     |                    |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | Lone Pine Sidewalk ADA                                       | Lone Pine Central Business District                                                                                     | Replace and construct sidewalks and pedestrian facilities to be ADA accessible              | 2023           | \$2,465             | ATP/COVID          | x                      |                     | x                                | x                                       | x                       |
| 1                                 | Lone Pine Town Rehabilitation                                | East Mountain View St., N. and S. Brewery St., Whitney Dr., Post St. Tim Holt Str. Lone Pine Av. Lake View and Muir St. | Reconstruct 2.75 miles of streets, repave and construct bike and walking lanes              | 2028           | \$3,700             | STIP/RMRA          | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       | x                       |
| 1                                 | State Line Road                                              | State Line Road from SR 127 to California/Nevada border                                                                 | Reconstruct 5.2 miles of State Line Road                                                    | 2028           | \$15,400            | FLAP               | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 1                                 | Old Spanish Trail Hwy                                        | Emigrant Pass                                                                                                           | Install high friction surface treatment, curve warning signs and flashing beacons           | 2025           | \$209               | HSIP               | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | Onion Valley Road Guardrail Project                          | Independence                                                                                                            | Replace 18 guardrail sections on Onion Valley Road                                          | 2023           | \$997               | HSIP               | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| <b>City</b>                       |                                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                             |                |                     |                    |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | East Line Street                                             | East Line Street Bridge over Bishop Creek Canal                                                                         | Replace and widen existing bridge, construct shoulders and sidewalks                        | 2025           | \$1,722             | STIP/COVID         | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                 | Downtown Bishop Parkways Green Alley Design -- Whitney Alley | Whitney Alley between Willow Street and Short Street                                                                    | Convert parking lots and alleyways into green space and multi-modal transportation corridor | 2024           | \$1,300             | Prop 68/City/Other | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       | x                       |
| 1                                 | Warren Street Rehab Project                                  | South end of Warren Street                                                                                              | Roadway and sidewalk improvements                                                           | 2025           | \$1,000             | CPFCDS             | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| <b>Death Valley National Park</b> |                                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                             |                |                     |                    |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | Badwater Road                                                | Various drainage crossings                                                                                              | Install below-ground reinforcements under roadway                                           | 2025           | NA                  | NPS                |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | North Highway/Bonnie Clare                                   | Various drainage crossings                                                                                              | Install below-ground reinforcements under roadway                                           | 2025           | NA                  | NPS                |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | Beatty Cut-Off, Daylight Pass, Mud Canyon                    | Various drainage crossings                                                                                              | Install below-ground reinforcements under roadway                                           | 2025           | NA                  | NPS                |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                 | Trona Wildrose Road                                          | From end of County maintained road to Wildrose Campground                                                               | Convert paved roadway surface to graded gravel                                              | 2025           | NA                  | NPS                |                        | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |

**Total Cost \$26,793**

Source: 2022 Inyo RTIP, City of Bishop, National Park Service

Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years

Note 2: PID = Project Initiation Document, PA & ED = Project Approval and Environmental Documentation, PS&E and R/W = Plans, Specifications, and Estimate and Right of Way, CON = Construction

Note 3: Represents total cost of project component, not just the ICLTC share

Note 4: HSIP = Highway Safety Improvement Program

Note 5: FLAP = Federal Lands Access Program

Note 6: Prop 68 funding is provided by the California Natural Resources Agency



**TABLE 17a: Inyo County Roadway Maintenance Projects**  
Currently Programmed Projects in CIP

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                    | Project Name                                                | Specific Location | Proposed Project Description                                                                                        | Construct Year | Total Cost (\$1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>                                                                                                                                              |                                                             |                   |                                                                                                                     |                |                       |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Crack Fill/Patching/Restriping/Overlay/Culverts             | Countywide        | Roadway and culvert repair, patching, restriping as required                                                        | 2023-2027      | \$7,500               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Watterson Road                                              | Bishop            | CMA Overlay on .3 miles of Watterson Road                                                                           | 2023           | \$114                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Sugar Loaf Road                                             | Big Pine          | CMA Overlay on .98 miles of Sugar Loaf Road                                                                         | 2023           | \$373                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Substation Road                                             | Lone Pine         | CMA Overlay on .4 miles of Substation Road                                                                          | 2023-24        | \$159                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Guardrail Replacement and Modernization - Design phase only | Countywide        | Whitney Portal Rd, Five Bridges Rd, Warm Springs Rd, Onion Valley Rd, Sabrina Rd, Brockman Ln, Barlow Ln, Poleta Rd | 2023           | \$150                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Horseshoe Meadow Road Slide Repair                          | Lone Pine         | Replace pavement with concrete thickened road section and guardrail at a landslide area                             | 2024           | \$1,000               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Poleta Road                                                 | Bishop            | CMA Overlay of .3 miles of Poleta Rd from Poleta Laws intersection east to cattleguard                              | 2024           | \$114                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Aberdeen Station Road                                       | Independence      | CMA Overlay of 1 mile of Aberdeen Station Road from US 395 to Tinnemaha Rd                                          | 2024           | \$380                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Fog Seal Project                                            | Countywide        | Whitney Portal Rd, Nine Mile Canyon Rd, Fort Independence Rd, Shabell Ln, Upper Rock Creek Rd                       | 2024           | \$759                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Horseshoe Meadow Road                                       | Lone Pine         | CMA Overlay of 1 mile of Horseshoe Meadow Rd between Whitney Portal Rd and Lubken Canyon Rd                         | 2025           | \$380                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County 2022 CIP                                                                                                                               |                                                             |                   |                                                                                                                     |                |                       |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years |                                                             |                   |                                                                                                                     |                |                       |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 17b: Inyo County Roadway Maintenance Projects**  
Currently Programmed Projects in CIP

| TABLE 17b: Inyo County Roadway Maintenance Projects<br>Currently Programmed Projects in CIP                                                                |                         |                   |                                                                               |                |                     |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                    | Project Name            | Specific Location | Proposed Project Description                                                  | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| County                                                                                                                                                     |                         |                   |                                                                               |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Independence Town Roads | Independence      | Type II Slurry Seal 1 mile segments                                           | 2025           | \$127               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | East Bishop Creek Road  | Bishop            | CMA Overlay of .76 miles from end of houses to end of pavement                | 2026           | \$289               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | School Street           | Big Pine          | CMA Overlay of 1.5 miles of School Street                                     | 2026           | \$570               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Fall Road               | Olancha           | CMA Overlay of .86 miles of Fall Road                                         | 2026           | \$327               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Bob White Way           | Tecopa            | CMA Overlay of .66 miles of Bob White Way                                     | 2026           | \$251               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Vanadium Road           | Bishop            | CMA Overlay of 1.75 miles of Vanadium Road                                    | 2027-28        | \$665               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Fish Hatchery Road      | Independence      | CMA Overlay of 1.21 miles of Fish Hatchery Road                               | 2027           | \$460               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Shop Street             | Olancha           | CMA Overlay of 1 mile of Shop Street                                          | 2027-28        | \$380               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Old State Highway       | Keeler            | CMA Overlay of .65 miles of Old State Highway                                 | 2027           | \$247               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Emergency Repairs       | Countywide        | Roadway, bridge, culvert repair as required in the event of natural disasters | TBD            | TBD                 | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Death Valley National Park                                                                                                                                 |                         |                   |                                                                               |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | Furnace Creek Road      | Death Valley      | CMA Overlay on 1 mile of Furnace Creek Road at Inyo County line               | 2023           | \$380               | RMRA           |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Total                                                                                                                                                      |                         |                   |                                                                               |                | \$14,625            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County 2022 CIP                                                                                                                               |                         |                   |                                                                               |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years |                         |                   |                                                                               |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 18a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Long-Term - 10 -20 years

| Priority(1)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Project Name/Route                   | Specific Location                                | Proposed Project Description                                  | Construct Year | Total Cost<br>(1,000s)(2) | Funding<br>Source  | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System<br>Investment | Environmental and<br>Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                      |                                                  |                                                               |                |                           |                    |                        |                     |                                     |                                            |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Trona-Wildrose Rd                    | 0.5 mile section from San Bernardino County Line | Level out uneven road surface (dips) on high speed rural road | TBD            | \$552                     | STIP               |                        | x                   | x                                   |                                            |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Old Spanish Trail Highway            | Old Spanish Trail Highway                        | Reconstruct roadway - transverse cracks                       | TBD            | \$26,527                  | STIP / FLAP / RMRA |                        | x                   | x                                   |                                            | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Independence Rehabilitation Phase II | Town streets in Independence                     | Reconstruct roadway - transverse cracks                       | TBD            | \$2,208                   | STIP               |                        |                     | x                                   |                                            |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Whitney Portal Road                  | US 395 to aqueduct                               | Reconstruct with addition of bicycle lanes                    | TBD            | \$552                     | STIP               | x                      | x                   | x                                   |                                            | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | South Barlow Lane                    | South Barlow Lane / Reata Road                   | Rehabilitation - transverse cracks<br>Possible bicycle lane   | TBD            | \$1,473                   | STIP               |                        | x                   | x                                   | x                                          |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | North Barlow Lane                    | From Hwy 168 to end of road                      | Reconstruct                                                   | TBD            | TBD                       | STIP               |                        | x                   | x                                   | x                                          |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Alabama Hills Rehabilitation Project | Streets in Alabama Hills Residential Area        | Rehabilitation - transverse cracks                            | TBD            | \$2,208                   | STIP               |                        |                     | x                                   |                                            |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Sawmill Rd                           | Sawmill Rd                                       | Rehabilitation - transverse cracks<br>Possible bicycle lane   | TBD            | \$2,208                   | STIP               |                        | x                   | x                                   | x                                          |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Aspendell Rehabilitation Project     | Town streets in Aspendell                        | Reconstruct and rehabilitate 2.7 miles of roadway             | TBD            | \$2,208                   | STIP / RMRA        |                        | x                   | x                                   |                                            |                         |
| <p>Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop, Fort Independence Tribe</p> <p>Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years</p> <p>Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 10 years of inflation based on the growth of the CPI from 1998 - 2018</p> |                                      |                                                  |                                                               |                |                           |                    |                        |                     |                                     |                                            |                         |





**TABLE 18b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Long-Term - 10 -20 years

| TABLE 18b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects<br>Long-Term - 10 -20 years                                                                               |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority(1)                                                                                                                                                | Project Name/Route   | Specific Location                         | Proposed Project Description                                            | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s)(2) | Funding Source      |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| County                                                                                                                                                     |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | West Bishop Phase II | McLaren and other streets                 | Reconstruct roadway - transverse cracks                                 | TBD            | \$3,312                | STIP                |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | See Vee Extension    | See Vee Lane                              | Extend See Vee Lane (joint with Caltrans)                               | TBD            | \$6,520                | STIP                | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Glacier Lodge Rd     | From US 395 to road end                   | Reconstruct                                                             | TBD            | \$1,104                | STIP match for FLAP |                        |                     | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Onion Valley Rd      | From west end of Independence to road end | Reconstruct                                                             | TBD            | \$1,104                | STIP match for FLAP |                        |                     | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Nine Mile Canyon Rd  | Nine Mile Canyon Rd                       | 2" AC overlay on a 6.0 mile stretch                                     | TBD            | \$1,104                | FLAP / RMRA         |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Mummy Lane           | Mummy Lane Bridge                         | Deteriorating bridge, does not qualify for regular bridge program funds | TBD            | \$1,656                | STIP, HSIP, Local   |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Death Valley National Park                                                                                                                                 |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                          | SR 190               | Death Valley - Ryans Pass                 | Visitor Use Facilities                                                  | TBD            | NA                     | FLAP                | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         | x                       |
| Fort Independence Tribe                                                                                                                                    |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Fort Independence    | US 395                                    | Grade-separated crossing to connect east and west sides of US 395       | TBD            | \$15,000               | TBD                 | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | Miller Lane          | Intersection with US 395                  | Turn lanes onto/off of US 395, safety improvements at intersection      | TBD            | NA                     | TBD                 |                        | x                   |                                  |                                         | x                       |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                 |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                | \$75,466               |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop, Fort Independence Tribe                                                                                               |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 10 years of inflation based on the growth of the CPI from 1998 - 2018                                       |                      |                                           |                                                                         |                |                        |                     |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 19a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Long-Term - 10 - 20 years

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Project Name/Route                 | Specific Location | Proposed Project Description                                                                      | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s)(2) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| City                    |                                    |                   |                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                       | East Line St Improvements          | East Line St      | Rehabilitate pavement, construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk, improve drainage, create bike lane   | TBD            | \$7,208                | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Willow Street Improvements         | Willow St         | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk along Willow Main to Hanby                          | TBD            | \$3,726                | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Iris Street Improvements           | Iris St           | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk                                                     | TBD            | \$466                  | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Clarke Street Improvements         | Clarke St         | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk along Clarke Main to Third                          | TBD            | \$1,863                | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Short Street Improvements Phase II | Short St          | Rehabilitate pavement, const curb, gutter, and sidewalk, imp drainage as practical east of Second | TBD            | \$1,118                | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Moffet Street Improvements         | Moffet St         | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk                                                     | TBD            | \$931                  | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Yaney Improvements                 | Yaney St          | Rehabilitate pavement, construct continuous curb, gutter, and sidewalk, improve drainage          | TBD            | \$5,961                | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Church Street Improvements         | Church St         | Rehabilitate pavement, construct continuous curb, gutter, and sidewalk as practical               | TBD            | \$931                  | STIP           | x                      | x                   | x                                | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Wye Road Intersection              | Wye Rd            | Improve intersections with Highway 6 and highway 395 (joint with Caltrans)                        | TBD            | \$3,726                | STIP           | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                       | First Street Improvements          | First St          | Drainage, pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk                                                        | TBD            | \$931                  | STIP           | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |

Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop

Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained

Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 20 years of inflation based on the CPI



**TABLE 19b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Long-Term - 10 - 20 years

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                   | Project Name/Route                 | Specific Location                    | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                                    | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s)(2) | Funding Source | Mobility/Access | Safety and Security | Transportation Investment | Environmental Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| City                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                    |                                      |                                                                                                                                                 |                |                        |                |                 |                     |                           |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | West Pine Street Improvements      | West Pine St                         | Rehabilitate pavement, continuous curb, gutter, and sidewalk, improve drainage Home to Main                                                     | TBD            | \$3,279                | STIP           | x               | x                   |                           |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Sneden Street Improvements         | Sneden St                            | Rehabilitate pavement, continuous curb, gutter, and sidewalk, improve drainage South to Line                                                    | TBD            | \$1,826                | STIP           | x               | x                   |                           | x                                   |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Warren St Rehab Project            | Warren Street                        | Roadway and sidewalk improvements                                                                                                               | TBD            | \$4,416                | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Short Street Improvements Phase 1  | Short St                             | Rehabilitate pavement, construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk, improve drainage as practical West of Sneden                                       | TBD            | \$662                  | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Third St Improvements              | Third St                             | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk, drainage along Third South to Pine                                                               | TBD            | \$2,868                | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | May St Improvements                | May St                               | Rehabilitate pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk along May Main to Hanby                                                                           | TBD            | \$2,868                | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Wye Road (Joint City/County)       | Wye Road Extension to Bishop Airport | New access to Bishop Airport, possibly to correspond with other airport improvements                                                            | TBD            | \$3,312                | STIP           | x               | x                   |                           |                                     | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop City Streets Rehabilitation | Misc Bishop Streets                  | Rehabilitate street pavement with PCI of less than 55 (failed to poor condition), improve drainage, repave and construct bike and walking lanes | TBD            | \$6,800                | STIP / RMRA    | x               | x                   | x                         | x                                   | x                       |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Johnston Drive Improvements        | Johnston Drive                       | Rehabilitate pavement, improve drainage South to Line, continuous curb and gutter                                                               | TBD            | \$2,868                | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Hanby Ave Improvements             | Hanby Ave                            | Rehabilitate pavement, improve drainage Spruce to Line, continuous curb, gutter, and sidewalks                                                  | TBD            | \$2,868                | STIP           | x               | x                   | x                         |                                     |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Misc. Alleys                       | Misc City of Bishop Alleys           | Rehabilitate alley pavement and improve drainage                                                                                                | TBD            | \$3,442                | STIP           |                 |                     | x                         |                                     |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                                                |                                    |                                      |                                                                                                                                                 |                | \$62,071               |                |                 |                     |                           |                                     |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop                                                                                                                                                       |                                    |                                      |                                                                                                                                                 |                |                        |                |                 |                     |                           |                                     |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained |                                    |                                      |                                                                                                                                                 |                |                        |                |                 |                     |                           |                                     |                         |
| Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 20 years of inflation based on the CPI                                                                                                     |                                    |                                      |                                                                                                                                                 |                |                        |                |                 |                     |                           |                                     |                         |



**TABLE 20: Inyo County Regional Highway Bridge Program Projects**

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                    | Project Proponent | Location                                   | Project Description                                                                                                                               | Total Cost (\$1,000) <sup>(2)</sup> | Construction Year | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Walker Creek Road Bridge                   | Replace Bridge No. 48C-39, across the Los Angeles Aqueduct. The existing one-lane, 9-foot wide bridge will be replaced with a 28 feet wide bridge | \$3,250                             | 2023-24           | HBP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Carroll Creek Bridge                       | Replace bridge over DWP aqueduct                                                                                                                  | \$2,450                             | 2025              | HBP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Brockman Lane over S. Fork of Bishop Creek | Replace bridge                                                                                                                                    | TBD                                 | TBD               | HBP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Old Sherwin Grade Rd                       | Replace bridge                                                                                                                                    | TBD                                 | TBD               | HBP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                          | County            | All bridge locations                       | Replace all bridges on County's bridge list that are structurally deficient/functionally obsolete                                                 | \$33,745                            | TBD               | HBP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| <b>Total Cost</b>                                                                                                                                          |                   |                                            |                                                                                                                                                   | <b>\$39,445</b>                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop                                                                                                                        |                   |                                            |                                                                                                                                                   |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years |                   |                                            |                                                                                                                                                   |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect inflation based on the CPI                                                                                  |                   |                                            |                                                                                                                                                   |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |

**TABLE 21: Inyo County Regional Culvert Projects**

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                    | Project Proponent | Location                  | Project Description                     | Total Cost (\$1,000) <sup>(2)</sup> | Construction Year | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Mazurka Canyon Rd         | Replace culvert at Owens River crossing | \$100                               | TBD               | TBD            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Manzanar Reward Rd        | Replace culvert at Owens River crossing | \$100                               | TBD               | TBD            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                          | County            | Lone Pine Narrow Gauge Rd | Replace culvert at Owens River crossing | \$100                               | TBD               | TBD            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| <b>Total Cost</b>                                                                                                                                          |                   |                           |                                         | <b>\$300</b>                        |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop                                                                                                                        |                   |                           |                                         |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years |                   |                           |                                         |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect inflation based on the CPI                                                                                  |                   |                           |                                         |                                     |                   |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 22a: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Financially Unconstrained

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Project Name/Route                                     | Proposed Project Description                                                                   | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s)(2) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>           |                                                        |                                                                                                |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Bishop & Big Pine Roadway Restoration Phase I          | 2" AC overlay on 8.2 miles of County maintained roads in and around Bishop & Big Pine          | TBD            | \$1,718                | RMRA           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Independence area roadway improvement project          | 2" AC overlay on 6.0 miles of roadway on rural roads near Independence                         | TBD            | \$1,080                | RMRA           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine roadway restoration project                  | 2" AC overlay on 6.7 miles of roadway in Lone Pine & the Alabama Hills subdivision             | TBD            | \$1,875                | RMRA           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Sage Flat Rd                                           | Reconstruct first mile of Sage Flat Rd and Olancho town streets                                | TBD            | \$4,823                | FLAP           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Lower Horseshoe Meadows Road                           | 2" overlay - From Whitney Portal Road to 1st turn, bicycle lanes from Whitney Portal to Sunset | TBD            | \$13,249               | FLAP / Local   |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Upper Horseshoe Meadows Road                           | Reconstruct - From first turn to Horseshoe Meadows recreational areas                          | TBD            | \$13,249               | FLAP           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Ninemile Canyon Road Rehabilitation Project            | Reconstruct, add additional guardrail                                                          | TBD            | \$8,833                | FLAP           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Pine Creek Road                                        | Reconstruct - From US 395 to Rovana                                                            | TBD            | \$2,744                | FLAP           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Bishop & Big Pine Roadway Restoration Phase II         | Chip seal on 31.4 miles of road in and around Bishop & Big Pine                                | TBD            | \$1,083                | RMRA           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Buttermilk Road Improvements                           | Improve roadway, parking, trailhead amenities                                                  | TBD            | NA                     | FLAP           | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | West Jay Street Extension                              | Extend West Jay Street west to Sunland Avenue                                                  | TBD            | \$5,589                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                       | See Vee Extension                                      | Extend See Vee Lane to Jay Street                                                              | TBD            | \$9,314                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Olancho, Cartago, & Darwin Road Rehabilitation Project | 2" AC overlay on 1.9 miles of road located near these rural communities                        | TBD            | \$311                  | RMRA           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Butcher Lane                                           | Reconstruct                                                                                    | TBD            | NA                     | IRR            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |

Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop

Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained

Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 20 years of inflation based on the CPI



**TABLE 22b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects**  
Financially Unconstrained

| TABLE 22b: Inyo County Regional Roadway Projects<br>Financially Unconstrained                                                                                                             |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                   | Project Name/Route       | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                      | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s)(2) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| County                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Various                  | Provide surface treatment every 10 years and repaving/reconstruction every 20 years                                               | Ongoing        | NA                     | STIP           |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | US 395 Truck Bypass      | Construct truck bypass around Bishop                                                                                              | TBD            | \$48,333               | STIP           |                        | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| City                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | A Street                 | Extend Pioneer Ln north to Sierra St and convert Sierra Bike Path to road, constructing new street between Line and N. Sierra Hwy | TBD            | \$11,177               | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lagoon Street Extension  | Extend Lagoon Street to Sunland Drive                                                                                             | TBD            | \$2,794                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | South Street West        | Extend South Street to Sunland Drive                                                                                              | TBD            | \$3,726                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Hanby Extension          | Extend Hanby to Wye Road                                                                                                          | TBD            | \$5,589                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | North Second Connections | Connect North Second Street to East Line Street                                                                                   | TBD            | \$2,794                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Grove/Pine Realignment   | Realign Grove Street and East Pine Street at Main Street and signalize                                                            | TBD            | \$14,903               | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Wye Road Improvements    | Rehabilitate pavement, construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk on south side from Hwy 6 to Spruce                                    | TBD            | \$1,490                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Fowler Extension         | Extend Fowler Street to Sierra Street                                                                                             | TBD            | \$2,000                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Sierra Street Extension  | Extend Sierra Street to See Vee Lane                                                                                              | TBD            | \$5,589                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                         | Horace Albright Ave      | Realign Park/Main intersection and construct street to connect at Rome and Home                                                   | TBD            | \$5,589                | STIP           | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                | \$163,178              |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 2: Construction costs adjusted to reflect 20 years of inflation based on the CPI                                                                                                     |                          |                                                                                                                                   |                |                        |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |





**TABLE 23: Inyo County Regional Public Transit Projects**

| TABLE 23: Inyo County Regional Public Transit Projects                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                               |                    |                     |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                   | Proposed Project Description                                                                  | Construct Year     | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Continual Fleet Replacement                                                                   | Began FY 2017 - 18 | NA                  | PTMISEA/ FTA   |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Replace 16 vehicles                                                                           | FY 2022-23         | \$3,350             | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Replace 1 vehicle                                                                             | FY 2023-24         | \$374               | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Replace 13 vehicles                                                                           | FY 2024-25         | \$6,416             | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Replace 2 vehicles                                                                            | FY 2025-26         | \$888               | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Replace 1 vehicle                                                                             | FY 2026-27         | \$225               | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Real-time Traveler Information                                                                | FY 2022-23         | \$40                | FTA            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Facility Security Improvements                                                                | FY 2022-23         | \$8                 | FTA            | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop and Lone Pine Vehicle Charging Infrastructure                                          | FY 2023-24         | \$20                | FTA            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Phase I Operations Facility Improvements Construct New Administrative and Operations Facility | FY 2022-23         | \$1,700             | FTA            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         | x                       |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Phase II Operations and Maintenance Facility Improvements Bus Parking Improvements            | TBD                | NA                  | FTA/STIP       |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Fleet Electrification Infrastructure                                                          | 2025               | NA                  | FTA/STIP       |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                         | Technological Improvements - software, onboard video, radios                                  | TBD                | NA                  |                |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                               |                    | \$13,022            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: ESTA                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                               |                    |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 5 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained |                                                                                               |                    |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 24: Inyo County Active Transportation Funded Projects**

| TABLE 24: Inyo County Active Transportation Funded Projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   |                     |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Project Name                                 | Specific Location                                                                                                       | Proposed Project Description                                                               | Construction Year | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| County                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Lone Pine Town Rehabilitation <sup>(2)</sup> | East Mountain View St., N. and S. Brewery St., Whitney Dr., Post St. Tim Holt Str. Lone Pine Av. Lake View and Muir St. | Reconstruct 2.75 miles of streets, repave and construct bike and walking lanes             | 2028              | \$3,026             | STIP           | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Lone Pine Sidewalk ADA <sup>(2)</sup>        | Lone Pine Central Business District                                                                                     | Replace and construct sidewalks and pedestrian facilities to be ADA accessible             | 2023              | \$2,465             | ATP/COVID      | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Big Pine Paiute Tribe                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Moving Towards All-Electric in Big Pine      | Big Pine Paiute Tribe                                                                                                   | Installation of EV chargers, new bus stops and purchase of EV transit bus                  | 2024              | \$1,000             | CMO            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Death Valley National Park                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Salt Creek Boardwalk                         | West of Furnace Creek off of SR 190                                                                                     | Replace pedestrian boardwalk and signage, repair access road, parking area, and facilities | 2024              | TDB                 | FHA ERFO       | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   | \$6,491             |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, National Park Service<br>Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/ high priority potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained<br>Note 2: Also included in the funded roadway projects table<br>Note 3: Clean Mobility Options (CMO) voucher program |                                              |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                            |                   |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 25a: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**

Mid-term, High Priority

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Location       | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                                               | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>           |                |                                                                                                                                                            |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                       | Lone Pine      | South Lone Pine Sidewalk (0.45 miles of sidewalk on one side of US 395 from end of sidewalk near LADWP to Teya Road)                                       | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 2                       | Bishop Area    | Meadow Farms North Sidewalk (0.23 miles of sidewalk on the north side of US 395 or North Sierra Highway from Cherry Lane to the art store)                 | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 3                       | Tecopa         | Old Spanish Trail Highway (0.72 miles from Tecopa Hot Springs Road to Downey Road) Class II/III                                                            | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 4                       | Big Pine Tribe | Improve pedestrian safety and sidewalks on Bartell Road and Blake St                                                                                       | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 5                       | Lone Pine      | Class II/III Bicycle Lanes on Post St., Lone Pine Av, and Lakeview St.                                                                                     | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 6                       | Bishop Area    | Class II/III Bicycle Lanes on Red Hill Road from Ed Powers Rd to SR 168                                                                                    | \$700               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 7                       | Big Pine       | Town to Tract Class II/III Bicycle Lanes - 1.7 miles On Reynolds from Myrtle Lane to County Rd, Baker Creek Rd to US 395 and all of School St and Blake St | \$868               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 8                       | Olancho        | Multi-use trail connection from SR 190 to Haiwee Trail and buffered Class II bike lanes added to SR 190                                                    | \$900               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 9                       | Olancho        | 190 Junction Amenities -- Install signage and trailhead, improve pedestrian safety and crosswalks, create pocket park                                      | \$900               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 10                      | Bishop Area    | Dixon Ln from Saniger Ln to US 6 - Class II/III Bicycle Lanes                                                                                              | \$6,683             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |

Source: Inyo County

Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria



**TABLE 25b: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**

Mid-term, High Priority

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Location         | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                    | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>County</b>           |                  |                                                                                                                                 |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 11                      | Cartego          | Class I path from Northern Gateway to SR 190                                                                                    | \$2,100             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 12                      | Big Pine         | Veteran's Path - .25 miles of Class I Path between Poplar St and Veteran's Memorial and crosswalk at US 395 and Mendenhall Park | \$1,000             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 13                      | Bishop Area      | Class II/III Bicycle Lanes Schober Lane (1.1 miles between Barlow Lane and Sunland Lane)                                        | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 14                      | Lone Pine        | Class II/III Bicycle Lanes Horseshoe Meadows Road (2.1 miles from Sunset Road to Whitney Portal Road)                           | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 15                      | Cartego          | Cartego Amenities -- Install signage and trailhead development, improve pedestrian safety and crosswalks                        | \$175               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 16                      | Bishop Area      | North Fork of Bishop Creek - Improve path along North Fork Bishop Creek between Highway 6 and Bishop Creek Canal                | \$50                | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 17                      | Bishop Area      | Bishop to Laws Path - Improve water crossings Bishop to Laws on proposed rail alignment                                         | \$1,000             | ATP            | x                      |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 18                      | Olancho /Cartego | Install wayfinding signage and improve pedestrian safety and crosswalks                                                         | \$160               | ATP            |                        | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 19                      | Bishop Area      | Five Bridges Rd from Jean Blanc to US 6 - Expand shoulder                                                                       | \$9,701             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 20                      | Bishop Area      | Class II/III Bicycle Lanes Sawmill Road (1.7 miles from Ed Powers Road west to US 395)                                          | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 21                      | Bishop Area      | Sidewalks on SR 168 between Meadow Lane and Grandview                                                                           | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |

Source: Inyo County

Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria



**TABLE 25c: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**  
Mid-term, High Priority

| TABLE 25c: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                 |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                        | Location            | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                                  | Total Cost | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| County                                                                         |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 22                                                                             | Bishop Area         | Bishop to Chalk Bluffs Path - Improve highway and water crossings Sierra Street to Chalk Bluffs Road along Bishop Canal                       | \$750      | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 23                                                                             | Inyo County         | Share the Road Signage in Round Valley                                                                                                        | NA         | ATP            |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 24                                                                             | Wilkerson           | Collins Rd from Gerkin Rd to US 395 - Expand shoulder                                                                                         | \$3,700    | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Ongoing                                                                        | Countywide          | Add fog lines and "Share the Road" signage on rural roads where feasible                                                                      | NA         | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
|                                                                                |                     |                                                                                                                                               | Total Cost | \$28,687       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Death Valley National Park                                                     |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                              | Death Valley NP     | Bicycle safety improvements on SR 190 from Cow Creek Rd to the Furnace Creek Inn                                                              | NA         | ATP/ FLAP      | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                              | Death Valley NP     | Class II/III bicycle lanes on SR 190 from Cow Creek Rd to Stovepipe Wells Resort                                                              | NA         | ATP/ FLAP      | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                              | Death Valley NP     | Class II/III bicycle lanes on Badwater Road from SR 190 to Badwater                                                                           | NA         | ATP/ FLAP      | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Bishop Paiute Tribe                                                            |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                              | Bishop Tribe/County | South Barlow Lane - Rehabilitate Class I Bicycle Path from Highland Drive to SR 168 and construct Class II Bicycle Lanes on North Barlow Lane | \$3,529    | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 2                                                                              | Bishop Tribe        | Sidewalk - Barlow Lane between SR 168 and US 395                                                                                              | \$639      | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 3                                                                              | Bishop Tribe        | Indian Path from See Vee Lane to Schools - Improve trail using decomposed granite and polymer stabilizer for all-weather durable surface      | \$171      | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: Inyo County                                                            |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria |                     |                                                                                                                                               |            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 25d: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**

Mid-term, High Priority

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                        | Location                       | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                                  | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Bishop Paiute Tribe</b>                                                     |                                |                                                                                                                                               |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                              | Bishop Tribe/County            | South Barlow Lane - Rehabilitate Class I Bicycle Path from Highland Drive to SR 168 and construct Class II Bicycle Lanes on North Barlow Lane | \$3,529             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 2                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Sidewalk - Barlow Lane between SR 168 and US 395                                                                                              | \$639               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 3                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Indian Path from See Vee Lane to Schools - Improve trail using decomposed granite and polymer stabilizer for all-weather durable surface      | \$171               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 4                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Sidewalk to Bus Stop - See Vee Lane to Hwy 395                                                                                                | \$666               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 5                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Street lighting on tribal roads to increase bicycle and pedestrian visibility and safety                                                      | \$14                | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 6                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Sidewalk - Diaz Lane Eastward from Barlow Lane                                                                                                | \$333               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 7                                                                              | Bishop Tribe                   | Sidewalk - Tu Su Lane                                                                                                                         | \$666               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| <b>Fort Independence Tribe</b>                                                 |                                |                                                                                                                                               |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                              | Fort Independence Tribe/County | Class I Path from Miller Lane to East Inyo Street                                                                                             | \$2,500             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 2                                                                              | Fort Independence Tribe        | Class I Path parallel to Frontage Rd, Sidewalks on Frontage Rd                                                                                | \$725               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: Inyo County                                                            |                                |                                                                                                                                               |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria |                                |                                                                                                                                               |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |





**TABLE 25e: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**

Mid-term, High Priority

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Location          | Proposed Project Description                                                                    | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>City of Bishop</b>   |                   |                                                                                                 |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                       | City/Bishop Tribe | Diaz to School Class I Bike Path - Diaz Lane to elementary schools                              | \$1,000             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 2                       | City of Bishop    | Pine to Canal Path - Class I bike path from East Pine Street to east side of Bishop Creek Canal | \$1,000             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                       | City of Bishop    | Yaney Sidewalks - Along Yaney at City Park                                                      | \$400               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 4                       | City of Bishop    | Clarke Street to Lagoon - Class II/III Bicycle Lanes, Sidewalks                                 | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 5                       | City of Bishop    | Academy Sidewalk - Provide continuous curb, gutter, sidewalk                                    | \$400               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 6                       | City of Bishop    | Bike Path Rehab - Reconstruct bike path between Sierra Street and North Sierra Highway          | \$1,717             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 7                       | City of Bishop    | Pine Sidewalks - Fill in gaps in sidewalk along at least one side of West Pine, Main to Fowler  | \$250               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 8                       | City of Bishop    | Fowler Sidewalk - Provide continuous curb, gutter, sidewalk                                     | \$980               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 9                       | City of Bishop    | Home St. Connection - Class I path west of elementary schools to Home Street School campus      | \$900               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 10                      | City of Bishop    | Close sidewalk gaps along Elm St.                                                               | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 11                      | City of Bishop    | Sierra to School Path - Extend Class 1 bike path from Sierra Street to elementary schools       | \$1,137             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |

Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop, Fort Independence Indian Reservation 2023 Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment

Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria



**TABLE 25f: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects**

Mid-term, High Priority

| TABLE 25f: Inyo County Unfunded Active Transportation Projects                                                         |                         |                                                                                                                  |                     |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Mid-term, High Priority                                                                                                |                         |                                                                                                                  |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                | Location                | Proposed Project Description                                                                                     | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| City of Bishop                                                                                                         |                         |                                                                                                                  |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 12                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Hanby Sidewalks - Curb, gutter, and sidewalk Line to Pine and Spruce to Yaney                                    | \$500               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 13                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Class II/III bicycle lanes on Fowler and Elm St. as alternative to US 395                                        | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 14                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Sierra Street Sidewalk- Construct sidewalk along at least the north side of Sierra between Main and Home         | \$300               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 15                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Main Street Streetlights - Place decorative streetlights and hanging baskets on Main Street                      | \$600               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| 16                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Hobson to Coats Path - Class I bike path/pedestrian path from Hobson Street to Coats Street                      | \$450               | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 17                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop/Caltrans | Continue Class II/III bicycle lanes on West/East Line Street                                                     | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 18                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Wayfinding signage to direct cyclists onto alternative routes to US 395                                          | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 19                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop/Caltrans | Continue Class II/III bicycle lanes on West/East Line Street                                                     | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 20                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | North Fork of Bishop Creek - Improve path along North Fork Bishop Creek between Highway 6 and Bishop Creek Canal | \$50                | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 21                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Bishop to Laws Path - Improve water crossings Bishop to Laws on proposed rail alignment                          | \$1,000             | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 22                                                                                                                     | City of Bishop          | Wayfinding signage to direct cyclists onto alternative routes to US 395                                          | NA                  | ATP            | x                      | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                             |                         |                                                                                                                  | \$40,937            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: Inyo County, City of Bishop, Fort Independence Indian Reservation 2023 Tribal Transportation Safety Assessment |                         |                                                                                                                  |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Based on Active Transportation Plan Prioritization Evaluation Criteria                                         |                         |                                                                                                                  |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**Table 26a: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**  
Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Location    | Facility                         | From              | To               | Proposed Project Description                                                                         | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class I</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |             |                                  |                   |                  |                                                                                                      |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Sunrise Ln/Longview Dr Connector | Sunrise Ln        | Schoeber Ln      | Extend path north of Schoeber Lane bend. Obtain easements and add path connections to these streets. | 0.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| <b>Class II or III</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |             |                                  |                   |                  |                                                                                                      |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Hanby Ave                        | E Yaney St        | E Line St        | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 0.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Main St (US 395)/US 6            | Dixon Ln          | Sunland Ln       | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 5.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | N Barlow Ln                      | US 395            | SR 168           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | N Barlow Ln                      | Bar M Ln          | US 395           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. Rehabilitate existing facilities.  | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | N See Vee Ln                     | US 395            | SR 168           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | N Tu Su Ln                       | US 395            | SR 168           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Pine Creek Rd                    | N Round Valley Rd | US 395           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1.7   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Poleta Rd                        | Canal bridge      | Airport Rd       | Existing shoulder wide enough for Class 3 facility, add signage.                                     | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Reata Rd                         | SR 168            | Coyote Valley Rd | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | N/S Round Valley Rd              | Birchim Ln        | Sawmill Rd       | Existing shoulder wide enough for Class 3 facility, add signage.                                     | 7.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Saniger Ln                       | Dixon Ln          | Bar M Ln         | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. Rehabilitate existing facilities.  | 0.7   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Sawmill Rd                       | US 395            | Ed Powers Rd     | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes.                                                | 1.7   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Bishop area | Schoeber Ln                      | S Barlow Ln       | Sunland Ln       | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                    | 1.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects.<br>Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained |             |                                  |                   |                  |                                                                                                      |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**Table 26b: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**

Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                               | Location        | Facility                                              | From                      | To                         | Proposed Project Description                                                                                               | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class II or III</b>                                                                                                                                                                                |                 |                                                       |                           |                            |                                                                                                                            |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Sunrise Ln                                            | S Barlow Ln               | End                        | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Underwood Ln                                          | Reata Rd                  | S Barlow Ln                | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.9   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | US 6                                                  | Dixon Ln                  | Silver Canyon Rd           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 2.7   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Wye Rd                                                | US 395                    | Spruce St                  | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Lower Rock Creek Road                                 | Birchim Ln/Pine Creek Rd. | Mono County Line           | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 2.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Route signage for "Laws – Warm Springs" loop route    |                           | Loop ride east of Bishop   | Add bike route signs with directions and distances at turns, for example "Laws Railroad Museum – 2"                        | 19.1  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Downtown commercial district circulation alternatives | Westerly US 395 Alternate | Through main street Bishop | Bike route with signage, and optionally Shared Roadway Bicycle Markings, on Fowler, Grove, Pine, Third, and South Streets. | N/A   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | E Line St                                             | S Main St                 | Canal bridge               | Existing shoulder wide enough for Class 3 facility, add signage.                                                           | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Gerkin Rd                                             | Sierra Bonita             | Collins Rd                 | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | US 395                                                | Inyo/Mono County line     | Barlow Ln                  | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, share the road signage.                                                                | 11.6  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | S Barlow Ln                                           | Underwood Ln              | Schoeber Ln                | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | S Barlow Ln                                           | S end of Class I facility | Underwood Ln               | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                                          | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop/Big Pine | US 395                                                | Sunland Dr                | County Rd, SR 168E         | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, share the road signage.                                                                | 11.5  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Eastside Rd                                           | Poleta Rd                 | Warm Springs Rd            | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                                                              | 2.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area     | Jean Blanc Rd                                         | Fish Slough Rd            | Five Bridges Rd            | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                                                              | 0.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects. |                 |                                                       |                           |                            |                                                                                                                            |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained             |                 |                                                       |                           |                            |                                                                                                                            |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**Table 26c: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**

Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                               | Location    | Facility               | From                                    | To                                                           | Proposed Project Description                                      | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class II or III</b>                                                                                                                                                                                |             |                        |                                         |                                                              |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Keough Hot Springs Rd  | County Rd                               | US 395                                                       | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 0.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Longview Dr            | S Barlow Ln                             | End                                                          | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Poleta Rd              | Airport Rd                              | Eastside Rd                                                  | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 3.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Warm Springs Rd        | S Main St                               | Eastside Rd                                                  | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 4.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Pleasant Valley Dam Rd | US 395                                  | Southern end of Pleasant Valley Reservoir                    | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 2.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Gorge Rd               | Lower Rock Creek Rd (Old Sherwin Grade) | Northern end of Pleasant Valley Reservoir, LADWP Power House | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 1.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Birchim Ln             | N/S Round Valley Rd                     | Lower Rock Creek Rd (Old Sherwin Grade)                      | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 1.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Bishop area | Wye Rd                 | Spruce St                               | Canal Path                                                   | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 0.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | Steward Ln             | US 395                                  | Newman St                                                    | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | Bartell Avenue         | US 395                                  | Newman St                                                    | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | County Rd              | Reynolds Rd                             | US 395                                                       | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | Fish Springs Rd        | US 395                                  | US 395                                                       | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 3     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | Newman St              | Bartell Rd                              | Steward Ln                                                   | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine    | Steward Ln             | Newman St                               | Big Pine Canal                                               | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects. |             |                        |                                         |                                                              |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained             |             |                        |                                         |                                                              |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**Table 26d: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**

Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                               | Location              | Facility              | From                | To                      | Proposed Project Description                                      | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class II or III</b>                                                                                                                                                                                |                       |                       |                     |                         |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine              | US 395                | County Rd           | Fish Springs Rd         | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, share the road signage.       | 5.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Black Rock Springs Rd | Tinemaha Rd         | US 395                  | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 0.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Aberdeen Station Rd   | Tinemaha Rd         | US 395                  | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 1.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Goodale Rd            | Tinemaha Rd         | US 395                  | Add signage and shoulder stripes                                  | 1     | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Tinemaha Rd           | Aberdeen Station Rd | Goodale Rd              | Add signage and shoulder stripes                                  | 5.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Tinemaha Rd           | Fish Springs Rd     | Fuller Rd               | Add signage and shoulder stripes                                  | 2.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Big Pine/Independence | Tinemaha Rd (north)   | Fish Springs Rd     | Tinemaha Rd             | Add signage and shoulder stripes                                  | 0.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | Fort Independence Rd  | Schabbel Ln         | US 395                  | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 0.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | E Miller              | Shabbell Ln         | Fort Independence Rd    | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes.             | 0.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | Fish Hatchery Rd      | S Oak Creek Rd      | US 395                  | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 1.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | Fort Independence Rd  | E Miller            | US 395                  | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 0.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | Shabbell Ln           | US 395              | Fort Independence Rd    | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage. | 1.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | US 395                | Fish Hatchery Rd    | Market St               | Add bike lanes, and share the road signage.                       | 2.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | Mazourka Canyon Rd    | US 395              | E of Abandoned Railroad | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                     | 4.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence          | US 395                | Fish Springs Rd     | Shabbell Ln             | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, and share the road signage.   | 16.5  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects. |                       |                       |                     |                         |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained             |                       |                       |                     |                         |                                                                   |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |





**Table 26e: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**

Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                               | Location                   | Facility               | From                 | To                 | Proposed Project Description                                                                       | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class II or III</b>                                                                                                                                                                                |                            |                        |                      |                    |                                                                                                    |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence               | US 395                 | E Market St          | Manzanar Reward Rd | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, and share the road signage.                                    | 5.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Independence/<br>Lone Pine | US 395                 | Manzanar Reward Rd   | Teya Rd            | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, and share the road signage.                                    | 11.1  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | E Begole St            | US 395               | N Jackson St       | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | E Muir St              | S Main St            | S Lone Pine Ave    | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | Horseshoe Meadows Rd   | Whitney Portal Rd    | Lubken Canyon Rd   | Add striping/ bike lanes. Bicycle safety signage present.                                          | 3.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | Lubken Canyon Rd       | Horseshoe Meadows Rd | US 395             | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes. May need to acquire additional right-of-way. | 3.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | N Jackson St           | E Begole St          | Whitney Portal Rd  | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.3   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | N Washington St        | W Locust St          | E Muir St          | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | S Lone Pine Ave        | E Locust St          | E Muir St          | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | SR 136                 | US 395               | SR 190             | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                  | 17.5  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | Sub Station Rd         | E Inyo St            | Abandoned Railroad | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                                  | 0.9   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | Tuttle Creek Rd        | Whitney Portal Rd    | Lubken Canyon Rd   | Route constrained by narrow canyon and riparian area. Add shoulder stripes or signage.             | 5.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | W Locust St            | N Washington St      | US 395             | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                                           | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | North Main St (US 395) | Lone Pine Park       | Pangborn Lane      | Signage, striping, sidewalk, both sides of Highway                                                 | 0.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Lone Pine                  | South Main St (US 395) | Inyo St              | CA 136             | Signage, striping, sidewalk, both sides of Highway                                                 | 1.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects. |                            |                        |                      |                    |                                                                                                    |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained             |                            |                        |                      |                    |                                                                                                    |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**Table 26f: Inyo County Regional Unconstrained Bicycle Facility Projects**

Long Term

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup> | Location  | Facility                                                   | From                      | To                          | Proposed Project Description                                                 | Miles | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Class II or III</b>  |           |                                                            |                           |                             |                                                                              |       |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | Lone Pine Reservation to Town (Teya St, Zucco Rd, Inyo St) | US 395 / Teya St          | US 395 / Inyo St            | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage             | 0.9   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | E Inyo St                                                  | S Main St                 | Sub Station Rd              | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.            | 0.2   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | E Muir St                                                  | S Washington St           | S Main St                   | Alternate route signage. Expand shoulder                                     | 0.1   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | Whitney Portal Rd                                          | S Main St                 | Horseshoe Meadows Rd        | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes. Bicycle safety signage present.          | 3.5   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | US 395                                                     | Gill Station Coso Rd      | Inyo/Kern County Line       | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, and share the road signage.              | 18    | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | Lone Pine Narrow Gauge Rd                                  | US 395                    | Owenyo Lone Pine Rd         | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.                              | 3.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Lone Pine | US 395                                                     | Teya Rd                   | Gill Station Coso Rd        | Add shoulder stripes or bike lanes, and share the road signage.              | 39.3  | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Olancho   | SR 190                                                     | US 395                    | Borax Mill Rd               | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                | 102   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | Furnace Creek Rd                                           | Old Spanish Trail Highway | China Ranch Rd              | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.            | 1.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | Furnace Creek Rd                                           | Old Spanish Trail Highway | China Ranch Rd              | Expand shoulder - add shoulder stripes or bike lanes and signage.            | 1.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | Tecopa Hot Springs Rd                                      | Furnace Creek Rd          | Tecopa Hot Springs (Resort) | Extend existing Class 3 facility near Tecopa Hot Springs to North and South. | 0.6   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | Old Spanish Trail                                          | Downey Rd                 | Nevada State Line           | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                | 30    | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | SR 127                                                     | SR 178                    | Furnace Creek Rd            | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                | 6.8   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | SR 178                                                     | Furnace Creek Wash Rd     | SR 127                      | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                | 6.9   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |
| U                       | Tecopa    | SR 178                                                     | SR 127                    | Chicago Valley Rd           | Expand shoulder, stripe/bike lanes or signage                                | 5.4   | x                      | x                   |                                  | x                                       |                         |

Source: 2008 Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, Inyo County. Projects are classed as Unfunded since there are no longer any regular sources of funding for alternative transportation projects.  
Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained



**TABLE 27: Inyo County Regional Airport Capital Improvement Projects**  
Short-Term Projects

| TABLE 27: Inyo County Regional Airport Capital Improvement Projects                                                                                                                       |                          |                                                                  |                |                     |                | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Short-Term Projects                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                                                                  |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                   | Location                 | Proposed Project Description                                     | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Runway 12-30 RSA Grading/Fencing                                 | 2024           | \$2,250             | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Replace rotating beacon on existing tower                        | 2024           | \$50                | AIG            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Design and Construct Airline Terminal, Access Road and Utilities | 2025           | \$16,000            | AIP            | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Construct ARFF, SRE, Maintenance Building                        | 2026           | \$2,247             | AIG            | x                      |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Construct Airline Ramp                                           | 2027           | \$10,000            | AIP            | x                      | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Bishop Airport           | Perimeter fencing upgrades                                       | TBD            | \$1,111             | AIP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Independence Airport     | Runway 14-32 Rehabilitation                                      | 2025           | \$1,500             | AIP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lone Pine Airport        | Taxiway A Pavement Resurfacing                                   | 2023           | \$200               | AIP            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lone Pine Airport        | Lighting Improvements                                            | 2025           | \$489               | AIG            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lone Pine Airport        | Taxiway B Pavement Rehabilitation                                | 2026           | \$750               | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lone Pine Airport        | Terminal Improvements                                            | TBD            | \$122               | AIG            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Lone Pine Airport        | Pavement Rehabilitation of the Airport Apron and Hanger Area     | TBD            | \$1,500             | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Furnace Creek Airstrip   | Rehab runway and tie-down area                                   | TBD            | \$5,000             | TBD            |                        | x                   | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 2                                                                                                                                                                                         | Stovepipe Wells Airstrip | Remove pavement and convert to graded gravel airstrip            | TBD            | \$1,000             | TBD            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| Total Cost                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                                                                  |                | \$42,219            |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Source: 2023-2028 ACIP, National Park Service                                                                                                                                             |                          |                                                                  |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |
| Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained |                          |                                                                  |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



**TABLE 28: Inyo County Regional Airport Capital Improvement Projects**  
Long-Term Projects

| Priority <sup>(1)</sup>                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Location                        | Proposed Project Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Construct Year | Total Cost (1,000s) | Funding Source | Mobility/Accessibility | Safety and Security | Transportation System Investment | Environmental and Health Sustainability | Economic Sustainability |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Bishop Airport                  | Runway safety area improvements on 17-35                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | TBD            | NA                  | AIP            |                        | x                   |                                  |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Bishop Airport                  | Extend runway 12/30 and Taxiway A approximately 1,200 feet to NW (8,700 feet), extend clear zone and runway safety area, continue development of infrastructure for convention center and commercial areas in Airport Master Plan, construct additional hangars and aprons, construct control tower, install navigational aids and markings | TBD            | NA                  | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Lone Pine Airport               | Pave runway 13/31, construct parallel taxiway along Runway 13/31 to improve safety, construct additional hangars and aprons                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | TBD            | NA                  | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | Shoshone Maury Sorrells Airport | Reconstruct runway 15/33 to remove sag, extend and widen Runway 15/33 to accommodate larger aircraft, replace lighting system along Runway 15/33                                                                                                                                                                                            | TBD            | NA                  | AIP            |                        |                     | x                                |                                         |                         |
| <p>Source: County of Inyo</p> <p>Note 1: Priority: 1 = Funded/construction 0 - 5 years, 2 = Unfunded/potential construction 0 - 10 years, 3 = Unfunded/potential construction 10 - 20 years, U = Financially unconstrained</p> |                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                |                     |                |                        |                     |                                  |                                         |                         |



### ***Caltrans SHOPP Minor Projects***

SHOPP minor projects (Table 15) are funded by the SHOPP Minor Program, a funding program reserved for SHOPP-eligible smaller capital improvement projects of less than \$1.2 million. Minor projects include bike and pedestrian improvements, improvements at a Caltrans maintenance station, and shoulder improvements. Projects are anticipated to total nearly \$18 million over the next ten years.

### ***Inyo County Top Priority Funded Regional Roadway Projects***

Inyo County's portion of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for fiscal years 2022-23 through 2026-27 is presented in Table 16. This table represents programmed Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds for the Inyo region.

The project intent statements below outline the purpose and need of Inyo County 2022 RTIP projects.

- Olancho – Cartago 4-Lane – This major highway project moved into the construction phase in 2021 and therefore is not included in the 2022 RTIP or Table 16. That being said, ICLTC continues to have a significant negative share balance due to its commitment to the terms of the MOU that was established between Inyo, Mono, and Kern Counties. This negative balance has a significant impact on available STIP funds during this planning period and warrants mention here. The tri-state MOU expired and was not renewed.
- Lone Pine Sidewalk ADA – This ATP project will replace and construct sidewalks and pedestrian facilities in the Lone Pine Central Business District in accordance with ADA standards. This project will increase mobility and safety for bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with limited mobility as well as visitors to Inyo National Forest. ATP grant funds have been secured and COVID funds will be utilized. The projected total cost is \$2.5 million.
- Lone Pine Town Rehabilitation – This project will repave the following streets: East Mountain View St., North and South Brewery St., North and South Whitney Dr., East Post St., West Post Street, Tim Holt St., North and South Lone Pine Av., North and south Lake View St. and East Muir St. Bike lanes will be striped on Post St. Lone Pine Ave and Lake View St. The ESTA bus loading area on E. Muir St. will be improved and all pedestrian facilities will be upgraded to ADA standards. Select streets will be striped for on-road walking lanes. This project will utilize STIP and RMRA funds and is projected to total \$3.7 million.
- Old Spanish Trail Highway – This state highway project will install high friction surface treatment to the section of Old Spanish Trail Highway over the Emigrant Pass. Additionally, curve warning signs and flashing beacons will be installed. This safety improvement project is funded by a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant and is projected to total \$209,000. This project was identified as a high priority in the Local Roadway Safety Plan.
- Onion Valley Road Guardrail Project – This safety improvement project will replace 18 guardrail sections on Onion Valley Road near Independence. This project is funded by an HSIP grant and is projected to total \$997,000.



- State Line Road Rehabilitation – This project will reconstruct 5.2 miles of State Line Road from SR 127 to the California/Nevada border. This significant roadway rehabilitation project is funded by a FLAP grant and is projected to total \$15.4 million.
- East Line Street Bridge Project – The East Line Street Bridge span is less than 20 feet and therefore ineligible for Highway Bridge Program funds. East Line Street is a two-lane city street and provides the only access to the Bishop Airport. The bridge crosses the Bishop Creek Canal at the eastern city limit. There is a lack of adequate separation between vehicular traffic and pedestrian traffic on the aging bridge as well as a lack of protection of the above-ground 10-inch water main. The maximum build-out of the project will replace the existing 18.5-foot long by 30-foot-wide bridge with a 30-foot long by 60-foot wide bridge. The project aims to provide a safe pedestrian and bike route across the bridge as well as a sidewalk extending to Johnston Drive. The project will be funded by STIP and COVID funds and totals \$1.7 million.
- Downtown Bishop Parkways Green Alley Design -- Whitney Alley – This project will enhance several parking lots and an alleyway in downtown Bishop adjacent to Main Street by adding green space, public art, and a multi-modal use path. The project will span from Willow Street to Short Street and is funded through a combination of grants, such as Prop 68, and City funds. The total cost is projected to be \$1.3 million.
- Trona Wildrose Road – This project in Death Valley National Park will convert the paved roadway surface to graded gravel on the Trona Wildrose Road from the end of the county-maintained road to the Wildrose Campground. This project will be funded by NPS.
- Death Valley National Park will install below-ground reinforcements under the roadway at various drainage crossings on Badwater Road, North Highway/Bonnie Clare, Beatty Cut-off, Daylight Pass, and Mud Canyon. This project will be funded by NPS.

### ***Roadway Maintenance Projects***

Table 17 lists roadway maintenance projects that are identified in the 2022 Inyo County Roads Capital Improvement Program (CIP). All projects listed are short-term rehabilitation projects that are funded using RMRA funds. The RMRA is funded through Senate Bill 1 Gas Tax. Projects programmed in the CIP include pavement rehabilitation, guardrail replacement, and bridge repair and total a projected \$16 million over the next five years.

### ***Long-Term Priority Regional Projects***

Tables 18 and 19 list projects that will potentially be funded over the latter half of the RTP planning period. STIP, Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP), and HSIP funds are potential funding sources for these county and city projects. Approximately \$89 million in funds will be required to construct these projects. These projects will address a variety of transportation issues identified in Chapter 3 of this RTP, including safety and preserving the roadway system which is often used by visitors to the area.





### ***Regional Highway Bridge Program Projects***

Local roadway bridge rehabilitation and reconstruction projects to be funded with Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds are presented in Table 20. The local match for these projects will likely stem from Toll Credits. A total of \$39.5 million in project costs is estimated.

### ***Regional Culvert Replacement Projects***

High-priority culvert replacement projects are presented in Table 21.

### ***Financially Unconstrained Regional Roadway Projects***

Table 22 presents Inyo County's "wish list" of transportation improvements to the roadway system. Although not considered top-priority projects, these improvements are important to the region. These projects could be funded using STIP, FLAP, RMRA, and Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) Program funds as well as competitive grant funding. Cost estimates for unconstrained projects reach over \$190 million.

### ***Transit Capital Improvement Projects***

Similar to other rural transit agencies, ESTA must operate long distances and in all types of weather conditions. As such, it is important to develop an appropriate transit vehicle replacement schedule. Installing EV charging infrastructure is also a high priority for ESTA during the planning period, as it supports the ESTA ZEV Roll-out Plan. Upgrading passenger facilities to improve the mobility of existing passengers, particularly ADA-eligible passengers, and upgrading the existing operations facility at the Bishop Airport are also priorities. Table 23 presents transit capital improvement projects for the short and long term. Transit vehicles will be replaced at the end of their useful life using a combination of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and state bond funds. Phased improvements for a new operations and maintenance facility and fleet electrification infrastructure will likely be funded with FTA and STIP funds.

### ***Non-Motorized Facility Improvement Projects***

Throughout the development of this RTP, the importance of increasing safety for bicyclists and pedestrians has been identified by stakeholders, tribal entities, and the public. The Eastern Sierra communities are fairly compact, lending them to easy non-motorized transportation provided it is relatively safe. Additionally, many residents do not have a vehicle. To promote safe active transportation, the County and the City of Bishop have identified a list of bicycle path and sidewalk projects. Short-term funded projects are identified in Table 24. Other mid-term, long-term, and financially unconstrained bicycle improvement projects outlined in the Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan 2008 and 2023 Active Transportation Plan (ATP) are displayed in Tables 25 and 26. The implementing agency must also ensure that there is sufficient funding and staff available to maintain the project after construction. Table 25 lists the higher priority ATP projects ranked by how well the project meets all the evaluation criteria. Table 26 lists long-term projects and projects which are currently in the conceptual phase.



## Airport Improvement Projects

The Inyo County Airport Capital Improvement Program for short-term projects is listed in Table 27. Roughly \$42 million in runway rehabilitation, airport lighting, and other projects have been identified, including improvements to improve the airport for commercial service. Long-term improvement projects such as runway extension for the Bishop Airport are displayed in Table 28.

## Tribal Transportation Projects

Tribal transportation needs for various types of transportation facilities have been discussed throughout this document. Fort Independence Tribe provided recent transportation safety plans which were reviewed as part of this update and the Bishop Paiute Tribe provided several transportation planning documents as part of the last RTP update. Projects on tribal land are included in their respective project tables.

## Goods Movement

Freight transportation, particularly trucking, is an important function of the Inyo regional transportation system. Trucking generates a significant percentage of traffic volumes on portions of US 395 in Inyo County. Roadway rehabilitation and reconstruction projects throughout the region as well as the four-lane US 395 project and US 6 improvements will improve the safety and reliability of goods movement throughout Inyo County. This RTP is consistent with the California Freight Mobility Plan.

## ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

The RTP Guidelines recommend that RTPs include a discussion of potential environmental mitigation activities and areas, including those mitigation activities that might maintain or restore the environment that is affected by the plan. The majority of RTP projects located within the Inyo region are road reconstruction or rehabilitation and do not require disturbing or paving new lands. New roadway projects will undergo a thorough environmental review before construction.

Before implementing road or bicycle/pedestrian improvement projects, the County of Inyo and the City of Bishop abide by all permitting requirements stipulated by applicable state and federal natural resource agencies, such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Forest Service, Army Corp of Engineers and Regional Water Quality Control Board. The County and the City follow all state regulations and BMPs concerning storm-water pollution prevention and water pollution control.

As part of the public participation process (described in Chapter 1 and documented in Appendix A), state and federal resource agencies were contacted and maps of natural resources under each agency's jurisdiction were requested. These agencies were contacted at the beginning of the RTP update process. Available natural resource agency maps and documents were compared to this RTP in an attempt to find potential conflicts between transportation improvement projects and natural resources. The details of these comparisons are summarized in the environmental agency consultation section of Chapter 1.



## Wildlife Considerations

As Inyo County is rich in biological diversity, ICLTC recognizes the need to consider the impacts of the RTP on wildlife, habitat connectivity and health, and species health. The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) identifies the presence of special-status species in Inyo County and multiple Essential Connectivity Areas and Natural Landscape Blocks have been identified by Caltrans and California Department of Fish and Game. Roadways can divide wildlife corridors and also create potential barriers to fish movement along waterways and any transportation improvement projects undertaken within Inyo County will evaluate their impacts on wildlife corridors and habitat connectivity.

The ICLTC supports actions that would retain and improve habitat connectivity, in accordance with Senate Bill 790 (2021) and supports interagency actions to identify and mitigate barriers to wildlife movement, created by the development of transportation infrastructure, in accordance with Assembly Bill 2344 (2022).



*This page intentionally left blank*



## Chapter 7

# FINANCIAL ELEMENT

---

The Financial Element is fundamental to the development and implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan. This chapter identifies the current and anticipated revenue resources and financing opportunities available to fund the planned transportation investments that are described in the Action Element in support of the goals, policies, and objectives presented in the previous Policy Element. The intent is to identify and define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. The following provides a summary of the federal, state, and local programs and funding sources available to the Inyo County region for transportation improvements. This chapter additionally examines future regional transportation revenues and compares anticipated transportation revenues with proposed transportation projects. From a practical perspective, finances and funding availability ultimately determine which projects are constructed.



The region is bound by strict rules in obtaining and using transportation funds. Some funding sources are “discretionary,” meaning they can be used for general operations and maintenance and are not tied to a specific project or type of project. However, even discretionary funds must be used to directly benefit the transportation system for which they are collected. For example, funds derived from gasoline taxes can only be spent on roads, and aviation fuel taxes must be spent on airports. State and federal grant funding is even more specific. There are several sources of grant funds, each designated to a specific type of facility (e.g., bridges or state highways), and/or for a specific type of project (e.g., reconstruction or storm damage). This system makes it critical for the county to pursue various funding sources for various projects simultaneously, and to have the flexibility to implement projects as funding becomes available.

The majority of RTP Action Element projects will be funded by recurring or non-competitive federal or state grants. In addition to recurring money, many competitive grants are available for transportation projects, but success in obtaining these types of funds is difficult to predict. A wide variety of funding sources that could be employed by Inyo County to complete the financially constrained and unconstrained projects outlined in the Action Element are listed below.

### TRANSPORTATION FUNDING SOURCES

A wide range of funding sources are available for roadway improvements and projects to advance the visionary goals outlined in federal and state strategic plans. The following discussion provides an overview of these programs, funding sources, and requirements.



## Federal Transportation Funding

***Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) or Bipartisan Infrastructure Law:*** Over the years, the federal government has provided guaranteed funding for surface transportation improvements through legislation. The IIJA is the most recent version and replaces the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The IIJA was signed into law on November 21, 2021. The IIJA funds surface transportation programs, including but not limited to federal highways, at over \$567.5 billion for fiscal years 2022 through 2026. This represents a \$274 billion increase over previous levels of funding through the FAST Act. Traditionally, the federal transportation bill has been funded through federal gas taxes, however as vehicles have become more efficient, there is less revenue to draw from. The passage of the IIJA represents a concerted effort to increase federal funding for transportation and implement several new funding programs that were not available previously. Many of the following programs are directly funded under the IIJA and are potential funding sources for Inyo County transportation improvement projects.

### ***National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)***

This competitive program focuses on repairing and improving the National Highway System. The Highway Bridge Program (HBP), which funds the repair of highway bridges according to federal safety standards, is a part of NHPP. State and local bridge replacement projects are funded through Caltrans with HBP grants. The goal of the program is to rehabilitate or replace public highway bridges when it has been determined that the bridge is significantly important and unsafe. The federal share of an HBP project is 80 percent. To be eligible for rehabilitation a bridge must be rated Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete with a sufficiency rate of less than 80. Under the IIJA, the NHPP can fund projects that increase resiliency to climate change impacts.

### ***Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)***

Generally, the Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance of Federal-aid highway, bridge, and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. Under the IIJA, the STBGP can fund the construction of wildlife crossings, EV charging infrastructure, and intermodal connections between innovative transportation technologies. Roughly \$14.4 billion in recurring flexible funding will be available annually nationwide. This program includes a set aside for Transportation Alternatives (non-motorized improvements and traffic calming techniques) and Recreational Trails. STBGP funds can be exchanged for state funds as discussed below to provide greater flexibility of funding and less administrative burden.

### ***Bridge Replacement, Rehabilitation, Preservation, Protection and Construction Program***

New under the IIJA, this recurring program allocates funding specifically for bridges, a percentage of which can be used for bridges off of the National Highway System.





### ***Bridge Investment Program***

New under the IIJA, \$12.5 billion is allocated competitively over five years for bridge and culvert rehabilitation by states, local, federal, and tribal entities.

### ***Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)***

This competitive program authorizes roughly \$3.1 billion in annual funding for projects to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Safety projects include traffic calming road design and construction and infrastructure safety needs, in addition to safety programs such as education, enforcement, and emergency medical services. California's Local HSIP focuses on infrastructure projects with nationally recognized crash reduction factors (CRFs). Local HSIP projects must be identified based on crash experience, crash potential, crash rate, or other data-supported means. Fatality rates on rural roads must be tracked to determine the allocation to the High-Risk Rural Road Program. IIJA emphasizes the safety of 'vulnerable road users' and requires a percentage of funds to be allocated to increase the safety of this group if a threshold is met for annual fatalities.

### ***Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Discretionary Grant Program***

Formerly known as BUILD and TIGER, this competitive program provides approximately \$1.5 billion annually in grant funding for surface transportation projects which will have significant regional impact. Eligible applicants include state and local governments, tribal governments, and counties. Project costs must be at least \$1,000,000 and no more than \$25 million and a benefit-cost analysis is required. Projects for this highly competitive grant program are selected by the Secretary of Transportation.

### ***Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) Grant Program***

This competitive grant program provides approximately \$2 billion a year for multimodal freight and highway projects. Local governments or groups of local governments and tribal governments are eligible to apply.

### ***Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program***

Part of the Multimodal Project Discretionary Grant Program (MPDG), the Rural program supports projects that improve and expand surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas to increase connectivity, improve the safety and reliability of the movement of people and freight, and generate regional economic growth and improve quality of life. Eligible projects for Rural grants include highway, bridge, and tunnel projects that help improve freight and safety, and provide or increase access to agricultural, commercial, energy, or transportation facilities that support the economy of a rural area. 90% of rural funding must be awarded in \$25 million or greater amounts. A total of \$675 million is available in 2023.



### ***Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant Program (SS4A)***

This new program competitively provides \$1 billion annually for competitive grants for “Towards Zero Death” initiatives, reducing and preventing deaths and injuries on roads and streets. This grant program is available to MPOs, local, and tribal governments.

### ***Climate Pollution Reduction Program***

This competitive program provides grants to states, local governments, tribes, and territories to develop and implement plans for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other harmful air pollution. This two-phase grant program provides funding of \$250 million for noncompetitive planning grants and \$4.6 billion for competitive implementation grants.

### ***Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program***

This program provides a recurring flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas). Projects that qualify include alternative mobility projects, such as bike share and shared scooter programs, and the purchase of medium and heavy-duty ZEVs and charging infrastructure.

### ***National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program***

This competitive program provides \$1 billion in annual funding for EV charging infrastructure. Funding can only be used for public charging stations and must be used on an Alternative Fueling Corridor (US 395 is one) until the corridor has sufficient charging infrastructure, at which time funding can be used for any public road or facility. This funding is allocated to the states to award.

### ***Discretionary Grants for Charging and Fueling Infrastructure***

IIJA provides competitive grant funding for the development of ZEV charging infrastructure along Alternative Fueling Corridors and within communities. States, MPOs, local governments, RTPAs, and tribes are all eligible to apply for these grants.

### ***Federal Lands Transportation Program***

This program provides around \$440 million annually for projects that improve access to national forests, national recreation areas, or other infrastructure owned by the federal government. The majority of funding, approximately \$340 million, is allocated to the National Park Service, another \$36 million to US Fish and Wildlife, around \$25 million to the Forest Service, and the remaining is allocated to the remaining federal agencies.



### ***Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)***

This program provides approximately \$295 million annually for projects that improve access to all Federal Lands, including wayfinding signage and re/construction of rest areas and parking areas. Funds are distributed to each state by a formula based on recreational visitation, land area, public road mileage, and number of public bridges.

### ***Tribal Transportation Program (TTP)***

This competitive program continues the Indian Reservation Roads program and adds set-asides for tribal road projects and tribal safety projects. It continues to provide set-asides for program management and oversight and tribal transportation planning. Roughly \$600 million will be available annually.

### ***Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects***

A discretionary grant for large federal land or tribal land projects.

### ***Highway Safety Research and Development***

This new competitive grant program provides \$970 million over five years for highway safety research and development activities. Counties, cities, tribes, educational institutions, and nonprofits are eligible to apply.

### ***National Culvert Removal, Replacement Grant***

This competitive grant program provides \$1 billion over five years for the replacement, removal, and repair of culverts. Local governments and tribes are eligible to apply.

### ***Advanced Transportation Technologies and Innovative Mobility Development Grant***

This new competitive grant program provides \$900 million over five years to deploy, install, and operate advanced transportation technology. Local governments, RTPAs, and transit agencies are eligible to apply.

### ***Pilot Program for Transit-Oriented Development***

This competitive grant program is focused on the integration between land use and transportation planning by funding projects that include multimodal connectivity and transit access and accessibility for active transportation users. IIJA ensures that this grant program provides \$14 million annually for five years. Local governments are eligible to apply.

### ***Federal Transportation Loan Programs***

Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) Rural Project Initiative (RPI)— This program provides low-interest loans and lines of credit to support large-scale rural surface transportation improvement projects. Eligible projects include roadway and bridge, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, aviation, and transit projects. Eligible applicants include state and local governments, transit agencies, and private entities.



In addition, Federal funds are available for transit operations and capital assistance through the Federal Transit Administration discussed below.

## State Transportation Funding

Transportation funding in California is both complex and full of uncertainty. Generally, revenue sources for transportation improvements are generated from fuel excise taxes, fuel sales taxes, and the statewide sales tax. In recent years, California transportation funding has become dependent on motor fuel sales tax. Since 2001, proceeds from these taxes have been diverted from the transportation program to address the general fund deficit, despite legislation prohibiting these actions except in the case of severe state fiscal hardship. As a result, the STIP and SHOPP funds (primary funding programs for the state highway system), as well as transit funding sources, have been raided for general fund purposes.

The struggle to balance the state budget and adequately fund transportation projects in California is ongoing. Various state legislation and ballot propositions in recent years have changed revenue flows for state transportation sources. The “gas tax swap” eliminated the sales tax on gasoline and implemented the price-based excise tax on gasoline to fund transportation improvements. As part of the legislation, an increase in the diesel fuel sales tax was offset by a decrease in the diesel fuel excise tax. The objective of the gas tax swap was to provide a mechanism to fund transportation bond debt service (gasoline sales tax revenues have more stringent restrictions on uses). At the same time, voters passed Proposition 22 which restricted diversions of fuel excise tax revenues in the State Highway Account for non-transportation purposes. Therefore, new legislation was passed that swapped weight fees, previously used for Caltrans operations to be used for bond debt service.

The result is that STIP roadway projects (State Highway Account) will be funded through fuel excise taxes. STIP Transit and transportation planning projects (Public Transportation Account) and public transit operations are funded primarily through sales tax on diesel fuel. State excise fuel taxes flow through the Motor Vehicle Fuel Account to fund the STIP, SHOPP, Active Transportation Program, and City and County Road Funds. Appendix F displays a chart of Caltrans’ Overview of Transportation Funding in California for reference.

The following section lists the transportation funding sources available through the State of California.

### ***California Senate Bill 1 (SB 1)***

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, also known as SB 1, provides additional recurring funding for existing transportation programs such as State Transit Assistance (STA) and funding for local streets and roads and creates new initiatives, such as the Roadway Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA). Effective November 1, 2017, and adjusted for inflation starting in 2020, SB 1:

- Increased the gasoline excise tax by an additional \$0.12 per gallon
- Increased the diesel fuel excise tax by \$0.20 per gallon
- Increased the sales tax on diesel fuel by 4 percent



- In addition to the excise tax increases, SB 1 creates a Transportation Improvement Fee (TIF), a new vehicle registration fee, and a Road Improvement Fee, a registration fee for ZEVs model year 2020 and newer. Revenue from the TIF and Road Improvement Fee along with the excise tax increases provides significant additional revenue for the STIP, SHOPP, ATP programs, local roadway projects, and bridge maintenance, as well as for public transit.

### ***Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)***

This account is an important source of recurring funding for priority roadway maintenance, rehabilitation projects, and safety projects. These funds are available for basic projects identified by counties in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). As this account collects funds from the excise tax, TIF, and Road Improvement Fee, the RMRA is poised to become an increasingly critical source of funding for local roadway maintenance.

### ***State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)***

This recurring funding source consists of two broad transportation improvement programs: (1) the regional program funded by 75 percent of new STIP funding, and (2) the interregional program funded by 25 percent of new STIP funding.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) – RTIP funds account for 75 percent of STIP funding. The 75 percent portion is subdivided by formula into county shares. The ICLTC program funds which are apportioned to the region. These funds may be used to finance projects that are both “on” and “off” the state highway system. This “regional share” must be relied on to fund capacity-increasing projects on much of the state highway system. Critical to rural California counties, regional STIP funding may be used for local rehabilitation projects.

Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) – The ITIP receives the remaining 25 percent of the STIP funding. This program is controlled and programmed by Caltrans, although regional agencies provide input on the specific ITIP projects for their region. One of the goals of the program is to encourage regional agencies and the state to establish partnerships to conduct certain projects. For the rural California counties, a challenge to use ITIP funding is the very limited availability of “local match” for ITIP-funded programs. (However, RTIP funds can be used as a match for the ITIP program.) In actuality, Caltrans receives 15 percent for state highway projects on the interregional system; potential projects must compete statewide for the remaining funds. Much of the state highway system is not eligible for interregional funding and must rely on the regional share to fund capacity improvement projects. US 395 is eligible.

### ***Planning Programming and Monitoring Funds***

Programming of these funds comes from county shares and can be programmed for each year of the STIP. The CTC STIP Guidelines define eligible PPM activities as regional transportation planning (including the development and preparation of the regional transportation plan), project planning (including the development of project study reports or major investment studies, conducted by regional agencies or by



local agencies in cooperation with regional agencies), program development (including the preparation of RTPs and studies supporting them), and monitoring the implementation of STIP projects (including project delivery, timely use of funds, and compliance with State law and the CTC guidelines).

Caltrans estimates the amount of funding available for the STIP program for five years every two years. The most recent STIP Fund Estimate was developed in 2023 for 2024. Based on that fund estimate and the STIP Guidelines, the ICLTC developed a program of projects for five years. The ICLTC submits this program of projects called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The RTIP specifies cost per project component and fiscal year over five years. When the CTC approves the RTIP, it becomes part of the STIP.

### ***State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)***

The purpose of the SHOPP is to maintain the integrity of the state highway system. Recurring funding for this program is provided through gas tax revenues. Projects are nominated within each Caltrans District office. Proposed projects are sent to Caltrans Headquarters for programming on a competitive basis statewide. Final project funding determinations are subject to the CTC review. Individual districts are not guaranteed a minimum level of funding. SHOPP projects are based on statewide priorities within each program category (i.e. safety, rehabilitation, operations, etc.) within each Caltrans district. SHOPP funds cannot be used for capacity-enhancing projects.

### ***SHOPP Minor Programs***

The “Minor A” Program is a Caltrans discretionary funding program based on annual statewide allocations by district. This program allows some level of discretion to Caltrans district offices in funding projects up to \$1,250,000. The “Minor B” Program funds are used for projects up to \$333,000. The advantage of the program is its streamlined funding process and the local district's discretion for decision-making. Funding is locally competitive within each district and limited to the extent of its allocation.

### ***Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)***

Rural counties can currently exchange federal STP dollars for State Highway Account (SHA) funds (a process known as “RSTP Exchange”). This is advantageous to RTPAs as federal funds have more stringent requirements such as a 20 percent local match, while state funds do not require any local match. The state also provides additional state funds to the county, as a match to the exchanged federal dollars.

Eligible RSTP projects include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on Federal Aid Highways (any highways that are not classified as local or rural minor collectors) and bridges (on public roads of all functional classifications).
- Environmental mitigation for an RSTP project
- Capital transit projects
- Carpool projects



- Highway and transit safety projects
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring
- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation enhancement activities
- Transportation control measures
- Highway and transit R&D and technology transfer programs

### ***Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program***

The purpose of the EEM is to offer state-level funding to remedy the environmental impacts of new or improved transportation facilities. Mitigation can include highway landscapes and urban forestry or the development of roadside recreational facilities such as roadside rest stops, trails, scenic overlooks, trailheads, parks, and snow parks. The bill appropriates \$7 million annually from the Highway Users Tax Account for these purposes and generally limits grants to \$500,000 each. The program is administered by the California Natural Resources Agency and is competitive.

### ***Active Transportation Program (ATP)***

The ATP (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354) was signed into law on September 26, 2013. The ATP consolidated existing federal and state transportation programs, including Transportation Alternatives Program, Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program with a focus on making California a national leader in active transportation. Disadvantaged communities must receive at least 25 percent of the program's funding.

The purpose of ATP is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation by achieving the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking,
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users,
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals,
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding,
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program, and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.
- There is a local match of 11.47 percent except for projects predominately benefiting a disadvantaged community. The program is very competitive but is the primary funding source for bicycle and pedestrian projects.





## ***Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)***

This recurring state grant program provides funds to rural RTPAs – on a reimbursement basis – specifically for purposes of transportation planning. Activities and products developed using these funds are governed by an annual Overall Work Program, prepared by the region and approved by Caltrans.

## ***Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program***

This competitive grant program was created to support Caltrans' current Mission: Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The overarching objectives of this grant program are to ensure consideration of these major efforts in transportation planning, including Sustainability, Preservation, Mobility, Safety, Innovation, Economy, Health, and Equity. There are three separate grant programs: Strategic Partnerships, Sustainable Communities, and Climate Adaptation.

Strategic Partnerships – Funded through the FHWA, for transportation planning studies of interregional and statewide significance in partnership with Caltrans. The minimum grant award is \$100,000 with a maximum award of \$500,000. RTPAs and MPOs are eligible primary applicants with transit agencies, local governments, tribal governments, universities, and non-profit organizations eligible to apply as sub-applicants. There is a 20 percent minimum local match. Examples of transportation planning studies include corridor studies, transportation demand management strategies, system investment prioritization plans, and studies that identify interregional or statewide mobility and access needs.

Sustainable Communities – Funded through FTA Section 5304 and the SHA, to study multimodal transportation issues which assist in achieving Caltrans' mission and overarching objectives. Primary eligible applicants include RTPAs, MPOs, transit agencies, local governments, and tribal governments. Non-profit organizations and other public entities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants. The minimum grant award is \$50,000 (underserved communities) or \$100,000 (all other applicants) with a maximum award of \$700,000. A local match of 11.47 percent is required.

Climate Adaptation – New for FY 2023-24, this state-funded planning grant will fund the development of climate adaptation plans and the identification of adaptation needs in transportation systems. Primary eligible applicants include MPOs, RTPAs, transit agencies, local governments, and tribal governments. Non-profit organizations and other public entities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants. The minimum grant award is \$100,000 with a maximum award of \$1.5 million (for a single organization) or \$3 million (for a partnership). A local match of 11.47 percent is required, although this match requirement is waived for tribal governments.

Example projects include:

- Studies that advance a community's effort to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gases
- Studies that assist transportation agencies in creating sustainable communities
- Studies that advance a community's effort to address the impacts of climate change and sea level rise



- Community to school studies or safe routes to school studies or plans
- Jobs and affordable housing proximity studies
- Context-sensitive streetscapes or town center plans
- Complete street plans
- Bike and pedestrian safety enhancement plans
- Traffic calming and safety enhancement plans
- Corridor enhancement studies
- Health equity transportation studies
- Climate change adaptation plans for transportation facilities
- Transit planning surveys and research
- Identification of policies, strategies, and programs to preserve transit facilities and optimize transit infrastructure
- Studies that evaluate accessibility and connectivity of the multimodal transportation network
- Short-range transit development plans
- Transit marketing plans
- Social service improvement studies
- Student Internships (Only for Rural Agencies)
- Studies that address environmental justice issues in a transportation-related context

### ***Clean California Local Grant Program***

This new competitive grant program was launched to support the beautification of communities and public areas along roadways and remove trash and debris statewide. \$1.1 billion is available over three years. Cities, counties, transit agencies, tribal governments, and government agencies are eligible to apply.

### ***Urban Greening Grant***

This competitive grant is distributed through the California Natural Resources Agency and is funded with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) revenues. Eligible projects must include one of the following elements:

- Sequester and store carbon by planting trees;
- Reduce building energy use by strategically planting trees to shade buildings; and
- Reduce commute vehicle miles traveled by constructing bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools.



- In addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, SB 859 requires all projects to achieve measurable benefits. Per statute, all projects must do at least one of the following:
  - Acquire, create, enhance, or expand community parks and green spaces, and/or use natural systems or systems that mimic natural systems to achieve multiple benefits.
  - Priority is given to projects in disadvantaged communities. Roughly \$47.5 million was available for the funding cycle in 2023. It is unknown if additional funding cycles will be available in the future.

### ***Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program***

The AHSC Program is funded through the Department of Housing and Community Development and focuses on promoting infill and compact development to reduce greenhouse gas reductions. The AHSC Program funds affordable housing developments, sustainable transportation infrastructure, and transportation-related amenities. Localities, public transit agencies, RTPAs, local transportation commissions, and federally recognized tribes are eligible to apply for this competitive program.

### ***Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant***

The REAP grant, funded through the Department of Housing and Community Development, promotes the development of housing, reduction of VMTs, and active transportation programs and projects. This competitive grant program specifically sets aside approximately five percent of funds for rural counties and tribal entities. Counties, cities, transit agencies, RTPAs, and tribes are eligible to apply.

### ***Fuel Excise Tax Revenues, Highway Users Tax Account***

Roughly 36 percent of the state base excise tax and 44 percent of the price-based fuel excise tax, and gas tax swap, (after revenue used to backfill weight fees which have been diverted) are allocated to cities and counties for road projects on a recurring basis. Allocation formulas are complex and based on population, proportion of registered vehicles, and proportion of maintained county road miles. These funds can be used for maintenance, new construction, engineering, administration, right of way, and other uses.

### ***Vehicle License Fees***

Revenue from motor vehicle license fees are allocated back to local jurisdictions for any purpose.

### ***Local Transportation Funding Sources***

At present, there are no local dedicated sources available for ongoing transportation costs other than those “passed through” from state or federal programs. The following sources of funding for transportation projects are available to local governments through various means:

### ***Traffic Mitigation Fees***

Traffic mitigation fees are one-time charges on new developments to pay for required public facilities and to mitigate impacts created by or reasonably related to development. There are several approaches to



charging developers for the provision of public facilities. In all cases, however, the fees must be clearly related to the costs incurred as a result of the development. Passed to govern the imposition of development fees, AB 1600 requires that a rational connection be made between a fee and the type of development on which the fee is based. Furthermore, fees cannot be used to correct existing problems or pay for improvements needed for existing development. A county may only levy such fees in the unincorporated area over which it has jurisdiction, while a city must levy fees within the city limits. Any fee program to pay for regional facilities must have the cooperation of all jurisdictions in which future growth is expected to take place. Traffic mitigation fees would be difficult to implement in Inyo County, due to (1) the dispersion of development over a wide area, which makes it difficult to allocate specific improvements to a range of developments, and (2) the desire to avoid discouraging development through the imposition of additional fees. In any case, the extremely low level of new development in Inyo County would generate minimal fee revenues.

### ***Development Mitigation Measures/Agreements***

Development mitigation measures are imposed whenever development requires approval by a local entity. Generally, mitigation measures are imposed as conditions on tentative maps. These conditions reflect on- and off-site project mitigation that must be completed to be able to develop. Development agreements are also used to gain the cooperation of developers in constructing off-site infrastructure improvements or dedicating rights-of-way needed as a result of the proposed development. As with impact fees, developer mitigations are not generally available to fund ongoing transportation maintenance and operations costs. Further, this funding source is improbable and insignificant in Inyo County.

## **TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT FUNDING**

A wide range of potential transit funding sources is available, particularly within California. The following discussion provides an overview of these programs.

### **Federal Funding Sources**

The following are discussions of federal transit funding programs available to rural areas:

#### ***FTA Capital Program Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Grants***

This program allocates funding for capital projects to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities. A sub-program provides competitive grants for bus and bus facility projects that support low and zero-emission vehicles.

#### ***FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities***

This recurring program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds for programs to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary



paratransit services. This program consolidates the old New Freedom Program with the Elderly and Disabled Program. Grants are available for both capital (20 percent local match) and operating purposes (50% local match) to areas with less than 200,000 in population. Projects to be funded with FTA 5310 funds must be derived from a Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan.

### ***FTA Section 5311 Rural Transit and Intercity Bus***

Federal transit funding for rural areas (population of less than 50,000) is currently provided through the FTA Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program. In California, an 11.47 percent local match is required for capital programs and a 44.67 percent match for operating expenditures. These funds, administered by Caltrans, are segmented into “apportioned” and “discretionary” programs. The bulk of the funds are apportioned directly to rural counties based on population levels. The remaining funds are distributed by Caltrans on a discretionary basis and are typically used for capital purposes.

### ***Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)***

The RTAP (49 USC. 5311(b)(3)) provides a competitive source of funding to assist in the design and implementation of training and technical assistance projects and other support services tailored to meet the needs of transit operators in non-urbanized areas. RTAP has both state and national program components. The state program provides an annual allocation to each state to develop and implement training and technical assistance programs in conjunction with the state’s administration of the Section 5311 formula assistance program. The national program provides for the development of information and materials for use by local operators and state administering agencies and supports research and technical assistance projects of national interest. There is no federal requirement for a local match.

### ***State Funding Sources***

A mainstay of funding for transit programs in California is provided by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). The TDA provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), which began in 1972, and the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, established in 1980.

### ***Local Transportation Fund (LTF)***

The majority of TDA funds are provided through the LTF. These funds are generated by a one-fourth cent statewide sales tax and returned to the county of origin. Consequently, LTF funds are based on local population and spending. The LTF may be allocated by the ICLTC for the following prioritized purposes:

- Whatever reasonable amount is needed by the ICLTC for TDA administration. This amount varies between RTPAs.
- Up to 3 percent of annual LTF revenues may be allocated to the RTPA for the conduct of the transportation planning and programming process.
- Two percent of the remaining amount may be provided for pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.



- Up to five percent of remaining funds may be allocated for coordinated community transit services.
- The remaining funds must be spent for transit and paratransit purposes unless the Transportation Commission finds that either no unmet transit needs or that unmet needs cannot be reasonably met.
- If there are no reasonable-to-meet unmet transit needs, remaining funds may be allocated to local streets and roads to jurisdictions based on population.

### ***State Transit Assistance (STA)***

In addition to LTF funding, the TDA includes an STA funding mechanism. The sales tax on diesel fuel is used to fund public transit operations and capital improvements. This amount is augmented by the diesel fuel sales tax increase from SB1 that began in 2017.

### ***The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)***

This is one of several programs that are part of the Transit, Affordable Housing, and Sustainable Communities Program established by the California Legislature in 2014 by Senate Bill 862. The LCTOP was created to provide recurring operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities. Eligible projects include new or expanded bus or rail services and expanded intermodal transit facilities and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, maintenance, and other costs to operate those services or facilities, as long as each project reduces greenhouse gas emissions. For agencies whose service area includes disadvantaged communities, at least 50 percent of the total moneys received shall be expended on projects that will benefit disadvantaged communities. This program is administered by Caltrans in coordination with the Air Resource Board (ARB) and the State Controller's Office (SCO).

### ***Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP)***

Also created by SB 862, this competitive program provides funding from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, for rail or intercity rail feeder bus projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Eligible applicants must be public agencies, including joint powers agencies, which operate or have planning responsibility for existing or planned regularly scheduled intercity or commuter passenger rail service (and associated feeder bus service to intercity rail services), urban rail transit service, or bus or ferry transit service (including commuter bus services and vanpool services). The recently passed SB 125 will change this program to allow use for operations purposes.

### ***Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP)***

Administered by CARB, this program aims to accelerate the adoption of cleaner, more efficient trucks and buses by providing fleets based in California with vouchers when they purchase zero-emission buses. The amount of the voucher depends on vehicle weight class, type of use, and whether or not it is in a



disadvantaged community. For a large transit vehicle purchase, a transit agency could receive around a \$150,000 voucher.

The California State Budget for FY 2022-23 proposes a \$1.7 billion investment in zero-emission vehicles. This could create additional funding sources for ESTA and the County of Inyo to meet CARB's goal to have a zero-emission bus fleet by 2040. A variety of smaller credit and voucher programs are available through the state to assist with the transition to ZEV.

## AVIATION

### Funding Sources

#### *Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP)*

The AIP provides 90 percent federal funding (requiring a 10 percent local and state match) for public-use airports that are part of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). Available for most capital expenditures, this recurring funding program must be approved annually by Congress. In recent years it has experienced major funding reductions. AIP funds are derived from user charges such as aviation fuel tax, civil aircraft tax, and air passenger fare surcharges. The Bishop Airport and Lone Pine Airport are on the NPIAS.

#### *State of California Airport Grants*

The California Division of Aeronautics makes competitive grant funds available for airport development and operations. Three types of state financial aid to publicly owned airports are available.

- Annual grants for up to \$10,000 per airport per year. These funds can be used for a variety of purposes from runway reconstruction, and obstruction removal to radios.
- Acquisition and Development (A&D) Grants provide funds for the cost of qualified airport developments on a matching basis, to the extent that state funds are available. Grant amounts can range from a minimum of \$20,000 to a maximum of \$500,000. The local match requirement is set annually by the CTC and can vary from 10 to 50 percent of total project costs. A&D grants cannot be used as a local match for FAA grants. A&D projects must be listed in the CIP and A&D grants are available to both NPIAS and non-NPIAS airports. The amount available for A&D grants is what is left in the Aeronautics Account after funding State Operations, Annual Grants, and AIP Matching.
- Local Airport Loan Program – This program provides discretionary low-interest State loans to eligible airports for projects that enhance an airport's ability to provide general aviation services (hangars, terminals, utilities, fueling facilities, A&D-eligible projects, etc.). A loan may also provide the local share for an AIP grant. Such a loan can be used in conjunction with a State-funded AIP Matching grant. The maximum term of a loan is 17 years.





Funding for airport improvements is limited. At the state level, excise taxes on AVGAS and General Aviation jet fuel are the only source of revenue for the Division of Aeronautics. Funding currently available represents a 25 percent decrease from historical levels.

It is anticipated that Bishop Airport will become classified as a Non-Hub Primary Airport shortly due to reaching 10,000 enplanements in 2022. Due to this change in classification, Bishop Airport will receive \$1 million annually from the FAA in entitlement funding for capital improvement projects instead of the current funding of \$150,000 annually. Revenue from fuel sales, leases, overnight parking fees, and commercial landing fees have increased at Bishop Airport since commercial flights began in 2021. Funding all maintenance needs and necessary improvements for airport facilities remains a challenge for Inyo County and state and federal grants and loans are difficult to obtain.

## PROJECTED REVENUES

Projecting revenues and expenditures over a 20-year horizon is difficult, in that funding levels can dramatically fluctuate or be eliminated by legislation and policy changes. In addition, many projects are eligible for discretionary funds, which are nearly impossible to forecast as discretionary funds are allocated through a competitive grant process. In the short term, expenditures in the RTP are consistent with figures programmed by the STIP, ITIP, and RTIP. Recurring regional transportation revenues were projected over the next 20 years, as shown in Table 29.

The 2024 STIP Fund Estimate projects \$2.5 billion in total STIP program capacity and a new STIP program capacity of \$906 million over the five-year STIP planning period statewide. It should be noted that programming capacity does not represent cash. It represents the level of programming commitments that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) may make to projects for each year within the STIP period.

Roughly \$13.4 billion in new SHOPP programming capacity is estimated for the five-year fund estimate. This is also a significant improvement over the prior STIP Fund Estimate and is due to the implementation of and continued fundraising of SB1 excise fuel taxes.

As referenced in the RTP Guidelines and required in Government Code Section 65080(b)(4)(A), STIP revenue projections over the first four years of the planning period are consistent with the 2024 STIP Fund Estimate. The county share for Inyo County STIP funds per the 2022 STIP Fund Estimate is \$1,560 through FY 2027-28, due to having previously received an advance for the Olancho-Cartago 4 Lane Project. As such, ICLTC will have limited programming capacity until the end of FY 2027-28. As shown in Table 29, beginning in FY 2028-29, annual STIP funds based on the 2024 STIP Fund Estimate Formula Distribution will total approximately \$2.5 million per year. STIP fund estimates are increased by three percent annually for the mid-term and two percent for the long-term.

The level of revenue available through the STIP and SHOPP are ultimately dependent on the demand for gasoline and diesel fuel. As prices go up there may be more demand for alternative fuels. Future revenue sources are assumed to increase by three percent annually over the mid-term planning period and two percent over the long term, however, actual revenues may be less if gas tax revenue decreases



**TABLE 29: RTP Forecast Revenue Summary**

All Figures in 1000s, adjusted annually for inflation

| Funding Source/Program                                                     | Fiscal Years                                         |               |               | Total     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|
|                                                                            | 23/24 - 27/28                                        | 28/29 - 32/33 | 33/34 - 42/43 |           |
| <b><u>Recurring Roadway and Bridge Capital Revenues</u></b>                |                                                      |               |               |           |
| STIP <sup>(1)</sup>                                                        | \$1,560                                              | \$12,960      | \$32,477      | \$46,997  |
| ITIP                                                                       | \$0                                                  | \$0           | \$0           | \$0       |
| SHOPP/Minor <sup>(2)</sup>                                                 | \$103,454                                            | \$113,145     | \$267,895     | \$484,494 |
| HBP/Toll Credits <sup>(3)</sup>                                            | \$5,700                                              | \$6,234       | \$34,420      | \$46,354  |
| Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) <sup>(4)</sup>              | \$4,364                                              | \$4,773       | \$11,301      | \$20,439  |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$115,078                                            | \$137,112     | \$346,093     | \$598,283 |
| <b><u>Competitive Roadway Transportation Funding</u></b>                   |                                                      |               |               |           |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) <sup>(5)</sup>                   | \$189                                                | \$0           | \$0           | \$189     |
| Federal Land Highway Program (FLAP) <sup>(6)</sup>                         | \$9,380                                              | \$0           | \$0           | \$9,380   |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$9,569                                              | \$0           | \$0           | \$9,569   |
| <b><u>Transportation Planning, Operations and Maintenance Revenues</u></b> |                                                      |               |               |           |
| STIP PPM <sup>(1)</sup>                                                    | \$874                                                | \$1,144       | \$2,747       | \$4,764   |
| Highway Users Tax (Gas) <sup>(4)</sup>                                     | \$17,261                                             | \$18,878      | \$44,697      | \$80,836  |
| SB 1 and RMRA <sup>(4)</sup>                                               | \$17,745                                             | \$17,745      | \$45,952      | \$81,442  |
| Interest, Road Permits, Miscellaneous <sup>(4)</sup>                       | \$375                                                | \$410         | \$971         | \$1,756   |
| S1608/HR2389 (Forest Reserves) <sup>(4)</sup>                              | \$1,150                                              | \$1,258       | \$2,978       | \$5,386   |
| City of Bishop Gas Tax Fund <sup>(7)</sup>                                 | \$0                                                  | \$0           | \$0           | \$0       |
| City of Bishop Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA) <sup>(7)</sup>             | \$600                                                | \$656         | \$1,693       | \$2,949   |
| City of Bishop RMRA <sup>(7)</sup>                                         | \$445                                                | \$487         | \$1,256       |           |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$38,450                                             | \$40,577      | \$100,293     | \$177,133 |
| <b><u>Bicycle and Pedestrian Revenues</u></b>                              |                                                      |               |               |           |
| ATP                                                                        | Discretionary and competitive. Difficult to project. |               |               |           |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$1,939                                              | \$0           | \$0           | \$0       |
| <b><u>Aviation Capital Revenues</u></b>                                    |                                                      |               |               |           |
| State CAAP <sup>(8)</sup>                                                  | \$200                                                | \$206         | \$2,301       | \$2,707   |
| AIP                                                                        | \$2,500                                              | \$39,719      | \$49,851      | \$92,070  |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$2,700                                              | \$39,925      | \$52,152      | \$94,777  |
| <b><u>Transit Capital Revenues</u> <sup>(9)</sup></b>                      |                                                      |               |               |           |
| State Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds                           | \$1,889                                              | \$2,123       | \$4,444       | \$8,455   |
| Federal Transit Administration Funds <sup>(10)</sup>                       | \$10,418                                             | \$7,528       | \$16,196      | \$34,141  |
| Other State Grants                                                         | \$227                                                | \$254         | \$532         | \$1,013   |
| Subtotal                                                                   | \$12,534                                             | \$9,905       | \$21,171      | \$43,610  |
| Total                                                                      | \$180,269                                            | \$227,520     | \$519,709     | \$923,372 |

Note: Assumed inflation rate is 3 percent for mid-term projections (FY 28/29-32/33) and 2 percent for long-term projections (FY 33/34-42/43).

Note 1: Short-term based on 2024 STIP Fund Estimate and 2022 RTIP. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 2: Based on short-term and mid-term SHOPP project lists. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 3: Based on short-term project lists. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 4: Based on Inyo County FY 22-23 Recommended Budget. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 5: Based on project lists. HSIP is a discretionary funding source. Additional funds may potentially be available for future projects.

Note 6: Based on project lists. FLAP is a discretionary funding source. Additional funds may potentially be available for future projects.

Note 7: Based on City of Bishop Adopted FY 2022-23 Budget.

Note 8: Assumed annual CAAP grant of \$10K per year for four Inyo County Airports.

Note 9: Short-term projections based on ESTA FY 2022-23 Budget. Mid-term and long term increased by assumed inflation rate.

Note 10: Based on public transit project lists. Mid-term and long-term projections based on ESTA FY 2022-23 budget and increase by assumed inflation rates.



significantly and no new funding sources replace it. On a federal level, this RTP assumes that the IJIA will be authorized at apportionment levels similar to previous years.

A total of \$900 million in recurring transportation revenue is anticipated to be available over the 20-year planning period for transportation projects. As many funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects, such as ATP funds, are discretionary and difficult to predict, grant funding beyond anything already secured is not included in the projections.


## Revenue to Expenditure Comparison

Tables 30 and 31 compare projected revenues to expenditures for Inyo regional roadway/bridge and STIP-funded bicycle/pedestrian improvements which are anticipated to be funded with recurring revenue sources. Projects to be funded with competitive revenue sources such as ATP are not included in the table. As noted above, ICLTC received an advance of STIP shares to fund the Olancho Cartago project during the prior planning period and therefore will receive minimal STIP funding during this planning period. This is reflected in the tables. Table 30 depicts a general picture of the level of transportation expenditures funded with recurring regional transportation revenues that are financially feasible in the next five years. Table 31 compares recurring transportation revenues to expenditures over the mid-term. As shown, the first five years of the planning period are funded. A comparison between recurring revenues and expenditures is not given for the final 10 years because project costs are not available for the majority of long-term projects identified in the RTP. It can be assumed, however, that total expenditures to complete all proposed long-term projects identified in the project tables would be higher than the recurring revenue sources.

It should be noted that Tables 30 and 31 do not include projects that are likely to be funded with competitive grants, as this is impossible to predict. Specific implementation dates for projects will depend on the actual revenue available. ICLTC /County continues to apply for competitive grant funding which may add to the revenue sources. Table 31 demonstrates that obtaining funding through discretionary grants will be key to implementing all the regional transportation capital improvement projects required to meet the needs identified in this RTP. The Inyo region will continue to plan and program transportation projects that are consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives in the Policy Element.

## Operations and Maintenance Costs

In addition to ensuring that the implementation of new or reconstructed transportation facilities identified in this RTP is financially constrained, it is also important to consider if there will be sufficient funds over the planning period to operate and maintain the facilities once constructed. Funds for roadway operation and maintenance stem from a variety of sources depending on the operator of the facility. SHOPP funds can be used to maintain the state highways. Gas tax funds are used to maintain roadways at the county and city levels. Table 29 shows projections for transportation planning, operations, and maintenance.



**TABLE 30: Short-term Regional Improvement Projects  
- Revenue to Expenditures Comparison**

**Recurring Revenue Funded Projects**

All Figures in 1000s, adjusted annually for inflation

| Program                                        | Fiscal Years<br>23/24 - 27/28 |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Revenues (Table 29)</b>                     |                               |
| STIP Regional Revenues - Programmed            | \$1,560                       |
| SHOPP/Minor                                    | \$103,454                     |
| HBP/Toll Credits                               | \$5,700                       |
| Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) | \$4,364                       |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>\$115,078</b>              |
| <b>Expenditures<sup>(1)</sup></b>              |                               |
| STIP Regional Project ICLTC Costs - Programmed | -\$180                        |
| SHOPP/Minor Projects                           | -\$103,454                    |
| Bridge Projects                                | -\$5,700                      |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>-\$109,334</b>             |
| <b>Balance</b>                                 | <b>\$5,744</b>                |

Note 1: 2022 RTIP ICLTC costs, Table14 short-term projects, Table 19 short-term projects

**TABLE 31: Mid-term Regional Transportation Capital  
Improvement Projects Revenue to Expenditure  
Recurring Revenue Funded Projects**

All Figures in 1000s, adjusted annually for inflation

|                                                | Fiscal Years<br>28/29 - 32/33 |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Revenues (Table 29)</b>                     |                               |
| STIP                                           | \$12,960                      |
| ITIP                                           | \$0                           |
| SHOPP/Minor                                    | \$113,145                     |
| HBP/Toll Credits                               | \$6,234                       |
| Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) | \$4,773                       |
| <b>Total Revenues</b>                          | <b>\$137,112</b>              |
| <b>Estimated Expenditures<sup>(1)</sup></b>    |                               |
| STIP Priority Projects                         | -\$68,768                     |
| SHOPP Projects                                 | -\$103,454                    |
| HBP Bridge Projects                            | -\$6,234                      |
| <b>Total Expenditures</b>                      | <b>-\$178,456</b>             |
| <b>Balance</b>                                 | <b>-\$41,343</b>              |

Note 1: Does not include projects with unknown costs or projects funded with discretionary funding sources.



These revenue projections are based on programmed projects identified in the project tables. As the majority of roadway projects in this RTP represent the reconstruction of existing facilities and therefore will not increase the roadway operations and maintenance budgets significantly, it is estimated that there will be sufficient revenue over the RTP planning period to operate and maintain roadways.

### **Transit Projects**

It is anticipated that planned ESTA vehicle replacements will continue over the next five years and will be funded with FTA funds. Fleet electrification is anticipated to begin in 2025 and will be funded with FTA and grant funds. Fleet Electrification infrastructure will be funded in the long term with FTA, STIP, and grant funds. The proposed new operations and maintenance facility will be funded in the mid and long planning periods with FTA and STIP funds.

### **Non-Motorized Facility Projects**

A variety of funding sources are available for non-motorized facility projects: ATP, STIP, RSTP, and TDA. In the interest of complete streets, many STIP-funded roadway rehabilitation projects will include the construction of safer non-motorized facilities such as sidewalks or striped bike lanes. TDA funding is primarily used to finance transit operations. ATP is a state-competitive funding source that could be used to fund top-priority projects. Overall, there is insufficient funding available to implement all identified bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects over the life of this RTP. Therefore, a good strategy for non-motorized facility projects is to continue to incorporate improvements to non-motorized facilities into roadway rehabilitation projects.

### **Aviation Capital Improvement Projects**

Table 27 presents top-priority airport capital improvements to be funded as part of the competitive FAA Airport Improvement Program (AIP). The local match will be derived from state CAAP annual grants and loans. Projects will be implemented as funding becomes available. Table 28 presents long-term airport capital improvement projects that will also be funded by the AIP.

*This page intentionally left blank*

**AGENCY NOTIFICATION AND CORRESPONDENCE**

---



*This page intentionally left blank*

| Table A1: Agency Notification List                |                     |                                    |                                                          |                |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Agency /Group                                     | Contact Person      | Email                              | Address                                                  | Phone Number   |
| Inye County                                       | Thomas Bolling      | tbolling@nyecountynv.gov           | 2041 E. Calveda Blvd. N. #3, Pahrump, NV 89048           | (775) 751-6270 |
| San Bernardino County Transportation Authority    | Steven Smith        | ssmith@gosbcta.com                 | 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92410  | (909) 884-8276 |
| Mono County Local Transportation Commission       | Wendy Sugimura      | wsugimura@mono.ca.gov              | PO Box 347, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546                      | (760) 924-1814 |
| Kern Council of Governments                       | Bob Snoddy          | bsnoddy@kerncog.org                | 1401 19th Street, Suite 300, Bakersfield, CA 93301       | (661) 635-2916 |
| Caltrans District 9                               | Neil Peacock        | neil.peacock@dot.ca.gov            | 500 S. Main St., Bishop, CA 93514                        | (760) 872-0601 |
| City of Bishop                                    | Nora Gamino         | ngamino@cityofbishop.com           | 377 W. Line St., Bishop, CA 93514                        | (760) 873-5863 |
| Native American Heritage Commission               | --                  | nahc@nahc.ca.gov                   | 1550 Harbor Blvd., Ste 100, West Sacramento, CA 95691    |                |
| Big Pine Paiute Tribe                             | Sally Manning       | s.manning@bigpinepaiute.org        | PO Box 700, Big Pine, CA 93513                           | (760) 938-2003 |
| Bishop Paiute Tribe                               | Kody Jaeger         | kody.jaeger@bishoppaiute.org       | 50 Tu Su Lane, Bishop, CA 93514                          | (760) 873-3584 |
| Bishop Paiute Tribe Dept Pub. Works               | Sandra Warlie       | sandra.warlie@bishoppaiute.org     | --                                                       |                |
| Fort Independence                                 | Carl Dahlberg       | carl@fortindependence.com          | PO Box 67, Independence, CA 93526                        | (760) 878-5160 |
| Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe                   | Mary Wuester        | vicechair@lppsr.org                | PO Box 747, Lone Pine, CA 93545                          | (760) 876-1034 |
| Timbisha Shoshone Tribe                           | Jimmy-John Thompson | jthompson@timbisha.com             | --                                                       |                |
| Death Valley Timbisha Shoshone Tribe              | George Gholson      | george@timbisha.com                | --                                                       | (760) 872-3614 |
| Tule River Indian Tribe                           | Neil Peyron         | neil.peyron@tulerivertribe-nsn.gov | PO Box 589, Porterville, CA 93258                        | (559) 781-4271 |
| Kern Valley Indian Community                      | Robert Robinson     | butterbreth@gmail.com              | Po Box 1010, Lake Isabella, CA 93240                     | (760) 378-2915 |
| Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians         | Darrell Mike        | 29chairman@29palmsbomi-nsn.gov     | 46-200 Harrison Place, Coachella, CA 92236               | (760) 863-2444 |
| Wukache Indian Tribe/Enhom Valley Band            | Kenneth Woodrow     | kwood8934@aol.com                  | 1179 Rock Haven Court, Salinas, CA 93906                 | (831) 443-9702 |
| North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians              | Elaine Fink         | efink@nfr-nsn.gov                  | PO Box 929, North Fork, CA 93643                         | (559) 877-2467 |
| City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power | Donald McGhie       | donald.mcghie@ladwp.com            | 300 Mandich St, Bishop, CA 93514                         | (760) 873-0248 |
| Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control Board   | Matt Kingsley       | mkingsley@inyocounty.us            | 157 Short St., Bishop, CA 93514                          |                |
| National Park Service, Death Valley National Park | Abby Wines          | abby_wines@nps.gov                 | PO Box 579, Death Valley, CA 92328                       | (760) 786-3221 |
| California Department of Fish and Wildlife        | Heidi Calvert       | heidi.calvert@wildlife.ca.gov      | 3602 Inland Empire Blvd., Ste. C-220, Ontario, CA 91764  | (760) 872-0751 |
| Bureau of Land Management                         | Sherri Lisius       | slisius@blm.gov                    | 351 Pacu Lane, Ste. 100, Bishop, CA 93514                | (760) 872-5000 |
| Forest Service                                    | Lesley Yen          | lesley.yen@usda.gov                | 351 Pacu Lane, Ste. 200, Bishop, CA 93514                | (760) 873-2400 |
| Office of Historical Preservation                 | Shannon Pries       | shannon.pries@parks.ca.gov         | 1725 23rd Street, Ste 100, Sacramento, CA 95816          | (916) 445-7028 |
| Bureau of Reclamation                             | Jack Simes          | jsimes@usbr.gov                    | 27226 Via Industria, Ste A, Temecula, CA 92590           | (951) 695-5310 |
| Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board     | Jan Zimmerman       | jan.zimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov   | 2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150        | (530) 542-5400 |
| Naval Air Weapons Station at China Lake           | --                  | --                                 | 1 Administrative Circle, STOP 1014, China Lake, CA 93555 | (760) 939-2303 |

*This page intentionally left blank*



*This page intentionally left blank*



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 28, 2022

Bishop Paiute Tribe  
50 Tu Su Lane  
Bishop, CA 93514  
(760) 873-3584

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 7, 2022

Big Pine Paiute Tribe  
Cindy Duriscoe  
PO Box 700  
Big Pine, CA 93513  
(760) 938-2003

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 7, 2022

Fort Independence  
PO Box 67  
Independence, CA 93526  
(760) 878-5160

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

FW Aggregates Inc  
PO Box 732  
Lone Pine, CA 93545

To Whom It May Concern,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with major businesses and landowners early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input FW Aggregates may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction might have on FW Aggregates mining and trucking operations within Inyo County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Crystal Geyser Bottling Plant  
1210 Highway 395  
Olancho, CA 93549  
(760) 764-2890

To Whom It May Concern,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with major businesses and trucking companies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input Crystal Geyser may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction might have on bottling plant and trucking operations within Inyo County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 12, 2022

Naval Air Weapons Station at China Lake  
1 Administrative Circle, STOP 1014  
China Lake, CA 93555  
(760) 939-2303

To Whom It May Concern,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with large landowners early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Naval Air Weapons Station may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on Naval Air Weapons Station land within Inyo County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Heidi Calvert, Regional Manager  
Inland Deserts Region  
3602 Inland Empire Blvd, Suite C-220  
Ontario, CA 91764  
(760) 872-0751

Dear Ms. Calvert,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the California Department of Fish and Wildlife may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on fish and wildlife within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any Fish and Wildlife Plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

California Office of Historic Preservation  
Shannon Pries  
1725 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916) 445-7028

Dear Ms. Pries,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the California Office of Historic Preservation may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on current and future historic preservation within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any preservation plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Bureau of Reclamation  
Southern California Area Office  
Jack Simes, Area Planning Officer  
27226 Via Industria, Suite A  
Temecula, CA 92590  
(951) 695-5310

Dear Mr. Simes,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Bureau of Reclamation may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on Bureau land and infrastructure within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any Bureau of Reclamation plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Bureau of Land Management  
Sherri Lisius, Field Manager  
Bishop Field Office  
351 Pacu Lane, Suite 100  
Bishop, CA 93514  
760-872-5000

Dear Ms. Lisius,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Bureau of Land Management may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on BLM land within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any BLM plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District  
Attn: Matt Kingsley  
157 Short Street  
Bishop, CA 93514

Dear Mr. Kingsley,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on air pollution within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

National Park Service  
Abby Wines  
Public Information Officer  
Death Valley National Park  
P.O. Box 579, Death Valley, CA 92328  
760-786-3221

Dear Ms. Wines,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the National Park Service may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on Park Service land within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any NPS plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

January 26, 2022

North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians  
Elaine Fink  
PO Box 929  
North Fork, CA 93643  
(559) 877-2467

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within and associated with Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 7, 2022

Timbisha Shoshone Tribe  
PO Box 1779  
Bishop, CA 93515

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

January 26, 2022

Tule River Indian Tribe  
Neil Peyron  
PO Box 589  
Porterville, CA 93258  
(559) 781-4271

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within and associated with Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Toiyabe Indian Health Project  
Joseph Herman  
250 N. See Vee Lane  
Bishop, CA 93514  
(760) 873-8464

Dear Mr. Herman,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPreduced.pdf>.

Current federal regulations encourage Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with major organizations within the community early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Toiyabe Indian Health Project may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on healthcare within Inyo County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

January 26, 2022

Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians  
Darrell Mike  
46-200 Harrison Place  
Coachella, CA 92236  
(760) 863-2449

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within and associated with Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

United States Forest Service  
Nathan Sill, Natural Resources Staff Officer  
Inyo National Forest  
351 Pacu Lane, Suite 200  
Bishop, CA 93514  
(760) 873-2400

Dear Mr. Sill,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the United States Forest Service may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on USFS land within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any forest plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

January 26, 2022

Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom Valley Band  
Kenneth Woodrow  
1179 Rock Haven Ct  
Salinas, CA 93906  
(831) 443-9702

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within and associated with Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

December 7, 2022

Nye County  
Thomas Bolling, Director of Public Works  
2041 Calveda Blvd. N., #3  
Pahrump, NV 89048  
(775) 751-6270

Re: Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Bolling,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. We are seeking your input in regard to the Inyo County 2023 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Inyo County as they impact Nye County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Nye County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Inyo County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Inyo County RTP enhance mobility in Nye County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Nye County have that ICLTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Nye County and Inyo County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Inyo County RTP.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>. Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Inyo County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

December 7, 2022

San Bernardino County Transportation Authority  
Steven Smith  
1170 W. Third Street  
San Bernardino, CA 92410  
(909) 884-8276

Re: Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Smith

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. We are seeking your input in regard to the Inyo County 2023 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Inyo County as they impact San Bernardino County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in San Bernardino County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Inyo County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Inyo County RTP enhance mobility in San Bernardino County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does San Bernardino County have that ICLTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between San Bernardino County and Inyo County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Inyo County RTP.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>. Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Inyo County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

December 7, 2022

Kern Council of Governments  
Bob Snoddy, Regional Planner  
1401 19<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 300  
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Re: Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Snoddy,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. We are seeking your input in regard to the Inyo County 2023 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Inyo County as they impact Kern County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Kern County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Inyo County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Inyo County RTP enhance mobility in Kern County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Kern County have that ICLTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Kern County and Inyo County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Inyo County RTP.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>. Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Inyo County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

January 26, 2022

Kern Valley Indian Community  
Robert Robinson  
PO Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA 93240  
(760) 378-2915

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within and associated with Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

December 7, 2022

Mono County Local Transportation Commission  
Wendy Sugimura  
PO Box 347  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
(760) 924-1814

Re: Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Sugimura,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. We are seeking your input in regard to the Inyo County 2023 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Inyo County as they impact Mono County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Mono County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Inyo County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Inyo County RTP enhance mobility in Mono County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Mono County have that ICLTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Mono County and Inyo County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Inyo County RTP.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>. Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Inyo County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
2501 Lake Tahoe Blvd.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
(530) 542-5400

To Whom It May Concern,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on water quality within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any water-oriented plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

July 17, 2023

City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power  
Donald McGhie  
300 Mandich St, Bishop CA 93514  
(760) 873-0248

Dear Mr. McGhie,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on LADWP water and power resources and facilities within Inyo County. We would also appreciate if you could send us or direct us to any LADWP plans which are relevant to transportation. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 7, 2022

Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe  
Janet Hansen, Chairperson  
Lone Pine, CA 93545  
(760) 876-1034

Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to prepare the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2023 update. The ICLTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Inyo County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Inyo County and is updated every five years. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Inyo County region. This letter serves as a formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

December 12, 2022

Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation  
PO Box 1227  
Lone Pine, CA 93545  
(760) 920-2547

To Whom It May Concern,

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) is conducting a 2023 update of the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Inyo County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Inyo County.

The current 2019 RTP can be downloaded here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf> This document lists a variety of transportation improvements recommended in Inyo County.

As the corporation behind the Mt. Whitney Apartments, we would appreciate any input Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation may have regarding the effect that transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction might have on assisted housing within Inyo County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response by January 30<sup>th</sup>

Once the Public Draft 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

## Local Government Tribal Consultation List Request

### Native American Heritage Commission

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
916-373-3710  
916-373-5471 – Fax  
[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)

#### Type of List Requested

- ☐ CEQA Tribal Consultation List (AB 52) – *Per Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subs. (b), (d), (e) and 21080.3.2*
- ☐ General Plan (SB 18) - *Per Government Code § 65352.3.*

#### Local Action Type:

\_\_\_ General Plan    \_\_\_ General Plan Element    \_\_\_ General Plan Amendment  
\_\_\_ Specific Plan    \_\_\_ Specific Plan Amendment    \_\_\_ Pre-planning Outreach Activity

#### Required Information

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Local Government/Lead Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Specific Area Subject to Proposed Action

County: \_\_\_\_\_ City/Community: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Project Description:

#### Additional Request

- ☐ Sacred Lands File Search - *Required Information:*

USGS Quadrangle Name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Township: \_\_\_\_\_ Range: \_\_\_\_\_ Section(s): \_\_\_\_\_

*This page intentionally left blank*





*This page intentionally left blank*

## Comments on the 2019 RTP by Abby Wines, NPS, Death Valley National Park

These roads include: Stateline Road, Panamint Valley Road, Old Spanish Trail Highway and Trona – Wildrose Road (part of the Inyo County Maintained Mileage System) and also Badwater Road, Scotty’s Castle Road, and Daylight Pass Road (maintained by DVNP).

*Partially maintained by NPS.*

*The Trona-Wildrose Road is partially maintained by NPS - the upper portion inside the park (but it doesn't transition responsibility at the park boundary, strangely).*

Goods movement

*Issues with truck use illegally on Daylight Pass Road.*

Percentagewise there has been around a 10 percent increase in truck traffic on SR 190 in Inyo County, with the exception of near Furnace Creek.

*What does this mean "with exception of near Furnace Creek"? I'd be really interesnted in the trend in truck traffic on 190 since 2019.*

Rideshare databases and websites are a good method of matching commuters and thereby reducing the number of vehicles on the road. ESTA administers a small vanpool program between Mammoth Lakes and Bishop.

*Death Valley's vanpool.*

*NPS staff have a vanpool daily from Pahrump to Furnace Creek and Cow Creek. Until COVID, we had 2 vans from Pahrump and one from Beatty.*

Figure 1

*Trona Airport is shown in the wrong location, and FC Airport is not shown.*

This route has caused truck issues on the roadway is not designed for truck traffic.

*Not legal for trucks to take Badwater Road. Also, not sure what is meant by that being the shortest route . . . it isn't. Touring cyclists are a thing, but most of our bicyclists are people that drive to the park and bicycle while here, including many people on guided bicylce tours (Woman Tours, Backroads, etc.). There are also some large bicycle events with permits in the park, including JDRF in October, and an event by EnviroSports. These are on CA-190, North Highway, BEatty Cutoff, Mud CAnyon, and Badwater Road.*

Table 5

*Please list Death Valley! We have about 450 residents, according to census, and most of them also work in the county.*

*It is a county subdivision and therefore doesn't show up as a CDP.*

*Death Valley should be listed! We have more employees than most of these census places listed!*

There is an unconstructed section that would connect San Bernardino and Inyo Counties through Death Valley and make the highway continuous.

*What is this reference to an unconstructed section that would go through Death Valley? Sounds impossible; suggest removing mention from this document.*

Recently bicycle touring from Las Vegas to Yosemite National Park to San Francisco is becoming more popular. SR 190 is part of this route and has limited or shoulders making safety for non-motorized users a concern.

*Also bicycle travel groups, and bicycle events. And people that travel to the park in private vehicle and then ride their bikes once they get here. Residents of Cow Creek would like to be able to bicycle to Furnace Creek. Xanterra employees walk on the road shoulder between Inn and Ranch because many don't have cars or bicycles. A lot of this walking is at night. Also, Badwater ultramarathon, and other marathons take place on CA-190.*

These roads include: Stateline Road, Panamint Valley Road, Old Spanish Trail Highway and Trona – Wildrose Road (part of the Inyo County Maintained Mileage System) and also Badwater Road, Scotty's Castle Road, and Daylight Pass Road (maintained by DVNP).

*Portion of Trona-Wildrose Road is maintained by NPS.*

#### Table 8

*Missing Beatty entrance.*

<https://irma.nps.gov/STATS/SSRSReports/Park%20Specific%20Reports/Traffic%20Counts?Park=DEVA>

#### Stovepipe Wells Airport

*Furnace Creek airport is missing entirely from this narrative. The number of landings at Stovepipe Wells and Furnace Creek is not exactly known, because there is no automated data logger at the airstrips. Log book data shows that from 2015 through 2019, an average of 278 people landed at Furnace Creek and Stovepipe Wells (combined) annually. However, it is likely that some pilots did not log their use, so this number should be considered a minimum estimate of actual use. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) website states that there are 1,000 private aviation operations at Stovepipe Wells Airstrip each year. NPS staff that live and work at Stovepipe Wells have stated that their estimates would be considerably lower than that number. The FAA website also lists unrealistically high numbers for Furnace Creek Airstrip: 10,000 private and 500 military landings annually. NPS staff working in the Furnace Creek area observe less than 5 private planes per day most winter days and almost no planes in the summer. The military does not land airplanes at Furnace Creek, and only lands helicopters there a few times per year when assisting the NPS with search-and-rescue operations. Worth noting that the pavement at Stovepipe Wells and Furnace Creek airstrips is significantly deteriorated. Park staff are concerned about our ability to maintain both of the park's paved airstrips for safe aviation in the future. Park staff have been unsuccessful for years in attempts to obtain funding for repairs of Furnace Creek or SPW airports. The presence of two paved airstrips so close together has hampered park staff's attempts to get repairs of either runway funded. The Death Valley National Park General Management Plan (2002, pg. 58) states, "A paved section of the existing [Stovepipe Wells] airstrip will be converted for helicopter use. The remainder of the airstrip will be converted to a gravel strip and not be used as an overflow camping area." The Stovepipe Wells Developed Areas Plan (2017) states that the airstrip is in poor condition and requires "significant investment to meet safety standards." The plan recommended closing the airstrip and repurposing it as a night sky viewing area, with a helipad for emergency operations. The public commented on the Environmental Assessment in January 2022. There were comments that suggested that the NPS consider Furnace Creek and Stovepipe Wells Airstrips holistically. The Timbisha Shoshone Tribe expressed concern about low-level overflights of Timbisha Village adjacent to Furnace Creek airstrip. The Park decided to do a more thorough analysis of both airstrips, and to decide later whether either—or both—airstrips would be converted to gravel or removed. Therefore, the current decision documented in the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is to not make a change at this time to the 2002 General Management Plan's decision that the Stovepipe Wells Airstrip will be converted to gravel. The Recreational Aviation Foundation (RAF) signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Death Valley National Park. RAF assists the park with maintenance of the Park's three airstrips, mainly vegetation clearing and grading. This assistance is helpful and appreciated by the Park. These efforts do not address the necessary work to maintain paved*

runways. A slurry seal surface treatment of Furnace Creek and Stovepipe Wells airstrips cost \$180,000 in 2004. This is the last maintenance done on the pavement surfaces. Park staff thought that runway repairs would be included with road projects that happened in the park in the past five years. However, these projects were funded by the Federal Highways Administration, and that funding can only be used for surface transportation, not runways and airstrips. At this point, the runways need much more than a surface treatment. Based on an analysis completed by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics, representing the Federal Aviation Administration, Furnace Creek needs a new road base to support and stabilize the runway; based on the condition of the airstrip. Stovepipe Wells Airstrip has pavement in poor condition, the runway hold-line is too close to the runway centerline; and better visibility is needed for aircraft and visitor safety. Some commenters in 2020 suggested the Park reach out to the Navy SeaBees. After receiving this suggestion, we did. The SeaBees are enthusiastic about Furnace Creek runway as a project. The SeaBees would fund the construction labor. However, the Park would still need to fund the materials, project design, and environmental compliance. Working with the SeaBees could reduce the project cost by about 50%. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has indicated to Park staff that these runways would not compete well for grant funding because of the low levels of use. The Park collects about \$4 million per year in entrance, passes, and camping fees. This is not adequate to fund a multi-million dollar airstrip rehabilitation. The Park would be questioned for using fees paid by 1,700,000 visitors per year to benefit a less than one percent of Park visitors. Fund source managers with the regional and national NPS offices have questioned the value of funding repairs of two paved airstrips so close together. Recently, during national level review, the Park was strongly encouraged to consider closing one of the two paved airstrips in order to be considered for future funding opportunities for the other.

#### Future of Transportation and New Technology

Xanterra has EV chargers at Ranch and Inn. Autonomous vehicles have been issued permits to test in the park (as many other cars are tested in the park).

#### Goal 6: Provide for the Parking Needs of Local Residents, Visitors, and Tourists

*Big need in Death Valley for easily accessed rest areas and parking lots! We could use more!*

Objective 7.1: Maintain, Preserve, and Enhance Existing Airports and Airstrips. Maintain, preserve, and enhance the existing airports and airstrips within the county in the safest and most operational conditions consistent with current funding constraints.

*We don't want this document to say that all airstrips need to be maintained and preserved. Death Valley is struggling to find funding to maintain our paved airstrips. We'd like to remove one of them (either Furnace Creek or Stovepipe Wells) or consider converting them to gravel (which the park could maintain by grading). FAA funding is not available to the NPS. Our road funding comes from Federal Highway Administration, and can't be used on runways. NPS funding is tight, and airstrips with low volume of visitor use compared to other areas in this park (and other parks) are unlikely to score high. The last pavement maintenance was done in 2004. Furnace Creek pavement is heavily buckled. The park would like to do a study to compare the two airstrips, which are less than 30 miles apart, and determine which to retain, and identify ways to fund that maintenance.*

SR 127 and 178 are important evacuation routes for the southeastern communities of Shoshone and Tecopa.

*Extremely true.*

#### Table 12

*Obviously, there has been work since 2019 to update here.*

*The Towne Pass Curve Correction project was a big one in the park. And Caltrans has done resurfacing (chip seal?) on portions of CA-190.*

Federal Lands Transportation Program

*Add Emergency Repair of Federally-Owned Roads (EFRFO) fund source as a separate bullet? NPS is using it extensively currently (like \$30 million this year) for flood repairs.*

Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP)

*Are DEVA's airports included?*

April 11, 2023

Ms. Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
[Acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:Acadia@lsctrans.com)

Dear Ms. Davis:

Subject: 2023 Update to the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is responding to your March 30, 2023 letter and offering the following comments regarding the consultation process for updating the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

- Data in the RTP indicates that local traffic in Bishop contributes approximately fifty percent to the total traffic counts. LADWP recommends that objectives be adopted to address the lack of road connectivity as described in the RTP. Alternative routes would ease traffic congestion on Line and Main Street and improve overall mobility.

In addition to the need to improve east-west connectivity, north-south connectivity needs to also be considered. The lack of connectivity funnels traffic across the Bishop Reservation and down Line Street or to Highway 395 (Main Street). Alternatives such as extending Kelso Street through to Highway 395 and developing an alternative route to the Airport should be considered. LADWP and others can route trucks and heavy equipment away from Main Street if alternative routes are developed.

- The Bishop Pavement Project proposes to install a pedestrian signal where North Sierra Highway crosses the B-1 Drain. This does not make sense to LADWP and adversely impacts LADWP operations. The Caltrans project calls for a class I bike and pedestrian path to be constructed on the south side of the highway.



Ms. Acadia Davis  
Page 2  
April 11, 2023

This new path eliminates the need to cross the highway at this location. Caltrans communicated that the signal was only being installed at the request of Inyo County and the City of Bishop.

LADWP requests the agencies to reconsider installing a traffic signal here. The bike path that extends from Sierra Street to the highway does not continue on the north side of the highway. LADWP utilizes this area with heavy equipment to operate and maintain the B-1 Drain. There are better and safer locations for pedestrian crossings such as the See Vee Lane signal light and the Highway 6 signal light. Adding a third signal here will obstruct traffic more than facilitate mobility. LADWP's access must be maintained.

Further, this project proposes to install a large drainage basin along North Sierra Highway. This does not seem to be conducive to Inyo County's future development plans for the corridor. Other alternatives should be considered.

- The RTP identified a need to replace numerous bridges. The Dixon Lane Bridge is one that LADWP recommends being prioritized. There is a road alignment and line-of-sight safety issue with this bridge. With an S-curve in the road and the high growth of willows on the south side, a blind spot is created for traffic exiting the canal road. This area is popular for public use and is used by LADWP personnel. There also appear to be structural issues creating holes between the road and bridge.
- LADWP's land management plan and others can be found online at [www.ladwp.com](http://www.ladwp.com). In the address bar type "Los Angeles Aqueduct web page." There you will find policies and plans. The Owens Valley Land Management Plan will be under Environmental Documentation.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please email Don McGhie at [Donald.McGhie@ladwp.com](mailto:Donald.McGhie@ladwp.com).

Sincerely,



Adam Perez  
Manager of Aqueduct

DSM:fm  
c: Mr. Donald S. McGhie

bc: Andrew L. Linard  
Adam Perez  
Russell N. Pierson  
Elsa Jimenez  
Eric Tillemans

Forest Mathieu  
Lori S. Dermody  
Real Estate  
PM 1041

April 11, 2023

Ms. Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
[Acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:Acadia@lsctrans.com)

Dear Ms. Davis:

Subject: 2023 Update to the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan

The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) is responding to your March 30, 2023 letter and offering the following comments regarding the consultation process for updating the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

- Data in the RTP indicates that local traffic in Bishop contributes approximately fifty percent to the total traffic counts. LADWP recommends that objectives be adopted to address the lack of road connectivity as described in the RTP. Alternative routes would ease traffic congestion on Line and Main Street and improve overall mobility.

In addition to the need to improve east-west connectivity, north-south connectivity needs to also be considered. The lack of connectivity funnels traffic across the Bishop Reservation and down Line Street or to Highway 395 (Main Street). Alternatives such as extending Kelso Street through to Highway 395 and developing an alternative route to the Airport should be considered. LADWP and others can route trucks and heavy equipment away from Main Street if alternative routes are developed.

- The Bishop Pavement Project proposes to install a pedestrian signal where North Sierra Highway crosses the B-1 Drain. This does not make sense to LADWP and adversely impacts LADWP operations. The Caltrans project calls for a class I bike and pedestrian path to be constructed on the south side of the highway.

Ms. Acadia Davis  
Page 2  
April 11, 2023


This new path eliminates the need to cross the highway at this location. Caltrans communicated that the signal was only being installed at the request of Inyo County and the City of Bishop.


LADWP requests the agencies to reconsider installing a traffic signal here. The bike path that extends from Sierra Street to the highway does not continue on the north side of the highway. LADWP utilizes this area with heavy equipment to operate and maintain the B-1 Drain. There are better and safer locations for pedestrian crossings such as the See Vee Lane signal light and the Highway 6 signal light. Adding a third signal here will obstruct traffic more than facilitate mobility. LADWP's access must be maintained.

Further, this project proposes to install a large drainage basin along North Sierra Highway. This does not seem to be conducive to Inyo County's future development plans for the corridor. Other alternatives should be considered.

- The RTP identified a need to replace numerous bridges. The Dixon Lane Bridge is one that LADWP recommends being prioritized. There is a road alignment and line-of-sight safety issue with this bridge. With an S-curve in the road and the high growth of willows on the south side, a blind spot is created for traffic exiting the canal road. This area is popular for public use and is used by LADWP personnel. There also appear to be structural issues creating holes between the road and bridge.
- LADWP's land management plan and others can be found online at [www.ladwp.com](http://www.ladwp.com). In the address bar type "Los Angeles Aqueduct web page." There you will find policies and plans. The Owens Valley Land Management Plan will be under Environmental Documentation.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please email Don McGhie at [Donald.McGhie@ladwp.com](mailto:Donald.McGhie@ladwp.com).

Sincerely,  


  
Adam Perez  
Manager of Aqueduct

DSM:fm  
c: Mr. Donald S. McGhie  




## NYE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

Thomas Bolling, Director

Pahrump Office: 2041 E. Calvada Blvd. N., Suite #3 Pahrump, NV 89048

Phone: (775) 751-6262 | Fax: (775) 751-4336 | Email: publicworks@co.nye.nv.us

3/27/2023

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

Re: Inyo County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Acadia,

Nye County is happy to look at the current Inyo County RTP and provide input for the 2023 RTP update. Please see our response to your questions below:

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Inyo County as they impact Nye County? **There are 5 major access routes between Inyo County and Nye County (SR 372/178, Tecopa Rd./Old Spanish Trail Hwy, Bell Vista Ave./State Line Rd., SR 373/127, SR 374/Daylight Pass Rd. Of these routes, Nye County owns and maintains Bell Vista Ave and Tecopa Rd. The rest of these are owned and maintained by NDOT. The road conditions in Inyo County**
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Nye County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Inyo County over the next 20 years? **The Spring Mountain Racetrack in Pahrump is always expanding and hosting events. This track is trying to become the largest in the world which could increase the amount and size of events. This could lead to increased traffic in Inyo County.**
3. How can the Inyo County RTP enhance mobility in Nye County? **Bell Vista Ave./State Line Rd. is one of the direct routes to Death Valley from Las Vegas and frequently has bicycle traffic. Please consider widening the shoulders or adding bike lanes along your side of this route to make it safer for the public.**
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Nye County have that ICLTC should be aware of in developing their RTP? **Nye County has an upcoming NFLAP project scheduled in 2024 for Bell Vista Ave from SR 160 to California/Inyo County. This project includes the rehabilitation of approximately 21 miles of roadway.**
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Nye County and Inyo County? If so, please describe. **Tecopa Road – This road starts in Clark County at SR 160, crosses into Nye County for ¾ of a mile, and continues into Inyo County. The road is in terrible condition and would be a great project to be jointly pursued between all three counties.**

Thank you,

  
Thomas Bolling,  
Public Works Director



**From:** [Steven Smith](#)  
**To:** [Acadia Davis](#)  
**Cc:** [Josh Lee](#); [Ginger Koblasz](#); [Carrie Schindler](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Consultation Notification for Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan Update  
**Date:** Monday, March 6, 2023 8:19:10 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[2023 Inyo RTP - SBCTA.doc](#)

---

Good morning Acadia,

Thanks for reaching back out to us at SBCTA. Our thoughts about the Inyo RTP would mainly be focused on US 395, which is a roadway of great importance to both our counties for the movement of freight, passenger vehicles, and recreational traffic. Caltrans has recognized this by designating US 395 as a Strategic Interregional Corridor in the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP).

As you likely know, SBCTA completed the first phase of the widening of US 395 between SR-18 and Chamberlaine Way to four lanes plus median in 2020. We are currently in design on the segment from Interstate 15 to SR-18, under the project title: US 395 Freight Mobility and Safety Project, with an anticipated construction start date in 2024, pending funding. This will be a similar cross-section: four lane divided with raised median. The third segment, Chamberlaine Way to Desert Flower Road, will be addressed at some future date. We have appreciated Inyo County's support for our improvements to the US 395 segments, and I believe both our counties share interests in maintaining and improving US 395 along its entire length.

In addition, Brightline West is well along in the development of its proposed high-speed rail system from Rancho Cucamonga to Las Vegas, planned largely within the right-of-way of Interstate 15, per agreement with Caltrans. The system will also have a stop in Hesperia at the junction of US 395 and I-15. This would mean that Inyo County residents could get on a train in Hesperia and connect with Metrolink at the Cucamonga station to access any number of destinations in the LA Basin. A shuttle is also available from the Cucamonga Station to Ontario International Airport.

These responses relate primarily to Questions 4 and 5 of your letter. We hope the responses are helpful and wish you the best in the preparation of the RTP. We look forward to seeing the draft and final products.

Regards,  
Steve

**Steve Smith, PE**

Director of Planning

[ssmith@gosbcta.com](mailto:ssmith@gosbcta.com)

909.884.8276 | Office



---

**From:** Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, March 6, 2023 7:28 AM

**To:** Steven Smith <[ssmith@gosbcta.com](mailto:ssmith@gosbcta.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Consultation Notification for Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan Update

Steven,

I want to make sure that San Bernardino does not have any input on the Inyo County RTP update.

Thank you,

Acadia Davis

---

**From:** Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, December 19, 2022 11:00 AM

**To:** '[ssmith@gosbcta.com](mailto:ssmith@gosbcta.com)' <[ssmith@gosbcta.com](mailto:ssmith@gosbcta.com)>

**Cc:** 'Nancy Strickert' <[nstrickert@gosbcta.com](mailto:nstrickert@gosbcta.com)>

**Subject:** Consultation Notification for Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan Update

Steven,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc. has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We invite you and the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority to provide input on the plan. Please see attached letter for more information. We would appreciate receiving your response by January 30<sup>th</sup>.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

**Transportation Planner**

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)

**From:** [John Wentworth](#)  
**To:** [Acadia Davis](#)  
**Cc:** [Kristy Williams](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Inclusion of ESSRP in the Active Transportation Plan update for Inyo County  
**Date:** Thursday, March 16, 2023 10:55:08 AM  
**Attachments:** [MLTPA Logo Email.png](#)

---

Good morning Acadia -

Many thanks for reaching out, please see my thoughts below:

- "Does ESSRP have any strategic plans or guiding documents that you could pass along?"
  - Over a series of meetings in 2021, the Eastern Sierra Sustainable Recreation Partnership met to develop long term priorities for sustainable recreation in the region. The "Prospectus" includes eight investment strategies, feasibility parameters, guiding principles, and ESSRP project pillars.
  - [Please see this link to the "ESSRP Prospectus for Future Investments"](#)
- "What are the top priority projects of the ESSRP for the next 5, 10, 20 years?"
  - The ESSRP - as a body - does not have the authority to fund or manage projects on it's own, but it has recommended a series of projects for funding that were developed through the "Sustainable Recreation and Tourism Initiative (SRTI)" funded by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy and Prop 68. The initiative was completed in January of 2022. The following projects are being pursued by a variety of regional partners, let me know if you'd like additional detail.
    - [Click here to review the "Sustainable Recreation and Tourism Initiative: Projects and Funding" web page](#)
- "Does ESSRP and partner agencies have plans for projects or development in the near future?"
  - Attached below are links to the currently funded projects that are currently underway through the Eastern Sierra Council of Governments (ESCOG)
    - [Eastern Sierra Campground Improvements](#)
    - [Towns To Trails Plan](#)
    - [Dispersed Camping Mitigation: Camp Like A Pro](#)
    - [Buttermilk Infrastructure And Recreation Planning Initiative \(BIRPI\)](#)

Let me know if you have any questions or if I can assist with any further clarifications.

Thnx - !

john

On Mar 16, 2023, at 10:21 AM, Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)> wrote:

Hello,

I am working for Inyo County to update their Active Transportation Plan (ATP), which acts as a long-term strategic planning document that identifies existing bike and



pedestrian facilities in the County and also identifies future needs and projects. In hopes of including the projects and priorities of ESSRP, I would appreciate your input on the following:

1. Does ESSRP have any strategic plans or guiding documents that you could pass along?
2. What are the top priority projects of the ESSRP for the next 5, 10, 20 years?
3. Does ESSRP and partner agencies have plans for projects or development in the near future?

Thanks for your input,

**Acadia Davis**  
**Transportation Planner**  
**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**  
PO Box 5875  
2690 Lake Forest Road  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410  
[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)

John Wentworth  
Board President  
Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation  
[www.mltpa.org](http://www.mltpa.org)

(760) 934 3154 [office]  
(760) 934 1279 [direct]  
(213) 309 5637 [cel]

Powered by Google Workspace



**Native American Heritage Commission  
Tribal Consultation List  
Inyo County  
1/25/2023**

**Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley**

James Rambeau, Chairperson  
P. O. Box 700  
Big Pine, CA, 93513  
Phone: (760) 938 - 2003  
Fax: (760) 938-2942  
j.rambeau@bigpinepaiute.org

Paiute-Shoshone

**Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiutes**

Carl Dahlberg, Chairman  
P.O. Box 67  
Independence, CA, 93526  
Phone: (760) 878 - 5160  
Fax: (760) 878-2311  
businesscommittee@fortindependence.com

Paiute

**Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley**

Danelle Gutierrez, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer  
P.O. Box 700  
Big Pine, CA, 93513  
Phone: (760) 938 - 2003  
Fax: (760) 938-2942  
d.gutierrez@bigpinepaiute.org

Paiute-Shoshone

**Kern Valley Indian Community**

Robert Robinson, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 1010  
Lake Isabella, CA, 93240  
Phone: (760) 378 - 2915  
bbutterbredt@gmail.com

Kawaiisu  
Tubatulabal  
Koso

**Big Pine Paiute Tribe of Owens Valley**

Sally Manning, Environmental Director  
P. O. Box 700  
Big Pine, CA, 93513  
Phone: (760) 938 - 2003  
s.manning@bigpinepaiute.org

Paiute-Shoshone

**Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe**

Mary Wuester, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 747  
Lone Pine, CA, 93545  
Phone: (760) 876 - 1034  
Fax: (760) 876-8302

Paiute-Shoshone

**North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians**

Elaine Fink, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 929  
North Fork, CA, 93643  
Phone: (559) 877 - 2461  
Fax: (559) 877-2467  
efink@nfr-nsn.gov

Mono

**Bishop Paiute Tribe**

Allen Summers, Chairperson  
50 Tu Su Lane  
Bishop, CA, 93514  
Phone: (760) 873 - 3584  
Fax: (760) 873-4143

Paiute-Shoshone

**Tule River Indian Tribe**

Neil Peyron, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 589  
Porterville, CA, 93258  
Phone: (559) 781 - 4271  
Fax: (559) 781-4610  
neil.peyron@tulerivertribe-nsn.gov

Yokut

**Death Valley Timbi-sha Shoshone Tribe**

George Gholson, Chairperson  
P. O. Box 1779 / 1349 Rocking W Drive  
Bishop, CA, 93515/ 935  
Phone: (760) 872 - 3614  
Fax: (760) 873-9004  
george@timbisha.com

Western Shoshone

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Project, Inyo County.

**Native American Heritage Commission  
Tribal Consultation List  
Inyo County  
1/25/2023**

***Twenty-Nine Palms Band of  
Mission Indians***

Darrell Mike, Chairperson  
46-200 Harrison Place  
Coachella, CA, 92236  
Phone: (760) 863 - 2444  
Fax: (760) 863-2449  
29chairman@29palmsbomi-  
nsn.gov

Chemehuevi

***Wuksache Indian Tribe/Eshom  
Valley Band***

Kenneth Woodrow, Chairperson  
1179 Rock Haven Ct.  
Salinas, CA, 93906  
Phone: (831) 443 - 9702  
kwood8934@aol.com

Foothill Yokut  
Mono

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Project, Inyo County.

## California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 9  
500 SOUTH MAIN STREET | BISHOP, CA 93514  
(760) 874-8330 | FAX (760) 872-0678 TTY 711  
[www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov)



October 26, 2023

Acadia Davis  
LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.  
PO Box 5875  
2690 Lake Forest Road  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Dear Acadia Davis:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (LTC) Draft 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We would like to offer the comments below to assist in the development of the plan. A few of the comments below correspond to the RTP checklist section numbers.

### **Inyo County LTC is commended for:**

- Providing a thorough Executive Summary
- Developing a detailed public involvement process which considers traditionally underserved communities and Tribal Governments in the participation plan;
- And providing appropriate reference locations for the RTP Checklist contents.

### **Consultation and Cooperation:**

- (2) Appendix B contains public outreach and stakeholder comments. Please expand on how the documented needs of traditionally underserved communities are being considered. We recommend referencing underserved communities added as a summary in the appendices.
- (10) Please be more detailed, if possible, on private sector involvement efforts. Which truck traffic generator and private transportation operators were contacted?
- In addition, while there were passing references related to public outreach and the stakeholders and community involved, the document does not have a summary of the results of the public outreach. Please provide a summary detailing the findings of the public outreach conducted in Appendix B and C in the body of the document.

DRAFT Inyo RTP Comment Letter  
October 26, 2023  
Page 2

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Annelise Quintanar at [annelise.quintanar@dot.ca.gov](mailto:annelise.quintanar@dot.ca.gov), or 442-359-9823. Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Maggie Ritter*

Maggie Ritter,  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Division of Planning & Environmental  
Caltrans, District 9  
500 S Main St.  
Bishop, CA 93514

Cc. Michael Casas, Justine Kokx

*This page intentionally left blank*

**PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

---



# **Inyo County LTC Public Procedures**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (LTC) serves as the Regional Transportation Planning Authority (RTPA) and is responsible for deciding transportation policies and adopting transportation plans and programs to carry out these policies in Inyo County. The California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Planning Guidelines (September 2007) require that each RTPA have a transportation planning process that includes a public involvement program. The public involvement program is intended to provide reasonable opportunity for citizens, private and public transit, freight operators, tribal governments, and other interested parties to participate early in the RTP development process. The Public Involvement Procedures document contains the LTCs' policies and implementation measures to strengthen public participation in the Inyo County RTP update process.

## **RELEVANT REGULATION AND STATUTES**

The public involvement procedures for the Inyo County RTP stem from the following regulations and/or statutes:

- **ISTEA/TEA 21** – Public involvement in the transportation planning process took on an increased emphasis when Congress passed the Federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). Federal regulations to implement ISTEA called for a proactive public involvement process. The process must respond not only to the requirements of ISTEA, but also those of related federal acts, such as the Clean Air Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) succeeded ISTEA after September 30, 1997. TEA-21 is the federal legislation that authorizes a balance of federal highway, highway safety, transit, and other surface transportation program. TEA- 21 builds on the initiatives established in ISTEA including the necessity for enhanced Public Involvement Procedures.

- **The Brown Act** (Government Code Sections 54950-54962) – The Brown Act governs the meetings and actions of governing boards of local public agencies and their created bodies. Requirements of the Brown Act also apply to any committee or other subsidiary body created by a governing board, whether permanent or temporary, whether decision making or advisory.

The Brown Act sets minimum standards for open meetings and public access to them, location of meetings, posting notice, agenda distribution, and public input. The public agency may adopt reasonable regulations ensuring the public's right to address the agency, including regulations to limit the total amount of time allocated for public testimony. The Inyo County LTC and its standing committees all adhere to Brown Act requirements including proper notice, access, and the ability to address the LTC and its committees.

- **Americans with Disabilities (ADA)** – The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) stipulates involving the community, particularly those with disabilities, in the development and improvement of transportation services. All events held for programs or projects with federal aid that are open to the general public must be made accessible to everyone, including the disabled.

The LTC is in compliance with the ADA by having accessible formats, public meetings and public hearings. The LTC also consults with individuals from the disabled community and by including representatives from or for the disabled and transportation disadvantaged on its standing committees.

- **Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ)** – Title VI requires each federal agency to ensure that no person is excluded from participation, denied the benefit of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, sex, disability, or religion. The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 clarified the intent of Title VI to include all programs and activities of federal-aid recipients, sub recipients and contractors whether those programs and activities are federally funded or not.

On February 11, 1994, the President of the United States signed Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low- Income Populations. The Executive Order

requires that each Federal agency administer and implement its programs, policies, and activities that affect human health or the environment so as to identify and avoid “disproportionately high and adverse” effects on minority and low-income populations.

In April 1997, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) issued the DOT Order on Environmental Justice to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. The Order generally describes the process for incorporating environmental justice principles into all DOT existing programs, policies and activities.

In December 1998, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations that requires the FHWA to implement the principles of the DOT Order 5610.2 and E.O. 12898 by incorporating environmental justice principles in all FHWA programs, policies and activities.

The FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning on October 7, 1999. The memorandum provides clarification for field offices on how to ensure that environmental justice is considered during current and future planning certification reviews. The Federal Highway Administration considers three fundamental environmental justice principles:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects on minority populations and low-income populations
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations

As the RTPA serving Inyo County, the LTC implements and integrates the principles of environmental justice into its transportation planning process. The LTC uses census information, special studies and public input to determine whether a particular population of people is receiving an inordinate number of government funded projects that negatively impact their neighborhoods and/or communities. Outreach activities included in the LTCs’ Public Involvement Procedures include provisions for additional public notification such as radio, display ads, and workshops.

Native Americans are also protected under Title VI and Environmental Justice laws and outreach efforts to the Tribes are an integral part of the RTP update and public involvement process. Indian Tribal Governments must be consulted with and their interests considered during the development of RTPs and RTIPs. The officially recognized tribal governments in Inyo County are listed in Table A-1.

| <b>Inyo County Officially Recognized Tribal Governments/Governing Bodies</b> |                |                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Big Pine Paiute Tribe                                                        | (760) 938-2003 | P.O. Box 700,<br>Big Pine, CA                                  |
| Bishop Paiute Tribe                                                          | (760) 873-3584 | 50 Tu Su Lane,<br>Bishop, CA                                   |
| Fort Independence Tribe                                                      | (760) 878-5160 | P. O. Box 67,<br>Independence, CA                              |
| Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Reservation                                        | (760) 876-1034 | P.O. Box 747,<br>Lone Pine, CA                                 |
| Timbisha Shoshone Tribe                                                      | (760) 872-3614 | PO Box 1779, 621 West Line<br>Street, Suite 109,<br>Bishop, CA |
| Source: Caltrans                                                             |                |                                                                |

- **SAFETEA-LU** – SAFETEA-LU requires that each RTPA provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, private transportation providers, representatives of public transportation users, representatives of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities users, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a “reasonable opportunity” to comment on the RTP. The public participation plan must be developed prior to updating the RTP and Federal Transportation improvement Plan (FTIP) and must provide for input from the stakeholders during its preparation (Title 23 CFR 450.316).

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS - GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

The public participation program and process for Inyo County is proactive and does provide for timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and continuing involvement of the public in developing the RTP. The following are the key program requirements and criteria included in the LTC public involvement procedures.

- **Timely Information:** Information about RTP issues and the update process will be provided to citizens, affected public agencies, interested parties and segments of the community affected by the RTP through public announcements, meeting agendas, and the Inyo LTC website. The information will be provided in a timely manner so that the public can participate in the decision process.
- **Public Access:** The public will be afforded reasonable public access to technical and policy information used in the development of the RTP. Reasonable is defined as “during normal business hours” and/or during regular meetings of the LTC and its standing committees.
- **Public Notice:** Adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points will be provided, including, but not limited to, approval of RTP policies and objectives, transportation project lists, and air quality conformity. Note: Because Inyo County is classified as a non-attainment area for particulate matter (PM10) the comment period shall be at least 30 days.
- **Consideration of Public Input:** Inyo County will demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input received during the planning and program development process by documenting public comments and suggestions.
- **Participation by Underserved Groups:** The County will make a special effort to target RTP outreach activities to low-income and minority households, and tribal governments through mailings and public service announcements. A contact list of individuals and groups that serve these underserved groups will be maintained.

- Open Meetings: All LTC meetings are open to the public, and agendas are mailed to interested parties and are posted. All LTC Board meetings and advisory committee meetings include opportunities for public participation on agenda and non-agenda items.
- Public Hearings: Public hearings will be held as required for adoption of the RTP and/or supporting documents.

## **LTC POLICY AND DECISION MAKING BODIES**

The LTC appoints the Social Services Transportation Advisory council (SSTAC) as an advisory body. The Policy Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and the Citizens Advisory Committee were taken out of the By-Laws in 2004. Article II, Section 1 of the By-Laws was revised to read, “The ICLTC may appoint additional ad hoc committees for special purposes from time to time as it may deem necessary.”

The primary policy and decision-making body for transportation planning in Inyo County is the Inyo County LTC. The LTC comprises three members appointed by the Inyo County Board of Supervisors and three members appointed by the Bishop City Council. When required, the LTC may appoint additional ad hoc committees for special purposes from time to time as it may deem necessary.

## **LTC ADVISORY BODIES**

The LTC appoints the Social Services Transit Advisory Council (SSTAC) as an advisory body.

### Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

The SSTAC is an advisory committee to the LTC on matters pertaining to the transportation needs of transit dependent and transportation disadvantaged persons. The SSTAC input shall be considered in and made an integral part of the LTCs’ annual “unmet transit needs” hearing and findings process. The SSTAC advises the RTPA on major social and transportation issues. The composition of the SSTAC, the terms of SSTAC appointments, and specific responsibilities of the SSTAC are found in the Public Utilities Code. The SSTAC consists of the following:

- A representative of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older
- A representative of potential transit users who are handicapped
- Two representatives of the local social service providers for seniors
- Two representatives of the local social service providers for the handicapped
- A representative of a local service provider for persons of limited means
- Two representative from the local Consolidated Transportation Service Agency

## **PUBLIC MEETING INFORMATION**

The dates and times for the various commission meetings in Inyo County are listed below. The public is invited to attend any and all commission meetings. When the commission agenda includes an RTP issue or decision, the public will be afforded the opportunity to provide their input consistent with commission rules and time limits established by the Commission Chair.

The LTC meets on the third Wednesday of every month. ICLTC meetings are usually convened at 9:00 AM at the City of Bishop Council Chambers, Bishop, California; except, the meetings convened in the first month of each quarter (January, April, July and October) which are scheduled to be conducted in Independence or other locations in a southerly community in the County. The SSTAC meets at a minimum of once a year prior to the first LTC unmet transit needs hearing and otherwise on an ad hoc basis.

## **INYO COUNTY LTC PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**

The following policies and procedures will guide the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan Update process.

#### Policies:

1. The LTC is a “public service” agency which supports an “open door” policy with respect to public involvement and access. The LTC office is open for public visitation during normal business hours and normal business days. Citizens are encouraged to visit the LTC offices and ask questions, make suggestions, or express concerns regarding the RTP, programs and projects. All citizens will be treated in a courteous and professional manner by LTC staff.
2. The LTC supports an “open file” policy wherein all documents in the LTC office are subject to public review except those that are deemed confidential as they relate to employee or personnel matters and/or flagged by LTCs’ legal counsel as “not for public review”. All LTC public documents that are requested for public review shall be viewed in the presence of a LTC staff member. No original LTC documents or files should leave the LTC office. LTC may recover actual costs for providing copies of file documents per public request. Loaner copies of LTC publications or library documents may be charged the cost to produce the publication or document that is requested.
3. No person shall be denied participation in LTC meetings and activities unless specific instruction to the contrary is provided by LTC legal counsel.
4. All LTC meetings will be held in ADA compliant facilities.
5. Any member of the public may request an item on the LTC agenda for consideration. Such items should be presented to the LTC Executive Director no later than one week prior to the respective LTC meeting date. The LTC generally meets on the 3rd Wednesday of each month.
6. At the beginning of every LTC meeting, an agenda item shall be reserved for “public comment”. The purpose of the “public comment” agenda item is to allow any member of the public to address the LTC on any subject. The time allotted may be limited to 5 minutes or less at the discretion of the LTC Chair. Because no LTC decisions can be made on any item not specified on the agenda, public matters not on the agenda that require a decision may be put on the agenda for decision at a future LTC meeting.
7. Any “public hearing” scheduled by the LTC will require public notice regardless of whether it is a regular LTC meeting time and place or not. All notices of public meetings or hearings will include the following:
  - Date, time, and place of public meeting/hearing
  - General description of the matter to be considered
8. LTC staff will maintain a mailing list of interested persons who desire to be kept informed about progress on the RTP and its related documents. LTC staff will provide progress reports and other relevant documents to persons on the mailing list to keep them informed about the project(s) of concern.
9. When feasible, direct mail, the internet, public announcements to local television and radio stations and flyers will be used to encourage involvement of the under-served and transit dependent citizens in the development of RTP projects and RTP workshops.
10. The LTC will provide news releases or communicate with reporters working for local newspapers, radio stations, or television in the effort to provide public information and insight about LTC plans, programs, or projects.

#### Public Involvement Implementation Measures:

- Disposition - Public written comments and/or oral comments that are received on the draft RTP and its various elements through the public involvement process, and that are deemed to be significant by the LTC, will be summarized as to their content and disposition in the Final RTP.

- **Public Workshops** – It is vital that the public has the opportunity to participate early in the planning stages for development of the RTP. Their input will be used as a review of proposed RTP projects and programs, and to suggest new projects and/or programs that have not been discussed before. The best venue to receive public input will be at commission meetings that are held monthly in the County. County Staff will schedule a standing item on upcoming commission agendas that discusses background information on the RTP process including a review of County transportation issues, proposed solutions, and financial constraints. Normal procedures for notifying the public about the time and location of commission meetings will be followed.
- **Other Relevant Public Involvement Measures** – The LTC will continue to comply with all State and Federal requirements regarding public participation, including those not explicitly provided for in this document. The LTC will periodically review the public involvement procedures and implementation measures relative to their effectiveness in assuring that the process provides full and open access to all citizens of Inyo County. When needed, the public involvement procedures will be updated or revised.



**Table B1: Public/Stakeholder Outreach**

| Organization                               | Contact Person  |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Crystal Geyser Bottling Plant              | --              |
| FW Aggregates Inc.                         | --              |
| Eastern Sierra Transit Authority           | Phil Moores     |
| County and City Health and Human Services  | Manilyn Mann    |
| Office of Education                        | Barry Simpson   |
| Death Valley Unified School District       | Jim Copeland    |
| Eastside Velo                              | --              |
| Aerohead Cycles                            | --              |
| Adventure Trails of the Eastern Sierra     | Randy Gillespie |
| Owens River Water Trail                    | Larry Freilich  |
| Lower Owens River Project                  | Larry Freilich  |
| East Side Sierra Shuttle                   | Paul            |
| Sierra Shuttle Service                     | --              |
| East Side Shuttle Service                  | Kurt            |
| Public Works Deputy Dir. Airports          | Ashley Helms    |
| Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped  | Jenny Park      |
| Eastern Sierra Disabled Sports             | Laura Beardsley |
| Kern Regional Center                       | Karen Harrison  |
| Eastern Sierra Area Agency on Aging        | Rhiannon Baker  |
| Lone Pine Chamber of Commerce              | Kathleen New    |
| Bishop Chamber of Commerce                 | Tawni Thompson  |
| Northern Inyo Healthcare District          | Greg Bissonette |
| Southern Inyo Healthcare District          | Peter Spiers    |
| Toiyabe Indian Health Project              | Joseph Herman   |
| Lone Pine Economic Development Corporation | --              |

## *Underserved Communities*

---

Concerted efforts were made throughout the RTP planning process to engage underserved communities in Inyo County. The following is a summary of how the ICLTC and Consultant Team considered specific underserved communities when conducting outreach activities and engagement efforts:

- Extensive efforts were made to engage Tribal Governments in the planning process well beyond the delivery of notification letters, as required by AB-52. Repeated efforts were made via email and phone to engage Tribal Governments in conversation and multiple contacts per Tribe were contacted.
- Focused efforts were made by the planning team to find, acquire and review Tribal transportation planning documents, such as safety and active transportation plans.
- All of the in-person public outreach efforts were located within disadvantaged communities, per the Active Transportation Program definition of disadvantaged community by income. These outreach efforts were conducted in Bishop, Lone Pine, and Tecopa.
- ICLTC conducted the focused Active Transportation workshop in Tecopa, which is geographically isolated from resources, services and jobs and is severely disadvantaged by income. This effort was specifically conducted in Tecopa to identify and document the active transportation needs of the community in order to increase future success of securing grant funding for localized transportation improvement projects.
- A link to the online community survey was distributed via individualized emails to stakeholder groups throughout Inyo County, such as medical providers, social service agencies, and alternative transportation providers.
- Advertisements for public outreach efforts, as well the online community survey itself, were available in both English and Spanish.

## *Public and Stakeholder Comments*

---

*This page intentionally left blank*



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

2 messages

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: inyomonoah@earthlink.net

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:35 AM

Hello,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the IMAH community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to colleagues, IMAH clients, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com

---

**inyomonoah@earthlink.net** <inyomonoah@earthlink.net>

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:35 AM

Reply-To: nobody@earthlink.net

To: Acadia Davis <acadia@lsctrans.com>

I apologize for this automatic reply to your email.

To control spam, I now allow incoming messages only from senders I have approved beforehand.

If you would like to be added to my list of approved senders, please fill out the short request form (see link below). Once I approve you, I will receive your original message in my inbox. You do not need to resend your message. I apologize for this one-time inconvenience.

Click the link below to fill out the request:

<https://webmail1.earthlink.net/newaddme?a=inyomonoah@earthlink.net&id=11ed-7a54-22067018-ad55-00144ff91269>



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

**FW: Follow up: We want your input on transportation needs in Inyo County**

2 messages

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: kcarr@inyocoe.org

Fri, Jan 6, 2023 at 2:15 PM

Kristin,

I am looking for input from the Inyo County school system on transportation needs in Inyo County and wanted to reach out to you since I have not received a response from Barry Simpson. Is there someone better suited to provide input, or would you be able to speak to this? I appreciate any leads you may be able to give me.

I am also specifically looking for an estimate on the percentage of students that walk and bike to school in each school district in Inyo County. Would you be able to help me with this?

Thank you for your help,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com

---

**From:** Acadia Davis <acadia@lsctrans.com>**Sent:** Friday, January 6, 2023 2:09 PM**To:** 'bsimpson@inyocoe.org' <bsimpson@inyocoe.org>**Subject:** Follow up: We want your input on transportation needs in Inyo County

Dear Barry,

I send you an email in December but have not received a reply and wanted to follow up with you. LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like to include any input that you and the school districts in Inyo County may have in regards to transportation needs in the county.



The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to teachers, parents, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)

---

**Mail Delivery Subsystem** <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>  
To: [acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)

Fri, Jan 6, 2023 at 2:15 PM

**Address not found**



Your message wasn't delivered to **kcarr@inyocoe.org** because the address couldn't be found, or is unable to receive mail.

[LEARN MORE](#)

The response was:

550 5.2.1 The email account that you tried to reach is disabled. Learn more at <https://support.google.com/mail/?p=DisabledUser> n46-20020a02712e000000b0038a3606a284sor898020jac.23 - gsmtip

Final-Recipient: rfc822; [kcarr@inyocoe.org](mailto:kcarr@inyocoe.org)

Action: failed

Status: 5.2.1

Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 550-5.2.1 The email account that you tried to reach is disabled. Learn more at 550 5.2.1 <https://support.google.com/mail/?p=DisabledUser> n46-20020a02712e000000b0038a3606a284sor898020jac.23 - gsmtip

Last-Attempt-Date: Fri, 06 Jan 2023 14:15:52 -0800 (PST)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Acadia Davis <[acadia@isctrans.com](mailto:acadia@isctrans.com)>

To: [kcarr@inyocoe.org](mailto:kcarr@inyocoe.org)

Cc:

Bcc:

Date: Fri, 6 Jan 2023 14:15:50 -0800

Subject: FW: Follow up: We want your input on transportation needs in Inyo County

----- Message truncated -----



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: info@disabledsportseasternsierra.org

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:38 AM

Hello,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the disabled sports community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to staff, volunteers, outdoor enthusiasts, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

7/17/23, 5:30 PM

lsctrans.com Mail - We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: eastsideveloinfo@gmail.com

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:22 AM

Hello,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link with clients, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

7/18/23, 11:28 AM

Isctrans.com Mail - We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: mmann@inyocounty.us

Tue, Dec 13, 2022 at 7:51 AM

Dear Ms. Mann,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County? To improve access to medical and social services?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to staff, volunteers, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

7/18/23, 11:29 AM

Isctrans.com Mail - We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



**From:** [Acadia Davis](#)  
**To:** ["Greg Bissonette"](#)  
**Subject:** RE: NOENCRYPT: Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County  
**Date:** Thursday, January 26, 2023 11:36:00 AM

---

Greg,

Thanks for taking the time to update the blurb about the Shuttle and share the survey!

We will be in touch as the year progresses when we schedule workshops and have a draft RTP out.

-Acadia

---

**From:** Greg Bissonette <Greg.Bissonette@nih.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 25, 2023 12:06 PM  
**To:** 'Acadia Davis' <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
**Subject:** RE: NOENCRYPT: Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Hi Acadia,

So, I've passed the survey along to our CAREShuttle coordinator and filled it out myself. Definitely seemed geared toward walking/biking improvements, but put my 2¢ in.

Then, as far as our program, here's what you can use for updated information:

Northern Inyo Healthcare District offers non-emergency medical transportation to/from medical appointments when ESTA or other transportation cannot be found. There is no cost to use this service and the CAREShuttle offers door-to-door service within a 60-mile radius of the city of Bishop, reaching from Mammoth Lakes to Lone Pine. The CAREShuttle is also transporting residents in Goldfield and Tonopah, NV who are seeking care at the District. The CAREShuttle uses wheelchair accessible and passenger vans and is partially supported by volunteer drivers. Since its start in 2016, the shuttle has made an estimated 8,000 trips totaling 250,000 miles, with an average of around 200 transports a month.

Let me know how that all sounds!!

Thanks-Greg

**Greg Bissonette**

Foundation Executive Director

T: (760) 873-2166

[www.nihdfoundation.org](http://www.nihdfoundation.org)

[greg.bissonette@nih.org](mailto:greg.bissonette@nih.org)

UPCOMING AWAY DATES:

---

**From:** Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2023 12:22 PM

**To:** Greg Bissonette <[Greg.Bissonette@nih.org](mailto:Greg.Bissonette@nih.org)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL MAIL]RE: NOENCRYPT: FW: [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

**\*\* This message has originated from outside the NIH network and has been tagged as EXTERNAL \*\***

**\*\* Use care when opening attachments. Attachments are a common method for delivering malware. Do you know the sender? Were you expecting this attachment? If the message appears suspicious to you in any way, DO NOT click on any links or open the attachment(s) and NEVER FORWARD any emails that you have questions about.**

If you are unsure what to do please Contact the service desk by email or phone [servicedesk@nih.org](mailto:servicedesk@nih.org) or X2835. \*\*

Greg,

Good question. The RTP will include reference to the CareShuttle and it would be great to have updated numbers on rides given and service area but they do not need to be super detailed. Here is what was included in the last RTP. If you would like to update/add to any of these statistics, that would be great!

“Northern Inyo Hospital CAREshuttle

Northern Inyo Hospital offers non-emergency medical transportation to/from medical appointments when ESTA or other transportation cannot be found. There is no cost to use this service and CAREshuttle offers door-to-door service within a 60-mile radius of the city of Bishop, reaching from Mammoth Lakes to Lone Pine. The CAREshuttle uses a wheelchair accessible van and volunteer drivers. Since it’s start in 2016, the shuttle has made an estimated 8,000 trips totaling 250,000 miles.”

The survey is geared more for public input so is going to ask you more about your personal transportation habits/concerns although there is ample opportunity for write-ins.

Thanks,  
Acadia

---

**From:** Greg Bissonette <[Greg.Bissonette@nih.org](mailto:Greg.Bissonette@nih.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2023 11:05 AM

**To:** 'Acadia Davis' <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Subject:** RE: NOENCRYPT: FW: [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Hi Acadia,

Thanks for the follow up there and shouldn't be an issue to have this wrapped up early next week. I'm off the end of this week and most everyone is out today, so I'll circle around with who I can tomorrow before I go out.

One other thing I was wondering, and maybe it's in the survey so want to be prepared, but will you be looking for data on our program and like the number of transports we do and locations those transports are happening in?? knowing that would be helpful as well!!

Thanks-Greg

**Greg Bissonette**

Foundation Executive Director

T: (760) 873-2166

[www.nihdfoundation.org](http://www.nihdfoundation.org)

[greg.bissonette@nih.org](mailto:greg.bissonette@nih.org)

UPCOMING AWAY DATES: Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup>

---

**From:** Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2023 11:18 AM

**To:** Greg Bissonette <[Greg.Bissonette@nih.org](mailto:Greg.Bissonette@nih.org)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL MAIL]RE: NOENCRYPT: FW: [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Greg,

Thanks for reaching out!

Ideally, we'd have a response by the end of January, but that's a soft deadline. We will still work to incorporate your feedback if you send it over after that.

That being said, if you are interested in taking and/or sharing the survey, we'd really appreciate if that happens by the end of January or sooner so we can begin looking at the responses.

Best,

-Acadia

---

**From:** Greg Bissonette <[Greg.Bissonette@nih.org](mailto:Greg.Bissonette@nih.org)>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 12, 2023 10:42 AM

**To:** 'acadia@lsctrans.com' <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Subject:** NOENCRYPT: FW: [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Hi Acadia,

I've been asked by Chad to follow up on this for the District, as I'm intimately involved with our CAREshuttle program that offers non-emergency transportation services to our patients.

One thing that jumped out to me first was a timeline you'd like our responses back by. Could you give me a heads up there?

Then, I need to coordinate with a few different departments here and gather their feedback before I'm comfortable providing some priorities on our end.

Looking forward to hearing what kind of timeframe we're working under!!

Thanks-Greg

## **Greg Bissonette**

Foundation Executive Director

T: (760) 873-2166

[www.nihdfoundation.org](http://www.nihdfoundation.org)

[greg.bissonette@nih.org](mailto:greg.bissonette@nih.org)

UPCOMING AWAY DATES: Jan. 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup>

---

**From:** Chad Chadwick <[Chad.Chadwick@nih.org](mailto:Chad.Chadwick@nih.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 9, 2023 5:04 PM

**To:** Greg Bissonette <[Greg.Bissonette@nih.org](mailto:Greg.Bissonette@nih.org)>

**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Greg, can you take a look at this please? Thanks.

## **Lionel "Chad" Chadwick, PhD, LFACHE**

Interim Chief Executive Officer

Northern Inyo Healthcare District

150 Pioneer Lane

Bishop, CA 93514

Phone: 760-873-2838

Fax: 760-872-5802

---

**From:** Acadia Davis <[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 9, 2023 2:48 PM

**To:** Chad Chadwick <[Chad.Chadwick@nih.org](mailto:Chad.Chadwick@nih.org)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL MAIL]Follow up to phone call about NIH input on transportation needs in the County

Chad,

Thank you for picking up the phone. I work for LSC Transportation Consultants Inc and we have been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities, and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the hospital best serve Inyo County? Are there any transportation related concerns about access to healthcare in the County you see?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to staff, volunteers, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**  
Transportation Planner  
**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**  
PO Box 5875  
2690 Lake Forest Road  
Tahoe City, CA 96145  
Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410  
[acadia@lsctrans.com](mailto:acadia@lsctrans.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message is intended for the use of the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error or are not the named recipient, please notify us immediately by contacting the sender at the electronic mail address noted above with a copy to [Compliance@NIH.org](mailto:Compliance@NIH.org) and destroy this message

**\* Privacy Notice \***

It is the policy of Northern Inyo Healthcare District to automatically encrypt all emails that contain some attachments. The sender of this email has elected to override this and not have the attachments encrypted. In doing so the sender acknowledges that no sensitive information or PHI is being sent. Should the receiver have concerns regarding this please contact the Northern Inyo Healthcare District Privacy Officer at [Compliance@nih.org](mailto:Compliance@nih.org).

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message is intended for the use of the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error or are not the named recipient, please notify us immediately by contacting the sender at the electronic mail address noted above with a copy to [Compliance@NIH.org](mailto:Compliance@NIH.org) and destroy this message

**\* Privacy Notice \***

It is the policy of Northern Inyo Healthcare District to automatically encrypt all emails that contain some attachments. The sender of this email has elected to override this and not have the attachments encrypted. In doing so the sender acknowledges that no sensitive information or PHI is being sent. Should the receiver have concerns regarding this please contact the Northern Inyo Healthcare District Privacy Officer at [Compliance@nih.org](mailto:Compliance@nih.org).

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message is intended for the use of the named recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error or are not the named recipient, please notify us immediately by contacting the sender at the electronic mail address noted above with a copy to [Compliance@NIH.org](mailto:Compliance@NIH.org) and destroy this message

**\* Privacy Notice \***

It is the policy of Northern Inyo Healthcare District to automatically encrypt all emails that contain some attachments. The sender of this email has elected to override this and not have the attachments encrypted. In doing so the sender acknowledges that no sensitive information or PHI is being sent. Should the receiver have concerns regarding this please contact the Northern Inyo Healthcare District Privacy Officer at [Compliance@nih.org](mailto:Compliance@nih.org).



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

4 messages

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: LonePineKurt@aol.com

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:33 AM

Kurt,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to clients, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com

---

**Lone Pine Kurt** <lonepinekurt@aol.com>  
Reply-To: Lone Pine Kurt <lonepinekurt@aol.com>  
To: acadia@lsctrans.com

Mon, Dec 26, 2022 at 11:05 AM

Acadia,

I am surprised at receiving this e-mail. I wonder how my name came up to ask me these questions. I did read the section on transportation in the RTP.

My first reaction is the need for transportation in the Eastern Sierra on weekends. Currently the ESTA only provides transportation weekdays. During the summer from June 1 through Labor Day there are hordes of hikers hiking in the Sierra that need to get from one town to another as well as transportation to an airport. I am not aware of the economics of operating the buses which may dictate the costs of providing weekend services. Over the many years I have found the ESTA services to be reliable and punctual. The drivers are friendly and helpful and it is a great service. I just wish they would operate on weekends. My perspective is as a trail angel providing rides for hikers from trail heads to town or vice versa.

The only other issue which may be beyond the purview of your contract is pedestrian safety in the towns, especially in Lone Pine. Drivers have been driving at 80 mph for the 100 miles from the south and they fail to slow down when coming through town. The speed limit is 25 mph but people drive through at 40 or greater without caution for the many pedestrians. The CHP does give out a lot of tickets but there is still a hazard for pedestrians. I can identify at least six crossings which are frequently used by pedestrians other than the single traffic light. The main street is much narrower than the main streets in Independence and Big Pine. The answer is NOT to create no parking on the main street. That would impact all the businesses that rely on street parking. My preference would be large overhead lighted signs similar to the Caltrans signs which would warn drivers to slow down. The small speed limit signs are easily missed. Interestingly I have observed this more as a northbound problem than a southbound problem.

I will be glad to enumerate on any of these observations. I have been around this area for 57 years off and on.

Kurt 661-972-9476

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: Lone Pine Kurt <lonepinekurt@aol.com>

Wed, Dec 28, 2022 at 8:40 AM

Kurt,

Thank you for your thoughtful input and response. There will be an opportunity to provide more feedback if interested this spring when we do outreach and workshops on a draft of the updated RTP.

I believe that your name came up as someone who is involved in and provides transportation in Inyo County. We are very much trying to reach a wide diversity of folks—agencies, organizations, tribes, businesses, community members—so thanks for being involved.

Best,

Acadia



[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Lone Pine Kurt** <lonepinekurt@aol.com>  
Reply-To: Lone Pine Kurt <lonepinekurt@aol.com>  
To: acadia@lsctrans.com

Sat, Dec 31, 2022 at 4:08 AM

Acadia,

As an example about weekend needs for transportation I just received an inquiry for a ride from Lone Pine to Lancaster on Saturday Aug 12 because ESTA does not operate on the weekends. There are tons of hikers needing transportation on the weekends during the summer. I have been providing a lot of those rides for the past nine years. I am not a business. I basically ask for gas money for the rides. We really need public transportation on weekends during the summer (June 1 until Labor Day).

Kurt

[Quoted text hidden]



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## Updating the Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation for Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>

Thu, Mar 16, 2023 at 9:52 AM

To: lfreilich@inyocounty.us

Larry,

I wanted to follow up with you and see if you would be willing to provide some updates on what is going on at the Lower Owens River Project in terms of transportation and recreation. As we are updating the Regional Transportation Plan and the Active Transportation Plan for Inyo County (two important strategic documents that guide transportation planning in the County), it would be great to include some of the planning happening at LOWP more recent than the Recreation Use Plan.

1. What recreational access, trails, and facilities exist with the LORP currently?
2. What are the priority future projects in terms of transportation (i.e. roadways, bike paths, trailheads, parking areas, walking paths, etc.)
3. What concerns do you have about recreational use and transportation in the County and for the LORP?

Please feel free to call as well. Thanks for your involvement,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

**Follow up: We want your input on transportation in Inyo County**

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: info@lonepinechamber.org

Mon, Jan 9, 2023 at 2:22 PM

Hello Lone Pine Chamber of Commerce,

I'm following up on an email I sent in December looking for input on transportation needs in Inyo County. LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. The ATP focuses on bike and pedestrian facilities and needs. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

We would appreciate the following:

- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County if you haven't already:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link on social media, and with staff and anyone else interested in transportation.
- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, etc.) are needed to help you and Lone Pine businesses?

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

Tahoe City, CA 96145

7/17/23, 5:27 PM

Isctrans.com Mail - Follow up: We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: kharrison@kernrc.org

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:40 AM

Dear Karen,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to staff, clients, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

7/17/23, 5:29 PM

lsctrans.com Mail - We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



Acadia Davis &lt;acadia@lsctrans.com&gt;

---

## We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

1 message

---

**Acadia Davis** <acadia@lsctrans.com>  
To: rbaker@inyocounty.us

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:42 AM

Dear Rhiannon,

LSC Transportation Consultants Inc has been hired by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) to update the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and we would like your input!

The RTP is a document that outlines the region's vision for all types of transportation capital improvements over the next 20 years. Any projects on roadways, bike paths, sidewalks, transit facilities and at the airports that are funded with state or federal funds must be named in the RTP. Therefore, it is important to hear from the community as to what transportation related issues and needs there are in Inyo County. The plan must be updated every 5 years.

A link to the current RTP is here: <https://www.inyocounty.us/sites/default/files/2022-08/Final%20Inyo%202019%20RTPReduced.pdf>.

We would appreciate the following:

- Let us know what types of transportation improvements (anything relating to roads, sidewalks, public transit, bike paths, parking, access, vehicles, etc.) are needed to help you and the community safely get around Inyo County?
- Complete a 5-minute survey regarding regional transportation issues in Inyo County:
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPPublicSurvey> (English)
  - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2023InyoRTPEncuestaPublica> (Spanish)
- Share the survey link to service users, friends, family, and others interested in transportation.

Thank you so much for being involved in this process! Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions or to provide input.

Best,

**Acadia Davis**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants Inc.**

PO Box 5875

2690 Lake Forest Road

7/17/23, 5:27 PM

Isctrans.com Mail - We want your input on transportation in Inyo County

Tahoe City, CA 96145

Office: 530-583-4053 ext.410

acadia@lsctrans.com



**From:** [Justine Kokx](#)  
**To:** [Acadia Davis](#)  
**Subject:** RE: More comments fro/orm today"s LTC meeting for ATP and/or RTP  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 10:53:09 AM

---

Hi Acadia,

Here is a comment from Robert Strub of Lone Pine for the RTP. I

**Missing comment:** the environmental portion of the RTP should include an evaluation of the viewshed of Inyo Counties primary transportation corridor known as US 395 so that areas not visible from 6' above the roadway can be determined and then shown as part of the RTP.

---

## **RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

---

The Draft Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan was circulated for a 30-day review period beginning on September 27, 2023, and closing on October 26, 2023. The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) received one comment letter from the Center for Biological Diversity. This comment letter and accompanying responses are included below.



October 26, 2023

*Sent via email*

Inyo County Local Transportation Commission  
168 N. Edwards Street  
Independence, CA 93526  
[jkokx@inyocounty.us](mailto:jkokx@inyocounty.us)

**Re: Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023-2043: Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration**

Dear Inyo County Local Transportation Commission:

A.1

These comments are submitted on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity (the “Center”) regarding the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan 2023-2043 (“RTP”) and the associated Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration (“ISPND”). The Center has reviewed the RTP and Negative Declaration and provides these comments for consideration by the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission. As outlined in further detail below, we urge the County to fully consider and mitigate the impacts of the RTP on wildlife connectivity and greenhouse gas emissions, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”). We are concerned that the Negative Declaration does not meet CEQA’s requirements.

The Center is a non-profit, public interest environmental organization dedicated to the protection of native species and their habitats through science, policy, and environmental law. The Center has over 1.7 million members and online activists throughout California and the United States. The Center and its members have worked for many years to protect imperiled plants and wildlife, open space, air and water quality, and overall quality of life in Inyo County and the surrounding region.

A.2

**I. The Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration (ISPND) Fails to Adequately Disclose, Analyze, and Mitigate the Project’s Impacts.**

CEQA is a comprehensive statute designed to provide for long-term protection of the environment. The law was enacted for the state to “take all action necessary to protect, rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state” and to “[e]nsure that the long-term protection of the environment . . . shall be the guiding criterion in public decisions.” (Pub.

*Arizona · California · Colorado · Florida · N. Carolina · Nevada · New Mexico · New York · Oregon · Washington, D.C. · La Paz, Mexico*

[BiologicalDiversity.org](http://BiologicalDiversity.org)

Res. Code § 21001.) Accordingly, the CEQA Guidelines explain that “CEQA was intended to be interpreted in such a manner as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language,” and that “[t]he purpose of CEQA is . . . to compel government at all levels to make decisions with environmental consequences in mind.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15003.)

CEQA applies to discretionary projects proposed to be carried out or approved by public agencies. (Pub. Res. Code § 21080(a).) A “project” is “the whole of an action” directly undertaken, supported or authorized by a public agency, “which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment.” (Pub. Res. Code. § 21065; CEQA Guidelines § 15378.)

Unless a proposed project is exempt from CEQA’s requirements, the lead agency is charged with conducting an “initial study” to determine the project’s potentially significant environmental impacts. (CEQA Guidelines §15063.) An environmental impact report (“EIR”) must be prepared if the initial study finds that a proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. (See Pub. Res. Code §§ 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21100, 21151.)

The EIR is the “heart” of CEQA’s environmental review requirement. (See *No Oil, Inc. v. Los Angeles* (1974) 13 Cal.3d 68, 84.) It serves as an environmental “alarm bell” whose purpose is to alert the public and decision-makers to environmental changes “before they have reached ecological points of no return.” (*County of Inyo v. Yorty* (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795, 810.) The EIR must identify and describe “[d]irect and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2(a)) and also identify and analyze cumulative effects when the “incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15130(a); id. § 15065(a)(3).)

If “there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project . . . may have a significant effect on the environment” the agency may prepare a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration instead of an EIR. (Pub. Res. Code § 21064.5; see also id. §§ 21064, 21080(c).) If an agency is presented with so much as “a fair argument that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency shall prepare an EIR even though it may also be presented with other substantial evidence that the project will not have a significant effect.” (CEQA Guidelines § 15064(f)(1); see also *No Oil, Inc.*, 13 Cal.3d at 75.)

The CEQA Guidelines provide guidance for determining if a project’s effects are significant. Such a determination “calls for careful judgment on the part of the public agency involved, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data” and a “consider[ation of] the views held by members of the public in all areas affected.” (*Id.* § 15064(b)-(c).) The lead agency must consider both direct and indirect physical changes in the environment caused by the project. (*Id.* § 15064(d).)

CEQA also requires consideration of cumulative impacts. An EIR is required “if the cumulative impact may be significant and the project’s incremental effect, though individually



limited, is cumulatively considerable . . . when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current project, and the effects of probable future projects.” (Id. § 15064(h)(1).) Cumulatively considerable environmental effects require a mandatory finding of significance. (Id. § 15065(a)(3).)

As described in more detail below, there is more than a “fair argument” that the adoption of the RTP will result in significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to the environment. Accordingly, the ISPND fails to provide adequate disclosure, analysis, and mitigation and the County should prepare an EIR for the RTP.

**a. The ISPND’s cursory “Analysis” of Impacts to Biological Resources Is Wholly Deficient.**

A.3

The ISPND provides a single paragraph that purports to analyze the RTP’s impacts to biological resources, arguing that “Transportation improvements in the plan that are on existing facilities will not have a significant impact on biological resources” (ISPND at 11). It provides no substantive evidence to support such a claim. And although the ISPND acknowledges that “facilities that will expand existing rights-of-way into undisturbed areas or construct new rights-of-way into undisturbed area have the potential to have a significant impact to biological resources” (ISPND at 11), it kicks the can down the road, ambiguously stating that “Project-specific environmental review and existing regulations will mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant status” (ISPND at 11). This is misrepresented in the table, which shows that impacts to biological resources would be “less than significant” not “less than significant with mitigation” (ISPND at 10). The ISPND also fails to provide any details regarding what the potential impacts may be or how such impacts will be mitigated to less than significant. Instead, the ISPND relies on the RTP’s vague goals and policies that have no meaningful or enforceable targets, actions, or mitigation measures. This analysis is insufficient.

The ISPND fails to mention any special-status species or sensitive habitats that are known to occur or may occur in the project area. According to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the County has large natural habitat areas with high levels of biodiversity, particularly in Owens Valley and along the Owens River, where the US 395 corridor is located.<sup>1</sup> Widening existing roads or building new roads in the area could have a significant impact on numerous sensitive animal and plant species, including the federally-endangered Amargosa vole and Sierra Nevada bighorn sheep, federally- and state-threatened desert tortoise, state-threatened Mohave ground squirrel, and the state-endangered Inyo rock daisy. Yet the ISPND fails to adequately disclose, assess, and mitigate the Project’s potential impacts to these and other sensitive species and habitats.

A.4

**b. The County Must Analyze and Mitigate the RTP’s Impacts on Wildlife Movement and Habitat Connectivity.**

<sup>1</sup> See CDFW Areas of Conservation Emphasis Version 3.0. Available at <https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/ace/> (Accessed October 18, 2023).

With Assembly Bill 2344 (AB 2344)—The Safe Roads and Wildlife Protection Act—passed and signed into law in 2022, the County and Caltrans are required to carefully consider and restore wildlife connectivity when there is new construction and/or when improvements are being made to existing transportation infrastructure. The bill specifically states:

It is therefore the policy of the state to protect, restore, and enhance the functioning of fish, wildlife, and habitat connectivity in connection with the planning, construction, and improvement of transportation infrastructure throughout the state and, where feasible, the operation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure throughout the state. (AB 2344 Section 1(b)).

Despite this clear language and the area's high wildlife biodiversity and large natural habitat areas, the IS/MND fails to make any attempt to assess and mitigate the Project's impacts to wildlife connectivity.

The County must analyze the potential impacts of the RTP and its associated projects on wildlife connectivity. As detailed in a 2021 Center Report (Yap et al., 2021), roads and development create barriers that lead to habitat loss and fragmentation, which harms native wildlife, plants, and people. As barriers to wildlife movement, poorly-planned development and roads can affect an animal's behavior, movement patterns, reproductive success, and physiological state, which can lead to significant impacts on individual wildlife, populations, communities, landscapes, and ecosystem function (Brehme et al., 2013; Ceia-Hasse et al., 2018; Haddad et al., 2015; Marsh & Jaeger, 2015; Mitsch & Wilson, 1996; Trombulak & Frissell, 2000; van der Ree et al., 2011). For example, habitat fragmentation from roads and development has been shown to cause mortalities and harmful genetic isolation in mountain lions in southern California (Ernest et al., 2014; Riley et al., 2014; Vickers et al., 2015), increase local extinction risk in amphibians and reptiles (Brehme et al., 2018; Cushman, 2006), cause high levels of avoidance behavior and mortality in birds and insects (Benitez-López et al., 2010; Kantola et al., 2019; Loss et al., 2014), and alter pollinator behavior and degrade habitats (Aguilar et al., 2008; Goverde et al., 2002; Trombulak & Frissell, 2000).

Numerous bears, mountain lions, and other animals have been killed on roads in Inyo County (Shilling et al., 2023). Policies that call for widening roads and increasing capacity, such as Policy 3.6—Provide a 4-lane facility for US 395 and CA 14 between Southern California population centers and Inyo County and Policy 3.8—Increase capacity of SRs as needed to maintain LOS, could result in more wildlife vehicle collisions that cause harm to drivers. Neglecting to consider and integrate wildlife movement into the design of such projects is out of compliance with AB 2344 and fails to achieve the RTP's stated safety, public health, and environmental goals, including:

- Goal 1: Safety—provide a safe and secure transportation system for all users.
- Goal 6: Quality of Life/Public Health—Enable vibrant and healthy communities.
- Goal 7: Environment—Enhance environmental health and reduce negative transportation impacts.



The Road Ecology Center at UC Davis estimated that reported wildlife-vehicle collisions with large mammals caused over one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000) in economic and social costs to Californians from 2016 to 2020 (Shilling et al., 2021). Many of these types of collisions go unreported or under-recorded, as some people may choose not to report crashes, people may not see animal carcasses on the road or in the right-of-way, or wounded animals move beyond the right-of-way before they die. Therefore, the wildlife death tolls, injuries to people, and costs could be much greater. Yet the ISPND provides no analyses regarding wildlife connectivity and no requirement to consider wildlife movement and implement wildlife crossings and/or wildlife fencing. Instead the RTP downplays the Project's potential impacts stating, "The majority of RTP projects located within the Inyo region are road reconstruction or rehabilitation and do not require disturbing or paving new lands" (RTP at 131) while failing to include enforceable mitigation measures for new roadway projects, stating that "New roadway projects will undergo a thorough environmental review before construction," (RTP at 131). The County may not postpone or delay analyzing these impacts to a later date under CEQA and AB 2344.

Wildlife crossing structures can increase driver safety and are highly effective at reducing wildlife-vehicle collisions. Numerous readily available measures exist to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate the impacts of roads on wildlife, including but not limited to the placement of exclusion/directional fencing and the construction of wildlife-friendly underpasses, overpasses, culverts, and elevated sections of road in key wildlife connectivity areas, and they have proved successful in other states. For example, wildlife passage features reduced vehicle-wildlife collisions along Highway 9 in Colorado by 92% (Kintsch et al., 2021) and along the I-15 in Utah by 98.5% (Bissonette & Rosa, 2012). Properly sited and designed wildlife passage features make roads safer for people and wildlife, which saves costs to society from fewer wildlife vehicle collisions (Center for Large Landscape Conservation, 2020). These safety measures can be applied to new transportation infrastructure as well as retrofitted to existing infrastructure to effectively reduce collisions.

Habitat fragmentation also severely impacts plant communities. An 18-year study found that reconnected landscapes had nearly 14% more plant species compared to fragmented habitats, and that number is likely to continue to rise as time passes (Damschen et al., 2019). The authors conclude that efforts to preserve and enhance connectivity will pay off over the long-term (Damschen et al., 2019). In addition, connectivity between high quality habitat areas in heterogeneous landscapes is important to allow for range shifts and species migrations as climate changes (Cushman et al., 2013; Heller & Zavaleta, 2009; Krosby et al., 2018). Loss of wildlife connectivity decreases biodiversity and degrades ecosystems. It also prevents the reestablishment of native species, like wolves, as was seen with the dispersing wolf OR93 who traveled south from Oregon and roamed California until it was killed by a vehicle strike in Kern County in less than a year.<sup>2</sup>

Edge effects of roads and development in and adjacent to open space will likely impact key, wide-ranging predators, such as mountain lions and bobcats (Crooks, 2002; Delaney et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2012; Riley et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2015, 2017; Vickers et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2017), as well as smaller species with poor dispersal abilities, such as song birds, small

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife. "Newsroom: OR93 Found Dead In Kern County." Accessed November 30, 2021. <https://wildlife.ca.gov/News/or93-found-dead-in-kern-county>

mammals, and herpetofauna (Benítez-López et al., 2010; Cushman, 2006; Kociolek et al., 2011; Slabbekoorn & Ripmeester, 2008). Limiting movement and dispersal can affect species' ability to find food, shelter, mates, and refugia after disturbances like fires or floods. Individuals can die off, populations can become isolated, sensitive species can become locally extinct, and important ecological processes like plant pollination and nutrient cycling can be lost. Negative edge effects from human activity, such as traffic, lighting, noise, domestic pets, pollutants, invasive weeds, and increased fire frequency, have been found to be biologically significant up to 300 meters (~1000 feet) away from anthropogenic features in terrestrial systems (Environmental Law Institute, 2003)

The County must also consider corridor redundancy (*i.e.* the availability of alternative pathways for movement) because it allows for improved functional connectivity and resilience. Compared to a single pathway, multiple connections between habitat patches increase the probability of movement across landscapes by a wider variety of species, and they provide more habitat for low-mobility species while still allowing for their dispersal (Mcrae et al., 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2013; Pinto & Keitt, 2008). In addition, corridor redundancy provides resilience to uncertainty, impacts of climate change, and extreme events, like flooding or wildfires, by providing alternate escape routes or refugia for animals seeking safety (Cushman et al., 2013; Mcrae et al., 2008, 2012; Olson & Burnett, 2013; Pinto & Keitt, 2008).

Corridor redundancy is critical when considering the impacts of climate change on wildlife movement and habitat connectivity. Climate change is increasing stress on species and ecosystems, causing changes in distribution, phenology, physiology, vital rates, genetics, ecosystem structure and processes, and increasing species extinction risk (Warren et al., 2011). A 2016 analysis found that climate-related local extinctions are already widespread and have occurred in hundreds of species, including almost half of the 976 species surveyed (Wiens, 2016). A separate study estimated that nearly half of terrestrial non-flying threatened mammals and nearly one-quarter of threatened birds may have already been negatively impacted by climate change in at least part of their distribution (Pacifi et al., 2017). A 2016 meta-analysis reported that climate change is already impacting 82 percent of key ecological processes that form the foundation of healthy ecosystems and on which humans depend for basic needs (Scheffers et al., 2016). Genes are changing, species' physiology and physical features such as body size are changing, species are moving to try to keep pace with suitable climate space, species are shifting their timing of breeding and migration, and entire ecosystems are under stress (Cahill et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2011; Maclean & Wilson, 2011; Parmesan, 2006; Parmesan & Yohe, 2003; Root et al., 2003; Warren et al., 2011).

It is widely recognized that the continuing fragmentation of habitat by humans threatens biodiversity and diminishes our (humans, plants, and animals) ability to adapt to climate change. In a report for the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), world-renowned scientists from around the world stated that "[s]cience overwhelmingly shows that interconnected protected areas and other areas for biological diversity conservation are much more effective than disconnected areas in human-dominated systems, especially in the face of climate change" and "[i]t is imperative that the world moves toward a coherent global approach for ecological connectivity conservation, and begins to measure and monitor the effectiveness of



efforts to protect connectivity and thereby achieve functional ecological networks” (Hilty et al., 2020).

The RTP should require road and highway projects to avoid large intact habitat areas and areas that are important for wildlife connectivity. The RTP should also specifically require that maintenance and new road projects comply with AB 2344 and implement adequate wildlife crossing infrastructure (including direction fencing if needed) with protected habitat on both to reduce impacts to wildlife movement and habitat connectivity. The County should consult biologists from CDFW, Caltrans, and other on-the-ground organizations and institutions, including Tribes, for such projects.

In developing and adopting such measures, it is important to consider that different species have different behaviors and needs that affect how they move. For example, smaller species with poor dispersal abilities, like rodents and herpetofauna, would require more frequent intervals of crossings compared to larger wide-ranging species, like mountain lions or coyotes, to increase their chances of finding a crossing. Gunson et al. (Gunson et al., 2016) recommend that crossing structures generally be spaced about 300m (~0.19mi) apart for small animals when transportation infrastructure bisects large expanses of continuous habitat, though they recognize that some amphibians may need more frequent crossings no more than 50m (~0.03mi) apart. And for many amphibian and reptile species, undercrossings should have grated tops so that the light and moisture inside the crossings are similar to that of the ambient environment. (Brehme & Fisher, 2020) and (Langton & Clevenger, 2021) also provide additional guidance regarding amphibian crossings. Therefore, multiple crossings designed for different target species may be required. In-depth analyses that include on-the-ground movement studies of which species are moving in the area and their home range area, habitat use, and patterns of movement are needed to determine how to best implement such crossings. In addition, associated crossing infrastructure (e.g., exclusionary fencing appropriate for target species, berms to buffer crossings from sound and light) should be included to improve chances of wildlife using crossings, and such crossings and associated infrastructure should be designed and built in consultation with local and regional experts, including agency biologists. And to improve the effectiveness of any wildlife crossings, there should be protected habitat on both sides of the crossing; therefore, mitigation should also include acquiring unprotected lands on both sides of the roads where a wildlife crossing would be implemented, again, in consultation with local conservation organizations and stakeholders, and preserving and managing those lands in perpetuity to ensure that the wildlife crossings and associated infrastructure remain functional over time.

**c. The RTP Can and Should Do More to Reduce, Avoid, Or Mitigate Impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.**

A.5

California is at the forefront of the climate crisis. Poor land-use planning and extreme weather events have led to an onslaught of disasters harming communities and threatening the state’s ecosystems and people’s livelihoods. This is evident from this year’s flooding in Inyo County due to Tropical Storm Hilary, which damaged several roadways throughout the county and required closure of Death Valley National Park and Manzanar. Yet the ISPND fails to adequately assess and mitigate the Project’s impacts on greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and climate change. Continuing business as usual and increasing capacity on existing roads for more

carbon emissions will have significant impacts on the environment and local communities. It is therefore more critical than ever that the County adequately disclose, analyze, and mitigate the RTP's GHG impacts.

**i. The RTP Should Prioritize Investment in Public Transportation.**

A.6

Providing alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel is essential to building an efficient, sustainable and equitable transportation system. Unfortunately, we have a long way to go if we are going to go to achieve this vision in the U.S. In 2013, it was reported that of all the U.S. daily commutes to work, 76.4% are of people driving alone.<sup>3</sup> According to the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2015, our collective daily transportation in the U.S. constitutes about 27% of the total greenhouse gasses released.<sup>4</sup>

To change these trends, government agencies need to invest in alternative modes of transportation to not only make them cheaper to use, but more efficient than driving. While the ISPND does include some goals around alternative modes of transportation including policy 7.5, which states that the County should "consider alternative transportation technologies, such as Zero Emission Vehicles and bike share programs," the lack of specific targets and mandated programs ensures that no meaningful change will be achieved.

Mandated goals on increasing public transportation usership should be articulated in the ISPND. Some best practices include:

*(1) Provide free public transit services for future residents and workers*

This is virtually certain to result in significant ridership increases no matter where it is implemented. Evidence from previous studies indicate that ridership will usually increase from 20% to 60% in a matter of just a few months.<sup>5</sup> One evaluation found that the net ridership increased by about 15% (about 45% during the off-peak periods) when there was no fee. This included the combined effects of an increase in trip frequency by prior users and an increase in the number of off-peak bus riders. Most new bus trips were diverted from other modes; very few were newly generated.<sup>6</sup>

*(2) Implement Bus Only lanes*

Building dedicated bus lanes are relatively cheap and quick to install, dramatically reduce congestion and increase efficiency. All of these benefits lead to increases in ridership. A summary of research suggests that bus lanes that reduce total transit door-to-door travel times by 5-15% will "by themselves increase urban peak ridership 2-9%." The City of Denver found that

<sup>3</sup> McKenzie, Brian. Who Drives to Work? Commuting by Automobile in the United States: 2013. Rep. N.p.: American Community Survey Reports, 2015. Print.

<sup>4</sup> "Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2015." EPA. Environmental Protection Agency, 09 June 2017. Web. 26 June 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Studenmund, A. H., and David Connor. "The free-fare transit experiments." *Transportation Research Part A: General* 16.4 (1982): 261-269.

<sup>6</sup> Ewing, Reid, and Robert Cervero. "Travel and the built environment: A meta-analysis." *Journal of the American planning association* 76.3 (2010): 265-294.



ridership increased 2.8% in the first six months of their TTLs' operation, even though travel speed improvements were relatively modest (3-6%), likely due to the TTL being an expansion of existing lanes that had already been operational during peak hours when TTLs yield the greatest benefits.<sup>7</sup>

*(3) Optimising bus routes to minimise overlap and ensure coverage across the city in line with demand.*

Regional planning allows resources to be used efficiently and effectively to serve the areas that need it most. Houston re-specified their service after the LRT was put in place to reduce overlapping of these services and to ensure transit coverage in other areas of the city. This resulted in a 7% increase in ridership on local bus and light-rail from 2015 to 2016.<sup>8</sup>

*(4) Providing high-frequency, reliable services.*

The bus network can be divided into main routes and local routes, with different frequencies. Bus routes on main city arteries and roads used for longer distance travel will require a frequent service, at least every 15 minutes. This is the minimum frequency at which the service is usually considered good enough for travellers to turn up without consulting a schedule. On local routes, a less frequent service may be sufficient, depending on demand and provided that the service operates punctually according to the timetable. São Paulo has implemented this dual frequency network timetable for the night shift, increasing night-time ridership by over 70%.<sup>8</sup>

*(5) Building regular bus stops for easy access.*

Ensuring accessibility and convenience is essential to increasing ridership. Providing more bus stops decreases the distance residents have to travel to access such services. In Barcelona, the maximum distance between transit stops in the new bus network is 350m. In Seattle, the bus network upgrade plan will increase the percentage of households within 800m of frequent transit routes from 43% in 2015, to 73% by 2040.<sup>8</sup>

**ii. The RTP Should Adopt Available Nature-based Solutions.**

- A.7 Transportation and land-use planners should also look to nature-based conservation strategies, including protecting and preserving the counties shrubland, grassland, and desert ecosystems to store and sequester carbon locally to increase our chances of fighting the climate crisis in an effective and equitable manner. The County consists of large habitat areas that store and sequester significant amounts of carbon. As detailed in a 2023 Center report "Hidden in Plain Sight: California's Native Habitats Are Valuable Carbon Sinks" ("2023 Center Report," Yap et al., 2023), nonforest arid and semi-arid habitats can store carbon by keeping it from being released and sequester it by removing it from the atmosphere. Yet the ISPND fails to adequately

<sup>7</sup> Galbauer, John, and Juan Matute. "Best practices in implementing tactical transit lanes." (2019). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1tj0974b>

<sup>8</sup> C40 Knowledge. "How to make public transport an attractive option in your city." Published August 2021. [https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/How-to-make-public-transport-an-attractive-option-in-your-city?language=en\\_US](https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/How-to-make-public-transport-an-attractive-option-in-your-city?language=en_US)

assess and mitigate the carbon lost from these ecosystems when they are destroyed or degraded. The ISPND argues that the RTP's "support" of increasing zero-emission vehicle use within the County will reduce GHG emissions and erroneously concludes that the RTP's impacts to GHG emissions would be "less than significant" without providing substantial evidence to support such claims. On the contrary, expanding roadway infrastructure increases vehicle miles traveled, which, in turn increases automobile-based GHG emissions (in addition to emissions from project construction). Because it fails to acknowledge any impacts, the ISPND fails to provide adequate mitigation, which should include protecting intact carbon-storing habitats throughout the County, for the increased carbon emissions due to more combustion engines on bigger roads and destroyed and degraded habitat. Instead, the County skirts responsibility of providing adequate analysis and mitigation of the Project's potential impacts to GHGs and climate change and states that "proposed projects will be reviewed on a project-by-project basis, therefore there is no potential for significant impact" (ISPND at 13).

**d. Adventure trails should be a part of the RTP update 2023-2043**

A.8

In 2019, the Inyo County Board of Supervisors approved a five-year extension to the program based on lack of data on the relative success or failure of the program. The County needs to make a date-certain commitment to collect the data and analyze the benefits and impacts of the program in order to evaluate the program and its future prior to the next sunset/extension of the program in 2025.

While off-road vehicular recreation will continue in Inyo County without the Adventure Trails program, the County must analyze the costs/benefits from having "greensticker" vehicles using County roads and the effects on road safety, road maintenance and the local communities.

**II. Conclusion**

We strongly urge the County to adopt our recommendations and include detailed analysis and mitigation measures that protect native species, promote habitat connectivity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments. We look forward to working with the Board to foster land use policy and growth patterns that promote wildlife movement and habitat connectivity and facilitate public health and safety. Please do not hesitate to contact the Center with any questions at the email addresses listed below.

Sincerely,



Tiffany Yap, D.Env/PhD  
Senior Scientist/Wildlife Corridor Advocate  
Center for Biological Diversity  
[tyap@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:tyap@biologicaldiversity.org)

Elizabeth Reid-Wainscoat  
Urban Wildlands Campaigner  
Center for Biological Diversity  
[ereidwainscoat@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:ereidwainscoat@biologicaldiversity.org)



## **References**

- Aguilar R, Quesada M, Ashworth L, Herrerias-Diego Y, Lobo J (2008) Genetic consequences of habitat fragmentation in plant populations: Susceptible signals in plant traits and methodological approaches. *Mol Ecol* 17:5177–5188
- Barry JM, Elbroch LM, Aiello-lammens ME, Sarno RJ, Seelye L, Kusler A, Quigley HB (2019) Pumas as ecosystem engineers: ungulate carcasses support beetle assemblages in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Oecologia* 577–586
- Benítez-López A, Alkamade R, Verweij PA (2010) The impacts of roads and other infrastructure on mammal and bird populations: A meta-analysis. *Biol Conserv* 143:1307–1316
- Benson JF, Mahoney PJ, Sikich JA, Serieys LEK, Pollinger JP, Ernest HB, Riley SPD (2016) Interactions between demography, genetics, and landscape connectivity increase extinction probability for a small population of large carnivores in a major metropolitan area. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 283:20160957
- Benson JF, Mahoney PJ, Vickers TW, Sikich JA, Beier P, Riley SPD, Ernest HB, Boyce WM (2019) Extinction vortex dynamics of top predators isolated by urbanization. *Ecol Appl* 29:e01868
- Bowler PA (1989) Riparian woodland: An endangered habitat in southern California. *Proc 15th Annu Symp South Calif Bot* 3:80–97
- Brehme CS, Fisher RN (2020) Research to Inform Caltrans Best Management Practices for Reptile and Amphibian Road Crossings
- Brehme CS, Hathaway SA, Fisher RN (2018) An objective road risk assessment method for multiple species: ranking 166 reptiles and amphibians in California. *Landsc Ecol* 33:911–935
- Brehme CS, Tracey JA, Clenaghan LRMC, Fisher RN (2013) Permeability of roads to movement of scrubland lizards and small mammals. *Conserv Biol* 27:710–720
- Cahill AE, Aiello-Lammens ME, Fisher-Reid MC, Hua X, Karanewsky CJ, Ryu HY, Sbeglia GC, Spagnolo F, Waldron JB, Warsi O, Wiens JJ (2012) How does climate change cause extinction? *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 280:20121890
- Ceia-Hasse A, Navarro LM, Borda-de-Água L, Pereira HM (2018) Population persistence in landscapes fragmented by roads: Disentangling isolation, mortality, and the effect of dispersal. *Ecol Modell* 375:45–53
- Chen I-C, Hill JK, Ohlemüller R, Roy DB, Thomas CD (2011) Rapid range shifts of species associated with high levels of climate warming. *Science* (80- ) 333:1024–1026
- Crooks KR (2002) Relative sensitivities of mammalian carnivores to habitat fragmentation. *Conserv Biol* 16:488–502
- Cushman SA (2006) Effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on amphibians: A review and prospectus. *Biol Conserv* 128:231–240
- Cushman SA, McRae B, Adriaensen F, Beier P, Shirley M, Zeller K (2013) Biological corridors and connectivity. In: Macdonald DW, Willis KJ (eds) *Key Topics in Conservation Biology* 2, First Edit. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp 384–403
- Damschen EI, Brudvig LA, Burt MA, Jr RJF, Haddad NM, Levey DJ, Orrock JL, Resasco J, Tewksbury JJ (2019) Ongoing accumulation of plant diversity through habitat connectivity in an 18-year experiment. *Science* (80- ) 365:1478–1480

*Arizona · California · Colorado · Florida · N. Carolina · Nevada · New Mexico · New York · Oregon · Washington, D.C. · La Paz, Mexico*  
[BiologicalDiversity.org](http://BiologicalDiversity.org)



- Delaney KS, Riley SPD, Fisher RN (2010) A rapid, strong, and convergent genetic response to urban habitat fragmentation in four divergent and widespread vertebrates. *PLoS One* 5:e12767
- Dickson BG, Jennes JS, Beier P (2005) Influence of Vegetation, Topography, and Roads on Cougar Movement in Southern California. *J Wildl Manage* 69:264–276
- Environmental Law Institute (2003) Conservation thresholds for land use planners
- Ernest HB, Boyce WM, Bleich VC, May B, Stiver SJ, Torres SG (2003) Genetic structure of mountain lion (*Puma concolor*) populations in California. *Conserv Genet* 353–366
- Ernest HB, Vickers TW, Morrison SA, Buchalski MR, Boyce WM (2014) Fractured genetic connectivity threatens a Southern California puma (*Puma concolor*) population. *PLoS One* 9:
- Fellers GM and, Kleeman PM (2007) California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana draytonii*) Movement and Habitat Use : Implications for Conservation. *J Herpetol* 41:276–286
- Goverde M, Schweizer K, Baur B, Erhardt A (2002) Small-scale habitat fragmentation effects on pollinator behaviour: Experimental evidence from the bumblebee *Bombus veteranus* on calcareous grasslands. *Biol Conserv* 104:293–299
- Gunson K, Seburn D, Kintsch J, Crowley J (2016) Best Management Practices for Mitigating the Effects of Roads on Amphibian and Reptile Species at Risk in Ontario
- Gustafson KD, Gagne RB, Vickers TW, Riley SPD, Wilmers CC, Bleich VC, Pierce BM, Kenyon M, Drazenovich TL, Sikich JA, Boyce WM, Ernest HB (2018) Genetic source–sink dynamics among naturally structured and anthropogenically fragmented puma populations. *Conserv Genet* 20:215–227
- Haddad NM, Brudvig LA, Clobert J, Davies KF, Gonzalez A, Holt RD, Lovejoy TE, Sexton JO, Austin MP, Collins CD, Cook WM, Damschen EI, Ewers RM, Foster BL, Jenkins CN, King AJ, Laurance WF, Levey DJ, Margules CR, Melbourne BA, Nicholls AO, Orrock JL, Song D, Townshend JR (2015) Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth’s ecosystems. *Sci Adv* 1:1–9
- Heller NE, Zavaleta ES (2009) Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: A review of 22 years of recommendations. *Biol Conserv* 142:14–32
- Hilty J, Worboys G, Keeley A, Woodley S, Lausche B, Locke H, Carr M, Pulsford I, Pittock J, White W, Theobald D, Levine J, Reuling M, Watson J, Ament R, Tabor G (2020) Guidance for conserving connectivity through ecological networks and corridors. Gland, Switzerland
- Hilty JA, Merenlender AM (2004) Use of Riparian Corridors and Vineyards by Mammalian Predators in Northern California. *Conserv Biol* 18:126–135
- Jennings M, Lewison R (2013) Planning for Connectivity Under Climate Change: Using Bobcat Movement To Assess Landscape Connectivity Across San Diego County’s Open Space
- Jennings M, Zeller K (2017) Comprehensive Multi-species Connectivity Assessment and Planning for the Highway 67 Region of San Diego County, California
- Kantola T, Tracy JL, Baum KA, Quinn MA, Coulson RN (2019) Spatial risk assessment of eastern monarch butterfly road mortality during autumn migration within the southern corridor. *Biol Conserv* 231:150–160
- Kilgo JC, Sargent RA, Chapman BR, Miller K V. (1998) Effect of stand width and adjacent habitat on breeding bird communities in bottomland hardwoods. *J Wildl Manage* 62:72–83
- Kociolek AV, Clevenger AP, St. Clair CC, Proppe DS (2011) Effects of Road Networks on Bird Populations. *Conserv Biol* 25:241–249



- Krosby M, Theobald DM, Norheim R, Mcrae BH (2018) Identifying riparian climate corridors to inform climate adaptation planning. *PLoS One* 13:e0205156
- Langton TES, Clevenger AP (2021) Measures to Reduce Road Impacts on Amphibians and Reptiles in California Best Management Practices and Technical Guidance
- Lee JS, Ruell EW, Boydston EE, Lyren LM, Alonso RS, Troyer JL, Crooks KR, Vandewoude S (2012) Gene flow and pathogen transmission among bobcats (*Lynx rufus*) in a fragmented urban landscape. *Mol Ecol* 21:1617–1631
- Lohse KA, Newburn DA, Opperman JJ, Merenlender AM (2008) Forecasting relative impacts of land use on anadromous fish habitat to guide conservation planning. *Ecol Appl* 18:467–482
- Loss SR, Will T, Marra PP (2014) Estimation of bird-vehicle collision mortality on U.S. roads. *J Wildl Manage* 78:763–771
- Maclean IMD, Wilson RJ (2011) Recent ecological responses to climate change support predictions of high extinction risk. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 108:12337–12342
- Marsh DM, Jaeger JAG (2015) Direct effects of roads on small animal populations. In: Roads and ecological infrastructure: Concepts and applications for small animals. pp 42–56
- Mcrae BH, Dickson BG, Keitt TH, Shah VB (2008) Using circuit theory to model connectivity in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *Ecology* 89:2712–2724
- Mcrae BH, Hall SA, Beier P, Theobald DM (2012) Where to restore ecological connectivity? Detecting barriers and quantifying restoration benefits. *PLoS One* 7:e52604
- Mitsch WJ, Wilson RF (1996) Improving the success of wetland creation and restoration with know-how, time, and self-design. *Ecol Appl* 6:16–17
- Moyle PB, Katz JVE, Quiñones RM (2011) Rapid decline of California's native inland fishes: A status assessment. *Biol Conserv* 144:2414–2423
- Olson DH, Burnett KM (2013) Geometry of forest landscape connectivity: pathways for persistence. In: Density Management in the 21st Century: West Side Story: Proceedings of the Density Management Workshop, 4–6 October 2011, Corvallis, Oregon.
- Pacifici M, Visconti P, Butchart SHM, Watson JEM, Cassola FM, Rondinini C (2017) Species' traits influenced their response to recent climate change. *Nat Clim Chang* 7:205–208
- Parnesan C (2006) Ecological and Evolutionary Responses to Recent Climate Change. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* 37:637–669
- Parnesan C, Yohe G (2003) A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems. *Nature* 421:37–42
- Pinto N, Keitt TH (2008) Beyond the least-cost path: Evaluating corridor redundancy using a graph-theoretic approach. *Landsc Ecol* 24:253–266
- Riley SPD, Pollinger JP, Sauvajot RM, York EC, Bromley C, Fuller TK, Wayne RK (2006) A southern California freeway is a physical and social barrier to gene flow in carnivores. *Mol Ecol* 15:1733–1741
- Riley SPD, Serieys LEK, Pollinger JP, Sikich JA, Dalbeck L, Wayne RK, Ernest HB (2014) Individual behaviors dominate the dynamics of an urban mountain lion population isolated by roads. *Curr Biol* 24:1989–1994
- Riparian Habitat Joint Venture (2009) California Riparian Habitat Restoration Handbook
- Riparian Habitat Joint Venture (2004) The Riparian Bird Conservation Plan: A strategy for reversing the decline of riparian associated birds in California
- Ripple WJ, Beschta RL (2006) Linking a cougar decline, trophic cascade, and catastrophic regime shift in Zion National Park. *Biol Conserv* 133:397–408



- Ripple WJ, Beschta RL (2008) Trophic cascades involving cougar, mule deer, and black oaks in Yosemite National Park. *Biol Conserv* 141:1249–1256
- Ripple WJ, Estes JA, Beschta RL, Wilmers CC, Ritchie EG, Hebblewhite M, Berger J, Elmhagen B, Letnic M, Nelson MP, Schmitz OJ, Smith DW, Wallach AD, Wirsing AJ (2014) Status and ecological effects of the world's largest carnivores. *Science* (80- ) 343:1241484
- Robins JD (2002) Stream Setback Technical Memo
- Root TL, Price JT, Hall KR, Schneider SH, Resenzweig C, Pounds JA (2003) Fingerprints of global warming on wild animals and plants. *Nature* 421:57–60
- Ruth TK, Elbroch LM (2014) The carcass chronicles : carnivory, nutrient flow, and biodiversity. *Wild Felid Monit* 14–19
- Scheffers BR, De Meester L, Bridge TCL, Hoffmann AA, Pandolfi JM, Corlett RT, Butchart SHM, Pearce-Kelly P, Kovacs KM, Dudgeon D, Pacifici M, Rondinini C, Foden WB, Martin TG, Mora C, Bickford D, Watson JEM (2016) The broad footprint of climate change from genes to biomes to people. *Science* (80- ) 354:
- Semlitsch RD, Bodie JR (2003) Biological criteria for buffer zones around wetlands and riparian habitats for amphibians and reptiles. *Conserv Biol* 17:1219–1228
- Shilling FM (2020) Wildlife Behavior in Response to Traffic Disturbance *Wildlife Behavior in Response to Traffic Disturbance*
- Slabbekoorn H, Ripmeester EAP (2008) Birdsong and anthropogenic noise: implications and applications for conservation. *Mol Ecol* 17:72–83
- Smith JA, Suraci JP, Clinchy M, Crawford A, Roberts D, Zanette LY, Wilmers CC (2017) Fear of the human 'super predator' reduces feeding time in large carnivores. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 284:20170433
- Smith JA, Wang Y, Wilmers CC (2015) Top carnivores increase their kill rates on prey as a response to human-induced fear. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 282:
- Stillwater Sciences (2002) Napa River Basin Limiting Factors Analysis
- Trenham PC, Shaffer HB (2005) Amphibian upland habitat use and its consequences for population viability. *Ecol Appl* 15:1158–1168
- Trombulak SC, Frissell CA (2000) Review of ecological effects of roads on terrestrial and aquatic communities. *Conserv Biol* 14:18–30
- van der Ree R, Jaeger JAG, van der Grift EA, Clevenger AP (2011) Effects of roads and traffic on wildlife populations and landscape function: Road ecology is moving toward larger scales. *Ecol Soc* 16:48
- Vickers TW (2020) Final Report: Santa Ana Mountains to Eastern Peninsular Range Conservation Connectivity Infrastructure Planning Project for Interstate 15 and Closely Associated Roadways
- Vickers TW, Sanchez JN, Johnson CK, Morrison SA, Botta R, Smith T, Cohen BS, Huber PR, Ernest HB, Boyce WM (2015) Survival and mortality of pumas (*Puma concolor*) in a fragmented, urbanizing landscape. *PLoS One* 10:1–18
- Wang Y, Smith JA, Wilmers CC (2017) Residential development alters behavior, movement, and energetics in a top carnivore. *PlosOne* 1–17
- Warren R, Price J, Fischlin A, de la Nava Santos S, Midgley G (2011) Increasing impacts of climate change upon ecosystems with increasing global mean temperature rise. *Clim Change* 106:141–177



- Wiens JJ (2016) Climate-related local extinctions are already widespread among plant and animal species. *PLoS Biol* 14:1–18
- Yap TA, Rose JP, Cummings B (2019) A Petition to List the Southern California/Central Coast Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) of Mountain Lions as Threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA)

Center for Biological Diversity Comments; Page 15

## RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

### Response A.1

Thank you for the comments regarding the proposed Negative Declaration (ND) for the 2023 Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. The following addresses comments made by the Center for Biological Diversity.

### Response A.2

The comment states that “The Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration (ISPND) Fails to Adequately Disclose, Analyze, and Mitigate the Project’s Impacts.” The ICLTC recognizes the integral role that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) plays in the evaluation of environmental impacts that transportation improvement projects can have within Inyo County. The RTP commits to environmental review, in accordance with CEQA regulations and those outlined in complementary County planning documents, such as general plans. The RTP in isolation is a programmatic document and does not negate the need for environmental review of individual projects that may have significant environmental impact.

The Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration considered the cumulative environmental impacts of the projects identified in the Action Element and determined that the impact of the RTP as a programmatic document is considered to be less than significant due to the following reasons:

- None of the transportation improvement projects located in Inyo County identified in the Action Element will expand roadway right-of-way or increase roadway capacity, as these projects involve rehabilitation of existing roadways. Therefore, environmental impacts will be limited and are considered less than significant.
- Changes to the RTP document were made to clarify the following: The RTP references a regionally significant expansion project located in Kern County which is managed by Caltrans and under the jurisdiction of the Kern Council of Governments: Freeman Gulch Segment 2. This project proposes to convert a 6-mile segment of SR 14 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane expressway to address safety and congestion issues along the SR 14/395 corridor. The project has undergone extensive environmental review under CEQA and is not anticipated to increase vehicle miles traveled within the project limit. ICLTC has not committed any funding for this project as it is under the jurisdiction of Kern COG. This project was originally part of a prior Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the counties of Kern, Inyo, and Mono County as a way to pool transportation revenues to implement regionally important projects. The MOU has expired and there are no plans to renew the agreement. To clarify the status of the Freeman Gulch project and the project’s relationship to Inyo County, reference to this old MOU project has been removed from ICLTC project lists. The project is discussed in the RTP as a regionally significant project.

### **Response A.3**

The comment states that the “The ISPND’s Cursory “Analysis” of Impacts to Biological Resources Is Wholly Deficient.” The RTP does not include any projects that will expand roadway facilities. The discussion of the impact of the RTP on Biological Resources has been amended to clarify a) the scope of the document, b) the less-than-significant impact of identified transportation improvement projects on biological resources, and c) the less-than-significant impact that the RTP in itself has, as a planning document, as the ND does not negate the need for full environmental review of individual projects.

Furthermore, a discussion has been added to the body of the RTP (Page 132) to ensure that ICLTC continues to consider the impacts of transportation improvement projects on wildlife, species, and habitat health and connectivity.

### **Response A.4**

The comment states that “The County Must Analyze and Mitigate the RTP’s Impacts on Wildlife Movement and Habitat Connectivity.” Amendment of the RTP (Page 132) stresses the support of the ICLTC for Assembly Bill 2344 during the planning period. The Initial Study discussion of Biological Resources has been amended to clarify the scope and impact of the RTP (see Response A.3).

### **Response A.5**

The comment states that “The RTP Can and Should Do More to Reduce, Avoid, Or Mitigate Impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.” The RTP goes beyond the requirements of the 2017 RTP Guidelines to identify means to reduce and avoid increases in greenhouse gas emissions and to mitigate the impacts of climate change. Refer to Goal 2, Goal 3, and Goal 7 of the Policy Element, as well as discussion of Zero-Emission Vehicles (Page 50) and Climate Resilience (Page 98). The RTP also identifies public transit capital projects, including the transition of the public transit fleet to Zero-Emission Buses (ZEBs) which will continue throughout the planning period.

Furthermore, amendments have been made to the discussion of Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the Initial Study to clarify the scope and impact of the RTP.

### **Response A.6**

The comment states that “The RTP Should Prioritize Investment in Public Transportation.” The RTP clearly expresses its programmatic support for public transit throughout Inyo County. Refer to the extended discussion of public transit services in Inyo County and identified public transit needs (Page 59), and Goal 2, Goal 3, and Goal 7 of the Policy Element.

The scope of an RTP, however, is to plan for transportation capital facilities (such as bus fleet replacement and new bus stops) and not service expansion. Thus, it is outside the scope of the RTP to address the specific suggestions provided in the comment letter.

**Response A.7**

The comment states that “The RTP Should Adopt Available Nature-based Solutions.” The RTP is compatible with the California State Wildlife Action Plan, which was reviewed during the RTP planning process. However, as the RTP is a transportation-specific strategic document, it is out of the scope of the RTP to assess specific conservation strategies at the ecosystem level to store and sequester carbon.

See Response A.5 for further discussion of Greenhouse Gas Emission reduction.

**Response A.8**

The comment states that “Adventure trails should be a part of the RTP update 2023-2043.” The body of the RTP has been amended (Page 38) to include a discussion of the Adventure Trails pilot program. The decision to continue the pilot program is that of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors and is not within the scope of the RTP.

*This page intentionally left blank*

**COMMUNITY OUTREACH SUMMARY**

---

*This page intentionally left blank*



# ONLINE COMMUNITY SURVEY SUMMARY

## SURVEY METHODOLOGY

As part of an effort to obtain input from Inyo County community members and stakeholders, an online survey was developed with input from Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) staff. The link to the survey was distributed to stakeholders via email, the link and a QR code were advertised in local newspapers (both print and digital), and the link was posted on social media by stakeholder agencies, tribal entities, and organizations. The survey was available in both English and Spanish. This survey addressed both regional and active transportation topics as it was a joint RTP/ATP community survey. Respondents were asked to answer a series of questions about their personal and household transportation experiences and transportation needs and concerns in their community. The survey was available online for December 2022 and January 2023.

## SURVEY ANALYSIS

A total of 238 survey responses were received, 237 in English and 1 in Spanish. The results are discussed in detail below.

### Where Do you Live and Work?

Figure C1 shows where survey respondents live. 57 percent of those who took the survey live in the Bishop area, followed by 25.7 percent that live in Big Pine, 5.5 percent that live in Lone Pine, and 4.2 percent that live in Independence. 7.6 percent of respondents indicated 'Other', living in Aberdeen, Aspendell, Bakersfield, Benton, Chalfant, Chalfant Valley, Mono County, Olancho, Old Wilkerson, Onyx, Tinnemaha, and Wilkerson.





Figure C2 shows where survey respondents work. 64 percent of respondents work in the Bishop Area, followed by 10.8 percent that work in Big Pine, 4.4 that work in Lone Pine, and 7.4 percent that work in Independence. Around 5 percent of respondents indicated that they work somewhere else in Inyo County and 8.4 percent indicated that they work outside of Inyo County. Eight respondents specified that they work or worked in Mono County and several worked county-wide. Twenty-seven respondents are retired. Specified employment locations outside of Inyo County include: Orange County, Reno, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. Four respondents specified that they work from home. A complete list of ‘Other’ work locations can be found in Attachment A.



**What Modes of Transportation Do You Use?**

| Table C1: What Mode of Transportation Used                       |                  |        |       |                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|--------|-------|----------------|
| Frequency of Use                                                 | Personal Vehicle | Walked | Biked | Public Transit |
| Never (0%)                                                       | 6.9%             | 54.5%  | 75.1% | 94.4%          |
| Some of the Time (1-99%)                                         | 50.2%            | 45.5%  | 24.9% | 5.6%           |
| Always (100%)                                                    | 42.9%            | 0.0%   | 0.0%  | 0.4%           |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023 |                  |        |       |                |

Survey respondents were asked to identify the modes of transportation that they use and how often by estimating what percentage of their trips are made using the following modes of transportation:

personal vehicle, walking, biking, public transit, and other. Respondents could choose as many modes as was applicable as long as the percentages totaled 100. Table C1 shows the percent of trips made using each mode of transportation for all survey respondents. In total, respondents used a personal vehicle for 83.8 percent of trips, walked for 17.5 percent of trips, biked for 17 percent of trips, and used public transit buses for 10.2 percent of trips. 16.3 percent of trips were made using another mode of transportation. Figure C1 shows that 45.5 percent of respondents walk, 24.9 percent bike, and 6 percent take the bus some or all of the time.

## How Would You Allocate Transportation Improvement Spending?

Each respondent was asked how they would spend \$100 on various types of transportation improvements. Respondents could choose as many project areas as they wished. Table C2 shows that respondents chose to spend the most on average on maintaining and reconstructing existing streets and roads (\$27), followed by improving/expanding sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian facilities (\$19) and improving/expanding bicycle routes and paths (\$15). The least was spent on building new local roads (\$3).

**TABLE C2: How Would You Spend \$100 on Transportation Improvements?**

| Improvement                                                                 | Avg. Dollars Spent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Maintain/reconstruct existing streets and roads                             | \$27               |
| Improve/expand sidewalks, crosswalks and other pedestrian facilities        | \$19               |
| Improve/expand bicycle routes and paths                                     | \$15               |
| Improve streetscape to make communities more attractive and inviting        | \$11               |
| Improve/increase bus stops, transfer centers, overall public transit system | \$10               |
| Improve local airport facilities                                            | \$7                |
| Increase the capacity of state highways                                     | \$5                |
| Build new local roads                                                       | \$3                |

*Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023*

## Which Transportation Issues Concern You the Most?

Table C3 shows the level of concern that respondents have about thirteen different transportation issues. Respondents are most concerned about unsafe intersections on state highways and not enough or poor condition sidewalks and crosswalks. 33.2 percent identified unsafe intersections on state highways as ‘very concerning’ and 37.6 percent identified them as ‘somewhat concerning’. Roughly 30 percent of respondents identified not enough or poor condition sidewalks and crosswalks as ‘very concerning’ and 34.6 identified them as ‘somewhat concerning’. Respondents were ‘not at all concerned’ about insufficient motorized recreational trails (43.29 percent) and not enough EV charging infrastructure (58.70 percent).

Respondents were also given the opportunity to comment on what they feel should be the top priority for transportation improvements in the County. According to the results, 66 percent of survey respondents identified at least one specific transportation improvement that is a top priority for them. Table C4 summarizes these comments. Of the 158 responses, 21 percent identified maintaining existing streets and roads as a top priority, followed by enforcement and reduction of speeding (20 percent), improving and expanding bike paths and lanes (18 percent), safer crosswalks (17 percent), and expanding public transit (16 percent). A full list of comments is included in Attachment A.

**Table C3: What Transportation Issues are Concerning to You?**

| Transportation Issues                                                   | Very concerning | Somewhat concerning | Not very concerning | Not at all concerning |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Pavement conditions on local streets and roads                          | 19.48%          | 45.02%              | 26.41%              | 9.09%                 |
| Congestion on US 395                                                    | 23.35%          | 35.68%              | 26.87%              | 14.10%                |
| Unsafe intersections on state highways                                  | 33.19%          | 37.55%              | 24.89%              | 4.37%                 |
| Unsafe conditions on local roads                                        | 19.82%          | 39.21%              | 33.48%              | 7.49%                 |
| Poor street lighting                                                    | 13.97%          | 32.75%              | 30.57%              | 22.71%                |
| Traffic congestion on local roads                                       | 8.33%           | 28.95%              | 40.35%              | 22.37%                |
| Not enough or poor condition of bicycle paths                           | 24.35%          | 25.22%              | 24.35%              | 26.09%                |
| Not enough or poor condition of sidewalks/crosswalks                    | 30.26%          | 34.65%              | 21.05%              | 14.04%                |
| Insufficient motorized recreational trails                              | 10.82%          | 22.08%              | 23.81%              | 43.29%                |
| Insufficient non-motorized recreational trails                          | 11.45%          | 22.47%              | 31.28%              | 34.80%                |
| Too much truck traffic                                                  | 23.68%          | 28.95%              | 35.53%              | 11.84%                |
| More commercial service at the Bishop Airport                           | 22.37%          | 25.44%              | 29.82%              | 22.37%                |
| Not enough Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure                     | 4.35%           | 8.26%               | 28.70%              | 58.70%                |
| <i>Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023</i> |                 |                     |                     |                       |

**TABLE C4: What are Your Top Priorities for Transportation Improvements?**

| Improvement                                                             | Responses (%) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Maintain existing streets and roads                                     | 21%           |
| Enforcement/reduction of speeding                                       | 20%           |
| Improve/expand bike paths/lanes                                         | 18%           |
| Safer crosswalks                                                        | 17%           |
| Expand public transit                                                   | 16%           |
| Build truck bypass around Bishop downtown                               | 12%           |
| Improve/expand sidewalks                                                | 8%            |
| Widen existing roadways                                                 | 8%            |
| Expand non-motorized trail system                                       | 7%            |
| Expand passenger air service                                            | 5%            |
| Other                                                                   | 16%           |
| <i>Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023</i> |               |

### **What Improvements Would Encourage You to Walk and Bike More?**

Respondents were asked to identify if eleven different transportation improvements would encourage them to walk and bike more. As shown in Table C5, new separated bike paths and increased safety for children walking and biking to school would encourage the most respondents to walk and bike more (42.3 percent and 50.0 percent, respectively). Better enforcement of traffic laws (38.8 percent), improved lighting (31.5 percent), and improved existing bicycle paths/lanes (30.3 percent) would also encourage more walking and biking among respondents. Several improvements offered would not make a difference

for many of the respondents, including marketing efforts to encourage biking and walking (52.6 percent), education programs (47.1 percent), new bicycle lanes on roadways (42.4 percent), and new sidewalks (40.9 percent).

Each respondent was also given the opportunity to comment on what specific improvements would encourage them to walk and bike more. Over half of survey respondents identified at least one improvement. Table C6 summarizes these comments. Of the 136 responses, 30 percent indicated that improved and expanded bike lanes and paths would be an encouragement, followed by improved crosswalks (21 percent), improved crosswalks specifically on US 395 (14 percent), and enforcement and reduction of speeding (14 percent). 7 percent of all responses specifically identified the US 395 crosswalk in Big Pine. A full list of comments is included in Attachment A.

| Table C5: What Types of Improvements Would Encourage You to Walk/Bike More? |                             |         |                             |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| Improvement                                                                 | Would not make a difference | Neutral | Yes, I would walk/bike more |
| New sidewalks                                                               | 40.9%                       | 30.5%   | 28.6%                       |
| Improve existing sidewalks                                                  | 37.3%                       | 37.8%   | 24.9%                       |
| New separated bike paths                                                    | 34.0%                       | 23.7%   | 42.3%                       |
| New bicycle lanes on roadways                                               | 42.4%                       | 29.1%   | 28.6%                       |
| Improve existing bicycle paths/lanes (fix cracks and potholes)              | 31.7%                       | 38.0%   | 30.3%                       |
| Improved walking and biking connections to transit                          | 36.4%                       | 38.4%   | 25.2%                       |
| Increase safety for children walking/biking to school                       | 18.1%                       | 31.9%   | 50.0%                       |
| Better enforcement of traffic laws                                          | 26.6%                       | 34.6%   | 38.8%                       |
| Marketing efforts to encourage walking and biking                           | 52.6%                       | 32.7%   | 14.7%                       |
| Education programs (walking, biking, and driving safety)                    | 47.1%                       | 36.5%   | 16.4%                       |
| Improved lighting                                                           | 31.5%                       | 37.1%   | 31.5%                       |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023            |                             |         |                             |

| TABLE C6: What Would Encourage You to Walk/Bike More?            |               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Improvement                                                      | Responses (%) |
| Improved/expanded bike paths/lanes                               | 30%           |
| Improved/more crosswalks                                         | 21%           |
| Improved/more crosswalks on US 395                               | 14%           |
| Enforcement/reduction of speeding                                | 14%           |
| Separated non-motorized paths                                    | 13%           |
| Improved/expanded sidewalks                                      | 13%           |
| Improved lighting                                                | 9%            |
| Traffic reduction                                                | 8%            |
| Crosswalk on US 395 in Big Pine                                  | 7%            |
| Improved condition of roadways                                   | 7%            |
| Improved/expanded public transit                                 | 3%            |
| Secure bike parking                                              | 3%            |
| Other                                                            | 14%           |
| Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inyo County Survey, 2023 |               |

Two pop-up workshops were held in May 2023 by the consultant team and County of Inyo staff in Bishop and Lone Pine to further capture public input. These informal workshops provided the public with an opportunity to view and comment on the top priority transportation projects for Inyo County and a forum to provide open-ended input and learn more about the RTP process.

**TABLE C7: Allocation of Transportation Funding by Pop-up Workshop Participants - Bishop**

| Improvement Type      | % of total funds |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Bicycle Facilities    | 32%              |
| Pedestrian Facilities | 26%              |
| Public Transit        | 16%              |
| Roads                 | 16%              |
| Airports              | 10%              |

Note: Each person, when given \$100 of simulated transportation funding, allocated it as they wished among five improvement categories.

Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Pop up workshops 2023

Individuals also had the opportunity to simulate the allocation of \$100 in transportation funding among five types of transportation improvements. Table C7 and C8 show the

percentage of total money allocated to each type of improvement at the Bishop and Lone Pine pop-ups, respectively. At the Bishop pop-up, participants chose to allocate the most funding (32 percent of total funds allocated) to bicycle facilities while at the Lone Pine pop-up, the most funding was allocated towards roads (42 percent of total funds allocated). Pedestrian facilities ranked second at both pop-ups, getting 26 percent of the funds in Bishop and 23 percent in Lone Pine. This difference in the prioritization of transportation funding between Bishop and Lone Pine participants reflects the comments we received in each location. All comments received at the pop-up workshops are included in Attachment B.

**TABLE C8: Allocation of Transportation Funding by Pop-up Workshop Participants - Lone Pine**

| Improvement Type      | % of total funds |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Roads                 | 42%              |
| Pedestrian Facilities | 23%              |
| Bicycle Facilities    | 18%              |
| Public Transit        | 11%              |
| Airports              | 6%               |

Note: Each person, when given \$100 of simulated transportation funding, allocated it as they wished among five improvement categories.

Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Pop up workshops 2023

# TECOPA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION SURVEY SUMMERY

## INTRODUCTION

As part of the effort to obtain input from Inyo County community members, a survey specifically designed to understand the active transportation needs of rural residents was developed by Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (ICLTC) staff with input from the consultant team. This survey was introduced at an in-person workshop in Tecopa held in April 2023 and was available online and in paper form. Respondents were asked to answer a series of questions about their personal active transportation experiences and transportation needs and concerns in their community.

## SURVEY ANALYSIS

A total of 30 survey responses were received. The results are discussed in detail below.

### Demographics





Figure C3 shows the vast majority of respondents live in Tecopa (70 percent) with the remaining respondents living in Shoshone (13 percent), Las Vegas, NV (7 percent), Pahrump (7 percent), and Bishop (3 percent). The majority of respondents (69 percent) were over

the age of 55 years old, 17 percent of respondents were aged 46-55, ten percent were aged 36-45, and three percent were aged 26-35. The majority of respondents were employed (58 percent), followed by retired (31 percent) and unemployed (8 percent). One respondent was a volunteer EMT/firefighter. Four respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents were Caucasian (64 percent), followed by Native American (9 percent) and Asian (4 percent). One respondent identified Two or More. Eight chose to skip the question and four chose not to say. The majority of respondents had a household income of less than \$25,000 (43 percent), 19 percent had a household income of \$25,000 - \$50,000, 14 percent had a household income of \$100,000 - \$200,000 and 9 percent had a household income of \$50,000 - \$100,000. Twelve respondents chose to skip the question or Prefer Not to Say. An equal number of respondents identified High School, Bachelor's Degree, and Trade School as the highest level of education that they had completed (18 percent for each), followed by 14 percent of respondents having completed an Associate's Degree and a Master's Degree. One respondent (4 percent) had completed a PhD or higher. Three respondents Preferred Not to Say and seven chose to skip the question.




## Current Use of Active Modes of Transportation


Respondents were asked which modes of active transportation they use when traveling from where they live. As shown in Figure C4, 73 percent walk, 47 percent bicycle, 43 percent use an E-bike, seven percent skate or skateboard, and 27 percent chose 'other' and identified that they drive a vehicle.



When asked how often they walk for more than five minutes for a single trip (Figure C5), 63 percent of respondents identified that they walk daily, followed by weekly (37 percent), monthly (10 percent), and seasonally (10 percent). Two respondents identified that they walk weather permitting.



When asked how often they bike for any purpose (Figure C6), 40 percent of respondents identified that they bike daily, followed by weekly (27 percent), never (17 percent), seasonally (7 percent), and yearly (3 percent). Two individuals identified that they bike daily *and* weekly and one individual specified that they bike 3-4 days a week weather permitting.



Respondents were asked why they walk, bike or roll. As shown in Figure C7, 93 percent of respondents walk, bike or roll to improve personal health and 77 percent said it was to be outside. Individuals also indicate that they walk, bike, or roll to help the environment (40 percent) reduce stress (33 percent), socialize with others (20 percent), because it is convenient (13 percent), to save money (7 percent), and because they have no choice: walking, biking, or rolling is the only or primary form of transportation or recreation (3 percent).




Table C9 shows where respondents walk, bike and roll to. The most common destinations are the post office (14 percent of respondents), unpaved off-street paths/trails (13 percent), restaurants/shops/bars (12 percent), and hot springs (12 percent). The least common destinations are open spaces (1 percent), place of worship (1 percent), running errand (1 percent), and school (1 percent).

| TABLE C9: Where do you walk, bike or roll to?                                                                                                                                       |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Destination                                                                                                                                                                         | Responses |
| Post Office                                                                                                                                                                         | 14%       |
| Unpaved, off-street paths/trails                                                                                                                                                    | 13%       |
| Restaurant/Shops/Bars                                                                                                                                                               | 12%       |
| Hot Springs                                                                                                                                                                         | 12%       |
| Visit friends                                                                                                                                                                       | 10%       |
| No particular destination (leisure/fun)                                                                                                                                             | 9%        |
| Park, recreation area                                                                                                                                                               | 9%        |
| Community Center                                                                                                                                                                    | 7%        |
| Work                                                                                                                                                                                | 7%        |
| Playground facilities                                                                                                                                                               | 3%        |
| Community Pool                                                                                                                                                                      | 2%        |
| In Open Areas                                                                                                                                                                       | 1%        |
| Place of Worship                                                                                                                                                                    | 1%        |
| Running errands                                                                                                                                                                     | 1%        |
| School                                                                                                                                                                              | 1%        |
| <p><i>Source: Inyo County Active Transportation Survey, 2023</i></p> <p><i>Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to respondents being able to choose more than one reason.</i></p> |           |

## Barriers to Active Transportation

Respondents were asked what prevents them from walking, biking, or rolling more often. Table C10 shows that the most commonly identified barriers are a lack of or incomplete sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or off-street trails (21 percent of respondents), weather (e.g., heat) (18 percent) and too much traffic or dangerous behavior by people driving (e.g., speeding, not yielding, etc.) (15 percent). Respondents were least likely to see safety (crime or personal safety) and insufficient bike parking as barriers to using active modes of transportation.

**TABLE C10: What prevents you from walking, riding your bike or rolling more often?**

| Reason                                                                                        | Responses |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Lack of or incomplete sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or off-street trails                          | 21%       |
| Weather (e.g. heat)                                                                           | 18%       |
| Too much traffic or dangerous behavior by people driving (e.g., speeding, not yielding, etc.) | 15%       |
| Lack of shade                                                                                 | 12%       |
| Lack of benches                                                                               | 9%        |
| Destinations are too far away                                                                 | 6%        |
| Lack of safe crossings (no marked crosswalks or traffic signals)                              | 6%        |
| No street lights (too dark)                                                                   | 4%        |
| Not enough time                                                                               | 4%        |
| Insufficient bike parking or bike racks                                                       | 3%        |
| I don't feel safe (crime, personal safety)                                                    | 1%        |
| Not physically able to walk or bike                                                           | 0%        |

*Source: Inyo County Active Transportation Survey, 2023*  
*Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to respondents being able to choose more than one reason.*

## Top Priority Improvements

When respondents were asked to prioritize the top three improvements to walking and biking in their community, new separated bike paths ranked the highest (25 percent of respondents), followed by new bicycle lanes on roadways (17 percent) and better enforcement of traffic laws (16 percent) (Table C11). The least important to respondents were education programs and new sidewalks (3 percent) and marketing and promotional efforts (1 percent).

**Table C11: Top Priority Bike and Pedestrian Improvements**

| Improvement                                                                                             | Responses |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| New separated bike paths                                                                                | 25%       |
| New bicycle lanes on roadways                                                                           | 17%       |
| Better enforcement of traffic laws                                                                      | 16%       |
| Traffic calming features such as traffic circles                                                        | 9%        |
| Improve existing bicycle paths/lanes (fix potholes and cracks)                                          | 8%        |
| Improved lighting                                                                                       | 6%        |
| New sidewalks where they don't exist today                                                              | 5%        |
| Pedestrian visibility improvements at crosswalks                                                        | 5%        |
| Other                                                                                                   | 5%        |
| Educational programs for people walking, biking, and driving                                            | 3%        |
| Marketing/promotional efforts to encourage walking and biking                                           | 1%        |
| <i>Source: Inyo County Active Transportation Survey, 2023</i>                                           |           |
| <i>Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to respondents being able to choose more than one reason.</i> |           |

When respondents were asked to describe specific locations where walking and biking access improvement were needed, nine respondents identified needing improvements on Hwy 127 and eight respondents specified that Old Spanish Trail needed improvements. Other comments identified needing improvements on Hwy 178, near Tecopa Hot Springs, along all county roads, on roadways through the reservation, and on roadways into BLM and wilderness areas.

When respondents were asked to describe where they would like to be able to walk or bike, the most commonly identified areas were between Tecopa and Shoshone along SR 127, along Tecopa Hot Springs Rd, along Old Spanish Trail Highway, and within the communities of Tecopa and Shoshone.

Respondents had the opportunity to provide any additional comments. The most common need identified was for bike lanes and paths, followed by a specific need to increase safety for bicyclists and pedestrians on roadways, public transit bus service to Pahrump, and improved roads.

## ATTACHMENT A: ONLINE SURVEY COMMENTS

### *Write out specific improvements that would encourage you to walk or bike more:*

Dedicated bike lanes on 395, in Bishop and Big Pine

Level sidewalks that were adequately lit when dark

Give us a stop light so people don't have to run the chance of being hit. At multiple locations. The one crosswalk we have is still dangerous.

Crosswalks with flashing lights

Bring back a regular route around the rez and West Bishop.

Better crossing along 395

Enforce speed limits on interstate through towns

None, it's a personal choice and we have many options in our communities. When I want to walk/bike I find a way.

Add sidewalk on both sides of 395 between Barlow and HWY 6, add crosswalk where people and bikes actually cross 395 between there every day

Walking/biking clubs/groups

Speed reduction through Lone Pine. Get on the bulb outs signage and lights to slow traffic down into Lone Pine especially on the south end before the high school

We need a real traffic signal in big pine on 395

More cross walks in Big Pine. ESPECIALLY near Copper Top/the park. There needs to be a safe way for us to cross there.


Maybe having a county wide summer goal program with walking biking and other goal rewarding partisans with partners from local businesses. Like walking 50 miles with your dog in March or going to a gym once a week. Partner with the local tribal community as well as the out door community like maybe a camping trip and such. Lol dang long winded

Any available transportation to and from Old Wilkerson would be much appreciated. If I want to go to Reno or Los Angeles, I have to walk a mile and stand on the side of the road because they don't serve Old Wilkerson

Safety from drivers on the 395

Maintain county roads

I walk enough already

Posting more lit up speed signs in town especially at night time and more police patrol to stop  many vehicles speeding through our many small towns!

More areas to park (secure) bikes

I would put a better crossing light in independence, though it is in caltrans district. Also, actual stop signs at the side street intersections

Safe places to cross the highway (traffic signals or low speed places to cross when heavily trafficked)

None. I only bike or walk off-road. Otherwise I drive.

Bike path connectors to ride north-south through Bishop without going on 395. Needed on both sides of the highway. City of Bishop should trim encroaching landscaping on sidewalks and fee titles road frontages to remove existing obstacles to pedestrian use of sidewalks (in some cases forcing children into the street).

Better/improved bike trails

Making bike paths that are safe and away from traffic. New road ways connecting west bishop to town. line street is now only 2 lanes and it's very congested and frustrating!

Getting people to slow down through town

Bike lanes from Lp to lees

Enforcement of speed limits through towns and on highways.

I hate bikes and I have no problem walking anywhere.

Most of my walking is on streets or out on trails. No improvements required.

Is it possible to run bike lanes off the main 395 through the LADWP land along canals to avoid vehicles? like from north bishop to west or east

More lights

Cars not speeding on Neighborhood streets and bicycles not being so chaotic when traveling

More bike and pedestrian paths  
More bike paths like in Mammoth



I live 5 Miles to Independence. I have appointments mostly in Bishop. If there was easy parking by bus stop and the bus ran between towns hourly then I would consider transit. Right now I would have to give up a whole day to use transit.

I have to drive to work due to needing my car to get from site to site

More afternoon buses back from big pine. I think my only option is at 6pm, but I work about 7:30-3:15, so one at 3:30 would be ideal.

Better pathways off the main highway down side streets.

Crosswalks are somewhat dangerous. Which I believe is due to speeding, texting while driving and just no concern about the law

Crosswalks with multiple warning light options and extreme lighted warning for drivers to slow down when entering towns.

You cannot even bike on Main St (395) in the town proper. It's too dangerous. People run the red light at the intersection of Main and Line frequently! If I were a cop I could have pulled people over numerous times for running red light. More speed control needs to be done. Trucks should have an alternate route. Main St is SO UNPLEASANT to walk on the sidewalk. The noise is ridiculous and safety... it's not safe, especially if on a bicycle. Also, there are more and more atv's and dirt bikes on city streets these days. They are on routes that are NOT designated combined use routes. They are in city streets! It makes neighborhoods less pleasant to walk or bike through or even sit in your front yard. There seems to be very little policing to stop this. I would walk/bike more to do errands if it were more pleasant. With the growth in traffic (tourists) and the amount of huge trucks in town it just isn't very appealing to walk or bike.

Create a shaded town path. Create a bike path separated by trees on line St. it is too dangerous for kids to ride to school from Barlow and Manor Market neighborhoods

More connected walking ways and sidewalks that connect with trails and hiking paths; a better crosswalk in big pine for safety.

None... too old to ride bikes

NA

Living on the out skirts of Bishop, if you want to walk or ride your bike you have to do this on the main highway with ALL of the large trucks and other vehicles, not a safe environment. A designated path(s) would increase the safety.

I walk when I'm in town, but the crosswalks need to be lighting up when someone is in them!!!

More safety crosswalks through town. Crosswalks are dangerous

I would walk more if I knew that I could safely cross 395 in Big Pine.

Make the pathways easy to use, provide me with maps of bike paths, racks with locks around town, provide affordable bike rentals or free maintained bikes to use. I'd like to see more large shade trees planted all around town on main bike paths.

I was told that you don't walk through the reservation if you don't live there. Plus, with my hours , I would be walking in biking at dark.

Fix the roads and sidewalks

More sidewalks and make land available for new construction in hope of corporate business opportunities

Remove burdensome fences like DWP's new fence around Big Pine Park and Little League. SHAME ON THEM!

Sidewalks on Reynolds Rd

The extreme lack of safety at pedestrian crosswalks in all Owens Valley towns other than Bishop and Lone pine poses a threat to locals in the community. Big Pine is particularly dangerous as 395 traffic routinely well exceeds the speed limit and do not observe/acknowledge those waiting to cross, as well as a lack of speed enforcement due to LEOs spread thin. Additionally, after Caltrans widened the highway to 4 lane in Big Pine years ago, there is virtually no safe option for street parking, unlike Bridgeport for example. "Main St." became just another section of 395 with an increased speed limit of 35mph. Most Big Pine residents have observed on multiple occasions where some vehicles are stopped at the crosswalk and others are blowing through at highway speeds while someone is in the middle of crossing. I would like to see it go back to 25mph with a pedestrian crosswalk including a flashing red stop light as Bishop has. Why wouldn't Big Pine qualify for a pedestrian stop light when the speed limit is 10mph greater than Bishop and traffic speeds are much higher? The added yellow flashing light does little to alert traffic and is inferior to an overhead dual flashing red light to Stop.

Improved lighting and sidewalks for sure

Leave things as they are. We are quickly losing out rural atmosphere.

Homeless. Every time I do walk in town, I have to witness a human stripping down and yelling at his reflection, a man pooping or dog poop everywhere.

Make bikes pay a license fee if they are going to use the roads

Put a stop sign at the 395 intersection on Bartel road to slow down traffic in big pine.

Reroute the 395 around Bishop and create a thriving, pedestrian-friendly downtown

Street lights and sidewalks along county road

While I live here, I travel around the west often. Many comparable towns I visit have far more paved bike trails that are functional for transportation and recreation. They make the towns appeal skyrocket.

Warmer weather

Designated bike paths (not in the gutters.)

Paved bike trails away from highway through DWP land - every town we visit that has these is inviting and makes us want to stop and explore (and spend money). Towns like Telluride, Gunnison, Crested Butte (last summer we went to Colorado - can you tell? 😊)

Enforcement of the rules of the road asking the highway for the safety of bicyclists & pedestrians asking 395.

The streets off of Main Street in our community are of Lone Pine are so broken up and P.O. holed children can't ride bikes or roller skate. I bought 5 bikes for my grandchildren for Christmas. We had to put them in our truck and take the kids to the basketball court at the park to ride them. When they tried to ride on the street they let falling after hitting cracks or broken asphalt. We're young grandparents who participate in activities and want our grandkids out exercising. Having fun. Kids don't ride bicycles in Lone Pine!

My commute for work is too far to walk/bike. When I run errands I have too much to carry/haul back to make walking or biking realistic.

Crossing SR 395 near the park and Copper Top in Big Pine is extremely dangerous, especially on a Friday or Sunday. Please install a crosswalk so that our community has safe access to the park! I am terrified of crossing the highway, sadly I would never allow my teenage daughter to cross the road to go to the park. I (and other community members) have been asking for this for over 15 years.

None. I hate what was done to West Line Street. The bike lanes ruined it. Please bring back 4 lanes for cars.

Let's focus on vehicle traffic. Not the 10 people out of ten thousand that actually walk or bike. Cars first.

None. We are rural. Where we live and work prohibits much of this plan. Unless you live and work in the City limits you need transportation.

Better security for bikes to prevent theft and vehicle speed enforcement

Safer routes to schools for kids from all neighborhoods.

I work 20 miles away. Walking or biking is not possible

Reroute commercial trucks around town.

Allowance of more live/work and light mixed use within existing neighborhoods. Eliminating off street parking requirements in residential areas. Being open to more housing within existing neighborhoods. Doing away with local ordinances that conflict with the above goals. Example: allow two ADU's under 1200sf on any one lot in bishop. This is being done in many California Cities. Preapproved ADUs. These are housing ideas that support local, walkable and bikable neighborhoods. If we keep enforcing zoning laws that were designed around the car 75 years ago we will never achieve places and transportation centered around "people"

There is nothing that would encourage me to bike for transportation it isn't safe to mix bikes & cars. And most of our community is too spread out to make it an efficient use of time.

More Stop signs in small towns

We need paths for walking and biking

Better crosswalks. We do not have a safe way to cross the highway in Big Pine. This greatly impacts my ability to get to the shops on the east side by walking.

New body that doesn't hurt

I live outside the city limits and do not bike into town.

Speed on Home Street with kids

Incentives like getting paid back fees from DMV if use bike or walk

North Baker to Center Street access trail from Reservation to Post Office. Bridge across Big Pine Canal reopened. Need more asphalt roads.

Improve alleys (which are streets) in Independence.

Riding on the highway is very scary and county roads are not paved all the way through for road biking. I would ride my bike more if there was a long distance off-highway paved path.

Lighting at crosswalks. At night it is hard to see people wearing black to see them. Even the light lighting the cross walk would be so much better. Someone is going to get hit and killed as it is now.

The Park in Big Pine

There are plenty of areas to walk and bike in without changing our streets.

Safe sidewalks and lighting near 395

safer crossings from the east side of Bishop to the west side - reroute the trucks that race through town and install more safe crossings for pedestrians and bikes, please

Separate biking or walking lanes. Isolated bike lanes that connect safe streets instead of along the highway would make my commute much easier and safer:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d8RRE2rDw4k>

Build a truck route to get semis off Main Street in Bishop

Less truck traffic on Hwy 395

Having safe walking biking routes would be a huge improvement

Bike walk underpass to make safe crossing 395 All communities with sidewalks so kids can walk in their neighborhoods

Marketing! Make cycling and walking everywhere a part of the culture in Inyo County.

Make bike paths in Bishop that connect into the surrounding public land. Reduce traffic in downtown area. When improving local roads, include improving shoulder to make it easier to bike.

I road bike for exercise A LOT. And also bike downtown from West Bishop with my roommates for social events most months of the year. I'm most concerned with bike safety/awareness downtown Bishop. Once outside of the city limits, I feel safe on my bike.

New separated bike/ped path from Browns Town to downtown Bishop. Bike lanes on Main St in Bishop. Separated bike paths with center line, or at minimum a bike lane on road that isn't blocked by parked vehicles. Public restrooms and trash receptacles. Bike racks all through-out town, as Bishop currently has almost no bike racks.

It feels like risking your life every time you try to cross 395 in Big Pine. People drive way too fast. They refuse to stop at crosswalks sometimes even when you're in the middle of crossing. I once saw a truck driver switch lanes to go around a car that had stopped to let me cross. Truck didn't even slow down just went around and blew through the crosswalk. I often drive if I need to go across town because crossing on foot feels so dangerous.

Children, families, and all need safe ways to cross highway 395. Bike/ pedestrian over or underpass needed.

In Big Pine we need stoplights! One by the school/ library and another one at the intersection of Crocker and 395. The cars going through Big pine on 395 don't stop when there are people in the cross walks. I walk most days and often attempt crossing 395 with my double stroller and cars often blow right by my and my kid as I'm in the crosswalk. One time about two months ago this happened as I was walking to the

library with my baby and toddler there was a parked CHP officer at the cross walk and one car did stop it another car behind it switches lanes and nearly hit us. The CHP did nothing! I fear for all residents of Big Pine that want to simply enjoy a walk but mostly for our children that may want to walk to their school. The half measure that is on Crocker is not enough and the blinking lights do nothing. I have so many near misses that this point, that I have started filming them. Its terrifying and negligent on behalf of Inyo county to let this continue. Please more needs to be done!

Fund city projects for recreation paths that people can use for recreation and non motorized travel which also connect to county areas.

Better road surfaces on bike paths and county roads. Bike paths are falling apart. County roads are paved poorly with jarring expansion joints, course chipseal, and uneven surface making biking uncomfortable, unenjoyable and often unsafe.

Separated Bike paths

Paved non motorized vehicle path from lone pine to independence to big pine to bishop.

Rough roads, and the complete lack of shoulders are the main deterrents to biking.

More lighting in neighborhoods, especially meadow creek

Question #6 only allows you to choose one option for each category (would not - neutral- would make a difference). There are several options that would make a difference in me choosing to ride my bike more.

Safer 395 corridor to walk from Bishop Reservation to town. Safety at Wye Roas a concern too

Crosswalks on east line street are needed. Speed bumps or traffic calming measures are needed on 3rd st and Yaney in east bishop. Main St in Bishop needs proper bike lines or a better north south alternate bike route

Bike paths, improved condition of pavement, bike lane along highway 395

Bette bike lanes, such as the one on W Line St in Bishop!! Better street lights.

Note: question 6 only allows me to answer 3 of the statements. I think basically all of those would encourage me to walk or bike more or I would feel neutral about. I would love to see more continuous sidewalks in bishop—they are sporadic at best in most neighborhoods. Better enforcement of speed limits going through all the towns on 395—people are at least forced to slow down some in Bishop but it's not uncommon for me to see people going 50 or 60mph through big pine or independence. And in Bishop the timing of the yellow lights is off on some of them. I have spoken to Caltrans about this because I walk across 395 at Yaney every day and 8/9 times (I count) there is still a car going through the intersection on 395 when the light in Yaney turns green. I have been hit in my bike at this intersection and I know at least 6 other people who have as well but when I talked with Caltrans they said their data doesn't say anything is wrong there. They say it's up to Bishop PD to enforce the speed limit. But I have learned from friends at

Caltrans that they tend to only look at car accident data for an intersection in keep pedestrian incidents separate which seems like a big problem in all our communities. Making Caltrans more responsive to and aware of pedestrian concerns would be one of my top priorities. I don't know how it could be done at this point, but crossing 395 is a big challenge for pedestrians, especially bicycles. In part because in the main part of Bishop Yaney street is the only street that goes straight across 395. With the exception of the weird jog that Line street makes, all other crossings require you to ride on 395 for a little while which is often terrifying. I wish there were more crossings that went straight across 395. And that more of the backstreets of bishop went through. You basically have to be on Hanby or Home to go north- south in Bishop. Designating these streets as bikeways and improving the biking infrastructure and signage would encourage me to bike more and make me more likely to bike with others. As far as walking, it would be so nice to see Main Street in Bishop improved. Walking down Main is very unpleasant which certainly hurts local businesses. The loud truck traffic, the relatively narrow sidewalks, and minimal shade all make it unpleasant. Obviously rerouting 395 around town would have been the thing to do but in my opinion that ship has sailed. Trying to encourage traffic to slow down, planting more trees, adding more light up crosswalks, and perhaps changing the lane arrangement to allow for more space for sidewalks (which would force traffic to slow) could be good. Rerouting truck traffic around Bishop would be rad but I realize that's a pipe dream.

Dedicated bike paths that are actually safe to ride on. The W Line street lane reduction is an example of creating new biking infrastructure that is not any safer than before, with the bike lane directly next to 45 mph traffic. Creating ways for bikes to trigger town traffic lights at specific crossing spots. Fixing the heinously deadly "bike lane" though Main Street downtown by creating an alternative signed route down Warren Street.

Separated bike paths and increased bicycle/pedestrian path connectivity through the reservation and the coso would help encourage people to ride to school and work. Studies show that the biggest factor in getting people to ride is having safe paths away from cars. Currently there are some paths in the coso and on the canals, but many of them do not connect.

Your survey is set up so you can't select multiple things that would improve walking/biking. Bishop and Inyo Co have incredibly poor bicycle infrastructure compared to other places in CA. Its such an obvious place to have safe bike lanes and bike routes because so many locals are cyclists and ride year round. The main street bike lane is a joke. It's half in the gutter and has dangerous grates to ride over that take up more than half the lane where they are. It's incredibly unsafe and traffic pushes you into it, or you're pushed into traffic trying to avoid the grates and gutter. This bike lane should be a full size, fully paved bike lane or else it's just unsafe and you're putting the kids who use it in danger sending them onto that street. It's so unsafe people ride on the sidewalk more often than in the street which is dangerous to the pedestrians. Our bike shop in Bishop was sexist to me when I tried to buy something there so I don't have a safe place to get my bike worked on is also a hindrance.

The streets and sidewalks in the town of Lone Pine are in terrible condition. Their rough condition discourages walking, biking, skating, etc.

Bike lanes. I once rode my bike on Main Street and was terrified!



PROTECTED bike lanes, such that it's impossible for a motor vehicle to hit a cyclist.

Less traffic. Wider bike lanes. Easier to cross the street

Separate bike paths connecting meadowbrook area to downtown bishop

We need bike lanes on Dixon Lane

Sidewalks on side streets

FYI the above question (#6) only allows 3 choices total. Trying to mark more than 3 total responses removes the previous one. Traffic enforcement, especially along Main St. in Bishop, would make people feel safer walking. Speeding semi trucks running red lights and people blowing through crosswalks is a big problem.

Nothing

K-rail protected bike and walking paths connecting City of Bishop with N Sierra Hwy, along the US395 corridor. FYI, tech issue on Question 6, the survey dashboard only lets the user select one option out of all the questions (Mac OS 12.6, Chrome).

I bike ride for recreation.

***Please write out specific transportation improvements you feel should be a top priority for Inyo County:***

Ticket speeders-trucks & cars

2 ROUND TRIP ESTA trips from Big Pine to Bishop. 8am to Bishop; return by 12pm 12 pm to Bishop return by 4pm

Airport services and infrastructure. Recreational cycling etiquette - this group is a hazard to themselves and others and a nuisance in Round Valley, Millpond, Bishop Creek. They do not use bike lanes when present and slow down actual transportation. It's like pedestrian traffic ignoring sidewalks and insisting on walking down the middle of the road.

Road conditions are vital as well as safe sidewalks. It's good when they have the flashing lights in the cross walk over 395

Nothing else matters except stop lights and proper crosswalks.

More regional transit to neighboring towns and counties, mono county, LA, reno

Getting rid of a consistent route that went around to the various bus stops was a mistake. It became inconvenient.

Safer crosswalks with lights that flash

Traffic light at Ft. Independence

IM Transit is getting better. Helping them with more frequent stops between Bishop and Lone Pine might help. I don't know how many people currently use that service though.

Resurfacing local streets where houses are, like Bear Creek in Bishop, that has not been resurfaced since the roads were first laid in the 1970s

Transportation for elderly to and from appointments.

Current safety and speeding traffic should be number one.

We need full time airlines in Bishop

Cross walks in Big Pine. Too much traffic for us to cross safely

OHV but also others come to visit and should get to know our trails but an updated offroad map as it's closed so some that are not in side by sides don't spend 5hrs on a trail then have to back track because a trail is damaged.

I don't know who decided there needed to be a bike lane to west Bishop, but in my opinion removing a lane added to the traffic congestion.

Road surface, road reflectors, lighting at intersections

Optional truck/traffic route and Get rid of the single lane restrictions on Line Street.

Fix and maintain the roads and sidewalks that we already have! Good lighting around crosswalks!

Better lighting at crosswalk especially at night time!!!!

Better traffic enforcement! Average speed on Main Street is 10 mph above the speed limit on tourist commuting days. Everyone runs the stop sign at Sierra and home street, speeds down Sierra.

Biking/walking trails in communities and connecting communities

Better safety crossings

Return West Line street in Bishop to 4 lanes. Main street bypasses.

Separate bike paths for students to commute from west Bishop and Meadowcreek to school. Healthy for children, and would reduce needless vehicle trips and neighborhood congestion.

Improved residential streets/ less trucks on Main St.

\*Make line street 4 lanes \*Add scenic and fun bike paths that connect county areas to city areas \*Divert semis from going down Main Street - so loud and so much noise and air pollution as you're walking or trying to walk Main Street \* Build new private or neighborhood specific roads that can connect west bishop and county areas to downtown. Like through the fields that reach from Barlow to Sunland.

More Public transportation

Don't put all the money in northern Inyo County. Aka bishop

FINISHING THE DAMN BRIDBE IN ROUND VALLEY!!!!

More bus availability North to Carson City and Reno

Maintaining current infrastructure

Fixing existing roads painting lines on roads more frequently advertising rules of the road for bicycles and cars

Restore 4 lanes on Line Street

Restore 4 lanes on Line Street

Enforce speed limits and running of red lights. Year round flights out of Bishop airport. Improving some well traveled roads in desperate need of fixing.

Transit from line pine Indy big pine to Bishop as well as a access to commercial air from Bishop year round.

Repaving old roads in the town of Lone Pine not just 395. More sidewalks throughout town. More forced stops on 395 (traffic lights pedestrian crossing etc)

Just more bus times! I love the bus from big pine and want to use it more. More bike Otha would be great too- ideally a big pine to bishop separated trail.

Crosswalks in Independence - probably more and definitely more visible/well marked. I'm 100% that increasing CHP presence on 395 specifically in the towns between LP & Bishop would pay for itself in tickets even only to the worst/most dangerous drivers. People FLY through LP, Independence, and Big Pine and it's dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, animals and drivers.

Stop Light in Big Pine, cross walk flashing lights are not sufficient enough to slow traffic going through town. Maybe like the red light cross walks in bishop would be better

A freeway bypass

Getting commercial vehicle traffic off of residential roads. Commercial truck parking in town to access services, mainly food, causes a lot of hazards and congestion for local traffic (vehicle, pedestrian and bike).

Create a truck route to the east of Bishop to get huge trucks off Main Street. Create some sort of interesting walking/bike route with art, trees, and a place to park/lock bikes in town. Have more traffic enforcement in town to curb speeding vehicles and drivers oblivious to speed limits and traffic lights.

Year round commercial/affordable air service from bishop airport to SFO, LAX and/or Denver etc. A regular bus to the airport from Big Pine and other communities.

Semi Truck speed on main St

Fix local streets, regularly maintain unpaved county roads(Manzanar Reward east) put in a stop light cameras to catch people running the red light.

This is a beautiful area and to get around via bicycle there are very few options for not riding with the traffic.

Keeping people (including motorized and non motorized users) on existing roads and trails to avoid creating new trails would help take maintain access to those trails and reduce impacts.

The line to Schats bakery has got to get help. It's too small of a. Area and it's a real pain

Transportation seems very limited later in the evening

West Line Street remarking.

More speed enforcement or some sort of "slow down" device/strategy implemented in our little towns. Trying to cross 395 in Big Pine on a weekend is down right dangerous. People constantly parking in the center median to grab a bite to eat, not slowing down below 50mph in town... The list goes on

Get the 395 off Main Street asap! A weekend bus schedule to and from Reno and Los Angeles, with additional departure times so that friend and family don't have to drive their car here.

Crosswalk next to kfc

Get rid of new red flashing lights at crosswalk in favor of yellow lights used around California that simply make you aware someone is trying to cross, instead of create a new set of rules no one seems to understand

Crosswalks need to be improved. I have almost been hit. That was during the summer. During ski season people from out of town just drive through them like they aren't even there. Even if people are in them. Fix the roads and sidewalks

Cross walks with light signals overhead and lights on the pavement

Improving side walks, removing obstacles like DWP fence around Big Pine Park/Little League and adding more water to places creating green spaces.

Please repave Reynolds Rd and add sidewalks.

There needs to be an increase of traffic enforcement by CHP and Inyo SO. Currently, Inyo SO deputies are not radar certified and do not have radar in their units which drastically reduces their ability to effectively enforce speed violations as they have to estimate and pace speeds which leads to Deputies choosing to issue warnings instead of citations (warnings do little to correct future driving behavior). Generally, Inyo SO views traffic enforcement as a primary duty of CHP, rightfully so. However, CHP highway beats are large and officers are spread thin. I think Deputies should be encouraged and supported to increase proactive traffic enforcement and provided radar and certification. Additionally, speed limits in Big Pine and Independence should be reduced to 25mph to increase safety while attempting to traverse/merge onto 395, as well as provide additional safety to those running errands, parking in front of local business etc.. one last rant - Big Pine locals should be able to park in front of local businesses on 395 without having to wait for a break in traffic traveling at literally highway speeds due to there being only inches of space between them and passing vehicles. I know Caltrans will never revert the town back to 2 lanes. BUT, maybe the speed limit can be reduced and enforced so Big Pine and Independence are respected as the local communities they are and not the inconvenient windshield blur they've become on the way to wherever. Thanks.

Might be Caltrans, but better crosswalks on 395 in downtown bishop. With at least flashing lights? Not necessarily the red ones that they just put in... they seem confusing to lots of folks. But someone is going to get hit in one of the crosswalks that are super hard to see downtown. Please address!!!

Fix existing roads, no new sidewalks, lighting, bike paths or stop signals especially on Line St.  
Enforcement of bike laws. 3 and 4 wide on county roads is illegal and impossible to safely pass on. But bicycles are not held accountable.

N/A

Route big rigs around the town.

Pot holes and pavement deteriorated in the city of Bishop! Tree roots!

Eliminate truck traffic on pedestrian areas for noise and safety

Speed bumps or something to SLOW down traffic in front of the school.

I would love to see easements on LADWP land where bike lanes could connect [portions of Northern Inyo County. That combines with good bike lanes. At a minimum, places like Meadow Creek and Wilkerson should have safe bicycle corridors to downtown Bishop.

Things that make the town more appealing to stroll and shop in - wider sidewalks and bike lanes downtown - either two lanes or reroute trucks. More sidewalk cafe/outdoor dining. Our town could be so cute and appealing - if only. Sitting outside at Looney Bean or Astorga's is great until trucks go by - the problem is they go by constantly.

Education and enforcement of laws between bicyclists, pedestrians, vs automobile. Easy to find information on when flights will be offered at the bishop airport. Repair & upkeep of current local roads including side roads, and dirt - be sure signage of roads are present for safety of getting on and off the highway.

We have to stop the vehicles speeding through our communities. CHP is short staffed, we all understand. But vehicles driving 60 mph in the morning past Lone Pine High School is unacceptable. Big Pine school seems to be able to have a CHP helping out to slow traffic down. Lone Pine needs help both North and South.

Ticket travelers speeding through town (Big Pine, Bishop, Independence, etc.). Ticket people with a ton of snow on top coming off the mountain. Find a better parking solution for Schat's Bakery. It's a traffic hazard. Add street lights from Home Street, down Sierra Street to Main Street. It's pitch black. No way I'm walking/biking after dark in that area.

Enforcing traffic laws. Stop Expanding the roads just. It ruins the land and encourages overuse Biking to the river on SR 168 is a favorite for our family, however on the return to town from SR 168 requires that a cyclist either cross SR 395 to get into the southbound bike lane or bike south in the northbound lane. This intersection is susceptible to vehicle collisions and automobile traffic speeds by dangerously fast in relation to cyclists. Installing a walking/biling path parallel to SR 395 from the north end of town (by Copper Top) to the intersection of SR 168 (by the Vetran's Memorial) would provide a safe path back to town where speed limits are decreased and crossing the highway is much safer. Freight truck parking in Big Pine is also a problem. Trucks park in the highway turn lanes and/or red zones along Main St (SR 395) to grab food etc. creating dangerous conditions for traffic pulling out onto Main St or turning off of the highway.

Bypass Bishop

Enforce traffic code. Make West Line a 4 lane road again.

Fix the truck traffic going thru bishop. More enforcement in downtown bishop of speeding traffic and monitoring trucks speeding and blowing thru red lights at line St and main. Happens all the time! We really need police enforcement downtown and on West Line St for speeding traffic including trucks. West line is seeing more and more traffic being diverted by map apps to route them around downtown and then down Sunland. It's becoming a real problem. West line is getting very noisy and busy with re routed traffic from 395. Main St and west line St need trafffic calming measures put in place to slow people down! We need better bike lanes that are more clearly marked. The ones on line st. Confuse many people as is evidenced by them driving in the right hand area or bike lane. Mark them green with bike symbol which is more universally understood. South Barlow has many pedestrians walking and running and is very dangerous. Cars speeding on south Barlow which has little enforcement and no real walking area for

pedestrians. It's a housing community with people exercising daily combating speeding cars and trucks. It really needs to be improved. A flashing speeding sign would even help quite a bit.

Widening 395 in areas where it is only one lane each way. I travel to so cal monthly.

Too much to say. I could right a book on improvements to Inyo county roads.

Maintain existing roads. Lack of staff prohibits much more than that.

Existing road maintenance

Street maintenance and law enforcement

Maintenance of existing county roads. Passing lanes or 4 lane improvements. The State hasn't completed its commitment to 4-laning many stretches of rural roads and needs to complete the system it started 100 years ago. The state has sacrificed safety in rural areas for urban areas.

Safer cross walks in Big Pine and Independence. Fix new pot holes or very worn highway sections.

Sidewalks

The local streets need serious improvements.

Increase bus service

395 road diet in Bishop. Start with temporary cheap glue down cones. Maybe more permanent improvements if it goes well. Parking along Main Street, which will create a more comfortable, inviting and safer walking experience. A study in Sweden found just marking parking spaces with tick lines slowed traffic down by 20%. The illusion of a narrower road slows people down. I would like Inyo County to look at these types of very affordable "tweaks" to our infrastructure as opposed to massive costly infrastructure projects. Also, improvements to asphalt to concrete transitions on Main Street Bishop could be done. Currently, agg trucks hit these bumps at speed making a huge "boom" sound. Getting tourist to come to a complete stop prior to entering each town so they will slow down through town. Contacting online map companies about alternative routes around Bishop, those roads weren't meant for that amount of traffic and it is damaging the roads.

Making 395 into 4 lanes all the way

Transit stops between Bishop and Big Pine

More stop signs in small towns

Fix and expand the number of lanes on 395 north of the 15 freeway through Kramer Junction. Get rid of the no passing zone or add several new passing zones.



The people of Independence have been requesting updated pedestrian warning lights to slow traffic through town for years and nothing yet, but Big Pine gets all new lighting. ???

Speeding through towns is horrible. I feel my life is in danger every time I use the crosswalk in Big Pine Addressing the dilapidated and dangerous alleys in Independence. They are designated as streets, with street names. The potholes are our kids splash pools during the rain. They have not been maintained/ repaired/ paved in at least 25 years.

Highway crossing Independence

Way too much congestion on Main Street. I know it's impractical but a bypass around the city would be wonderful.

Occasional benches to catch my breath, old lady

Don't waste \$ chasing a truck route. Fix crosswalks and speeds in ALL communities on 395.

New asphalt on old roads

More bus route times for local travel from Lone Pine to Bishop. Needs to be a fixed route for 8 to 5 employees using bus transportation.

Truck by-pass off Bishop main street, more frequent and consistent flights out of Bishop airport to major transit hubs, more frequent shuttle to/from Mammoth and June Mountain.

Crosswalk safety, increased public transit

Line street needs to be put back to four lanes. Too congested with traffic and never see anybody in bike lanes. Heard they were thinking of putting bike lanes in big pine on 395 DO NOT do this.

Increased access to public transportation

The intersection by grocery outlet needs a traffic signal. There have been too many accidents.

Putting more day to day bus routes between Big Pine and up to Mammoth would help with people who don't drive, to get to a job or the supermarket, doctors or whatever.

The wye road triangle is always congested and unsafe, for cars and walkers. The "bike lanes" on Main St in Bishop are a joke - very unsafe, basically a 4 inch strip in the gutter. More bike racks around town would be a cheap and easy way to promote biking - the 3 slots in the little park on Main and Academy doesn't begin to allow for everyone who wants to ride to Amigos, frozen yogurt, and the movie theater to park. So people don't ride. Also: PLEASE REROUTE THE TRUCKS FROM MAIN STREET IN BISHOP, they are hands down the number one reason why people drive 3 blocks rather than walk or bike, you feel like you're going into battle, or playing a game of chicken, trying to cross with trucks + the Mammoth ski traffic.

Increased bike infrastructure and increased public transportation (more shuttles, more stops) within town and also between towns on 395.

Build a truck route to get semis off Main Street in bishop

Better visibility for pedestrians at crosswalks- but not the confusing flashing lights near Yamatani

Pedestrian safety!! Crosswalks that are safe, and traffic actually stopping. LEO, doing more than just sitting and watching school traffic, go into the parking lots and educate people. School traffic, ingress and egress is ridiculous. Tourism speeding is out of control

Home St light congestion

Developed infrastructure for recreation, not just transportation.

More bus transits and/ or electric scooters

Create a truck route that bypasses bishops downtown and make the downtown more pedestrian friendly.

Downtown bike safety, awareness, lanes

Speed enforcement approaching and through communities. Improving infrastructure to enable more safe trips via bicycle (including more electric ones).

Efficient and price-effective public transit. Getting reliable flights in/out of Bishop airport all throughout the year (not just when Mammoth tourism is up). Marking crosswalks in town clearly and safely so no one gets hit.

Walking and bicycling infrastructure for people who live here should take priority

I feel really proud of the re paving work that was done in the Reynolds neighborhood this year. It makes me want to improve my front yard. It makes me feel like our community is nicer and worthy. Thank you for the work you did. When you improve non-Bishop communities, I suspect that at least some would feel like me and it might lead to some small revitalization. I wish the Reynolds neighborhood had sidewalks along Reynolds road and County Rd from 395 to Reynolds. Cars go quickly and it's a very commonly walked path. It would make walking with a child feel easier and might cause cars to slow a bit.

1) Safe bike routes to schools, 2) passive recreational trails accessible from town

As our community is growing we need to work to it's great recreation, transportation. Cities like Boise, and Idaho I have made this a priority only benefit from the access to outdoor spaces, but can create business opportunities through proper transportation planning is it work to be innovative, and think of the county not only a separate city, but a whole. Eastern fear experience as a bike, packing and mountain biking river gorge like fisherman people who claim or three people become more into Overland or

experiences. It would be smart to start to create waves are transportation and trails can link up and therapies population with having bathroom facilities, places for clean access to climbing and river faces, as well as shut to allow from biking from one end of the valley together. Which also allows for the benefits of the residents who live here, long-term if we can be innovative with her thinking, we can help to promote recreation and create facilities for everyone here.

Divert through traffic and commercial traffic around downtown.

Fix existing bike paths and complete safe routes to join paths or lead to destinations. Specifically, complete the path from Dixon Lane across north Sierra Highway to Elm Street School. Long overdue! Link Line street bike lane to Millpond!

Send truck traffic around Bishop.

Slowing down the Main Street traffic especially the big trucks

Stop light in big pine for pedestrians to cross highway 395. Drivers still don't stop at people in the crosswalk even when I have my kids in a stroller!

A north to south bike path and shoulders on the highways through Death Valley National Park.

Make west line St two lanes again. Please please.

Bike lanes on Main Street. Better stop lights for crosswalks instead of the current ones that stay red for minutes after the pedestrians have crossed.

\* Safe/ separate bike lanes/paths. \* Slowing traffic down when entering our small towns (by creating an identifiable change between the open highway and entering a small town or photo tickets?? I don't know but go sit at Big Pine School one day and see how scary fast some people go by the school!). \*\*\*Big time dream: California creates a high speed train connecting Eastern Sierra to San Diego and LA area to cut down on all the speeding traffic :)

Air service to LAX, all year air service to at least one major airport.

Buses that run on weekends!!!! Especially Bishop -Mammoth

Enforce speed limits through towns on 395, create more continuous sidewalks, plant and maintain more trees along sidewalks for better shade (Warren street looks great!), add more crosswalks (especially with flashing lights), make all stoplights able to be triggered by bicycles (home street can be triggered but none of the others can in Bishop). Also identifying the good bike and walking routes through town and focusing pedestrian infrastructure on those routes. Thanks for putting this survey out!

Pedestrian crossings on 395. The new crossing signals are a good start, but now the non-signalized crossings are still dangerous. People should be able to walk the downtown area without fear of getting hit

by a vehicle crossing the street. At a minimum, there needs to be flashing street lights embedded in the road and flashing crossing signs at the Academy and Clarke street crossings. Traffic enforcement for speeding in downtown Bishop is poor.

Within the Bishop area, the county should work to ensure a livable city and avoid the pitfalls other western towns make when they develop infrastructure solely for cars. Bishop has limited space and devoting more of that to roadway and parking removes public space for people. Walkable public space downtown and safe walking and cycling paths around the area would allow children to get to school and workers to commute without the need for increased traffic and parking.

Repave and redesignate more of Main St in Bishop to be a real bike lane and not the fake gutter/grate "bike lane" that is there now. Make the 395 have a wide enough shoulder the whole way to safely bike between mammoth and bishop. I also tried commuting by bus recently and it was so horrible I'll probably never try again and am warning others away from it. First off, you should be able to just buy a bus ticket online. Currently, you have to send in a form and wait for it to be approved, so you can never just make spur of the moment decisions to ride the bus. I'm not going to call in, what is this 1985. I took the bus instead of driving to mammoth recently due to road conditions from that storm that came in early January. The bus from Bishop to mammoth was 25 minutes late, and arrived way later than the schedule said making me late for work. Then, when I left, the bus was a full HOUR AND 15 MINUTES late. I understand there can be delays with the snow, but you'd think by now a TRANSPORTATION company would have figured that out and sent drivers out earlier or adopt a "snow schedule" to announce these delays. As it was, there was maybe 15 of us standing still on the snow bc there's no shelter, in 20 degree weather at night, for again, an hour and 15 minutes. And no one was working dispatch after 5:00 so when I tried to call to ask when the bus was coming there was no one to talk to. We all just waited indefinitely. Then when the driver got there he was grumpy, yelled at riders for putting skis in the back when that's exactly what the morning driver had them do, offered no apologies or discounts for the lateness. There were kids and elderly people waiting. And they don't even have a stop at the Pine Creek Rd turn off, so me a Rovana resident had to go extra the wrong way to get picked up and dropped off by the bus in bishop. Specific improvements for ESTA: Make a snow schedule so residents aren't left stranded with no info and can get to work on time. Make a heated bus stop or at least shelter with seating in Mammoth so we don't have to wait below freezing in the snow. Make a bus stop for Pine Creek Rd so we don't have to anxiously flag the driver down standing on a major highway. Make it so you can buy tickets online instantly. Staff customer service to answer phones so riders can talk to someone about where the bus even is since it was more than an hour late I tried to take it. RUN ON THE WEEKENDS so tourists can get to recreation sites! Go to recreation sites/trailheads! Residents also need to get to Reno/LA on weekends for flights! Thanks district 9 in general for the work you do to keep the roads in great shape and snow cleared in the winter. I lived in Oakland before this and the roads here are so good in comparison it's dreamy honestly. Keep up the good work on that front. :)

Improve local streets, add sidewalks & bike lanes, EV infrastructure.

EV charging, rerouting of truck traffic, more bike lanes and ped access around Main Street.

I am legally blind, a better bus service from Big Pine to Bishop offering more times for coming and going at least one or two times a week. The service should come door to door.

Protected bike lanes. Greatly improved cushioning on the ESTA bus passenger seats.

Reduce truck traffic and through traffic on Main Street

Improve pedestrian crossings and bike path/lane connectivity

More bus stops

Family bike path east to west

Traffic enforcement from law enforcement, especially in and around the towns. Year round commercial air service. Aesthetic improvements to encourage walking - trees, traffic calming infrastructure, etc.

Better snow and ice removal in downtown areas like parking lots and sidewalks on the occasions we do get snow.

Allow more use of OHV on streets as Arizona has done and many other states.

I feel more corridors and shared OHV combined use roads would reduce trailer trips and congestion  
Connecting Bishop to N Sierra Hwy along the US395 corridor with bike/walking path protected by a K-Rail.  
This route would be lit at night and follow the supposed broadband route that has yet to be installed.

I would like Inyo County to expand combined use routes.

*This page intentionally left blank*

## **ATTACHMENT B: POP-UP WORKSHOP COMMENTS**



*This page intentionally left blank*

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Later bus service & later bus service on Sundays

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Homeless people make biking unsafe. Bike lane on Main St unsafe. Cuts through park instead to avoid Main St.

Bike path parallel 395 (needed) so bikers don't have to bike on Main St

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Current bus every  $\frac{1}{2}$  hour at Vons, Pite Lake Casino, Reservation  
Bishop area

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Educated bike riders. Reflective tape for back of bikes for night. No lights on Res or Dixon

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Herland is usually improved we need sidewalks  
Sierra St, we tripped. Need DAP, a lot of elderly people  
live here. Consider older folks, crosswalks, sidewalks

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Lower Rock Creek, Washed out

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

No Notes in Wells in Tungsten Hill Rd. / Dleaving is problem  
More aforment is needed Roads are fine

No OHV on regular streets, repeat that

Bike paths OK  
alot of cyclists on  
Bishop Creek Rd

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

1. Improve access to Vans

2. Add a Bishop town shuttle like Mammoth has:

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Showers for travelers

Am BNB

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

W. Hanson → B. Lake → O. Creek, floods alot

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Bad road on 395 in Mono County toward Junelake

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

\* Bike path to tourist destination, airport  
See it into town, Bike lane on Line St to Owens River, 4 mi.  
Bishop creek go up a couple miles,

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_  
Dune St bike path needs to be repaved + extended

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Commercial service to airport

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Line St. make 2 lanes again  
get rid of Those islands on main st.  
They only clog up traffic. Airport 2 lanes would help

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Ranch Rd - needs maintenance (potholes, ruts)

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

More connectivity in bike routes throughout Inyo County. Especially need to increase safe routes for kids to bike.

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

On highways - need bike lanes

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Bishop to Shafant - bike path

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Improve Park To Vans - get that truck on North side of Sierraville  
There are good roads  
More dog poop receptacles

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Community Park - central place for upkeep.  
Upgrades for children.

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Line St bike lane extended to college

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

<sup>condition</sup>  
Pavement, 99, 395

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Bridge over 395 from E/W of Bishop

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Make the buildings look more cohesive - better matching look.

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Juniper, bike lane paths / Riota / E. Line St  
Hwy 6 → need bike lanes

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Animal shelter for Res dogs.

Bike lane on Main Street.

Email for Vons gift card drawing:

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Need more public transport accessibility.

Email for Vons gift card drawing:

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Better lighting throughout the backstreets in town, especially noticeable in winter when it's dark earlier and there's early evening events in the dark when going to the car.

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Keep the airport & increase flights. Direct from EUG or PDX!

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Addition of sidewalks

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Update sidewalks in Lone Pine

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

There needs to be a regular bus shopping/drs appts/visits service to Keeler. My mother is disabled & many residents need such a service. Better publicity about!

Email for Vons gift card drawing: [REDACTED]



If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

We could use some form of public transportation  
to Darwin for elderly folks or those with no vehicle  
- like a couple days a month or once a week

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Rodney Hoyer # 559 205-6401  
Bike lanes, bike racks

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

A Bike PATH From THE LP/DV AIRPORT To  
TOWN WHERE THE SIDE WALK IS PROPOSED.  
NEW PAVEMENT IN TOWN'S (LP) LOCAL ROAD

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Our streets are terrible -  
we have lived 70 years! No work done  
on roads!!!

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Lone Pine Town Streets have terrible  
potholes

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

It would be the ROADS  
Lone Pine Roads are crap! They tear up our tires.

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Repair Lone Pine Streets /  
add sidewalks

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

If you could fix one thing about transportation in Inyo County (roads, sidewalks, bikepaths, public transit, crosswalks, etc), what would it be?

Need more signals in Lone Pine

Email for Vons gift card drawing: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT C: TECOPA ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION WORKSHOP COMMENTS

### ***Please describe specific locations where walking & bicycling access improvements are needed in your community.***

A bike path between Shoshone and Tecopa. Rails-to-trails (using existing old railroad berm as a connecting bike and walk trail between the communities.

Old Spanish Trail Hwy, Hwy 127, Bob White way

Hwy 127 thru Shoshone is dangerous - need to reduce speed limit, add speed bumps, and other measures

Places along highways that have soft or no shoulder.

BETWEEN TECOPA HOT SPRINGS (COMMUNITY CENTER) AND TECOPA POST OFFICE. THE POST OFFICE AREA KNOWN AS THE TRIANGLE NEEDS TO HAVE A MARKED CROSSWALK FOR THE LOCAL BUSINESSES THERE

We need bike lanes and (or at the very least) "Share the Road" signs on Hwy 127 from Ibex Pass to Shoshone at least, ideally all the way to Death Valley Junction or Ash Meadows.

Tecopa Heights. China ranch road, around post office

From Tecopa Heights to Post Office to Tecopa Hot Springs they 127 and Old Spanish Trail from Charleston View California to Hwy 127.

Hwy 178 both east to Stateline at Pahrump Nevada. Hwy 178 west into Death Valley National Park.

Hwy 372 to Shoshone, CA hwy 127 and Old Spanish Trail

Highway 127 & Old Spanish Trail

Old Spanish trail hwy

Need safe crossing of hwy 127 in Shoshone

Into the wild open spaces, BLM and Wilderness areas

Tecopa Hot Springs Road and/or Old Spanish Trail

Pahrump 132 sq miles of this woke town!

N/S through reservation

All county roads

Tecopa Hot Springs

Lighting near sidewalk

EVERYWHERE!!!

### ***Where would you like to be able to walk and bike?***

Between Tecopa and Shoshone

From Shoshone to Tecopa and back.

Old Spanish Trail Hwy

"TECOPA HOT SPRINGS ROAD, OLD SPANISH TRAIL HIGHWAY, TECOPA HEIGHTS RESIDENTIAL AREA, TECOPA TRIANGLE POST OFFICE AREA "

Places where I won't encounter O.H.V. (Off Highway Vehicles)

Bike from Tecopa to Shoshone and beyond to Death Valley Junction, Tecopa to Ibex Pass and beyond to Dumont Dunes, walking and biking trails on Tecopa Hot Springs Rd. and the Old Spanish Trail Highway to Charleston View.

Tecopa spa district

"From Tecopa Heights to Tecopa Post Office and adjacent restaurants, Tecopa Hot Springs Community Center and Tecopa Hot Springs.

From Tecopa Hot Springs to Hwy 127 to see the wetlands and view the birds and to see the Amargosa River. In Shoshone to Hwy 178 west to Death Valley Park boundary.

"To the closest major grocery shopping which is in Pahrump Nevada.

To Death Valley National Park via Hwy 178 west.

On hwy 127 within Shoshone."

NV Hwy 372 to CA 127 to Old Spanish Trail

County hot springs, borehole, China ranch, Shoshone, Tecopa triangle

Old Spanish trail hwy, 127,178

Across hwy 127 without fearing for my life

Shoshone

Post office, water kiosk, hot springs

Down the roads I live by

All places in community

To China Ranch

Community Center

Near my house

In town

Tecopa, CA

Old Spanish Trail, Tecopa Hot Spgs Rd, Hwy 127

Work, school, store

***Do you have additional comments regarding walking or biking in Tecopa and Shoshone?***

Lots of our visitors and guests bring bicycles to this area. We should have bike-friendly trails for them so they can stay off the highways.

Hwy 127 is NOT SAFE for bicycling and walking!!)

It's very dangerous to bicycle on any roads due to vehicles going too fast and are not looking for or are aware of bicyclists. Having signage that make people aware of cyclists could be helpful.

THERE IS A RISK OF BEING BITTEN BY AGGRESSIVE "PET" DOGS ROAMING FREE ESPECIALLY IN THE TECOPA HEIGHTS RESIDENTIAL AREA FOR ANYONE BICYCLING AND WALKING

The number of folks who are riding e-bikes these days in our neck of the woods is astounding! We would love to ride on Hwy 127 and feel safe doing it. There aren't even shoulders on that stretch of highway. So, bike lanes would be awesome, not to mention some signage asking drivers to "Share the Road," at least reminding them that there may be bicyclists ahead. Walking and biking is what we live for in the Winter and the early Summer mornings or late nights.

"We also need weekly bus service to shop in Pahrump since it too far for biking and no stores here"

"Walking and bicycling in Tecopa and Shoshone can be fun, healthy, economical, environmentally sound, adventurous and worthwhile on all levels.

It's a way to meet neighbors, visitors, tourists and people passing through.

It's a fun healthy way to socialize and bring us all together.

It's healthy and fun and economical and environmentally friendly to use my bicycle to get to the beginning of trails I want to hike..

I would like to see a bicycle and walking trail going from Tecopa to Shoshone on the obsolete old Tonapah and Tidewater railroad bed that already runs between the two towns."

A wide enough bike lane for a trike between Tecopa and Shoshone.

Thank you for this opportunity

We also need the bus to Pahrump to be reinstated (it stopped because of covid and has not resumed)

Cars speed by the post office all time. Stop signs, speed bumps, or a traffic circle would help make this situation safer

Areas to e-bike not on roadways

There used to be a bus to Pahrump. If the route could be revived I would take it and I know a few others in Tecopa have said they would as well.

No, just get the grant to improve the citizens, taxpayers, and voters, safety, health, and workforce.

Move the transfer station down by the post office and turn that area into a park

Wider shoulders on 127 would facilitate riding bikes from Shoshone to Tecopa

Better paved roads/better pavement

Awesome place

No shoulders, no signs, no bike trails

I've not seen one bicyclist since February 2023



**Chance to  
win a gift  
card to  
Vons!**

**Do you walk,  
bike, drive a car,  
take the bus, live or  
work in Inyo County?**

- **Where is it unsafe to walk or bike?**
- **What road needs improvement?**
- **Is it hard for you to get around?**
- **How can roads, bike paths, sidewalks be improved?**

**Share your  
opinion!**

The Inyo County Local Transportation Commission is currently updating the Inyo County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and we want you to tell us what the priorities are for improvement projects.



**TELL US WHAT COULD BE BETTER**



**PAVEMENT CONDITIONS INDEX INVENTORY**

---



*This page intentionally left blank*

Table D1: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 1008         | 3          | 1975       | 0   | 4421         | 2          | 1960       | 12  |
| 1030         | 4          | 1971       | 0   | 5017         | 6          | 1960       | 12  |
| 1044         | 3          | 1971       | 0   | 1024         | 1          | 1960       | 13  |
| 5006         | 6          | 1960       | 0   | 5007         | 001        | 1960       | 13  |
| 4058         | 4          | 1960       | 2   | 5007         | 005        | 1960       | 13  |
| 5024         | 5          | 1960       | 2   | 5017         | 5          | 1960       | 13  |
| 5048         | 5          | 1960       | 2   | 4019         | 8          | 1960       | 14  |
| 4048         | 1          | 1960       | 3   | 4052         | 6          | 1960       | 14  |
| 5031         | 1          | 1960       | 3   | 4409A        | 1          | 1960       | 14  |
| 4423         | 2          | 1960       | 4   | 4416A        | 3          | 1960       | 14  |
| 4430         | 2          | 1960       | 4   | 5014         | 5          | 1960       | 14  |
| 5017         | 10         | 1960       | 4   | 1003         | 5          | 1971       | 15  |
| 5024         | 4          | 1960       | 4   | 1029         | 1          | 1960       | 15  |
| 3419         | 1          | 1960       | 5   | 3401         | 3          | 1960       | 15  |
| 4026         | 1          | 1960       | 5   | 4052         | 2          | 1960       | 15  |
| 5007         | 002        | 1960       | 5   | 4058         | 2          | 1960       | 15  |
| 1080         | 2          | 1960       | 6   | 4409         | 3          | 1960       | 15  |
| 4003         | 4          | 1960       | 6   | 5018         | 5          | 1960       | 15  |
| 4429         | 2          | 1960       | 6   | 1069         | 1          | 1960       | 16  |
| 3031         | 1          | 1960       | 7   | 4021         | 2          | 1960       | 16  |
| 4423         | 1          | 1960       | 7   | 4046         | 1          | 1960       | 16  |
| 5017         | 1          | 1960       | 7   | 4202         | 1          | 1960       | 16  |
| 1075         | 1          | 1960       | 8   | 5017         | 4          | 1960       | 16  |
| 3039         | 4          | 1960       | 8   | 3018         | 16         | 1960       | 17  |
| 4023         | 3          | 1960       | 8   | 4003         | 3          | 1960       | 17  |
| 5014         | 6          | 1960       | 8   | 4010         | 4          | 1960       | 17  |
| 5020         | 3          | 1960       | 8   | 4010         | 2          | 1960       | 17  |
| 5073         | 1          | 1960       | 8   | 4053         | 4          | 1960       | 17  |
| 3040         | 1          | 1960       | 9   | 4407         | 5          | 1960       | 17  |
| 3041         | 1          | 1960       | 9   | 5007         | 34         | 1960       | 17  |
| 4044         | 2          | 1960       | 9   | 5007         | 006        | 1960       | 17  |
| 4421A        | 3          | 1960       | 9   | 5029         | 2          | 1960       | 17  |
| 3040         | 6          | 1960       | 10  | 1073         | 1          | 1960       | 18  |
| 5017         | 9          | 1960       | 10  | 1102         | 1          | 1960       | 18  |
| 5018         | 10         | 1960       | 10  | 3038         | 1          | 1960       | 18  |
| 5018         | 1          | 1960       | 10  | 3038         | 7          | 1960       | 18  |
| 1008         | 1          | 1975       | 11  | 3040         | 2          | 1960       | 18  |
| 3039         | 5          | 1960       | 11  | 3419         | 2          | 1960       | 18  |
| 4058         | 3          | 1960       | 11  | 4006         | 4          | 1960       | 18  |
| 4409         | 4          | 1960       | 11  | 4052         | 4          | 1960       | 18  |
| 4426         | 1          | 1960       | 11  | 4052         | 3          | 1960       | 18  |
| 5007         | 004        | 1960       | 11  | 5020         | 5          | 1960       | 18  |
| 5017         | 3          | 1960       | 11  | 5029         | 10         | 1960       | 18  |
| 5024         | 2          | 1960       | 11  | 1113         | 1          | 1960       | 19  |
| 3401         | 1          | 1960       | 12  | 3039         | 1          | 1960       | 19  |
| 4003         | 6          | 1960       | 12  | 3045         | 7          | 1960       | 19  |
| 4003         | 5          | 1960       | 12  | 4006         | 1          | 1960       | 19  |
| 4052         | 1          | 1960       | 12  | 4021         | 1          | 1960       | 19  |
| 4053         | 3          | 1960       | 12  | 5007         | 003        | 1960       | 19  |
| 4409A        | 2          | 1960       | 12  | 5020         | 2          | 1960       | 19  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D2: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 5024         | 1          | 1960       | 19  | 4407         | 4          | 1960       | 27  |
| 1122         | 1          | 1960       | 20  | 1067         | 1          | 1960       | 28  |
| 3020         | 2          | 1960       | 20  | 1067         | 2          | 1960       | 28  |
| 3401         | 2          | 1960       | 20  | 1069         | 2          | 1960       | 28  |
| 4006A        | 1          | 1960       | 20  | 2050         | 1          | 1960       | 28  |
| 1025         | 2          | 1960       | 21  | 4017         | 16         | 1960       | 28  |
| 1069A        | 3          | 1960       | 21  | 4052         | 7          | 1960       | 28  |
| 3040         | 3          | 1960       | 21  | 4429         | 1          | 1960       | 28  |
| 4020         | 3          | 1960       | 21  | 1026         | 1          | 1960       | 29  |
| 5018         | 2          | 1960       | 21  | 1081         | 2          | 1960       | 29  |
| 5018         | 4          | 1960       | 21  | 3028         | 4          | 1960       | 29  |
| 5029         | 6          | 1960       | 21  | 4004         | 2          | 1960       | 29  |
| 1008         | 2          | 1975       | 22  | 4010         | 3          | 1960       | 29  |
| 4006         | 2          | 1960       | 22  | 4053         | 6          | 1960       | 29  |
| 4010         | 6          | 1960       | 22  | 5012         | 2          | 1960       | 29  |
| 5007         | 007        | 1960       | 22  | 5017         | 7          | 1960       | 29  |
| 5023         | 2          | 1960       | 22  | 5021         | 2          | 1960       | 29  |
| 3017         | 34         | 1960       | 23  | 3038         | 3          | 1960       | 30  |
| 4017         | 3          | 1960       | 23  | 3038         | 2          | 1960       | 30  |
| 4050         | 1          | 1960       | 23  | 3402         | 2          | 1960       | 30  |
| 4423A        | 1          | 1960       | 23  | 4017         | 1          | 1960       | 30  |
| 5017         | 2          | 1960       | 23  | 4414A        | 2          | 1960       | 30  |
| 5017         | 8          | 1960       | 23  | 5018         | 7          | 1960       | 30  |
| 5046         | 1          | 1960       | 23  | 5018         | 9          | 1960       | 30  |
| 5060         | 1          | 1960       | 23  | 5029         | 5          | 1960       | 30  |
| 1069A        | 1          | 1960       | 24  | 2081         | 3          | 1960       | 31  |
| 1110A        | 1          | 1960       | 24  | 3018         | 7          | 1960       | 31  |
| 2022         | 7          | 1960       | 24  | 3040         | 4          | 1960       | 31  |
| 2097         | 1          | 1960       | 24  | 4006         | 3          | 1960       | 31  |
| 3419A        | 1          | 1960       | 24  | 4017         | 4          | 1960       | 31  |
| 4019         | 7          | 2011       | 24  | 4017         | 6          | 1960       | 31  |
| 4422A        | 1          | 2002       | 24  | 4421A        | 1          | 1960       | 31  |
| 5007         | 33         | 1960       | 24  | 1079         | 1          | 1960       | 32  |
| 5029         | 3          | 1960       | 24  | 1082         | 1          | 1960       | 32  |
| 5048         | 4          | 2000       | 24  | 2039         | 3          | 1960       | 32  |
| 1114         | 1          | 1960       | 25  | 3017         | 24         | 1960       | 32  |
| 2089         | 1          | 1960       | 25  | 3028A        | 2          | 1960       | 32  |
| 3018         | 4          | 1960       | 25  | 3028A        | 5          | 1960       | 32  |
| 3426         | 2          | 1960       | 25  | 3031         | 2          | 1960       | 32  |
| 5020         | 4          | 1960       | 25  | 3039         | 7          | 1960       | 32  |
| 5078         | 1          | 1960       | 25  | 4052         | 5          | 1960       | 32  |
| 2086         | 1          | 1960       | 26  | 4053         | 5          | 1960       | 32  |
| 4005         | 2          | 1960       | 26  | 5017         | 12         | 1960       | 32  |
| 4421         | 1          | 1960       | 26  | 5018         | 6          | 1960       | 32  |
| 5071         | 1          | 1960       | 26  | 5201         | 2          | 1960       | 32  |
| 2087         | 1          | 1960       | 27  | 5201         | 1          | 1960       | 32  |
| 3402         | 3          | 1960       | 27  | 1067         | 3          | 1960       | 33  |
| 4010         | 5          | 1960       | 27  | 1069A        | 2          | 1960       | 33  |
| 4016         | 1          | 1960       | 27  | 1123         | 1          | 1960       | 33  |
| 4017         | 11         | 1960       | 27  | 2026         | 1          | 1960       | 33  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D3: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 2100         | 1          | 1960       | 33  | 3408         | 2          | 1960       | 37  |
| 3042         | 1          | 1960       | 33  | 1072         | 2          | 1960       | 38  |
| 4044         | 1          | 1960       | 33  | 1089         | 1          | 1971       | 38  |
| 4046         | 2          | 1960       | 33  | 3017         | 30         | 2006       | 38  |
| 5027         | 1          | 1960       | 33  | 4202         | 3          | 1960       | 38  |
| 1069         | 3          | 1960       | 34  | 4411         | 1          | 1960       | 38  |
| 4020         | 2          | 1960       | 34  | 5007         | 10         | 1960       | 38  |
| 4032         | 1          | 1960       | 34  | 5072         | 3          | 1960       | 38  |
| 5021         | 3          | 1995       | 34  | 1082         | 5          | 1960       | 39  |
| 5041         | 2          | 1960       | 34  | 1141         | 1          | 1960       | 39  |
| 5201         | 3          | 1960       | 34  | 3214         | 2          | 1960       | 39  |
| 1063         | 5          | 1960       | 35  | 3404         | 2          | 1960       | 39  |
| 1070         | 1          | 1960       | 35  | 4017         | 10         | 1960       | 39  |
| 1082         | 4          | 1960       | 35  | 4017         | 13         | 1960       | 39  |
| 2039         | 4          | 1960       | 35  | 4207         | 3          | 1960       | 39  |
| 3017         | 11         | 1960       | 35  | 5007         | 008        | 1960       | 39  |
| 3017         | 25         | 1960       | 35  | 5012         | 1          | 1960       | 39  |
| 3048         | 4          | 1960       | 35  | 5029         | 29         | 1975       | 39  |
| 3402         | 1          | 1960       | 35  | 5054         | 2          | 1960       | 39  |
| 4017         | 5          | 1960       | 35  | 5077         | 2          | 1960       | 39  |
| 4045         | 3          | 2002       | 35  | 1070A        | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 4053         | 2          | 1960       | 35  | 1080         | 3          | 1960       | 40  |
| 4053         | 1          | 1960       | 35  | 2039         | 2          | 1960       | 40  |
| 4206         | 1          | 1960       | 35  | 2058         | 1          | 1971       | 40  |
| 4403B        | 2          | 2003       | 35  | 2099         | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 1068         | 1          | 1960       | 36  | 3027A        | 2          | 1960       | 40  |
| 1080         | 4          | 1960       | 36  | 3039         | 6          | 1960       | 40  |
| 1081         | 1          | 1960       | 36  | 3208         | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 1082         | 3          | 1960       | 36  | 4023         | 4          | 2007       | 40  |
| 1082         | 2          | 1960       | 36  | 4403B        | 5          | 2006       | 40  |
| 1142         | 1          | 1960       | 36  | 5007         | 23         | 1960       | 40  |
| 3039         | 3          | 1960       | 36  | 5020         | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 3040         | 7          | 1960       | 36  | 5021         | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 4017         | 17         | 1960       | 36  | 5029         | 35         | 1960       | 40  |
| 4021         | 4          | 1960       | 36  | 5077         | 1          | 1960       | 40  |
| 4414A        | 3          | 1960       | 36  | 2094         | 1          | 1960       | 41  |
| 5018         | 8          | 1960       | 36  | 3017         | 14         | 1960       | 41  |
| 5018         | 14         | 1960       | 36  | 3017         | 23         | 1960       | 41  |
| 5029         | 36         | 1960       | 36  | 3028A        | 3          | 1960       | 41  |
| 5029         | 25         | 1975       | 36  | 3028A        | 1          | 1960       | 41  |
| 5072         | 4          | 1960       | 36  | 3038         | 5          | 1960       | 41  |
| 1053         | 1          | 1960       | 37  | 4020         | 1          | 1960       | 41  |
| 1086         | 1          | 1960       | 37  | 4034         | 3          | 1960       | 41  |
| 1109         | 2          | 1960       | 37  | 4403A        | 2          | 1960       | 41  |
| 1124         | 1          | 1960       | 37  | 4409         | 2          | 1960       | 41  |
| 2022         | 8          | 1960       | 37  | 5007         | 14         | 1960       | 41  |
| 2081         | 2          | 1960       | 37  | 5017         | 11         | 1960       | 41  |
| 3001         | 1          | 1960       | 37  | 5029         | 32         | 1960       | 41  |
| 3017         | 29         | 1960       | 37  | 5072         | 2          | 1960       | 41  |
| 3018         | 8          | 1960       | 37  | 5072         | 1          | 1960       | 41  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D4: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 1119         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 4001         | 2          | 1960       | 46  |
| 2083         | 11         | 1975       | 42  | 4205         | 3          | 1960       | 46  |
| 3038         | 4          | 1960       | 42  | 4405A        | 3          | 1960       | 46  |
| 3039         | 2          | 1960       | 42  | 5007         | 31         | 1960       | 46  |
| 3419A        | 4          | 1960       | 42  | 5053         | 2          | 1960       | 46  |
| 4015         | 3          | 2002       | 42  | 4205         | 1          | 1960       | 47  |
| 4022         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 4403B        | 3          | 2004       | 47  |
| 4204         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 4404A        | 1          | 1960       | 47  |
| 4421A        | 2          | 1960       | 42  | 4414A        | 1          | 1960       | 47  |
| 4422A        | 2          | 1960       | 42  | 1009         | 6          | 1971       | 48  |
| 4424A        | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 1036         | 1          | 1971       | 48  |
| 5008         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 1138         | 1          | 1960       | 48  |
| 5025         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 2027         | 1          | 1971       | 48  |
| 5037         | 1          | 1960       | 42  | 2040         | 2          | 1960       | 48  |
| 1072         | 1          | 1960       | 43  | 3017         | 13         | 1960       | 48  |
| 1100         | 1          | 1960       | 43  | 3070         | 1          | 1960       | 48  |
| 1106         | 2          | 1960       | 43  | 3209         | 3          | 1960       | 48  |
| 2060         | 1          | 1971       | 43  | 4017         | 15         | 1960       | 48  |
| 3208         | 2          | 1960       | 43  | 5007         | 26         | 1960       | 48  |
| 4021         | 3          | 1960       | 43  | 5029         | 11         | 1960       | 48  |
| 4205         | 2          | 1960       | 43  | 5029         | 22         | 1960       | 48  |
| 5007         | 25         | 1960       | 43  | 1009         | 4          | 1971       | 49  |
| 5029         | 31         | 1960       | 43  | 1120         | 2          | 1960       | 49  |
| 1012         | 1          | 1960       | 44  | 2022         | 5          | 1960       | 49  |
| 3017         | 18         | 1960       | 44  | 2058         | 2          | 1971       | 49  |
| 3020         | 1          | 1960       | 44  | 3017         | 009        | 1960       | 49  |
| 3028A        | 4          | 1960       | 44  | 3017         | 10         | 1960       | 49  |
| 3209         | 1          | 1960       | 44  | 3410         | 1          | 1960       | 49  |
| 3421A        | 5          | 1960       | 44  | 4017         | 12         | 1960       | 49  |
| 4204         | 2          | 1960       | 44  | 4203         | 5          | 1960       | 49  |
| 4204         | 3          | 1960       | 44  | 4419A        | 1          | 1960       | 49  |
| 5029         | 4          | 1960       | 44  | 5002         | 6          | 1960       | 49  |
| 5029         | 1          | 1960       | 44  | 5007         | 27         | 2010       | 49  |
| 5029         | 28         | 1960       | 44  | 5029         | 33         | 1960       | 49  |
| 5054         | 1          | 1960       | 44  | 5029         | 23         | 2002       | 49  |
| 1118         | 1          | 1960       | 45  | 5043         | 1          | 1960       | 49  |
| 3017         | 004        | 1960       | 45  | 3209         | 2          | 1960       | 50  |
| 3214         | 1          | 1960       | 45  | 3403         | 1          | 1960       | 50  |
| 3411         | 1          | 1960       | 45  | 3404         | 1          | 1960       | 50  |
| 4017         | 2          | 1960       | 45  | 4045         | 2          | 2002       | 50  |
| 4022         | 2          | 1960       | 45  | 4049         | 1          | 1960       | 50  |
| 4403B        | 4          | 1960       | 45  | 4050         | 2          | 1960       | 50  |
| 5029         | 13         | 1960       | 45  | 4404         | 2          | 1960       | 50  |
| 5061         | 1          | 1960       | 45  | 5007         | 24         | 1960       | 50  |
| 1009         | 5          | 1971       | 46  | 5029         | 24         | 1960       | 50  |
| 2096         | 1          | 1960       | 46  | 1069         | 4          | 1960       | 51  |
| 2098         | 1          | 1960       | 46  | 1117         | 1          | 1960       | 51  |
| 3017         | 15         | 1960       | 46  | 2029         | 1          | 1970       | 51  |
| 3017         | 19         | 1960       | 46  | 2090         | 1          | 1960       | 51  |
| 3028         | 3          | 1960       | 46  | 3017         | 12         | 1960       | 51  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D5: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 3017         | 002        | 1960       | 51  | 3216         | 2          | 1960       | 53  |
| 3017         | 21         | 1960       | 51  | 3419A        | 3          | 1960       | 53  |
| 3017         | 005        | 1960       | 51  | 4005         | 1          | 2004       | 53  |
| 3021         | 2          | 1960       | 51  | 4017         | 8          | 1960       | 53  |
| 3050         | 2          | 1960       | 51  | 4045         | 1          | 2002       | 53  |
| 3052         | 1          | 1960       | 51  | 4207         | 1          | 1960       | 53  |
| 3057         | 2          | 1960       | 51  | 4209         | 1          | 1960       | 53  |
| 3419A        | 2          | 1960       | 51  | 5029         | 17         | 1960       | 53  |
| 4017         | 7          | 1960       | 51  | 5029         | 26         | 1995       | 53  |
| 4407         | 3          | 1960       | 51  | 5038         | 3          | 2012       | 53  |
| 4414         | 1          | 2002       | 51  | 5205         | 1          | 1960       | 53  |
| 5007         | 11         | 2001       | 51  | 1025         | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 5041         | 1          | 1960       | 51  | 1027         | 2          | 1960       | 54  |
| 5048         | 3          | 1985       | 51  | 1027         | 1          | 1995       | 54  |
| 1013         | 2          | 2012       | 52  | 1028         | 3          | 1960       | 54  |
| 2022         | 2          | 1960       | 52  | 2022         | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 2057         | 1          | 1985       | 52  | 2091         | 1          | 2003       | 54  |
| 3012         | 3          | 1960       | 52  | 3014         | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 3017         | 22         | 1960       | 52  | 3017         | 20         | 1960       | 54  |
| 3018         | 2          | 1960       | 52  | 3017         | 27         | 1960       | 54  |
| 3048         | 2          | 1960       | 52  | 3054         | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 3058         | 1          | 2008       | 52  | 3201         | 2          | 1960       | 54  |
| 3201         | 1          | 1960       | 52  | 3421A        | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 3216         | 1          | 1960       | 52  | 4036         | 1          | 1960       | 54  |
| 4051         | 1          | 1960       | 52  | 4204         | 5          | 1960       | 54  |
| 4057         | 2          | 1960       | 52  | 4207         | 2          | 1960       | 54  |
| 4203         | 4          | 1960       | 52  | 4403B        | 1          | 2005       | 54  |
| 4204         | 4          | 1960       | 52  | 4407         | 2          | 1960       | 54  |
| 4414         | 2          | 1960       | 52  | 4425         | 2          | 1960       | 54  |
| 5007         | 22         | 1960       | 52  | 5007         | 32         | 1960       | 54  |
| 5007         | 12         | 1960       | 52  | 5007         | 30         | 1960       | 54  |
| 5007         | 009        | 1960       | 52  | 5029         | 27         | 1960       | 54  |
| 5018         | 15         | 1960       | 52  | 1043         | 1          | 2012       | 55  |
| 5040         | 4          | 1995       | 52  | 1044         | 1          | 1971       | 55  |
| 1042         | 2          | 1971       | 53  | 1049         | 1          | 1960       | 55  |
| 1044         | 2          | 1971       | 53  | 1078         | 2          | 1960       | 55  |
| 2023         | 1          | 1960       | 53  | 1079A        | 1          | 1960       | 55  |
| 2055         | 1          | 1971       | 53  | 1091         | 2          | 1960       | 55  |
| 2088         | 1          | 1960       | 53  | 1120         | 1          | 1960       | 55  |
| 3011         | 2          | 1960       | 53  | 2014         | 1          | 1971       | 55  |
| 3017         | 001        | 1960       | 53  | 3002         | 008        | 1960       | 55  |
| 3017         | 35         | 2000       | 53  | 3016         | 1          | 1960       | 55  |
| 3018         | 13         | 1960       | 53  | 3017         | 007        | 1960       | 55  |
| 3018         | 12         | 1960       | 53  | 3017         | 006        | 1960       | 55  |
| 3025         | 1          | 1960       | 53  | 3017         | 003        | 1960       | 55  |
| 3028         | 1          | 1960       | 53  | 3018         | 10         | 1960       | 55  |
| 3045         | 4          | 1960       | 53  | 3018         | 11         | 1960       | 55  |
| 3068         | 1          | 1960       | 53  | 3038         | 6          | 1960       | 55  |
| 3202         | 1          | 2012       | 53  | 3045         | 6          | 1960       | 55  |
| 3215         | 4          | 1960       | 53  | 3045         | 3          | 1960       | 55  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D6: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 4425         | 3          | 2002       | 55  | 5029         | 34         | 1960       | 58  |
| 5007         | 13         | 1985       | 55  | 1024         | 2          | 1960       | 59  |
| 5029         | 16         | 1960       | 55  | 1103         | 2          | 1998       | 59  |
| 5029         | 30         | 1960       | 55  | 1125         | 1          | 1960       | 59  |
| 5029         | 18         | 1960       | 55  | 3002         | 005        | 1960       | 59  |
| 1042         | 1          | 1971       | 56  | 3002         | 004        | 1960       | 59  |
| 1105         | 1          | 1960       | 56  | 3047         | 12         | 1960       | 59  |
| 2018         | 5          | 1970       | 56  | 3056         | 2          | 1960       | 59  |
| 2020         | 009        | 1971       | 56  | 3057         | 1          | 1960       | 59  |
| 2039         | 1          | 1960       | 56  | 4203         | 2          | 1960       | 59  |
| 3017         | 26         | 1960       | 56  | 4208         | 2          | 1960       | 59  |
| 3053         | 1          | 1960       | 56  | 4409         | 1          | 1960       | 59  |
| 3215         | 2          | 1960       | 56  | 5007         | 29         | 1960       | 59  |
| 3426         | 1          | 1960       | 56  | 5052         | 1          | 1960       | 59  |
| 4001         | 5          | 1960       | 56  | 2022         | 3          | 1960       | 60  |
| 4017         | 18         | 1960       | 56  | 2062         | 1          | 1960       | 60  |
| 4017         | 20         | 1960       | 56  | 3002         | 002        | 1960       | 60  |
| 4034         | 2          | 1960       | 56  | 3002         | 006        | 1960       | 60  |
| 5029         | 19         | 1960       | 56  | 3003         | 5          | 1960       | 60  |
| 5040         | 3          | 1960       | 56  | 3003         | 7          | 2003       | 60  |
| 2013         | 6          | 1971       | 57  | 3017         | 008        | 1975       | 60  |
| 2029         | 2          | 1970       | 57  | 3047         | 11         | 1960       | 60  |
| 2088         | 2          | 1960       | 57  | 3050         | 1          | 1960       | 60  |
| 2093         | 1          | 1960       | 57  | 3210         | 1          | 1960       | 60  |
| 3409         | 1          | 1960       | 57  | 3213         | 4          | 1960       | 60  |
| 4010         | 1          | 1960       | 57  | 3215         | 1          | 1960       | 60  |
| 4203         | 1          | 1960       | 57  | 4033         | 1          | 2014       | 60  |
| 5014         | 4          | 1960       | 57  | 4425         | 4          | 2003       | 60  |
| 5029         | 14         | 1960       | 57  | 5002         | 5          | 2000       | 60  |
| 5048         | 1          | 2005       | 57  | 5018         | 13         | 1960       | 60  |
| 1054         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 5040         | 6          | 1995       | 60  |
| 1055         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 5204         | 2          | 2004       | 60  |
| 1107         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 2019A        | 4          | 1960       | 61  |
| 2019A        | 3          | 1960       | 58  | 2020         | 004        | 1971       | 61  |
| 2020         | 008        | 1971       | 58  | 2020         | 005        | 1971       | 61  |
| 3002         | 001        | 1960       | 58  | 2054         | 1          | 1971       | 61  |
| 3003         | 8          | 1960       | 58  | 2059         | 1          | 1971       | 61  |
| 3018         | 15         | 1960       | 58  | 2081         | 1          | 1960       | 61  |
| 3018         | 9          | 1960       | 58  | 3037         | 1          | 1960       | 61  |
| 3032         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 3048         | 3          | 1960       | 61  |
| 3033         | 2          | 1960       | 58  | 5029         | 12         | 1960       | 61  |
| 3213         | 6          | 1960       | 58  | 5048         | 2          | 1960       | 61  |
| 4017         | 14         | 1960       | 58  | 1001         | 3          | 1975       | 62  |
| 4017         | 9          | 2004       | 58  | 1068         | 2          | 1960       | 62  |
| 4034         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 1071         | 1          | 1960       | 62  |
| 4038         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 2018         | 8          | 1977       | 62  |
| 4056         | 2          | 1960       | 58  | 2041         | 1          | 1960       | 62  |
| 4404         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 3040         | 5          | 1960       | 62  |
| 4424         | 1          | 1960       | 58  | 3046         | 2          | 1960       | 62  |
| 4424         | 3          | 1960       | 58  | 4208         | 1          | 1960       | 62  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D7: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Year of Last |            |            |     | Year of Last |            |            |     |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----|--------------|------------|------------|-----|
| Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI | Branch ID    | Section ID | Major Work | PCI |
| 4407A        | 2          | 1960       | 62  | 1129         | 1          | 1960       | 66  |
| 4416A        | 1          | 1960       | 62  | 2083         | 4          | 1960       | 66  |
| 4416A        | 2          | 1960       | 62  | 2083         | 5          | 1960       | 66  |
| 5007         | 15         | 1975       | 62  | 3004         | 2          | 1960       | 66  |
| 5014         | 1          | 1995       | 62  | 3018         | 17         | 1960       | 66  |
| 5029         | 21         | 2004       | 62  | 3065         | 1          | 1960       | 66  |
| 5202         | 1          | 2011       | 62  | 4203         | 3          | 1960       | 66  |
| 1040         | 1          | 1960       | 63  | 4405         | 2          | 1960       | 66  |
| 2012         | 1          | 1960       | 63  | 4413         | 1          | 2004       | 66  |
| 2020         | 11         | 1971       | 63  | 5018         | 3          | 1960       | 66  |
| 2042         | 1          | 1960       | 63  | 5040         | 7          | 1975       | 66  |
| 2059         | 2          | 1971       | 63  | 5203         | 1          | 1960       | 66  |
| 2083         | 9          | 1960       | 63  | 1103         | 1          | 1998       | 67  |
| 3060         | 1          | 1960       | 63  | 2019         | 2          | 1980       | 67  |
| 3211         | 1          | 1960       | 63  | 2019A        | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 4018         | 2          | 1960       | 63  | 2040         | 1          | 1960       | 67  |
| 4409         | 5          | 1960       | 63  | 2083         | 7          | 1960       | 67  |
| 5007         | 28         | 1975       | 63  | 3059         | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 1033         | 6          | 2012       | 64  | 3061         | 2          | 1995       | 67  |
| 2056         | 1          | 1971       | 64  | 3403         | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 2095         | 1          | 1960       | 64  | 3403A        | 1          | 2012       | 67  |
| 3032         | 2          | 1960       | 64  | 3407         | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 3051         | 4          | 1960       | 64  | 4401         | 1          | 2006       | 67  |
| 3051         | 1          | 1960       | 64  | 4404A        | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 3421A        | 4          | 1960       | 64  | 4411         | 3          | 2005       | 67  |
| 4011         | 1          | 1960       | 64  | 5002         | 2          | 1960       | 67  |
| 4411         | 2          | 1960       | 64  | 5020         | 6          | 1975       | 67  |
| 4419         | 2          | 1960       | 64  | 5023         | 1          | 1960       | 67  |
| 1078         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 5040         | 1          | 1975       | 67  |
| 1101         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 5202         | 2          | 2011       | 67  |
| 2022         | 4          | 1975       | 65  | 1009         | 3          | 1971       | 68  |
| 2053         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1010         | 5          | 1971       | 68  |
| 2083         | 10         | 1960       | 65  | 1010         | 3          | 1971       | 68  |
| 2085A        | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1010         | 6          | 1971       | 68  |
| 2101         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1033         | 4          | 2012       | 68  |
| 3017         | 28         | 1960       | 65  | 1038         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 3028         | 6          | 1997       | 65  | 1051         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 3047         | 10         | 1960       | 65  | 1061         | 2          | 2013       | 68  |
| 3215         | 3          | 1960       | 65  | 1074         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 3408A        | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1106         | 3          | 1960       | 68  |
| 4043         | 1          | 2012       | 65  | 1109         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 4412         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1121         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 4419         | 1          | 2004       | 65  | 1127         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 5018         | 12         | 1960       | 65  | 1127         | 3          | 1960       | 68  |
| 5018         | 11         | 1960       | 65  | 1128         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 5029         | 20         | 1960       | 65  | 1139         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 5045         | 1          | 1960       | 65  | 1140         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 1010         | 4          | 1971       | 66  | 1144         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 1037         | 1          | 1971       | 66  | 1145         | 1          | 1960       | 68  |
| 1127         | 2          | 1960       | 66  | 2014         | 2          | 1971       | 68  |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022



Table D8: Inyo County Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

|           |            | Year of Last |     |           |            | Year of Last |     |           |            |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-----|-----------|------------|--------------|-----|-----------|------------|
| Branch ID | Section ID | Major Work   | PCI | Branch ID | Section ID | Major Work   | PCI | Branch ID | Section ID |
| 2018      | 7          | 1977         | 68  | 1013      | 1          | 2011         | 70  |           |            |
| 2018      | 2          | 1980         | 68  | 1035      | 1          | 1971         | 70  |           |            |
| 2019      | 1          | 2010         | 68  | 1036      | 2          | 1971         | 70  |           |            |
| 3002      | 10         | 1960         | 68  | 1108      | 2          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3003      | 4          | 1960         | 68  | 2018      | 1          | 1970         | 70  |           |            |
| 3003      | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 2018      | 3          | 1980         | 70  |           |            |
| 3003      | 3          | 1960         | 68  | 2018      | 4          | 1995         | 70  |           |            |
| 3004      | 1          | 1975         | 68  | 2020      | 002        | 1971         | 70  |           |            |
| 3011      | 3          | 1960         | 68  | 2022      | 6          | 1985         | 70  |           |            |
| 3017      | 31         | 1960         | 68  | 2025      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3018      | 14         | 1960         | 68  | 2043      | 1          | 1971         | 70  |           |            |
| 3048      | 5          | 1960         | 68  | 2083      | 8          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3206      | 2          | 2004         | 68  | 2083      | 3          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3402A     | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 3003      | 2          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3412      | 2          | 1960         | 68  | 3011      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 4405A     | 2          | 1960         | 68  | 3025      | 2          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 4405A     | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 3029      | 3          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 4407A     | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 3047      | 14         | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 5002      | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 3213      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 5025      | 4          | 2011         | 68  | 3217      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 5040      | 10         | 1960         | 68  | 3403A     | 3          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 5040      | 5          | 1985         | 68  | 3403A     | 2          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 5070      | 1          | 1960         | 68  | 3404A     | 3          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 1033      | 10         | 1960         | 69  | 3406A     | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 1050      | 1          | 1960         | 69  | 3406A     | 3          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 2018      | 6          | 1980         | 69  | 3412      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 2083      | 2          | 1960         | 69  | 3414      | 2          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 3002      | 007        | 1960         | 69  | 4018A     | 18         | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3007      | 1          | 1960         | 69  | 4019      | 4          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 3017      | 33         | 1960         | 69  | 4023      | 2          | 2002         | 70  |           |            |
| 3024A     | 2          | 1960         | 69  | 4023      | 1          | 2003         | 70  |           |            |
| 3033      | 3          | 1960         | 69  | 4414      | 3          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3037      | 3          | 1960         | 69  | 4422      | 1          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3045      | 2          | 1960         | 69  | 4424      | 2          | 1960         | 70  |           |            |
| 3406      | 1          | 1960         | 69  | 5038      | 1          | 2012         | 70  |           |            |
| 3406      | 2          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3408      | 1          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3408A     | 2          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3414A     | 2          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3414A     | 3          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3419      | 3          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3423      | 1          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 3424      | 3          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 4018A     | 3          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 4037      | 2          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 4405      | 1          | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 5007      | 21         | 1960         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 5011      | 3          | 2004         | 69  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 1007      | 3          | 1977         | 70  |           |            |              |     |           |            |
| 1010      | 2          | 1971         | 70  |           |            |              |     |           |            |

Source: Inyo County LTC Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D9: City of Bishop Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Branch Name      | Sections | PCI | Branch Name      | Sections | PCI |
|------------------|----------|-----|------------------|----------|-----|
| ALLEY O          | 3        | 7   | HIGH STREET      | 2        | 32  |
| ALLEY E          | 4        | 9   | HOBSON STREET    | 3        | 32  |
| ALLEY T          | 2        | 11  | LAGOON STREET    | 4        | 32  |
| W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 11  | MAY STREET       | 7        | 32  |
| ALLEY H          | 2        | 13  | N. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 32  |
| E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 13  | W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 32  |
| ALLEY E          | 4        | 14  | W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 32  |
| ALLEY C          | 2        | 16  | ACADEMY STREET   | 3        | 33  |
| ALLEY C          | 2        | 16  | ALLEY F          | 4        | 33  |
| ALLEY J          | 1        | 16  | S. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 33  |
| W. SOUTH STREET  | 2        | 16  | S. WARREN STREET | 2        | 33  |
| MANDICH STREET   | 2        | 17  | W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 33  |
| CHURCH STREET    | 3        | 18  | W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 33  |
| ALLEY F          | 4        | 20  | W. YANEY STREET  | 5        | 33  |
| ALLEY R          | 3        | 20  | ALLEY I          | 2        | 34  |
| ALLEY E          | 4        | 21  | ROSE STREET      | 2        | 34  |
| ALLEY K          | 2        | 22  | W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 34  |
| N. SECOND STREET | 4        | 22  | WILLOW STREET    | 8        | 34  |
| CLARKE STREET    | 5        | 23  | ALLEY R          | 3        | 35  |
| E. YANEY STREET  | 3        | 24  | MAY STREET       | 7        | 35  |
| E. SOUTH STREET  | 4        | 25  | ROSE STREET      | 2        | 35  |
| N. SECOND STREET | 4        | 25  | ALLEY T          | 2        | 36  |
| SHORT STREET     | 4        | 25  | HOBSON STREET    | 3        | 36  |
| CHURCH STREET    | 3        | 26  | IRIS STREET      | 1        | 36  |
| HOWARD STREET    | 1        | 26  | N. SECOND STREET | 4        | 36  |
| ALLEY B          | 1        | 27  | SCHLEY STREET    | 3        | 36  |
| CLARKE STREET    | 5        | 27  | SYCAMORE DRIVE   | 1        | 36  |
| E. SOUTH STREET  | 4        | 27  | W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 36  |
| SHORT STREET     | 4        | 27  | W. YANEY STREET  | 5        | 36  |
| W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 27  | E. SOUTH STREET  | 4        | 37  |
| WILLOW STREET    | 8        | 27  | HAMMON STREET    | 4        | 37  |
| HAMMON STREET    | 4        | 28  | S. WARREN STREET | 2        | 37  |
| JOHNSTON DRIVE   | 1        | 28  | SCHLEY STREET    | 3        | 37  |
| MOFFETT DRIVE    | 1        | 28  | W. YANEY STREET  | 5        | 37  |
| W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 28  | WILLOW STREET    | 8        | 37  |
| W. YANEY STREET  | 5        | 28  | WILLOW STREET    | 8        | 37  |
| ALLEY E          | 4        | 29  | ALLEY G          | 2        | 38  |
| ALLEY S          | 1        | 29  | MAPLE STREET     | 1        | 38  |
| JAY STREET       | 1        | 29  | MAY STREET       | 7        | 38  |
| MAY STREET       | 7        | 29  | S. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 38  |
| N. FOWLER STREET | 6        | 29  | ALLEY F          | 4        | 39  |
| ALLEY K          | 2        | 30  | ALLEY O          | 3        | 39  |
| GROVE STREET     | 8        | 30  | HIGH STREET      | 2        | 39  |
| SCHLEY STREET    | 3        | 30  | ALLEY L          | 1        | 40  |
| W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 30  | ALLEY O          | 3        | 40  |
| W. SOUTH STREET  | 2        | 30  | E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 40  |
| N. FOWLER STREET | 6        | 31  | S. FOWLER STREET | 4        | 40  |
| W. YANEY STREET  | 5        | 31  | MANDICH STREET   | 2        | 41  |
| ALLEY A          | 1        | 32  | ALLEY P          | 3        | 42  |
| E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 32  | ALLEY P          | 3        | 42  |

Source: City of Bishop Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

Table D10: City of Bishop Roadway Segments with PCI of 70 or Less

| Branch Name      | Sections | PCI | Branch Name        | Sections | PCI |
|------------------|----------|-----|--------------------|----------|-----|
| E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 42  | N. FOWLER STREET   | 6        | 58  |
| KELSO ROAD       | 3        | 42  | PIONEER LANE       | 1        | 58  |
| BRUCE STREET     | 1        | 43  | WYE ROAD           | 2        | 58  |
| CENTRAL AVENUE   | 1        | 43  | SHORT STREET       | 4        | 59  |
| HAMMON STREET    | 4        | 43  | SIERRA STREET      | 6        | 59  |
| N. WARREN STREET | 6        | 43  | SNEDEN STREET      | 3        | 59  |
| E. ELM STREET    | 3        | 44  | WILLOW STREET      | 8        | 59  |
| N. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 44  | HANBY AVENUE       | 6        | 60  |
| S. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 44  | HOBSON STREET      | 3        | 60  |
| E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 45  | SPRUCE STREET      | 4        | 60  |
| HAMMON STREET    | 4        | 45  | WILLOW STREET      | 8        | 60  |
| KELSO ROAD       | 3        | 45  | BUSH STREET        | 1        | 61  |
| KEOUGH STREET    | 2        | 45  | SIERRA STREET      | 6        | 62  |
| KEOUGH STREET    | 2        | 45  | SIERRA STREET      | 6        | 63  |
| ALLEY D          | 2        | 46  | SPRUCE STREET      | 4        | 63  |
| E. LINE STREET   | 8        | 46  | HANBY AVENUE       | 6        | 64  |
| N. WARREN STREET | 6        | 46  | ALLEY F            | 4        | 65  |
| PARK AVENUE      | 1        | 46  | N. FOWLER STREET   | 6        | 65  |
| CLARKE STREET    | 5        | 47  | W. ELM STREET      | 7        | 65  |
| E. ELM STREET    | 3        | 47  | E. PINE STREET     | 8        | 66  |
| ACADEMY STREET   | 3        | 48  | E. PINE STREET     | 8        | 66  |
| ALLEY I          | 2        | 48  | GROVE STREET       | 8        | 66  |
| HANBY AVENUE     | 6        | 48  | COATS STREET       | 1        | 67  |
| N. FOWLER STREET | 6        | 48  | CROSBY STREET      | 1        | 67  |
| S. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 48  | E. SOUTH STREET    | 4        | 67  |
| W. ELM STREET    | 7        | 48  | N. SECOND STREET   | 4        | 67  |
| E. YANEY STREET  | 3        | 49  | GROVE STREET       | 8        | 68  |
| LAGOON STREET    | 4        | 49  | CHAMBERLAIN STREET | 1        | 69  |
| N. WARREN STREET | 6        | 49  | LAGOON STREET      | 4        | 69  |
| SIERRA STREET    | 6        | 49  |                    |          |     |
| ALLEY P          | 3        | 50  |                    |          |     |
| S. FOWLER STREET | 4        | 50  |                    |          |     |
| SIERRA STREET    | 6        | 50  |                    |          |     |
| ALLEY D          | 2        | 51  |                    |          |     |
| S. FIRST STREET  | 3        | 52  |                    |          |     |
| ALLEY R          | 3        | 53  |                    |          |     |
| MAY STREET       | 7        | 53  |                    |          |     |
| N. THIRD STREET  | 4        | 53  |                    |          |     |
| S. FIRST STREET  | 3        | 54  |                    |          |     |
| KELSO ROAD       | 3        | 55  |                    |          |     |
| S. FOWLER STREET | 4        | 55  |                    |          |     |
| W. PINE STREET   | 7        | 56  |                    |          |     |
| WHITNEY ALLEY    | 1        | 56  |                    |          |     |
| WILLOW STREET    | 8        | 56  |                    |          |     |
| ALLEY Q          | 3        | 57  |                    |          |     |
| CLARKE STREET    | 5        | 57  |                    |          |     |
| E. PINE STREET   | 8        | 57  |                    |          |     |
| ALLEY Q          | 3        | 58  |                    |          |     |
| E. YANEY STREET  | 3        | 58  |                    |          |     |
| MAY STREET       | 7        | 58  |                    |          |     |


Source: City of Bishop Pavement Management Program Update 2021/2022

**CRASH HISTORY FOR INYO COUNTY**

---

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Ten Year Collision History



Date: 3/19/2012



*This page intentionally left blank*

**A SIMPLIFIED OVERVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING**

---



*This page intentionally left blank*

# A SIMPLIFIED OVERVIEW OF FY 2022-23 TRANSPORTATION FUNDING: CHART 1\*



Note: SB 1 established new revenue mechanisms and rate increases (see narrative on pages 10 and 12 and Chart 3). This portion of the diagram only signifies newly created fees based on the passage of SB 1 (2017). Revenues from these fees are allocated to state entities and programs.

\* This document includes some but not all budget and accounting information. For more information on budget or accounting see <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/budgets> and <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov>.

\*\* State base excise tax also pays for the Aeronautics Account.