

APPENDIX VI
PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

H:\RTPA\2014 RTP Update\FINAL Chapters\Appendix VI Public Coment-Response - 2014 Final RTP.doc



Kings County Association of Governments

339 W. "D" Street, Suite B, Lemoore, California 93245

(559) 852-2654 ❖ FAX (559) 924-5632

www.kingscog.org

Member Agencies: Cities of Avenal, Corcoran, Hanford and Lemoore, County of Kings

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE
DRAFT 2015 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM,
DRAFT 2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN / SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY,
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND
CORRESPONDING DRAFT CONFORMITY ANALYSIS**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG) will hold a public hearing on May 28, 2014 at 4:30 p.m. for the Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and will hold a second public hearing on June 25, 2014 at 4:30 p.m. regarding the Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2015 FTIP), the Draft 2014 RTP / SCS, the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and corresponding Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2015 FTIP and 2014 RTP / SCS. Both public hearings will be at the Board of Supervisor's Chambers, Administration Building, Kings County Government Center, 1400 W. Lacey Blvd., Hanford, CA. The purpose of this combined public hearing is to receive public comments on these documents.

- The 2015 FTIP is a near-term listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Kings County during the next four years.
- The 2014 RTP / SCS is a long-term strategy to meet Kings County transportation needs out to the year 2040.
- The Program EIR provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts related to the implementation of the RTP / SCS as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.
- The corresponding Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2015 FTIP and 2014 RTP / SCS meet the air quality conformity requirements for ozone and particulate matter.

As the public involvement process for the FTIP is used to satisfy the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5307 program of projects (POP), this public notice also satisfies the program of projects (POP) requirements of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5307. If no comments are received on the proposed POP, the proposed transit program (funded with FTA 5307 dollars) will be the final program.

Individuals with disabilities may call Terri King at (559) 852-2678 (with 3-working-day advance notice) to request auxiliary aids necessary to participate in the public hearing. Translation services are available (with 3-working-day advance notice) to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.

A concurrent 55-day public review for the Draft 2014 RTP / SCS will commence April 28, 2014 and a 45-day public review and comment period for all other documents will commence on May 9, 2014 and conclude on June 25, 2014. The draft documents are available for review at the KCAG office, located at 339 W. D Street, Suite B, Lemoore, CA and on KCAG's website at www.kingscog.org.

Public comments are welcomed at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by 4:00 p.m. on June 25, 2014 to Bruce Abanathie at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the KCAG Transportation Policy Committee at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on July 23, 2014. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Bruce Abanathie, Regional Planner
339 W. D Street, Lemoore, CA 93245
(559) 852-2584
E-mail: Bruce.Abanathie@co.kings.ca.us

**COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE
DRAFT 2014 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND
THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Since the mid-1970s, with the passage of AB 69, (Chapter 1253, Statute of 1972) California State law has required the preparation of RTPs to address transportation issues and assist local and State decision-makers in shaping California's transportation infrastructure.

The development of the RTP is consistent with California Government Code sections 14522, 65080, and 21061.3 and the changes to federal statute implemented by the Code of Federal Regulations (CFRs) that are also known as the "final rules" promulgated by MAP-21 section 6001. Particularly with reference to Title 23 CFR Part 450, which states in part that: "...MPOs should make special efforts to engage interested parties in the development of the plan."

For this reason, transportation planning by MPOs/RTPAs is a collaborative process, led by the MPO/RTPA, state, tribal, and other key stakeholders in the regional transportation system. The process is designed to foster involvement by all interested parties, such as the business community, California Tribal Governments, community groups, environmental organizations, the general public, and local jurisdictions through a proactive public participation process conducted by the MPO/RTPA in coordination with the State and transit operators. It is essential to extend public participation to include people who have been traditionally underserved by the transportation system and services in the region. Neglecting public involvement early in the planning or programmatic stage can result in delays during the project delivery stage.

The Draft 2014 KCAG RTP with the SB 375 required Sustainable Communities Strategy was circulated for a 55-day public review and comment period beginning April 28, 2014, with two public hearings. The accompanying EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period that began May 9, 2014 and both concluded on June 25, 2014. The comment period for the EIR was extended until July 15, 2014.

Each comment that KCAG received is included in this section. Responses to these comments have been prepared to address the concerns raised by the commenters and to indicate where and how the RTP and the RTP EIR address the pertinent issues.

| Comment | FROM | AGENCY/ORGANIZATION | DATE |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Rick Telegan | Fresno3RDM | 11/15/2013 |
| 2 | Kathleen A. Dadey, Ph.D. | Dept. of the Army, Corps of Engrs. | 11/14/2013 |
| 3 | Jeffrey R. Single, Ph.D. | CA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife | 11/18/2013 |
| 4 | Diane Friend | Kings Co. Farm Bureau | 01/22/2014 |
| 5 | Len Marino, P.E. | Central Valley Flood Prot. Board | 05/28/2014 |
| 6 | Diana Gomez | CA HSR Authority | 06/06/2014 |
| 7 | Paul-Albert Marquez | Caltrans, D-6 Planning | 06/09/2014 |
| 8 | Diane Friend | Kings Co. Farm Bureau | 07/15/2014 |

Letter 1

FROM: Rick Telegan, Fresno 3RDM

DATE: November 15, 2013

Comment 1-1

“The KCAG Regional Transportation Plan must correlate with all of the following:

1. *All General Plans, including respective Land Use Diagrams, for every city within Kings County,*
2. *All current Transportation Reports (Caltrans) for SR 33, SR 41, SR 43, SR 198, and S 269, together with the SR 198 Corridor Systems Management Plan (February 2012), and*
3. *All state and/or federal major transportation projects planned that could have impacts to Kings County.*

The items listed need to be added to the “references”.”

Response 1-1

Some of the information included in this comment is accurate with respect to *Section 2.5 Consistency with Other Planning Documents* of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, although not necessarily to the degree referenced. As stated in the following excerpts from the guidelines:

While preparing an updated RTP, MPOs/RTPAs should, as appropriate, incorporate or consult such local/regionally prepared documents as:

1. General Plans (especially the Circulation and Housing Elements);
2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans;
3. Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIPs);
4. Short- and Long- Range Transit Plans;
5. Habitat Conservation Plans;
6. Urban Water Management Plans;
7. Local Coastal Programs (if applicable) and
8. Public Agency Trail Plans (if applicable)

MPOs/RTPAs also should consult State prepared transportation planning documents such as:

1. California Transportation Plan;
2. California Rail Plan;
3. Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan;
4. Transportation Concept Reports;
5. California Aviation System Plan;
6. Goods Movement Action Plan;
7. Strategic Highway Safety Plan;
8. California Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and
9. Corridor System Management Plans.

While KCAG does not list all of these documents in the more than 50 documents referenced and considered in Chapter 1, Section V “Relationship to Other Plans” of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, KCAG does consult these plans and documents for consistency, for potential projects, for possible impacts to the KCAG Region transportation system, and for possible air quality conformity issues.

Letter 2

FROM: Kathleen A. Dadey, Ph.D., Department of Army, Corps of Engineers

DATE: November 14, 2013

Comment 2-1

The Department expressed concerns related to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and potential discharge into US Waters.

Response 2-1

The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Letter 3

FROM: Jeffrey R. Single, Ph.D., CA Department of Fish and Wildlife

DATE: November 18, 2013

Comment 3-1

The Department expressed concerns related to threatened species.

Response 3-1

The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Letter 4

FROM: Diane Friend, Executive Director, Kings County Farm Bureau

DATE: January 22, 2014

Comment 4-1

"... the procedures the KCAG Staff has instituted with regard to the RTP Stakeholder Group Meetings. ... the agenc[ies]' inability to perform adequate outreach activities that include proper and timely notification of all stakeholder's meetings."

Response 4-1

Comment noted. Outreach and Stakeholder Working Group efforts are summarized in Chapter 12, Section 3.0.

Comment 4-2

The lack of inclusion and follow-through in the distribution of pertinent information is unacceptable and lacks transparency to those most impacted by the initial study.

Response 4-2

Comment noted. Outreach and Stakeholder Working Group efforts are summarized in Chapter 12, Section 3.0.

Comment 4-3

“Due to the significant land use and planning consideration that need to be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy initial study, we believe our voice and that of our 800+ members should be heard.”

Response 4-3

Comment noted. The KCAG Commission extended the comment period for the EIR to July 15, 2015 in response to the Kings County Farm Bureau’s request.

Comment 4-4

“It is unreasonable to receive notification (during the Christmas holiday) on December 27, 2013 for a meeting on January 8, 2014..”

Response 4-4

Comment noted.

Comment 4-5

“These actions clearly disregard the stakeholders in our county who will undoubtedly live with inaccurate assumptions made by staff who have turned their back on the farmers in this county”

Response 4-5

Comment noted.

Comment 4-6

“The lack of outreach has produced the lost opportunity to voice concerns.”

Response 4-6

Comment noted. Outreach and Stakeholder Working Group efforts are summarized in Chapter 12, Section 3.0.

Comment 4-7

“I (the farm bureau) request that you open and extend the period for which the stakeholders can be duly informed of future meeting and voice their concerns adequately.”

Response 4-7

Comment noted. The KCAG Commission extended the comment period for the EIR to July 15, 2015 in response to the Kings County Farm Bureau’s request.

Letter 5

FROM: Len Marino, P.E., Central Valley Flood Protection Board

DATE: May 28, 2014

Comment 2-1

“The proposed transportation plan may result in projects located adjacent to or over regulated streams under the board’s jurisdiction.”

Response 2-1

The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Letter 6

FROM: Diana Gomez, Central Valley Regional Director, CA High Speed Rail Authority and Mark McLoughlin, Director, Environmental Services

DATE: June 6, 2014

Comment 6-1

“The Authority has invited the Kings County Association of Governments to apply to Partnership Program to plan a regional transportation hub at the Kings/Tulare Regional Station. The Authority also supports station communities by providing information including but not limited to sustainability, livability and transit connectivity to assist development around station areas. This information should be included in the Kings County Draft 2014 RTP/SCS high-speed rail section, of Chapter 6 Public Transportation (pages 6-10).”

Response 6-1

Comment noted. The City of Hanford may be interested in applying for the funding. The Kings/Tulare Station more accurately is the Kings/Tulare *Potential* station as the final decision on the placement of the station is not included in any of the documents. This addition will be considered for the 2018 RTP.

Comment 6-2

“Implementation of the high-speed rail program will result in reductions to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) across the state, including Kings County. Please update the GHG emissions analysis to reflect the program in that analysis.”

Response 6-2

The level of information specific to the Kings County region has not been provided to KCAG such that it can be effectively included in our GHG reduction information. According to Section 3.3.3.3 on page 3.3-13 of the Air Quality Document issued by CAHSRA “GHG was examined on a statewide level.” Also stated on the same page is the assertion by CAHSRA that the HST project will not commence operation for almost ten years and not be fully operational for 25 years, accurate GHG assessment specific to Kings County is premature. In the meantime “HST has the potential to exceed or contribute to exceedances of the ambient air quality standards and to cause adverse health impacts” during the construction phase. (p. 3.3-31)

Comment 6-3

The letter states that the CA HSR will “contribute to economic development and a cleaner environment, preserve and reduce the urbanization of agricultural lands, promote increased livability and efficient mobility within the Central Valley.” The letter also speaks of an “ongoing collaboration” with KCAG.

Response 6-3

The HST will have significant impacts on the entire San Joaquin Valley, but particularly negative impacts on the Kings County Region due to the agricultural importance to the region. Additionally, the future housing and land use impacts have a much higher propensity for the urbanization of prime agricultural land than the CAHSRA is representing. Examples of this have been seen in areas of the extensions of BART and in the northern portions of the valley with Bay Area commuters. These impacts will require much more “collaboration” and clarification before KCAG can accurately include the results in the Regional Transportation Plan. We recommend that the CAHSRA establish a larger presence with the regional planning agencies in order to fully understand the future of the project for inclusion of the information in the 2018 RTP.

Letter 7

FROM: Paul-Albert Marquez, Chief, Planning Office-South, Caltrans D-6

DATE: June 9, 2014

Comment 7-1

"KCAG has provided current projects, future proposals, and a thorough analysis of their region KCAG's Draft RTP addresses Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The Draft RTP also addresses Senate Bill (SB) 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, and includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as Chapter 12 of the RTP."

Response 7-1

Comments noted.

Comment 7-2

"KCAG should consider adding a vision statement to the Draft RTP. KCAG should consider adding a mission statement to the Draft RTP"

Response 7-2

Although these are two separate comments, they are considered together. KCAG does not have a Commission-approved mission or vision statement at this time. We will consider developing statements during the development of the next KCAG Overall Work Program and present them to the commission for adoption.

Comment 7-3

"KCAG should consider adding a specific reference to the California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2040 and information on GHG therein."

Response 7-3

The California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2040 was consulted, but not quoted. We will consider more information related to the CTP in the next RTP.

Comment 7-4

The California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) recommends regions and local governments fully implement the "fix-it first" policy to preserving the State Highway System. Caltrans recommends adding the "fix-it first" approach under Chapter 12, Table 6.0, Performance Measures .

Response 7-4

Fix-it-first approach added to performance measures (Chapter 12, Table 6.0)

Comment 7-5

"Please provide more detail in the discussion describing public sector involvement efforts that were used during the development of the Draft RTP."

Response 7-5

Elements and explanations of the public participation in the development of the RTP are included in chapters 1 (pgs. 1-1 section III-A, 1-7 sections VI-D and VII, and 1-8), 2 (p. 2-12), and 12 (pgs. 12-5, 12-8, 12-14, 12-15) primarily. The Public Participation Plan is also included in Appendix III.

Comment 7-6

"...please clearly indicate the Financial Plan portion of the Draft RTP. Where cost estimates for project implementation are identified, provide clarity by reflecting "year of expenditure dollars" to reflect inflation rates.."

Response 7-6

The project lists in Chapter 4 list the cost of the project in "year of expenditure" dollars as noted in Page 4-46, Item D. The items explains that the estimates of reasonably expected funding are based on historical apportionments.

Comment 7-7

"All the exhibits in the Draft RTP are labeled as "Figures". To provide greater clarity to the overall document, consider creating categories for the exhibits (for example, Figures, Tables, and Charts) to organize and label them accordingly."

Response 7-7

This will be considered for the next RTP update.

Comment 7-8

"The RTP Checklist must be signed and should reference item locations in the body of the Draft RTP. Also, provide page numbers whenever possible. In the RTP Checklist under "Consultation/Cooperation", Items 6, 9, and 10 all reference Page 2-14, yet this page was not in the document. Please correct the references or provide the additional pages to Chapter 2."

Response 7-8

We will have the checklist signed for the final and the page number has been corrected to p. 2-12.

Comment 7-9

"Appendix III makes no reference to involvement of federal land management agencies during the preparation of the RTP document."

Response 7-9

This is addressed on p. 12-12. Additionally, the PPP in Appendix III has a section for the Naval Air Station and the Tribal Lands.

Comment 7-10

"Kings County appears very proactive in their freight planning. There is reference to the San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan and an additional study conducted in 2011-13."

Response 7-10

Comment noted.

Comment 7-11

"Flooding or extreme heat events could both have negative impacts on the State Highway System, as well as local county roads and city streets. Caltrans recommends consideration of Climate Change and/or Adaptation related treatments as criteria for evaluating projects."

Response 7-11

This recommendation will be considered as we develop new project selection criteria.

Comment 7-12

“Per Section 19 of the 2006 STIP Guidelines, please include a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and FTIP “

Response 7-12

Language added to p. 4-46.

Comment 7-13

“On Pages 3-6 through 3-8, Aviation Goals, Policies and Objectives were laid out extremely well with easy to understand concepts and logical progression.”

Response 7-13

Comment noted. Thank you.

Comment 7-14

“On Page 4-4, in Figure 4-2, the Kings County Circulation Designations are not consistent with the FHWA classifications as stated on Page 4-2 under Section A, “Functional Classification System”. They are similar and could still be used in the RTP;”

Response 7-14

Comment noted.

Comment 7-15

“On Page 4-28, establish the purpose of Section D, “Local Perception of State’s Inattention to Rural and Small Urban Needs”, and how it may aid in framing policy. Also, in the 2nd paragraph on this Section, the third sentence, consider the use of the term “skewed” rather than “oblique” in describing the State’s perspective.”

Response 7-15

This section explains how smaller MPOs and rural areas perceive the state’s position when decisions are made that obviously favor the larger metropolitan areas. For example, the CTC report to the Legislature last year when they recommended a totally competitive distribution of funding in CA, or the 2011 Needs Assessment authored for the CTC in which neither the entire San Joaquin Valley and the Great Northern Area were recognized for their needs, or lastly, see comment/Response 7-19 , below on how the Active Transportation Program eliminated guaranteed funding to smaller MPOs and RTPAs included in the federal Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in favor of a competitive process in which the larger metropolitan areas can also compete. The ATP kept the guaranteed TAP funding for the larger MPOs. The recommended wording change has been made.

Comment 7-16

“On Page 4-29, the statement about Caltrans’ Transportation Concept Report (TCR) in the third paragraph should be re-written to clarify that the TCR is not a single report but rather a series of reports,”

Response 7-16

Text amended and websites added.

Comment 7-17

“On Page 4-38, in Figure 4-24, more clarity is needed to describe how the (nearly) \$18 million is being programmed. Please include text explaining the reason for the negative programmed amount..”

Response 7-17

A paragraph has been added to clarify the negative balance.

Comment 7-18

“On Page 4-42, in Figure 4-28, the map does not clearly identify where the Overlay and the Median Barrier projects are occurring.”

Response 7-18

Map will be corrected.

Comment 7-19

“On Page 4-45 in the sixth paragraph, clarify that the \$129.5 million is for Statewide funding. Please remove or revise language on Page 8-18 stating no Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding is being projected. ATP funds are available, and local agencies within Kings County are eligible to apply for ATP funds.”

Response 7-19

On page 4-45 it explains that all ATP funding available to KCAG agencies is competitively based. KCAG does not project any availability for competitive programs because the funding is not reasonably available. This is a direct result of the content of Section D on page 4-28 (see Comment/Response 7-15).

Comment 7-20

“On Page 4-60, indicate where the “Project Site” is located in the image.”

Response 7-20

Locations have been added to the project sites.

Comment 7-21

“Caltrans considers Chapter 6 of the Draft RTP, Public Transportation to be very comprehensive in describing all transit services available in the region. Figure 6-4 identifies all transportation providers in Kings County. KCAG provided a good overview of all Federal & State Transit Programs available. This Chapter was very thorough of all public transportation elements.”

Response 7-21

Comment noted. Thank you

Comment 7-22

“On Page 7-1 under Chapter 7, Aviation Overview, second paragraph states, “The forecast projects “light sport” aircraft (single propeller/two seater lightweight aircraft) used for recreation will impact the market with a 3.2 percent annual growth for 2013 and slow to 2 percent per year thereafter.” Caltrans recommends that a source to this prediction be cited to determine which forecast predicts this and based upon what information.”

Response 7-22

In the same paragraph, the source is already cited *FAA Aerospace Forecast Fiscal Years 2013-2033*.

Comment 7-23

“On Page 7-1 under Chapter 7, Aviation Overview, second paragraph states, “Changes in population demographics regarding the number of people in younger age groups who might become involved in recreational flying...are anticipated to impact future growth in General Aviation activity within Kings County.” Caltrans strongly recommends the source of this prediction, as increased demographics in younger age groups alone has no bearing on probable growth in General Aviation activity.”

Response 7-23

This reference has been deleted.

Comment 7-24

“On Page 7-3, Airport Inventory Section 2, “Private Airports: Open to Public Use”, under Corcoran Airport, the document states, “Corcoran Municipal Airport is the second busiest public-use airport in Kings County.” Corcoran Municipal Airport is no longer a public-use airport. It was a privately-owned, public-use airport but has since changed to a privately-owned, private use for agricultural purposes. Please make this modification in your document.”

Response 7-24

Corcoran Airport has been revised as a “private – private use” airport.

Comment 7-25

“In Chapter 8, Non-Motorized Facilities, Section 5, “Action Element”, under Implementation Strategies on Page 8-4, regarding Item 8, Caltrans recommends that KCAG consider adding to this strategy the development of an Active Transportation Plan to define strategies to secure ATP funding.”

Response 7-25

KCAG will consider the development of an Active Transportation Plan in the next Overall Work Program.

Comment 7-26

“Chapter 12, It would be beneficial to the reader if more information was provided on each of the scenarios.”

Response 7-26

Additional explanations added.

Comment 7-27

“Caltrans requests more detailed discussion in the following SCS components areas within the Kings County region sufficient to house all of the region’s population and sufficient to house an eight-year projection.”

Response 7-27

Text regarding the RHNA process has been included. KCAG is currently in the process of preparing the 2014 RHNA Plan, scheduled for adoption by January 2015. The methodology for the distribution of the housing units for the 2014 RHNA was adopted by the KCAG Commission on April 23, 2014. The local jurisdictions have been notified, as of July 1, 2014 of their draft allocation share of 10,220 housing units for the 2014 RHNA.

Comment 7-28

“Caltrans requests more detailed discussion regarding the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region.”

Response 7-28

This information is included in the EIR

Comment 7-29

“Development identified in the SCS is located exclusively in Lemoore. Caltrans requests any development proposed in these areas be submitted to Caltrans to be evaluated for traffic impacts, and/or to contribute towards other modal enhancements to better manage travel demand.”

Response 7-29

Comment noted.

Comment 7-30

“Caltrans supports the implementation of the Travel System Management (TSM) goals and recommends developing a list of travel demand measures that the residents and businesses of Kings County and its incorporated cities are likely to support and adopt.”

Response 7-30

Comment noted.

Comment 7-31

“Future developments in the County and Cities should consider the future expansion of state transportation facilities and the local agencies should work with Caltrans to preserve the footprint for the future freeway modification of interchanges to accommodate future growth.”

Response 7-31

Comment noted.

Comment 7-32

“Development near State Highways, freeways, and expressways should be limited to facilitate future modification or expansion of the State Highway system.”

Response 7-32

Comment noted.

Comment 7-33

“Consideration should be given to re-titling Figure 4-37 on page 4-54-55. While developing a process for prioritizing transportation projects is important, this methodology appears restricted to highway projects only, not transportation projects covering all modes.”

Response 7-33

The title of these tables has been revised.

Comment 7-34

“Please note that multimodal transportation plans should be a priority, that congestion would be unavoidable and that air pollution would get worse for population growth beyond 2040. KCAG should direct more funding for smart growth strategies for any proposed new developments. Caltrans suggests more attention to the mix of uses.”

Response 7-34

These are identified in the expanded descriptions of the scenario inputs in Chapter 12.

Comment 7-35

“Kings County should also adopt a transportation development impact improvement fee program for all new developments within the County’s General Plan boundary area.”

Response 7-36

This was considered by the County and not undertaken.

Comment 7-37

“On Page 16, Caltrans District 6 notes there is a difference of less than 0.05% percent in Greenhouse Gas Reductions between Scenarios in the SCS. Please provide justification for the minimal difference in reductions.”

Response 7-37

The justification is partially the benefit of the Blue Print Program, and the positive effect that it has had on the general plans in the area. Another element is the fact that the 4-step model is not sensitive enough to pick up on all of the benefits recommended in the SCS scenarios, particularly for a small region the size of Kings. This last portion is the reason for the explanation of the off-model measures that could be employed.

Comment 7-38

“Page 16, under “Off-Model Adjustments”, please describe how the adjustments of the “off-model” techniques are measured.”

Response 7-38

As noted in paragraph three of the “Off Model” section, transportation changes would be measured using the project classification (bicycle, pedestrian, TDM, etc) and the calculations established by the Air Resources Board Guidance for the Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects. The land use projects would be evaluated for their air quality benefit using one of the applicable methods listed in the tools provided through the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) as noted in paragraph two. None of the off-model measures were utilized in establishing the GHG reductions noted for the SCS scenarios.

Letter 8

FROM: Diane Friend, Executive Director, Kings County Farm Bureau

DATE: July 15, 2014

Comment 8-1

“Agricultural conservation easements could be implemented by directly purchasing easements”

Response 8-1

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-2

‘Table 4.8.1 “Existing and Projects GHG Emissions Reported in the Regional Climate Action Plan’ is deficient in that it identifies only the GHG Emissions identified for two communities, Avenal and Hanford. . . .’

Response 8-2

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-3

'Impact GHG-1 Applicable GHG-reducing measures include measures that are applicable to NOx reduction strategies than GHG strategies . . .'

Response 8-3

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-4

'Page 4.9-4 states 'The results of a subsequent study (1998) conducted by the USGS on nitrate and pesticide trends in groundwater in the eastern San Joaquin Valley indicate that groundwater drinking supplies have been degraded by fertilizers and pesticides . . .'

Response 8-4

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-5

'5(b) Rural roadway alignments shall follow property lines to the extent feasible, to minimize impacts to the agricultural production value of any specific property. . .'

Response 8-5

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-6

'5(c) When new roadway extensions are planned in areas that contain sensitive farmland, the local jurisdiction in which the RTP project is located shall assure that project-specific environmental reviews . . .'

Response 8-6

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-7

'We take issue in the Biological Resource section, with the use of National Inventory Databases that inaccurately depict land uses. . . .'

Response 8-7

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-8

'The Kings County Farm Bureau does agree with the recommended preferred Superior Environmental Alternative, Alternative 2. . . .'

Response 8-8

Comment noted. The response to these environmental concerns will be included in the Response to Comments section of the Environmental Impact Report.

Comment 8-9

'Chapter 5: Goods Movement; This chapter examines ways to ensure that freight and commodities are efficiently transported through Kings County and the region. . . .'

Response 8-9

Comment noted.

Comment 8-10

The commenter suggests changes in the RTP related to aviation (including edits in Chapter 3 and Chapter 7) including an edit that the Corcoran Airport is no longer a public use airport.

Response 8-10

The RTP has been updated consistent with the commenter's suggestions.

Comment 8-11

The commenter suggests that in the RTP, references to industrial farming be modified and that Corcoran should be identified as the "Farming Capital of the World".

Response 8-11

The RTP has been updated with the commenter's suggested edits

Comment 8-12

The commenter suggests edits to the RTP related to high speed rail.

Response 8-12

The RTP has been updated in response to this and others' comments.

Comment 8-13

The commenter suggests edits/updates to the RTP related to disadvantaged communities.

Response 8-13

The RTP has been updated in response to this comment.

Comment 8-14

The commenter suggests edits/updates to the RTP related to Enviro screen.

Response 8-14

The RTP has been updated in response to this comment. Text was added to explain the EnviroScreen tool.

Comment 8-15

The commenter suggests edits/updates to the RTP related to abandoned rail lines.

Response 8-15

The RTP has been updated with revised maps in response to this comment.

Comment 8-16

The commenter suggests edits/updates to the RTP related to abandoned rail lines through agricultural production property.

Response 8-16

The RTP has been updated in response to this comment in Chapter 5 – Goods Movement and Chapter 8 – Non Motorized Facilities.

Comment 8-17

The commenter suggests that the RTP incorrectly states that KCAG staff spearheaded the Kings County Blueprint process and suggested that Regional Blueprint Awardees be recognized.

Response 8-17

The comment is incorrect. Text has been added to identify the Regional Blueprint awards received by Kings County jurisdictions in response to this comment.

Comment 8-18

The commenter suggests updates in the RTP related to the federal 1-hour ozone standard.

Response 8-18

The RTP has been updated to reflect the suggested edits.

Comment 8-19

The commenter in conclusion expresses frustration with the process for the RTP-SCS and RTP-SCS EIR and is interested in receiving the final determination regarding compliance with the GHG per capita reduction targets.

Response 8-19

Comment noted. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) must review the adopted SCS to confirm and accept the MPO's determination that the SCS, if implemented, would meet the regional GHG targets. The ARB does not begin their official review until after the submittal of the adopted RTP/SCS by KCAG. It is at this point that ARB's 60 day review process begins. It is expected that the ARB will take action on the San Joaquin Valley SCSs at its October meeting.