Section VII
SCAG's Response to Comments

SECTION VII

SCAG'S RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Table of Contents

Matrix of 2017 FTIP Comments with responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
FTIP 17-1	July 8, 2016	Sophie Steeno	Steeno Design Studio Inc.	Very comprehensive Update, thank you for sharing. We look forward to improvements all over and particularly in San Bernardino County.	Comment Noted	August 10,2016
FTIP 17-2	July 10, 2016	Dennis Bell	Private Citizen	Greetings, the online draft of this is bullshit. It jumps from page to page so it's unreadable. and the internet computers at the public library i use aren't set-up to send e-mails through the archaic outlook 2007.	SCAG has made every effort to make the document accessible and readable. SCAG staff reached out to Mr. Bell to offer how to access the document step by step. Mr. Bell's response is under comment #17-3. .	July 11, 2016
FTIP 17-3	July 11, 2016	Dennis Bell	Private Citizen	Thank you.	Comment noted.	N/A
FTIP 17-4	July 12, 2016	Caroline Smith	Private Citizen	As a long time public transit user, buses are becoming more spooky and dangerous. The new light rail are slow, noisy, eyesore and effective. I hope SCAG do not convert our region to a Chicago style streets, with full of these ugly light rail, that can receive graffities easily. In 1965 at the LA international expo, was a new type of suspended light rail from a that was very beautiful. SCAG should research these type of Smart light rails. Thank you for these opportunity, and I hove you make a Smart decision. Caroline Smith	The FTIP is developed through a "bottom-up" approach; projects are submitted by the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) as part of their county TIP. The RTP/SCS identifies the long range transit improvements planned for the region, including for bus and rail.	August 10,2016
FTIP 17-5	July 14, 2016	Tressy Capps	Toll Free IE	Suggested that the public hearings ought to be held in a different month other than July as many people travel during that month.	Comment noted. The FTIP Public Hearings were scheduled to adhere to State Department of Transportation's deadline for	July 14, 2016 (Public Hearing)

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
					statewide FTIP submittals (deadline is September 30, 2016)	
FTIP 17-6	July 21, 2016	Grace Alvarez	Riverside County Transportation Commission	RCTC appreciates the hard work SCAG does on behalf of the Riverside County, in particular the huge undertaking to review process and secure approvals for the 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The FTIP is an important programming document that implements the long-range Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy in compliance with federal requirements. Most importantly, it facilitates the utilization of state and federal funds to leverage local funds to implement important local and state highway improvements as well as providing funding for Active Transportation, transit and rail improvements and services in the region. The Riverside County portion of the FTIP was developed in cooperation with Caltrans, local agencies, and transit operators. As with most growing regions, Riverside County strives to improve transportation by providing alternatives to driving by implementing multimodal improvements and programs that reduce congestion and improve air quality. The 2017 FTIP includes 267 projects in Riverside County totaling a $5.7 billion investment in the next six years. We are excited to see the final stages of the 2017 FTIP approval and look forward to continuing to implement the planned improvements and moving our region forward.	Comment Noted	July 21, 2016 (Public Hearing)
FTIP 17-7	July 21, 2016	Ben Ku	Orange County Transportation Authority	Good Afternoon, My name is Ben Ku and I'm the Principal Transportation Funding Analyst here at the Orange County Transportation Authority. The projects programmed in 2017 FTIP are critical to the movement of people and goods throughout Orange County and would provide significant air quality benefits. Therefore it is crucial that the 2017 FTIP be approved in a timely manner.	Comment Noted	July 21, 2016 (Public Hearing)

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				I'd like to thank Maria Lopez and her FTIP staff at the Southern California Association of Governments on their excellent work putting together the 2017 FTIP. We realize it's a very difficult and intensive process and we'd like to especially thank Pablo Gutierrez for his dedication, patience, and guidance. OCTA appreciates SCAG's efforts and looks forward to continuing our partnership regarding the FTIP.		
FTIP 17-8	July 21, 2016	Peter DeHaan	Ventura County Transportation Commission	Mr. DeHaan expressed appreciation for the collaborative work by SCAG's staff on the 2017 FTIP. Additionally, as Ventura County does not have a local sales tax measure for transportation, the 2017 FTIP is of critical importance to Ventura County as it provides access to state and federal funding.	Comment Noted	July 21, 2016 (Public Hearing)
FTIP 17-9	July 21, 2016	Andrea Zureick	San Bernardino Associated Governments	Ms. Andrea Zureick endorsed the comments of previous speakers regarding the importance of the 2017 FTIP and appreciation for SCAG's staff's effort on the document which contains 2,000 projects.	Comment Noted	July 21, 2016 (Public Hearing)
FTIP 17-10	July 28, 2016	Abhijit J. Bagde, P.E. Senior Transportation Engineer Division of Transportation Programming	Caltrans	Hello Maria, Thank you very much for providing us an opportunity to review SCAG's Draft 2017 FTIP. My compliments to you and your staff for preparing an excellent document. Please include response to the comments below when submitting final 2017 FTIP to Caltrans. Let me know of any questions. Thank you. **General comments:** 1. Expedited Project Selection Procedures (EPSP), Technical Appendix, Volume II of III, Section iv, Attachment E:	Technical Appendix Volume II of III, Section IV Attachment E has been updated per suggested language.	July 28, 2016

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Below are suggested edits: · Move Highway Maintenance (HM) Program from Caltrans Local Assistance managed programs, and combine it with SHOPP in the paragraph above. **Financial Summary:** 1. STIP: 2016 STIP (IIP and RIP) financial information for the SCAG region is shown below. Please process an amendment to align the 2017 FTIP with the CTC adopted 2016 STIP. The FTIP amendment must be submitted to Caltrans by **September 30, 2016.** Also include any revenue/programming from the 2014 STIP (for the projects that received CTC allocation or time extension) under "STIP Prior" in the financial summary. **2016/17 2017/18 2018/19 201** **13,031k 168,763k 156,997k 152** 2. SHOPP: Please process an amendment to align the 2017 FTIP with the 2016 SHOPP. The FTIP amendment must be submitted to Caltrans by **September 30, 2016.** 3. Highway Maintenance (HM) Program: Include funding information for FY 2016/17 per link below through the first amendment to the 2017 FTIP. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/fedfiles/various_pgms/hwy_mtc/hwy_mtc_program.htm 4. Highway Bridge Program (HBP):	2016 STIP funding will be updated in Amendment #17-01. 2016 SHOPP funding will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Highway Maintenance (HM) Program will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Highway Bridge Program (HBP) will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Revenue/Programming is not consistent with the approved funding posted at the link below http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/list-updated.html		
				5. CMAQ: Revenue for FY 2016/17 is not consistent with the approved funding posted at the link below. Please clarify if the revenue includes any borrowed funds from other regions. If yes, then include footnote in the financial summary.	Footnote included in Financial Agreement summary to reflect exchange between SANBAG and SACOG dated September 3, 2014.	
				6. Include funding for the State Minor Program in the first amendment to the 2017 FTIP. See link below for information. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/fedfiles/various_pgms/minor/minor_pgm.htm	State Minor Program will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				7. Federal Transit Administration: 5310 Program funding is awarded by CTC on an annual basis. Explain the basis of revenue/programming for the 4-year cycle of the 2017 FTIP.	Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC) – 5310 funds from FY-13/14 added to project description in Amendment #17-01	
				Project Listings:		
				1. SHOPP Projects: Update programming for consistency with the 2016 SHOPP through Amendment No. 1. The FTIP amendment must be submitted to Caltrans by **September 30, 2016.**	– Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) is sub-recipient and can program funds in 2017 FTIP – Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is sub-recipient and can program funds in 2017 FTIP	
				2. LA0G872: 2016 SHOPP includes $32,970,000 for the construction phase as shown below that are not	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				programmed.		
				3. LA0D451: STIP-RIP funding in the amount of $55.6M has been deleted from the 2016 STIP. Please adjust the programming.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				4. LALS09: Include funding information under "State Minor Program" instead of "SHOPP" in the financial summary.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				5. ORA130060: This project has been deleted from the 2016 STIP as shown below.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				6. RIV031215: Per 2016 STIP, hange fund type "Local Funds" instead of "STIP-AC" for $33,402,000 as shown below.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				7. RIV071267: Change the fund type from "CMAQ-AC" to "CMAQ".	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				8. RIV131202: Include construction phase cost in total project cost (PTC) in the project description.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				9. SBD 20159902: Per 2016 STIP, RIP funding of $39,745,000 is programmed in FY 2020/21.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				10. SBD 34770: Realign IIP funding as shown below.	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	
				11. ORA020501: HBP funding programmed in FY 2016/17 is not consistent with the approved funding posted at the link	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				below. Please update programming through Amendment No. 1. http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/2016/March/Lump_Sum_Program_Lists/2016_03_29_Dist12_OrangeCountyTransporLumpSumItem.pdf 12. SBDLS08: HBP funding programmed in FYs 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2019/20 is not consistent with the approved funding posted at the link below. Please update programming through Amendment No. 1. http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/2016/March/Lump_Sum_Program_Lists/2016_03_29_Dist08_SanBernardinoAssociaLumpSumItem.pdf 13. VENLS07: HBP funding programmed is not consistent with the approved funding posted at the link below. Please update programming through Amendment No. 1. http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/2016/March/Lump_Sum_Program_Lists/2016_03_29_Dist07_VenturaCountyTranspoLumpSumItem.pdf 14. LA0F075: Update STIP funding per 2016 STIP shown below. 15. LA0D198: Change fund type from Surface Trans Prog – RIP" to "RIP – STIP AC".	Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01. Project will be updated in Amendment #17-01.	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
FTIP 17-11	August 8, 2016	Pete Sluis	Private Citizen - San Dimas	***updated***8/8/2016 ***FINAL*** Project ID - LA0G1092 "Lone Hill Avenue to Control Point (CP) White Double Track. With the proposed 3.9 mile project segment, an existing siding will be lengthened to provide 8.1 miles of continuous double track between Lone Hill Ave and CP Central." I am very strongly opposed to this project and would ask that it be eliminated from the Federal Transportation Improvement Program. This double tracking is in a San Dimas residential neighborhood which currently is under much duress from Metrolink operations which run from roughly 4:30 AM until past Midnight and on which Metrolink has never performed an Environmental Impact Study nor taken any mitigating noise, vibration or safety measures. Our residents now endure noise and vibration levels greatly exceeding FRA levels considered extreme, and this unacceptable condition will continue even after BSNF locomotives are removed, though that will be a needed improvement. This was once a very infrequently used freight line generally consisting of a few freight cars running at a very slow speed converted by Metrolink into what is now a mostly commuter rail line running 40 speeding trains daily past our neighborhood homes, blaring horns and shaking houses with the deadliest commuter rail service in America, often with nearly empty trains. An estimated 375 people attended a recent Metrolink community event in San Dimas a few days after Memorial Day in response to the current intolerable conditions and this will just make it worse. When this was mentioned by Metrolink at that community horn meeting an audible negative reaction was heard. Since then nothing further has been directly communicated to San Dimas residents about this and this obscure project inclusion doesn't even refer to San Dimas nor is it something that a resident would routinely be aware of. Having this short extension of a current double track into a residential neighborhood would appear to have little or no real benefit at a large cost with many drawbacks. Obviously this would place the tracks closer to residents in this narrow corridor and increase unacceptable noise levels and vibrations experienced at a residence. The idling train would be the source of more pollution and its passengers would invade the privacy of peoples backyards, windows and personal space	The FTIP like the RTP/SCS is based on a "bottom-up approach". The CTCs are the lead agencies that are in charge of prioritizing projects within their respective counties. As such, SCAG cannot unilaterally delete or change projects that are contained in the FTIP. The project is in the beginning stage and is programmed as a planning study project. SCAG staff reached out to Los Angeles County Transportation Authority (LA Metro) and received the following response: *"Thank you for your comments on the Lone Hill to White Double Track Project, as part of the public comment on the draft SCAG FTIP for 2017.This proposed project would add 3.9 miles of a new second main line track along corridor in the cities of San Dimas and La Verne, between Lone Hill Ave. and White Ave. There are two existing main line tracks east of Control Point (CP) White.* *This is an important project for regional mobility that would benefit many stakeholders. The project includes safety improvements for passengers and communities. The safety improvements made to the crossings will make the crossings qualify for Quiet Zones, should the cities decide to pursue them. This will eliminate the most prohibitive barrier to cities establishing quiet*	August 8, 2016

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				while it towers above waiting to return to the single track. The trains Metrolink utilizes were never meant to be deployed in quiet and peaceful residential neighborhoods and this would even make the current situation more unbearable. Our mayor recently wrote the FRA regarding train horn impacts and he stated approximately 18% of San Dimas residents reside within 1000 feet of the rail corridor and have been living with the nuisance of train horns for years. That equates to 6,000 San Dimas residents, many of whom would now be further compromised. I would estimate up to 1,000 residents have line of sight contact with this line or directly abut, some as near as 5 yards separated at times by just chain link or wrought iron fences. In the event of a train derailment, which has occurred on Metrolink, just not yet in a residential neighborhood, having residences even closer would pose a greater safety hazard, risking resident's lives. Another safety hazard is created when the trains are occupying both tracks which creates a very dangerous situation. This happened just this year in Corona when a young couple walking together waited for an eastbound train to pass and the 19 year old man was killed by a westbound train they hadn't seen. Having a single track is obviously safer and preferable for communities and that condition should remain. As residents we are also concerned about physical health issues, mental health issues, sleep deprivation, devalued property values and a declining quality-of-life all attributable to Metrolink and this unnecessary double track project will make all those worse. While this project is listed at $3 million, the San Gabriel Valley Subregion project list says the agency minimum cost to build just this short extension into a residential community is $68 million (and probably much higher because that was quoted at 3.1 miles versus the 3.9 listed here) and will certainly be fought by both residents and taxpayers. Many, many miles of single track exist on this line and to choose a residential community which has suffered so much, for a short double track costing so much and with so many negatives, is just plain wrong. And after the Metrolink Northridge double track project was recently put on hold for similar reasons as expressed here, this should have been a non-starter.	*zones.* *Additionally, the double-track will enable Metrolink to reduce delays to passengers and result in fewer emissions that result from idling. Both delays and idling occurs when trains have to wait for another train to pass.* *Double-tracking has various safety benefits. There is a reduced risk of head-on collisions which can occur on single track. Additionally, the will be safety measures such as additional crossing gates added at each crossing.* *Metro is beginning the environmental process which includes noise and vibration studies. It will also include several formal meetings with communities for them to express any concerns. As part of the process Metro will provide answers and, where possible, solutions for these concerns. Metro will begin its public outreach and coordination in late 2016 and is working to share some initial results with the public in early 2017.* *Metro is aware that there are residential homes within 1000 feet from the tracks and Metro will be happy to meet with you and the affected communities in person to discuss any issues and concerns for the Lone Hill to White project before the environmental document is released.* *The Metrolink San Bernardino line has the heaviest ridership in the*	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Finally it should also be noted that in my opinion reckless inaction with safety issues by Metrolink on this particular rail segment needs to be addressed and in an expedited manner. I would have Metrolink expedite and fund a complete EIS from the baseline that existed before they arrived, implement the extremely safe "quiet zones" to address safety and noise issues as well as any additional EIS issues, before any non-safety spending is done here. This very segment has had Metrolink collisions with a bus, a truck and pedestrian fatalities, including one just this week, on 8/3/2016. Turning a blind eye to safety, health, and quality-of-life issues for corridor residents who were here before Metrolink is inexcusable and safety measures should no longer be delayed or tied to other projects or new possible revenues. Pete Sluis San Dimas CA	*Metrolink system, with approximately 11,000 boardings per weekday. SCRRA's agreement for the BNSF locomotive will end as early as November 2016 and the locomotives are currently being phased out which should help to significantly reduce noise impacts along the corridor.* *We are confident we can work together to address these concerns so that this project may move forward to benefit the many stakeholders in the region.* *We look forward to our continued conversation."*	
FTIP 17-12	August 8, 2016	Ben Cacatian, Air Quality Specialist Planning, Rules & Incentives Division	Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	Hello, Pablo. I am submitting the following comments for the Draft 2017 FTIP: 1) II-26 Latest ARB Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets using EMFAC2014 v1.0.7 are: Yr2018 ROG=6/tpd & NOx=8/tpd and Yr2020 ROG=5/tpd & NOx=7/tpd. No Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets are available for 2030 and 2040. 2) III-6 Applicable TCM projects Landuse Strategies and Transit Strategies are two separate and distinct TCM categories. This is shown separately in both the 1995 and 2007 VC AQMPs. 3) The 2016 RTP/SCS Table 81.1 showed the VEN110308 Thousand Oaks project as ongoing. It is not shown in section III of the 2017 FTIP. 4) The 2016 RTP/SCS Table 81.2 shows completed TCMs in the timely implementation report.	1) The latest budgets have not been approved by U.S. EPA. 2) The TCM categories have been revised to be consistent with those in 2007 VC AQMP. 3) VEN110308 was complete as noted in Final 2016 RTP/SCS Transportation Conformity Analysis Appendix Table 57. 4) Completed projects in previous FTIPs are not carried over to the current FTIP. The completed TCMs in the 2016 RTP/SCS are also the	August 8, 2016

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Shouldn't these TCMs also be shown as complete in the 2017 FTIP? If not, where have they been documented in a previous FTIP as completed? 5) Table III-5.2 of the 2017 FTIP shows Bernardino County in the heading. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to review and comment on the Draft 2017 FTIP. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.	completed TCMs in the 2015 FTIP Consistency Amendment #15-12. 5) The typo has been corrected.	
FTIP 17-13	August 8, 2016	Joyce Dillard	Private Citizen	We question the use of funds for the following projects: PROJECT LIST A Project: LA0G1147 Agency: Paramount Description: Garfield Avenue Improvements from 70th Street to Howery Street – widen street 1 to 4 feet for 2 miles to accommodate a third lane in each direction requiring partial takes from 2 parcels, add medians, narrow existing medians, add second left turn lane in all directions at two intersections, Rosecrans Ave. and Alondra Blvd., resurface street, concrete intersections, traffic signal improvements, street lights, underground utilities, "green street" improvements, and stormwater and watershed BMPs. COMMENTS: This is related to the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS004001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System MS4 permitting in relationship to green street improvements, stormwater and watershed BMPS. This is not a transportation project but a voluntary compliance to an Enhanced Watershed Management Plan and no transportation funding should be used. Caltrans responsibility is not identified. City of Long Beach is separate under Order No. R4-2014-0024. PROJECT LIST B	The FTIP has no legal authority over local land use or the implementation of local General Plan(s), including storm water matters which falls under the purview of local jurisdictions. The FTIP is a programming document for financial and air quality planning purposes. The FTIP like the RTP/SCS is based on a "bottom-up approach". The CTCs are the lead agencies and are in charge of prioritizing projects within their respective counties. As such, SCAG cannot unilaterally delete or change projects that are contained in the FTIP. The project scope is identified by the sponsoring agency. It is not unusual for transportation projects to have more than one benefit. Each project may have more than one fund type, each with its own eligibility requirements from the	August 8, 2016

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Project: EA5 28660 Description: Route 001: In Long Beach, Signal Hill And Lakewood On Various Routes At Various Locations. Mitigate For Stormwater Quality By Installing Bio- Filtration Swales, Basins, Media Filters And Gross Solid Removal Devices, And Other Best Management Practices (Bm Project: EA5 28670 Description: Route 001: In The Cities Of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Signal Hill, Lakewood, Carson, And Hawthorn On Various Routes At Various Loaction. Mitigate For Stormwater Quality By Using Best Management Practices (Bmp'S). Project: EA5 30040 Description: Route 101: In The Cities Of Los Angeles And Calabasas, At Various Locations From Alameda Street To Mureau Road. Mitgate For Stormwater Quality By Installing Best Management Practices (Bmp'S) And Stabilizing Soil Erosion. Project: EA5 31230 Description: Route 014: In And Near Santa Clarita, From North Of Sierra Highway To South Of Soledad Canyon Road, At Various Locations. Install Storm Water Mitigation Devices. Project: EA5 31250 Description: Route 005: Near Gorman, From Route 138 To South Of Frazier Mountain Park Road, At Various Locations. Install Storm Water Mitigation Devices Project: EA5 31280 Description: Route 014: Near Santa Clarita And Palmdale At Various Locations, From South Of Soledad Canyon Road To South Of Mountain Spring Road. Install Storm Water Mitigation Devices. Project: EA5 28150 Description: Route 101: Near Hidden Hills, From Calabasas Parkway In Los Angeles County To Hampshire Road In Ventura County. Storm	funding agency or project sponsor.	

Comment ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response	Acknowledgement of Receipt
				Water Mitigation Through Erosion Control. Project: EA5 28920 Description: Route 710: In Various Cities, From North Of Rosecrans Avenue To Ford Boulevard Ramps. Storm Water Mitigation Through Erosion Control. COMMENTS: COMMENTS: This is related to the LA Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region ORDER NO. R4-2012-0175 NPDES PERMIT NO. CAS004001 Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System MS4 permitting in relationship to green street improvements, stormwater and watershed BMPS. This is not a transportation project but a voluntary compliance to an Enhanced Watershed Management Plan and no transportation funding should be used. Caltrans responsibility is not identified. City of Long Beach is separate under Order No. R4-2014-0024. Joyce Dillard P.O. Box 31377 Los Angeles, CA 90031		
FTIP 17-14	August 8, 2016	Michael Morris	FHWA – Cal South	FHWA is agreeable with SCAG's Draft 2017 FTIP. As also indicated previously we're happy to have observed the CMP section in the document whereby the new process eliminates the $50M threshold for single occupant vehicle (SOV) capacity increasing project CMP evaluations. Respectfully, Michael Morris Jr. Southern CA Transportation Planner FHWA Cal-South	Comment Noted	August 8, 2016