

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT 2011 FTIP

COMMENT FROM: Steven Tracey: Caltrans (Local)

1. I trust that you will be incorporating the 2010 SHOPP (besides carrying over amendment 23 after it is approved) into the 2011 FTIP. --We did not get any new projects in the SHOPP, but there were some funding changes which should be captured.

Response: The 2010 SHOPP most recent list, dated 5/10/10, has been incorporated in the 2011 FTIP.

2. Abhijit sent out the Department's 2010/11 Minor program for federal programming on May 20, include it in the 2011 document.

Response: The 2010/11 Minor Program received on 5/20/10 has been incorporated in the 2011 FTIP.

3. We did get a new STIP Interregional TE project on SR 168 (PPNO 6466 EA 06-0M020) in the recently adopted 2010 STIP which would be good to capture.

Response: The STIP Interregional TE project on SR 168 has been incorporated in the 2011 FTIP.

COMMENT FROM: Dennis Jacobs-Caltrans

1. I do not see a link to your Public Participation Plan.

Response: A link will be provided on our website.

2. We need a link to your back up list for grouped projects.

Response: A link will be provided on our website and a hard copy will be submitted with the 2011 FTIP Document.

3. SHOPP Lump Sum Lists, do not all align with the 2010 SHOPP grouped project listing report that was sent out on 5/10/10. Please check the FYs and \$.

Response: The 2010 SHOPP most recent list, dated 5/10/10, has been incorporated in the 2011 FTIP which aligns with Caltrans' funds by year and phase.

4. For FRE040501, HBP group project listing. This project does not reflect the latest HBP listing sent out by HQ local assistance. Please use the latest info to update your 2011 FTIP.

COMMENT FROM: Bruce Webber, P.E., Principal, STAR Engineering

1. The only comment I might have on the FTIP Amendment is that on the first four tables "Fresno County Region (in \$000.00s)", you might want to alter the title to read "Fresno County Region (in \$1,000s)".

Response: Comment greatly appreciated. To avoid further confusion and rounding errors, the reports have been changed to reflect actual dollars.

COMMENT FROM: Tom Krazan

PLEASE ADD THE FOLLOWING TO THE DRAFT FTIP:

1. "New Technology" is defined as the usage and knowledge of tools, techniques, and crafts, or is systems or methods of organization, or is a material product (such as clothing) which is used in a way that is not commonly used at this time.

Response: Thank you for your comment; however, this comment does not relate to the FTIP, it is an RTP comment and will be addressed in the RTP.

COMMENT FROM: Scott Carson - Federal Highway Administration

1. Year of Expenditure, inflation rate of 3% and Operation and Maintenance (O&M) are clearly identified on page 16; details on O&M costs are included in Appendix L in a summary table format. Is further supporting documentation on the O&M calculations available from the submitting agencies compared to what is shown.

Response: We currently use the State of California Streets and Roads Annual Report to obtain this information. We will collaborate with the local agencies to see if they can provide supporting documentation on the O&M calculations.

2. The Financial Plan templates appear to be in the wrong section. They are shown in the "Project Listing By Agency" Section rather than being incorporated in the Financial Plan that starts on page 14.

Response: Thank you for your comment and observation. The Financial Plan will be moved to the Financial Plan Section in the 2011 FTIP.

3. The project Listings are sorted by Fresno COG's unique FTIP number in alphabetic/ascending order. Does the Fresno COG FTIP software allow the data to be sorted by mode? Another way in which this organization could be arranged would be a summary table broken down by mode, similar to the unified Valley-wide FTIP listing format that is used by other Valley MPO's.

Response: The Project Listings are sorted by Agency (in alphabetical order) and then by the unique FTIP number. We will work with our FTIP software provider