Section VI
SCAG's Responses to Comments

SECTION VI

SCAG'S RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Table of Contents

Page

Response to Comments.....VI-1

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-101	June 26	Marcie Malaster	Santa Monica Big Blue Bus	Asked about project LA973503 to see if it was reflected correctly in Draft 2006 RTIP. Marcie RTIP staff looked at the Draft 2006 RTIP and the project was reflected correctly. She said that MTA distributed flyers with the incorrect public hearing date (June 26 instead of June 29)	Marcie and RTIP staff looked at project LA973503 in the Draft 2006 RTIP. The project was reflected correctly.
RTIP 06-102	July 6	Carol Herrera	City of Diamond Bar	Wrote letter asking SCAG to include the 57/60 Freeway Interchange project on both the SCAG RTP and RTIP lists.	Wrote response letter on July 10. The 57/60 Interchange project is in the RTP and Draft 2006 RTIP.
RTIP 06-103	July 6	Carol Herrera	Four Corners Transportation Coalition	Wrote letter asking SCAG to include the 57/60 Freeway Interchange project, the completion of SR-71 from SR-60 to I-10, improvements to the SR-91 corridor, and improvements to the Pine/Schleisman/Arlington corridor on both the SCAG RTP and RTIP lists.	Wrote response letter on July 10. All four projects are in the RTP. The Pine/Schleisman/Arlington Corridor project has not yet advanced to the programming stage so it is not in the Draft 2006 RTIP. The other three projects are in the Draft 2006 RTIP.
RTIP 06-104	July 7	Douglas Dunlap	City of Pomona	Wrote letter asking SCAG to include the 57/60 Freeway Interchange project, the completion of SR-71 from SR-60 to I-10, improvements to the SR-91 corridor, and improvements to the Pine/Schleisman/Arlington corridor on both the SCAG RTP and RTIP lists.	Wrote response letter on July 10. All four projects are in the RTP. The Pine/Schleisman/Arlington Corridor project has not yet advanced to the programming stage so it is not in the Draft 2006 RTIP. The other three projects are in the Draft 2006 RTIP.
RTIP 06-105	July 7	Frank Hall	City of Norco	Wrote letter asking SCAG to include the 57/60 Freeway Interchange project, the completion of SR-71 from SR-60 to I-10, improvements to the SR-91 corridor, and improvements to the Pine/Schleisman/Arlington corridor on both the SCAG RTP and RTIP lists.	Wrote response letter on July 10. All four projects are in the RTP. The Pine/Schleisman/Arlington Corridor project has not yet advanced to the programming stage so it is not in the Draft 2006 RTIP. The other three projects are in the Draft 2006 RTIP.
RTIP 06-106	July 10	Paul Fagan	Caltrans - District 8	Wrote e-mail stating that the San Bernardino-395 corridor project was not listed in the Draft 2006 RTIP.	Staff responded that the project is in the RTIP under the "Previously Obligated Projects" section.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-107	July 12	Ilene Gallo	Caltrans - Division of Transportation Planning	There is no mention of Interagency coordination with SCAG region tribes in the Executive Summary Interagency Coordination portion of Volume 1 Draft 2006 RTIP. I am aware that SCAG is working with the Tribes on regional issues and is working to include Tribal representatives on the SCAG Regional Council and committees. Hopefully this is an oversight, however, you may want to check your records and amend the section to include discussion of SCAG's tribal interagency coordination in relation to this 2006 draft RTIP.	For nearly three years, the Southern California Association of Governments has been meeting with federally-recognized Tribal Governments in the region, in order to engage the Tribal Governments in SCAG's regional transportation planning and programming processes. In June 2006, the SCAG General Assembly approved By-laws changes that provide Tribal Governments with one voting seat on the SCAG Regional Council, two voting seats on each Policy Committee (Transportation & Communications; Community Economic and Human Development; and Energy & Environment) and a voting seat on the Administration Committee. The Tribal Governments have selected the Tribal Council member that will sit on the SCAG Regional Council , and will be meeting to fill the other policy committee seats. SCAG sent the Draft 2006 RTIP to the Tribal Governments for their review, as part of the July 2006 Regional Council and TCC Agendas and attachments. SCAG also sent a copy of the notice of availability and public hearing for the Draft 2006 RTIP to each of the tribal governments in the SCAG region.
RTIP 06-108	July 18	Ken Lobeck	RCTC	Wrote e-mail asking to shift $2,000,000 from Right of Way in FY 06-07 to Construction in FY 06-07 for the Jurupa Ave. undercrossing project.	Staff responded and made the requested change in the Final 2006 RTIP.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	**Technical Appendix, Volume II, Section IV, Financial Plan:** EPSP language needs to state that the projects within first 3 years from 2007 FTIP have been selected through EPSP.	The language is included in the EPSP "Project Programming" section.
				1. Per information provided by our office dated April 27, Subject: "SHOPP Report For SCAG", The total programming/revenue information for FYs 2006/07 and 2007/08 are $512,840,000 and $835,388,000 respectively. However, the SCAG Regional Financial Plan shows $540,155,000 and $842,788,000 for FYs 2006/07 and 2007/08 respectively. Please clarify the discrepancies.	The SHOPP contains a notation that the Minor A program totals are included in this figure. The Minor A will be separated from the SHOPP total.
				2. 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan: Explain source information for $19,854, 000.	The 2006 RTIP projects were changed for consistency with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.
				Also it appears that 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan funding is included in STIP. But the information referenced above includes funding for both STIP and SHOPP projects.	Split ROW Revenue between SHOPP and STIP
				Also per above information funding available to SCAG region is $55,251,000 for FY 2006/07 compared with $77,030,000 reported as available revenue.	The 2006 RTIP projects were changed for consistency with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	3. CMAQ and RSTP Programs: Please compare the available revenue reported on the financial plan with the information sent by Cathy Gomes on February 8, subject: 2006 FSTIP Estimates (CMAQ & RSTP), and make corrections as required.	CMAQ includes adjustments for Imperial & Ventura. Imperial' 6/7 revenue was increased by $900,000 for payback from SACOG. Also 6/7 contains an adjustment for Ventura for deobligation of funds due in 6/7. Los Angeles CMAQ revenue figures were adjusted for consistency with 2/8/06 Caltrans transmittal. The RSTP SCAG Regional Total reflected in the February 8 Caltrans transmittal does not include Imperial County's apportionment in the grand total.
				4. HBRR Program: Per information that was sent on March 27, available revenues for FYs 2007/08 and 2008/09 are $58,354,000 and $113,551,000 respectively. Please clarify.	Per discussions with Abhijit Bagde on 7/21 Caltrans concurs that SCAG's figures are accurate.
				5. Emergency Repair Program: Please refer to the information transmitted for March 28 CFPG meeting for instructions for programming this project.	Corrected SCAG lump sum fund source to ER-State (was NH)
				6. Other Federal Highway Programs: Please provide back-up information for "Other" Federal Highway Programs.	SCAG will provide the data.
				7. STIP Programming: Reference: Spreadsheet from your e-mail dated July 18. a. Los Angeles County: The revenue and programming does not match with the adopted 2006 STIP.	SCAG will provide a listing of STIP projects to be included in the 2006 RTIP Amendment #1. The revenue matches the adopted 2006 STIP.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	b. Riverside County STIP Reconciliation: The summary sheet submitted by SCAG for Riverside County does not tie to the authorized STIP. Please provide additional details or a reconciliation of the amounts. The revenue amounts as stated on the SCAG summary sheet is the programmed amounts per CTIPS for FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09, but the programmed amount per SCAG is approximately $22M less. The revenue amount for FY 2006/07 per SCAG summary sheet includes $49M of STIP/RIP prior commitments - please provide a reconciliation of this amount.	A reconciliation will be provided with the final document.
				c. Adjust the RW funding programmed for prior SHOPP/STIP projects per our discussion on July 17.	The 2006 RTIP projects were changed for consistency with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.
				8. Revise the funding for STIP in the "SCAG Regional Financial Plan" per No. 7 above.	
				Project Listings	
				1. For 2006 STIP projects programmed in FTIP change STIP RIP/IIP "federal funds" (NHS, STP) to "State Cash" or "PTA" for transit projects per attached CTC Resolution adopting the 2006 STIP. The 2006 STIP Resolution that states except for TEA and GARVEE debt service payments all STIP projects will be funded through non federal funds.	This has been completed.
				I have identified few projects below. Please make sure that for all STIP projects in 2007 FTIP are consistent with the adopted 2006 STIP.	This has been completed.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/STIP2006/Files/2006%20STIP%20Adoption%20Resolution.pdf LA0D73B, LA000358, LA000357, LA996134, IMP0021, ORA020109, LA29202N, 1238J	This has been completed.
				2. LA0D73B: Please refer to e-mail sent by me on June 12, 2006, Subject "FY 2006/07 Right of Way Allocation Plan".	This has been completed.
				Per FY 2006/07 Right of Way Allocation Plan RW phase funding allocated is $1,750,000 compared to $36,513,000 programmed in draft FTIP.	The 2006 RTIP projects were revised with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.
				General comments for programming prior RW funding: Please make sure that projects that have RW funding programmed in the prior years, RW funding programmed needs to be from the last column, 2006/07 FY Planned R/W Expenditures, of the attached allocation plan.	This has been completed.
				Also make sure that revenue for these projects (that are not programmed in 2007 FTIP as part the 2006 STIP and 2006 SHOPP projects) as "STIP Prior" or "SHOPP Prior" under "State Highway Account Funds" in the project listings and in the Financial Summary Form for 2007 FTIP. (See attached file: 2006-07 RW Allocation Capital CTC Book Item.pdf)	This has been completed.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	3. LA000357: TCRP funding is not consistent with the list that was presented to CTC in June. Please refer to the e-mail from me dated June 6, Subject "Projected Allocations for TCRP Projects".	See #18 for response (duplicate comment)
				4. LA998410, COUNTYVEN001004 - Soundwall Program: Provide back-up project list for this lump sum project.	Will provide back-up listing with the final 2006 RTIP
				5. IMPL502: Funding programmed is less than the SHOPP report transmitted to SCAG on April 27. Clarify if this is because non-exempt projects are listed separately.	The programming amounts in project IMPLS02 match the figures reflected in the April 27 SHOPP Caltrans transmittal. (6/7 $2,383; 7/8 $8,358 and 9/10 $5,539)
				6. IMP0021: Please refer to e-mail sent by me on June 12, 2006, Subject "FY 2006/07 Right of Way Allocation Plan". Per FY 2006/07 Right of Way Allocation Plan RW phase funding allocated is $11,924,000 compared to $17,854,000 programmed in draft FTIP. Is this project	The 2006 RTIP projects were changed for consistency with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.
				7. LALS09, VENLS06: Provide back-up project list for this lump sum project. Change the fund type to "State Cash".	Minor A Lump sum project listing will be transmitted with final 2006 RTIP. The fund source for VENLS06 was updated to State Cash.
				8. LA996343, LAE0340: Program High Priority Projects Program (HPP) projects per attached guidance. (See attached file: High Priority Projects Example.pdf). Note: Please correct programming of all HPP projects per above guidelines.	Further coordination required with Commissions/IVAG and project sponsors and SCAG will submit all changes in 2006 RTIP Amendment #1.
				9. LA450022: Provide back-up project list for this lump sum project.	Will provide back-up listing with the final 2006 RTIP

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	10. ORA981101: Is this project funded through 2006 SHOPP. Provide back-up project list for this lump sum project.	ORA981101 is programming a 2006 SHOPP - Emergency Reponse project. The funding and fund source is consistent with the 2006 SHOPP April 27 Caltrans transmittal.
				12. ORA990906 and ORA990907: Provide project lists for these TEA lump sum projects. Also program matching funds.	Will provide back-up listing with the final 2006 RTIP
				13. Imperial County 0520A: Could not locate the project in 2006 STIP with funding of $276,000 programmed in FY 2008/09.	The funding PPNO 520A of $3.300 million in 8/9 less negative programming of $1.512million and ($907,000) leaving a net programming amount of $276,000 in 8/9(figures in Green CTC adopted 2006
				14. LA0D356: Clarify if "BONDL" funding is available or committed.	MTA confirms that the bond funds are committed funds.
				15. LA0D193, LA0D194: FTIP programming does not show IIP GARVEE Debt Service Payments as shown below. (Embedded image moved to file: pic26434.jpg) (Embedded image moved to file: pic28405.jpg)	The projects were updated to include the IIP Garvee debt service payments.
				16. LA990305: STIP portion for this project is funded through PTA as shown below. Please make corrections as required. (Embedded image moved to file: pic15263.jpg)	The fund source is now consistent with the adopted STIP
				17. LA0C10: $314,653,000 are funded through "PTA" and not from "STATE Cash". Please make corrections as required. (Embedded image moved to file: pic16920.jpg)	The fund source is now consistent with the adopted STIP

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	18. TCRP Projects: I have identified few projects below for which the funding is inconsistent with List of TCRP projects (attached below) presented at the June CTC meeting. Please make sure funding programmed for all projects is consistent with the list below that was presented to CTC. LA0C53, LA000357, LA0B951: Programming is not consistent with the schedule submitted to TCRP Office. (See attached file: 3.8 Att 1 future allocations vfin1.xls)	Duly noted.
				19. Prior Year STIP Projects: Reference: My e-mail dated May 25, 2006, Subject: Carry Over of 2004 STIP Projects into 2007 FTIP (See attached file: FY 2005-06 Project List With Status - May 9th 2006.xls). Please confirm if the following projects are programmed in FTIP. PPNOs: 3415, 3401, 3176 PPNO: 3141, 3140 are these included in a lump sum project. Please clarify.	**Los Angeles County** - 3415 is MPO ID LA0C8250 in Monrovia and the fund source was updated. PPNO 3401 and 3176 are not programmed and will be added in the first amendment. **Ventura County** - PPNO 3141 and 3140 are programmed under VEN001004 a lump sum in the state highway section.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	20. Many projects have different phases programmed across several fiscal years. For example PE, R/W, and or Con may have amounts for each phase programmed in 06/07, 07/08, 08/09. For most of these projects, it does not appear that they would require separate contracts for each phase. Projects should be reviewed and necessary corrections made. Several examples in San Bernardino are as follows: Project ID: 2002160 - construction is shown in 08/09 and 09/10 Project ID: 43320 - construction is shown in prior, 06/07, 07/08, 11/12 Project ID: 200152 - all phases are shown in several years	Further coordination required with Commissions/IVAG and project sponsors and SCAG will submit all changes in 2006 RTIP Amendment #1.
				21. Project ID #45600, Riverside County, Riverside Co. State Highway, shows R/W costs of $7,832 in 06/07. The Authorized STIP shows $8,629. Please make sure that FTIP programming is consistent with STIP.	The 2006 STIP reflects a negative $797 in the prior year column. The $8,629 less the $797 leaves $7,832, the amount which is programmed.
				22. Right of Way - Carryover Amounts from Prior Year - Only the amounts listed as 2006/07 Planned R/W Expenditures listed in the R/W Allocation Plan distributed by Abhijit Bagde in e-mail dated 6/12/06 may be carried over from the prior year. This correct amount to enter in the FTIP is the last column of the attachment and not the initial programmed R/W .	The 2006 RTIP projects were changed for consistency with the 2006/07 ROW Allocation Plan.
				23. TCRP Projects - Project ID 43320 - The FTIP does not reflect the expenditure plan per the TCRP.	San Bernardino County - Project 43320 splits the TCRP between 06/07 and 07/08

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-109	July 19	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	24. Project ID 200606 - Project is not included in the authorized STIP, yet shows State Cash in FY 2006/07.	This is a San Bernardino Minor A project.
				25. Project ID 0H760 - Project is not included in the authorized STIP, yet shows State Cash in FY 2006/07.	This is a San Bernardino Minor A project.
				26. Project ID 33390 - Project shows State Cash in 06/07 in FTIP, authorized STIP shows State Cash in FY 2009/10.	This is a San Bernardino Minor A project.
				27. Project ID 43320 -The FTIP does not reflect the expenditure plan per the TCRP.	Duplicate - same as comment #23
				28. Project ID 20620 - The FTIP shows different prior year amounts for RIP funds than the authorized STIP.	Fund source changed per 2006 STIP. The programmed amount in 07/08 matches the 2006 STIP and CTIPS
				29. Unable to fully reconcile TCRP projects to the CTC approved TCRP expenditure list for San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.	Reconciliation will be transmitted with final document
				30. CMAQ Projects: (See attached file: General CMAQ Comments V2.doc)	Duplicate - same as comment #8
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	**TCM Comments** 1) I could not find the following TCMs from the 04 RTIP in the timely implementation listing. Please makes sure they are either included appropriately or let FHWA know why they are not included.	

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	LA8STIP13	This project is listed as completed in 2004 RTIP (p. iii-21) and therefore was not included in the 2006 RTIP Timely Implementation Report
				LA0C37	This project is listed as completed in 2004 RTIP (p. iii-23); therefore it was not included in the 2006 RTIP Timely Implementation Report
				LA0D340	This project is not listed in the 2004 Timely Implementation report. In the Draft 2006 RTIP it is listed on page 38.
				LA0C8364	This project is listed on page 28 in Draft 2006 RTIP
				LA0D180	This project is not in 2004 Timely Implementation report. Furthermore, the project consists of road widening and does not meet the definition of a TCM in the SCAB, the final 2004 RTIP reflects this change (project is listed as non-exempt)
				LA0D189	Based on the project description this project is not a TCM; this was corrected in the final 2004 RTIP
				LA974129	Listed on page 33 in the 2006 RTIP Timely Implementation Report
				LA0C8130	Listed on page 34 in 2006 RTIP Timely Implementation Report

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	RIV010212	This is an Exempt project and was not included in the 2004 RTIP Timely Implementation Report. The project did not have funds for ROW/CON in prior year. This project now has ROW in 07/08 and CON in 09/10; therefore this project became a committed TCM in 2006 and will be reported on in the 2008 Timely Implementation report.
				LA29202U2	This project is listed on page 48 in 2006 RTIP
				2) LA962148 – if the project is to be completed in 2007, shouldn't there be some programming in the RTIP?	Local PC25 funds from FY 01/02 are still available and will be used to complete this project. (p. iii-24)
				3) A number of projects have conflicting open to traffic dates between the "2006 RTIP Completion Date" and the "Project Status". The dates should be consistent. Projects with this issue include:	
				LA963526	Completion date is 6/30/08 – all local funds (p. iii-25)
				LA9622145	This project number does not exist. Staff is surmising that this is referring to 962214 which has a 6/1/07 completion date (p. iii-29)
				LA973029	This is not a valid project number.
				LA29204	Completion date is 6/30/07 (p. iii-35)
				4) LA002633 – is this the project that EPA agreed was not a TCM? If so, the project status should be updated.	Yes, the project status is reflected in final RTIP (p. iii-6/iii-26)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	5) LA0C53 – If the project is not funded, SCAG will have to make a commitment in the project status column to substitute the project.	MTA is programming $2.85 million of CITY funds for construction in FY 07/08. (p.iii-32)
				6) LA0C57 – if the project is to be completed in 2007, shouldn't there be some programming in the RTIP?	The completion date for this project is 2010; the project is funded in 06/07 through 08/09 (p.iii-33)
				7) LA0C8156 – Are not PS&E and ED/Pre-design different phases? The project status should be updated to clarify.	This project is finishing design phase. Construction is scheduled to begin in spring 07 with an estimated completion date in late spring 08. (p.iii-34)
				8) LA0C8164 – Please include the status of the environmental document in the project status report.	The FEIR was completed December 2005. Final design in May 2006 (p.iiii-37)
				9) There are some projects on the completed list of projects where the project status implies that they are still under construction. The projects include:	
				LA0C8072	This project is now complete; furthermore based on the description it does not meet the definition of a TCM (p. iii-51)
				LAOC8250	This project does not meet the definition of a TCM, it is a safety project. (p. iii-53)
				10) Projects that have been determined not to be TCMs should include a note as to why they are not TCMs. These projects include:	
				LA0D174	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA0D76	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA0C8303	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	LA996241	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA996290	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA996390	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA0C8250	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA0D28	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-53)
				LA0D287	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-54)
				LA0D190	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-54)
				LA0D46	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-54)
				LA0D48	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-54)
				LA0B7009	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-54)
				20090	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-55)
				ORA120318 (not fully-funded is not a reason that the project is not a TCM)	This project not a committed TCM - it does not have funding for ROW or Construction in either 04/05 or 05/06. (p.iii-62)
				ORA120322	Correction reflected in final (p. iii-62)
				RIV990709	Correction from TCWG discussion, reflected in final (p.iii-74)
				RIV0084	Correction from TCWG discussion, reflected in final (p.iii-75)
				11) ORA000193 – The project status needs to include why the project is delayed and what is being done to overcome the issues?	This project should not have been listed as a TCM in 2004; it was not a committed TCM at that time. It became a committed TCM in 2006 (funds for CON in 05/06). Prior years were only design. It will be reported on as a TCM in the next Timely Implementation report (p. iii-56)
				12) RIV010227 - The project status needs to include why the project is delayed and what is being done to overcome the issues.	This is an ongoing project (p. iii-64)
				13) RIV011242 – Funding is not an acceptable issue for timely implementation.	The project received STIP funding April 2006. This project is on track. (p.iii-65)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	14) RIV520109 – Is this project reported on per the project status of RIV990902.	Not a committed TCM. (p.iii-66)
				15) RIV011243 – Has this project gone through the substitution process?	This project went through the substitution process in 2004; therefore does not need to be included in the 2006 RTIP (p.iii-70)
				16) 200220106 – The project status should include why the project is delayed and what is being done to overcome obstacles to implementation.	The platform is complete and in use with an at-grade crossing. The undercrossing is currently in the design phase; however, the lead agency had to reconsider the design to accommodate the Gold Line which is currently planned to terminate in Montclair. SCRRA is the lead agency for the design and construction. (p.iii-73)
				17) VEN990319 - if the project is to be completed in 2007, shouldn't there be some programming in the RTIP?	Funds for this project are in FY 06/07 and will be obligated shortly (p.iii-78)
				18) VEN990304 - if the project is to be completed in 2008, shouldn't there be some programming in the RTIP?	This project is listed under an incorrect project ID - correct project number is VEN54122 (p.iii-79)
				19) "No project activity" is not acceptable for the timely implementation of TCMs, and should updated. Projects with this status include:	
				VEN031230	Potential ROW issues with this project; if needed Ventura has agreed to substitute this project in the event that it cannot be implemented by 2010. (p.iii-82)
				VEN051401	Scheduled to start in 06/07; consistent with 2004 RTIP (p.iii-82)
				VEN054605	Scheduled to start in 06/07; consistent with 2004 RTIP (p.iii-82)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
				VEN055408	Scheduled to start in 07/08; one year delay from 2004 RTIP (p.iii-82)
				VEN055410	Scheduled to start in 07/08; consistent with 2004 RTIP (p.iii-82)
				VEN055413	Scheduled to start in 08/09; consistent with 2004 RTIP (p.iii-82)
RTIP 06-110	July 19	Jean Mazur	FHWA	**Conformity Comments** 1) While it is noted within the documentation, it should added to the introduction of the conformity documentation that the conformity analysis is also for the RTP. It should also be added to the executive summary.	Clarifying language added. (Final pp. ES-8, ES-12, I-1, I-15, and II-1)
				2) Page I-9 – Applicable Emissions Budgets – SCAG should document that the one-hour ozone budgets are being used for the 8-hour ozone standard as agreed to through interagency consultation.	Information added (Final p. 1-8)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-111	July 24	Jean Mazur	FHWA	3) Page II-6 – Modeling Assumptions – Please include reference to where a discussion of the "preferred plan" alternative is described in the RTP	The text on page II-6 of the RTIP Technical Appendix refers to the socio-economic data (population/household/employment growth forecast) used in the modeling and emissions analysis. The "preferred plan" alternative, as opposed to the "no-project" or "baseline" alternative, refers to the adopted 2004 RTP growth forecast which includes assumptions for future policy intervention to promote infill development, focus growth along transit corridors, promote jobs/housing balance, and better utilize existing and planned transportation infrastructure. This is described in further detail in the 2004 RTP on pages 94 and 95. The "plan" alternative as a whole, including both socio-economic and transportation components, is described in Chapter 4. Reference added (Final p.5)
				4) Page II-12 – Please provide Table 3C for the last to RTP amendments to FHWA. Why has the transit service miles increased so significantly since the original 2004 RTP. The express bus centerline miles have not changed, but the service miles have.	Overall, service miles have not changed significantly from the 2004 RTP. The Draft 2006 RTIP inadvertently used a different definition of express bus (inclusive of rapid bus service). To maintain consistency with the 2004 RTP we have regrouped rapid bus with local bus and corrected the table for the Final. (Final p. II-11)
				5) Page II-19 – the text should include some discussion of how the annual PM2.5 emissions were calculated.	As per consensus of the TCWG, the annual PM2.5 was calculated by multiplying the daily emissions by 365. (Final p. II-18)
				6) Page II-25 – The text should identify which SIP the applicable budget came from.	Information included in pages I-7 through I-9 of Draft 2006 RTIP. Reference to this information included with final 2006 RTIP. (Final p. II-21)

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-111	July 24	Jean Mazur	FHWA	7) Please include the EMFAC outputs in an appendix. **General RTIP Comments** 1) FHWA would like the footnote for the previously obligated project listing to be state that it is for federal actions other than funding. We suggest: These projects may still require state of federal action, other than funding, and they are included in the previously obligated list of the 2006 RTIP for this purpose. 2) Please double-check the available CMAQ revenues. They did not seem consistent with Caltrans' Feb 06 estimates.	The EMFAC output is formatted and packaged to provide the public with an understandable set of data, since it is assumed that including the EMFAC output as part of the RTIP would generate confusion for the general public. We have included electronic EMFAC output files as part of the Final RTIP transmittal package to the Federal agencies and available to others upon request. 1) The correction has been made. 2) The figures were corrected.
RTIP 06-112	July 24	Ken Lobeck	RCTC	Wrote e-mail stating the project RIV62024, RCTC's SR79 realignment project, is not in the 2006 Draft RTIP. Requested that this project be placed in the 2006 RTIP.	Staff responded that the project is in the "previously obligated" portion of the 2006 RTIP. There were no funds included in the triennial element of the RTIP.
RTIP 06-113	July 24	Cathy Gomes	Caltrans	Wrote e-mail commenting on the CMAQ eligibility of three projects. The three projects are: 1) Project No. ORA000193; 2) Project No. RIV990701; and 3) Project No. 200064.	Project ORA000193 - Eligble for CMAQ funding because the study is directly related to construction of a CMAQ eligible project; Project RIV990701 - Eligiblility based on lengthy reviews from Local Assistance and Caltrans Environmental; Project 200064 - SCAG will send eligibility documentation under separate cover.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-114	July 24	Altagrace Balmir	FHWA	**General Comments** Overall, the TIP is very much improved from the 2004 RTIP.	
				The RTIP Guidelines should be referenced in the TIP and also made available to the public, since it refers to the process and procedures by which projects are selected, and the overall process for TIP development and procedures.	The reference is incorporated in page one of the Executive Summary.
				Please provide more discussion and assurance demonstrating financially that the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained	Addressed in page 17 of the Executive Summary.
				Please ensure that Public Comments received and responses given are incorporated in final FTIP	The public comments and responses will be incorporated into the final 2006 RTIP Technical Appendix, Section VI.
				Please verify that Financial Capacity numbers are accurate	Completed.
				SCAG currently provides the total programmed cost versus the total project cost. Please find a way to provide total estimated project cost.	SCAG is developing an updated RTIP Database that includes a field for the estimated total project cost.
				Project Specific Comments	
				Please verify that these projects are modeled, if they need to be and/or justify that the project is correctly labeled	Completed.
				RIV050531	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-114	July 24	Altagrace Balmir	FHWA	RIV050532	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time
				Moreno Valley 32300	Project is modeled
				RIV050535	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time
				RIV031222	Project adds turn lanes to intersection so the project does not need to be modeled
				RIV050534	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time
				RIV060111	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time
				RIV050533	Project in early stages so not modeled at this time
				RIV030642	This project is a State Tranportation Improvement Program Reimbursement project.
				LA County LAE0896 PLN40 Is project a PSR and/or project study. Please state type of study.	Project Study Report
				ORA000140	Intersection/Widening project and not accomodated by the model.
				ORA020507 Since the Audit of OCCOG has occurred, will they continue to receive $	Yes, project sponsor will be changed through an administrative amendment prior to federal approval of the 2006 RTIP.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-115	July 24	Ben Cacatian	Ventura County APCD	General Comments	
				Page II-7 - Need to reformat borders in Table 1A to separate the figures belonging to San Bernardino from the Ventura County row	Comment unclear. Table appears to be formatted correctly.
				Volume II -- There should be a Table of Contents at the beginning of the volume to show that there are three sections contained within this appendix.	A table of contents has been included for Volume II to show that there are six sections contained within Volume II.
				Page III-15 -- Please add a TCM Table after the Ventura County TCM Project Categories descriptions, similar to the SCAQMD Table on page III-11. Also VC project categories are based on the 2004 SIP consistent with the TCMs in the 1994/95 SIP.	The SCAQMD table was taken directly from SCAQMD's 2003 AQMP. A similar table for Ventura County is not currently available. It should be noted that the text is complete for both SCAQMD and Ventura County, and the table merely summarizes the SCAQMD information.
				Page III-16 -- First paragraph, TCM requirement for projects funded under CMAQ was not used as a screening criterion. Delete the sentence. However, for your information, an STP project was given extra credit if it was a TCM.	Correction made.
				Pages III-75 through 79 -- Correct "RITP" headings	Typo corrected.
				Volume III - Double check project air basins. Some projects have been incorrectly labeled SCCAB when the project is clearly in the SCAB basin, vice versa. Also, I noticed projects incorrectly labeled as the "SCAG" air basin.	Identified typos have been corrected. Additional typos will be corrected as identified.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-116	July 25	Antonio Rossman	City of South Pasadena	The City of South Pasadena is requesting the deletion of the references to the 710 surface freeway extension in the 2006 RTIP. The City states that its project should be removed from its list of planned projects in the RTIP and should not be used in SCAG's proposed Clean Air Act conformity determination.	In response to the letter from Rossmann and Moore LLP, dated July 25, 2006 regarding the Rt 710 Projects referenced in the RTIP and the RTIP Conformity determination, SCAG has analyzed the comments recieved and the sections referenced. The item referenced by Mr. Rossman's letter is volume 3 page 21. This project identifies costs and activities associated with Property Management of the Caltrans owned properties within the proposed alignment. This was not used for modeling conformity in this TIP. Extraneous editorial references to potential future project emission benefits identified by Mr. Rossman have been removed in the TCM section cited, as well.
RTIP 06-117	July 27	Sue Kiser Jean Mazur Altagrace Balmir Ray Sukys Ted Matley	FHWA/FTA	There needs to be some discussion as to why SCAG changed its policy in providing a meeting/opportunities to the outlying areas an opportunity to comment at public meetings. I believe the current Public Involvement Plan is being updated. Please provide an adequate discussion detailing the public Involvement procedures that are used to develop the RTIP	An explanation can be found in page 17 of the Executive Summary.
				Advance Construction Conversion should be listed in the RTIP in order to receive FHWA funding	Duly noted.
				All planning studies should be included in the SCAG Work Program	Duly noted.
				All projects requiring NEPA approval or needing to complete PE-Project Engineering should come from SCAG's conforming RTP	Duly noted.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-117	July 27	Sue Kiser Jean Mazur Altagrace Balmir Ray Sukys Ted Matley	FHWA/FTA	Please clarify that projects within the Comprehensive Modeling Listing that show no build out date are included in the 2030 build out year	The modeling listing was revised to reflect the 2030 year.
				Funding Expense / Expenditure Summaries and the summary of Revenues and Carryover Source are difficult to read, thereby, difficult to verify. Please provide a legible copy of these spreadsheets	This has been completed.
				The continued use of the "ITSnn" Program Codes is welcomed, because it allows for the quick identification of ITS projects. However, we have discovered that there are some projects with other codes that contain embedded ITS elements. In a few cases (e.g. freeway widening) these ITS elements can be major (some as large as $1M for the ITS elements). To ensure FHWA's ability to monitor the ITS portion of such "mixed" projects for compliance with the USDOT ITS Architecture Rule, we need some way to identify them.	SCAG is working with FHWA to develop a listing of ITS and "Mixed" projects.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-117	July 27	Sue Kiser Jean Mazur Altagrace Balmir Ray Sukys Ted Matley	FHWA/FTA	In our analysis of the 2004 SCAG RTIP, we manually identified over 150 projects that were "ITS" or "mixed" out of the (several thousand?) projects in the RTIP and subsequent amendments. Because this is a highly labor-intensive project, we request that SCAG email to us an "ITS Extract" -- a computer file containing all ITS and "Mixed" projects -- when the final version of the 2006 RTIP is published and with each amendment. This would preferably be a spreadsheet with the same format and content as the published version on the SCAG website.	SCAG is working with FHWA to develop a listing of ITS and "Mixed" projects.
				Noting that you have already broken out the 5307 funds into a separate section in the TIP, I'd suggest that you consider breaking out the 5309 transit earmarks (bus and bus related and New Starts), either in addition to or in place of the 5307 funds if the document is getting too big. The reasons we're usually more concerned about making sure the 5309 earmarks are programmed are: 1) The earmarks have a shorter life span than the 5307 funds (3 versus 4 years) and they have to be programmed and then awarded before they expire 2) The earmarks usually have more problems since they can only be spent on one designated project, while the 5307 funds have a lot of flexibility and agencies have less trouble spending them	This has been completed.

Response to Comments

Record ID#	Comment date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
RTIP 06-117	July 27	Sue Kiser Jean Mazur Altagrace Balmir Ray Sukys Ted Matley	FHWA/FTA	3) There is no longer a requirement that the 5307 funds be programmed before the 5309 earmarks So in general we worry a lot more about the programming and implementation of the earmarks, so a breakout that allowed us to focus quickly on them would be helpful.	This has been completed.