

**Background Information:**

**Consent Calendar:**

**2. Approval of the January 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes.**

**Regular Agenda:**

**3. Report on the SR120/108 (Yosemite Junction) Intersection Control Evaluation Report**

Staff will present an oral report on the status of the Yosemite Junction safety project

**Recommended Action:**

*No action required.*

**4. Recommend certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report, adopting the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopting the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, and recommend adopting the Final 2016 Regional Transportation Plan.**

The Tuolumne County Transportation Council has released the 2016 Final Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 RTP.

**2016 Draft Regional Transportation Plan**

The Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) released the 2016 Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for review and comment for the public on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and the comment period ended on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016. A public hearing on the 2016 Draft Regional Transportation Plan was held on September 14, 2016 at 3pm at the Board of Supervisors Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> Floor at 2 Green Street Sonora, CA 95370.

**2016 RTP Draft Public Participation**

TCTC hosted community workshops in six different communities throughout Tuolumne County including Jamestown, Groveland, Twain Harte, Tuolumne Sonora, and Columbia. The Community workshop provided an opportunity to showcase the Draft RTP as well as visually present the policies, objectives, goals, and capital improvement projects. The community workshops focused on listening and receiving input from the public in a formal presentation which provided active dialog about regional transportation. The community workshops helped identify the needs of the community and the where the highest priorities are in terms of transportation projects.

The TCTC received written comments from seven different public members which were received by mail or email. Caltrans submitted 95 comments. Additionally, comments were received from the City of Sonora that were included in the Final RTP. Comments were also received from Technical Advisory Committee (TAC & CAC) meeting and TCTC Council meeting. For more information on the public participation process for the 2016 RTP please

review Appendix J: Results of the Public Participation for more details. Appendix J also includes more details about all of the comments submitted and the responses to the comments

## **2016 Final Regional Transportation Plan**

**The 2016 Final RTP reemphasizes priorities for a multi-modal transportation system.**

**Some of the minor changes in the Final RTP include but are not limited to:**

### **Complete Streets Projects**

The Final RTP reemphasizes the Complete Streets policies for future review and implementation in the constrained Expenditure Plan. An example would be SR 49/108 Five Lane Widening in Jamestown between Fifth Ave and South Main Street. This project would include Complete Streets improvements including a bicycling lane, sidewalks, and bus stop shelter and turnout (page 264).

### **Non-Motorized Transportation Improvements**

Most of the programmed (Tier 1a) and planned (Tier 1b and Tier 1c) State Highway and Local Road capital improvement projects in the 2016 Draft RTP did not include or list the non-motorized transportation improvements in the project description. However, many of these programmed or planned projects do in fact include non-motorized transportation improvements. Specific details about these non-motorized transportation capital improvement projects are now included in the Final RTP on pages 177-183.

### **Vision Sonora Plan Projects**

A more thorough description of the Vision Sonora Plan's non-motorized transportation projects were added in the body of the Non-Motorized Transportation Chapter on pages 167-170. An updated project description of the Vision Sonora Project, SR 49 Complete Streets and ADA Improvements in Sonora was included in the Final RTP.

### **Dragoon Gulch Trail Expansion Phase I**

This new trail project was added into the Final RTP. This trail project would be the first phase of the Dragoon Gulch Trail expansion.

### **Steward Street Public Restroom Facility Sidewalk Project**

This new sidewalk project was added into the Final RTP. This project would construct sidewalk improvements which consistent with ADA laws. The improvements would be along Steward Street between Theall Street and Mehan Street. The restrooms will comply with accessibility requirements which also require modifications to the City sidewalk in front of the building.

## **The highlights of the 2016 Final RTP include:**

### **Improve State Highways**

The 2016 RTP emphasizes providing a safe and well-maintained State Highway system that meets the needs for all transportation users. The State Route 108/49 widening to five lanes with Complete Streets Improvements from South Main St. to Fifth Ave is an important project that will help relieve traffic along SR 49-108 in Jamestown.

### **Improve Local Roads**

The 2016 RTP emphasizes providing a safe and well-maintained local circulation system that meets the needs for all transportation users. The Expenditure Plan plans capital improvement projects to help reduce traffic congestion, improve mobility, and improve safety.

The North-South Connector - Phase I - Greenley Road Extension from Lyons Rd to State Route 49 is an important project that will help relieve downtown Sonora traffic congestion.

### **Preserve the Transportation Network**

The 2016 RTP emphasizes preserving the multimodal system by maintaining, managing, and efficiently utilizing the existing transportation system. The Financial Element and the Local Roads Chapter discusses the major maintenance needs in Tuolumne County for the existing transportation network including: local roads, State Highways, bridges, and transit.

### **Supports Good Movement**

The 2016 RTP supports the movement of goods by improving our State Highway network. The SR 108 and Peaceful Oak Road Interchange Project will help improve goods movement and improve access along the State Highway system.

### **Expand the Use and Safety of Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

The 2016 RTP supports the expanded use of and safety of bicycle and pedestrian use through the implementation of Complete Street Improvements. An example of Complete Streets Projects, include projects in downtown Sonora, Jamestown, and Groveland. These improvements also include American with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant enhancements.

### **Implement the Rural Sustainable Strategies**

The 2016 RTP ensures the balance of environmental, economic, and social equity metrics in making transportation decisions. The Rural Sustainable Strategies focus on rural issues such as but not limited to safety, system preservation, public transit, complete streets, State Highways and local roads.

### **Reduce State Highway and Local Road Fatalities and Injuries**

The 2016 RTP will emphasize safety and operational improvements on State Routes 49, 108, and 120. The Yosemite Junction Safety Project at the intersection of SR 108 & 120 will help improve the safety and reduce traffic congestion at key route to Yosemite National Park.

### **Improve Public Transit**

The 2016 RTP emphasizes providing a safe, reliable, and effective public transportation. The 2016 RTP is helping improve public transit by proposing new transit services such as: seasonal service to Pinecrest and constructing ten new or improved transit shelters through Tuolumne County.

### **Financial Alternatives - Pursue New Funding Sources**

The 2016 RTP uses Financial Alternatives B, C, and D as a discussion point to pursue new revenue sources that could become available in the future. These alternatives include a list of future planned capital improvement projects that would be constructed with new funds. It is important to note, that some of the potential new revenue sources in the alternatives require changes in State law, passing of local ordinances, or voter initiatives. These financial alternatives present a discussion on what new transportation revenue sources are available and what priorities or actions the TCTC should pursue in the future to help reduce the transportation funding shortfall.

Financial Alternative B focuses on funding non-motorized transportation, transit, and road maintenance projects and this alternative anticipates three new revenue sources: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Active Transportation Program (ATP), and Cap and Trade Funds. In this alternative, all new funding is designated for specific transportation modes such as non-motorized transportation, transit, and road maintenance projects. Proposed changes in legislation would greatly increase funding for projects without increasing the tax burden to its citizens.

Financial Alternative C focuses on improving road network deficiencies on the State Highways and on local roads, and maintenance of local roads. This alternative anticipates three new revenue sources: a quarter-cent sales tax, redirecting some of the existing Cap & Trade funds to Tuolumne County, and an increase in the Regional Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program's (TIMF) fees.

Financial Alternative D focuses on improving road network deficiencies on the State Highways and on local roads, and maintenance of local roads. This alternative anticipates three new revenue sources: a quarter-cent sales tax, redirecting some of the existing Cap & Trade funds to Tuolumne County, and an increase in the Regional Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Program's (TIMF) fees.

### **Draft Environmental Impact Report – Comments and Responses**

The Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) released the 2016 Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Draft RTP and was circulated for a 45-day public review period that began September 21, 2016 and concluded on November 4, 2016. A public hearing on the 2016 Draft EIR was held on October 12, 2016 at 3pm at the Board of Supervisors Room on the 4<sup>th</sup> Floor at 2 Green Street Sonoma, CA 95370.

In accordance with Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC), as the lead agency, has reviewed the comments received on the Draft Program EIR for the 2016 RTP and has prepared written responses to the written and verbal comments received. The Draft Program EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period that began September 21, 2016 and concluded on November 4, 2016. The comment letters included herein were submitted by public agencies and local organizations. The Transportation Council received four comment letters on the Draft EIR.

**Table 8-1  
Commenters on the Draft EIR**

<b>Letter No.</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
1	Stephanie Tadlock	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board	10.18.16	8-3
2	Ken Baxter	Caltrans – District 10	11.4.16	8-14
3	Meg Layhee and John Buckley	Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center	10.26.16	8-29
4	Kevin Day	Tuolumne Me-Wuk Tribal Council	10.31.16	8-47

Responses to these comments have been prepared to address the environmental concerns raised by the commenters and to indicate where and how the Final Program EIR addresses pertinent environmental issues. The comment letters have been numbered, and each issue within a comment letter, if more than one, has a number assigned to it (for example, letter 1, comment 2 is referenced as 1.2). Each comment letter is reproduced in its entirety with the issues of concern numbered in the right margin. The commenters are listed in Table 8-1. The focus of the responses to comments is the disposition of environmental issues that are raised in the comments, as specified by Section 15088 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines. Detailed responses are not provided to comments on the merits of the proposed project.

### **Summary of Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report**

The changes incorporated into this Final Program EIR correct minor errors or clarify information. These edits, in addition to other minor or technical edits found in the text of the Final Program EIR (including in the Appendices), do not result in presentation of new substantial adverse environmental effects and do not affect the conclusions of the EIR. The page numbers of the changes to the Draft Program EIR are listed in Section 8.2 Comments and Responses following the response to a comment that suggests or warrants a change/edit to the Draft Program EIR. The Final Program EIR (including the Appendices) reflects the final, corrected EIR text.

In addition to revisions to the Draft Program EIR that were suggested by the comments received (as listed in Section 8.2), edits have been made to the Final Program EIR as suggested by TCTC staff to clarify information in the EIR and Draft RTP and/or provide more updated data than was available prior to the release of the Draft EIR. Section 2.0 *Project Description* has been updated with minor edits and corrections in Table 2-1 to reflect the Final 2016 RTP. None of these changes result in any new impacts. Section 4.6 *Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change* has

been updated to include information related to Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) which was signed into law on September 8, 2016. SB 32 requires the State to further reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, codifying Executive Order B-30-15. SB 32 requires the same emissions targets as Executive Order B-30-15; therefore the greenhouse gas impact analysis remains unchanged. These changes do not result in presentation of new substantial adverse environmental effects and do not affect the conclusions of the EIR.

### **Summary of CEQA Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

**Findings for Significant PROJECT and Cumulative Impacts for Which Project's Incremental Contribution has Been Mitigated to Less than Significant Levels (Class II Impacts)**

For the following impacts, TCTC hereby finds mitigation measures have been identified in the Final Program EIR that will avoid or substantially lessen the proposed project's incremental contribution to the following significant project and cumulative impacts to a less than significant (i.e., less than cumulatively considerable) level. The significant impacts and the mitigation measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level are as follows:

- Impact AES-1; Mitigation Measures AES-1(a) – (c)
- Impact AES-2; Mitigation Measures AES-2(a) – (c)
- Impact AQ-1; Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) – (d)
- Impact B-1; Mitigation Measures B-1(a)-(b)
- Impact B-2; Mitigation Measures B-2(a)-(c)
- Impact B-3; Mitigation Measure B-3
- Impact CR-2; Mitigation Measures CR-2(a)-(d)
- Impact G-1; Mitigation Measure G-1
- Impact G-2; Mitigation Measures G-2(a)-(b)
- Impact GHG-1; Mitigation Measure GHG-1
- Impact W-1; Mitigation Measures W-1(a)-(d)
- Impact W-2; Mitigation Measures W-2(a)-(b)
- Impact W-3; Mitigation Measure W-3
- Impact LU-1; Mitigation Measures for Impacts AQ-1(a)-(d) and N-1 to N-2
- Impact LU-2; Mitigation Measures LU-2(a)-(c)
- Impact LU-5; Mitigation Measure LU-5(a)-(c)
- Impact N-1; Mitigation Measures N-1(a)-(e)
- Impact N-2; Mitigation Measures N-2(a)-(b)

**Findings for Significant Project and Cumulative Impacts for Which Project's Incremental Contribution has Not Been Mitigated to Less than Significant Levels (Class I Impacts)**

For the following impacts, TCTC hereby finds that mitigation measures have been identified, where feasible, in the Final Program EIR that will reduce the proposed project's incremental contribution to the following significant cumulative impacts, but not to a less than significant (i.e., less than cumulatively considerable) level. The significant impacts and the mitigation are as follows:

## Impact CR-1; Mitigation Measure CR-1

- Impact TC-1; Mitigation Measure TC-1(a)-(h)
- Impact TC-2; Mitigation Measure TC-2(a)-(f)
- Impact GHG-3; No Feasible Mitigation Available
- Impact GHG-4; No Feasible Mitigation Available

## Statement of Overriding Considerations

TCTC adopts and makes this statement of overriding considerations concerning the Project's unavoidable significant impacts to explain why the project's benefits override and outweigh its unavoidable impacts. Even with implementation of all feasible mitigation, the project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts as follows:

1. Implementation of the 2016 RTP would disturb known and unknown cultural resources such as historic structures. (Impact CR-1)
2. Implementation of the 2016 RTP would exceed the year 2040 efficiency threshold with transportation emissions. (Impact GHG-3)
3. Implementation of the 2016 RTP would be inconsistent with SB 32 and Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15. (Impact GHG-4)
4. Implementation of the 2016 RTP would result in deficiencies on twelve roadway segments based on a threshold of level of service D. (Impact TC-1)
5. Implementation of the 2016 RTP would result in deficiencies on three intersections in 2030 and two intersections in 2040 based on a threshold of level of service D. (Impact TC-2)

Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding consideration warranting approval of the project, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact.

- The implementation of 2016 RTP transportation projects will provide for a comprehensive transportation system of facilities and services that meets the public's need for the movement of people and goods, and that is consistent with the social, economic, and environmental goals and policies of the region.
- The project will improve transportation safety, mobility, and accessibility in the county.
- The project will promote consistency between the California Transportation Plan 2025 and other plans developed by cities, counties, districts, Native American Tribal Governments, and State and Federal agencies in responding to Statewide and interregional transportation issues and needs.
- The RTP will contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, helping Tuolumne County to achieve the regional GHG reduction targets set by Assembly Bill 32.
- The construction of transportation projects will result in both short-term and long-term economic benefits to the Tuolumne County area and its residents. Transportation projects



will indirectly provide for a number of jobs relating to construction and maintenance. The RTP program includes transportation investments in the TCTC region. Other California MPO studies have shown that investments in regional transportation projects and programs provide numerous jobs locally (see, for example, SANDAG 2050 RTP-SCS, Technical Appendix 3, Table TA 3.1, average annual increase of 18,500 jobs).

### **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

- TCTC finds that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the 2016 RTP has been prepared for the project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings (Public Resources Code, § 21081.6(a)(1)).

#### **Attachments:**

1. *Final Draft Environmental Impact Report – Volume 1*
2. *Final Draft Environmental Impact Report – Volume 2 - Appendices*
3. *Resolution 558-17- Certifying the Final EIR*
4. *2016 RTP CEQA Findings & Statement of Overriding Considerations*
5. *2016 Final Regional Transportation Plan*
6. *Resolution 559-17 – Adopting the 2016 Final RTP*

#### **Recommended Action:**

*Recommend certifying the Final Draft Environmental Impact Report, adopting the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, adopting the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, and recommend adopting the Final 2016 Regional Transportation Plan.*

5. **Adopt Resolution 556-17 allocating \$51,682 in Bicycle/Pedestrian Local Transportation Fund Reserves to the City of Sonora for ADA sidewalk improvements on the east side of Stewart Street associated with the Bathroom project.**

The purpose of this agenda item is to present for consideration a request from the City of Sonora for funding for the Stewart Street Public Restroom Facility Project. The City's Request is included as an attachment to this agenda.

This project includes the renovation of the City's 1200 sq. ft. building located at 201 S. Stewart Street. The proposed renovation of the structure includes two public restrooms accessible from the exterior of the building. The restrooms will comply with accessibility requirements which also require modifications to the City sidewalk in front of the building. Renovations to the building will also include an office and storage area for the Sonora Farmers Market.

The need for accessible public restrooms within the historic downtown business district was identified under the Vision Sonora Plan and later established as a priority project under the public's priority setting activity. Currently the City has one public restroom, located on Green Street next to the Sonora Police Department, which is not easily accessible from Washington Street.



This project is an eligible use of the TCTC's Bicycle/Pedestrian Local Transportation Fund Reserves.

#### *Financial Impact*

Staff reviewed the request and determined that this project would be eligible for funding from the TCTC's Bicycle/Pedestrian Local Transportation Funds Reserve. As you may recall, the TCTC sets aside 2% of the total Local Transportation Funds Estimate each year toward funding future Bicycle/Pedestrian type projects.

The Reserve Fund has a current unobligated fund balance of \$87,053. The City's request for \$51,682 will reduce the current fund balance to \$35,371.

#### **Attachments:**

*Request from City, Resolution 556-17*

#### **Recommended Action:**

*Adopt Resolution 556-17 allocating \$51,682 in Bicycle/Pedestrian Local Transportation Funds Reserves to the City of Sonora for the Stewart Street Public Restroom Facility Project.*

### **6. Letter of support for AB174**

Assemblyman Bigelow has introduced a bipartisan bill to require at least one member of the California Transportation Commission be from a rural county with less than 100,000 population. This legislation is consistent with the TCTA's adopted legislative priorities. Staff will present a letter of support for AB174 at the meeting.

#### **Recommended Action:**

*Recommend authorization for the chair to sign a letter of support for AB174.*

### **7. Reports**