



Appendix D

Public Comment and Responses

Regional Transportation Plan Response to Public Comment



The following letters were received during the Public Comment period for the 2045 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan and have been included in this appendix and responded to. In addition, oral comments received at one Public Hearings for the Regional Transportation Plan were also included and responded to in this appendix.

COMMENT NO. 1	
Commenter Date: January 28, 2022 Name: Caltrans	
Comment	COG Response
Caltrans would like to commend SBCOG for providing a robust discussion of the region. As well as working with the other agencies in the region to come up with a comprehensive and coordinated long range plan.	Thank you.
Ensure that the RTP Checklist is accurate and encompasses all the pages in the RTP that meet the corresponding requirements.	Comment has been addressed.
RTP checklist, Appendix E (1): The pages referenced do not answer the question in the checklist. Please revise.	Comment has been addressed.
Some charts and figures have a low image resolution. In some figures there are data labels that are difficult to read clearly.	Comment has been addressed.
(3) It is unclear if the chapter referenced shows that a periodic review of the participation plan's effectiveness was performed. Please revise and ensure this requirement is met.	Comment has been addressed.
(4) It is unclear if the pages referenced show that the appropriate state and local representatives from environmental and economic communities were consulted. Please revise and ensure this requirement is met.	Comment has been addressed. The EIR was reviewed by the required state and local agencies from environmental and economic communities were consulted

(10) It is unclear if the pages referenced describe private sector involvement adequately. Please revise and ensure this requirement is met.	Comment has been addressed. The private sector was consulted in the development of the San Benito Regional Transportation Plan. Please see page 7-4.
(11) It is unclear if the pages referenced shows coordination and consistency with the Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. Please revise and ensure this requirement is met.	Comment has been addressed. Please see page 7-9.
(1) A more extensive discussion of the intermodal and connectivity issues of the region is appropriate to fulfill this requirement. Please revise.	Comment has been addressed. Please see pages 4-20 through 4-29.
(10) A more focused discussion on goods movement would be useful here. Please add more details about goods movement in the region.	Comment has been addressed. Please see pages 4-15.
(5) It is unclear whether the numbers represented are in "Year of Expenditure" dollars. Please add more details in order to meet this requirement.	Comment has been addressed. The Regional Transportation Plan Project List are listed in Year of Expenditure, please see Appendix A.
Page 0-10: Please include an explanation of how the "Flexible" category is defined.	Comment has been addressed. Discretionary monies are relatively "flexible" funds typically available for a variety of projects. Please see page 5-3.
Page 1-3: Suggest revising "and bicycle and pedestrian improving mobility," to "improving bicycle and pedestrian mobility," at end of 2nd paragraph.	Comment has been addressed.
Page 1-6: Bottom of the page, Union Road mentioned twice.	Comment has been addressed.
Page 2-7: Recommend adding the CTP year. Should read CTP 2050.	Comment has been addressed.
Page 2-9: Please include on the State plan list: Caltrans D5 Active Transportation Plan and Caltrans D5 Adaptation Plan.	Comment has been addressed.
Page 3-10, paragraph 3: Since Covid-19, have these travel patterns significantly changed?	Comment has been addressed. Please see page 3-8.

<p>Page 4-3: Caltrans no longer maintains State Route (SR)146 within San Benito County. It has been relinquished to National Parks.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed.</p>
<p>Page 4-6: There is more recent data than the 2014 Truck Traffic data stated in this section. Please work with Caltrans to obtain the 2020 AADT information for SR 25.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed. Caltrans relinquished a portion of SR 146 to the National Park Service. Please see page 4-14</p>
<p>Page 4-10: We suggest revising this statement to indicate that solutions to this section of US 101 will be developed to be in alignment with CTP 2050, CAPTI and the Caltrans Strategic Plan to ensure an emphasis on solutions that take a multi-modal approach and support interregional movements.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed. Solutions to this the US 101 will be developed to be in alignment with the California Transportation Plan 2050, the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, and Caltrans Strategic Plan to ensure an emphasis on solutions that take a multimodal approach and support interregional movements. Please see page 4-10.</p>
<p>Page 4-12: Caltrans recommends updating the traffic volumes that currently use 2008 figures. Please refer to https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/census to obtain the most up to date volumes.</p>	<p>Comment cannot be addressed at this time.</p>
<p>Page 4-17: Figure 4-16 is missing the map legend.</p>	<p>Figure 4-16 cannot be edited as it was not prepared by San Benito COG. Nonetheless, a description of the map is included on the paragraph above the map. The paragraph states “As shown in Figure 4-16, the San Benito region ranked one of eight counties in the State of California to have an average pavement condition of less than 49, significantly worse than the statewide average.⁹ The countywide average pavement condition index in San Benito is 37, which is a significant drop from 46 in 2016.</p>
<p>Page 6-7: Please revise SR 25 project names. Should be consistent with names on the Caltrans projects list.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed.</p>
<p>Page 6-7: Project SB-CT-A43: Revise heading to State Highway Operation and Protection Program. Also suggest deleting "Roadside" from 1st sentence.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed.</p>
<p>Page 6-23: Under “Environmental Review”, there is no mention of NEPA review for federally funded projects.</p>	<p>Comment has been addressed.</p>

Project SB-SBC-A71: Request that this project not list a determined scope “New Signalization” and replace with “Operational Improvement”	Comment has been addressed.
Project SB-CT-A01 “San Benito Route 156 Improvement Project San Juan Bautista to Union Road”: If this is Caltrans EA 05-34490, the amount shown in the RTP is \$68,339 but the current programming is \$107,607	Comment has been addressed. The construction cost of the project is listed in the RTP as \$68,339.
Project SB-CT-A56 US 101 to SR 129: Please clarify moving project into a placeholder position.	Comment has been addressed.