

Please review
these general
plan provisions
for inclusion in
the Circulation
Element

5-29-19

Tom Infusino

CPC

For the Circulation
Element, please
consider the
policy suggestions and
mitigation measures
on FEIR pages

2-177 to 2-184

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

Impacts related to the above issue are not further analyzed or discussed in this EIR chapter. (Emphasis added)

On the Calaveras County website the population listed is 44,828 (2015).

The Suburban Website listing Population Demographics for Calaveras County, California 2017, 2018 listed 45,578. (<https://suburbanstats.org/population/california/how-many-people-live-in-calaveras-county>)

Calaveras County was required to institute a Storm Water Grading Ordinance with a population below 50,000, when the threshold for such an ordinance was a population of 100,000. This occurred because during heavy development there were sediment issues in rivers and streams that were a serious concern to the authorities at the state level.

Given the existing lack of funding to meet current and future road maintenance and improvements, and given that there are many approved, unbuilt subdivisions that will probably be built if the economy continues to improve; and given that there are already 13 segments that are degraded down to LOS D – all on State Highway Segments depended upon for regional and statewide transportation; there is a crying need to adopt feasible measures to mitigate significant traffic congestion impacts. Congestion Management Plans are a feasible mitigation, as they are routinely conducted by local governments throughout the State of California (including neighboring San Joaquin County, see Exhibit 8). (*Sierra Club v. County of San Diego* (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1173 [When provided examples of mitigation measures implemented elsewhere, and agency must either implement them or explain why not].)

The fact that a congestion management plan is not yet required by the Congestion Management Act, is not relevant. The question is, Can Calaveras County feasibly complete a Congestion Management Plan during the next 20 years leading to the reduction in traffic congestion impacts from general plan buildout? Is it feasible to complete the plan and reap congestion management benefits prior to the County reaching the 50,000 in population threshold? It is important to implement impact mitigation BEFORE the significant impacts result from development under the proposed general plan. (*POET, LLC v. State Air Resources Board* (2013) 218 Cal.App.4th 681, 736-740 [Mitigation cannot be deferred past the start of project activity that causes the adverse environmental impact].)

We want the County to prepare and deal with the existing and resulting congestion. The DEIR does not adequately justify delaying discussion of a Congestion Management Program (CMP). Why isn't it appropriate to list a CMP as a Policy, with a stated time line to allow

11-154
Cont'd

11-155

4.13-11

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-155
Cont'd

CCOG time to do the work to get the program in place? Please respond to this recommendation in the final EIR.

The excerpt below offers justification for a CMP.

2018 Regional Congestion Management Program San Joaquin Council of Governments

1 Chapter 1 Introduction 1.1 PROGRAM BACKGROUND

In June, 1990 California voters approved legislation which increased funding for California's transportation system. With the passage of Proposition 111 there were new requirements for the transportation planning process that requires urbanized counties, such as San Joaquin County, to prepare, adopt, and biennially update a Congestion Management Program (CMP).

As the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Joaquin County, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is required to maintain the state-mandated CMP for San Joaquin County. For most CMA's, implementation of the state CMP requirements also implements the federal Congestion Management System (CMS) planning requirements. The objective of the CMS/CMP is to ensure that new land uses are developed in tandem with the necessary transportation improvements by coordinating the land use, air quality, and transportation planning processes.

The Measure K Renewal Ordinance, approved by San Joaquin County voters in November 2006, required SJCOG to have in place and be fully implementing a regional CMP by January 1, 2008 (referred hereafter as the RCMP). The 2012 RCMP updated SJCOG's RCMP process to comply with state and federal requirements by developing methods and guidelines to streamline the congestion management process and facilitate program implementation via automation and web based applications. It also achieved greater consistency with current state law by integrating the SJCOG CMP process with SJCOG's other transportation planning and programming functions. This in turn, enhanced SJCOG's ability to satisfy the federal Congestion Management System (CMS) requirements as proscribed by FHWA's federal certification review process. The 2016 RCMP further refined SJCOG's RCMP process by better capturing the benefits and products developed as part of the 2012 RCMP update and better synced the RCMP with the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program.

Final Draft- San Joaquin County Regional Congestion Management Program, April 2018

11-156

4.13-12

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-156
Cont'd

(<https://www.sicog.org/DocumentCenter/View/3804/2018-Regional-Congestion-Management-Program-Final-Draft>)

What are the differences between a Congestion Management Program and a Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (IMC-2B)?

Page 4.13-16 & 4.13-22 Conflicts with approved plans.

11-157

In 2017, Calaveras COG adopted a new Regional Transportation Plan. (See Exhibit 6) The CPC comments on that plan identify conflicts between the 2017 RTP and the Draft General Plan that may result in environmental impacts. (See Exhibit 6) In the Final EIR, please identify mitigation measures to resolve these conflicts.

11-158

Page 4.13-27, under **Mitigation Measures, Policy C 2.2**, 13 county road segments are listed as exceptions to the LOS C required operating level.

- SR 26 from the San Joaquin County line to Silver Rapids Road-LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 4 from Vallecito Road to Kurt Drive-LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 4 from Lakemont Drive to Henry Drive-LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 4 from Henry Drive to Sierra Parkway- LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 12 from SR 26 to SR 49 – LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from Pool Station Road to Gold Strike Road- LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from Gold Oak Road to Mountain Ranch Road- LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from Dog Town Road to SR 4 (W)- LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from SR 4 (W) to Murphys Grade Road – LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from Stanislaus Avenue to Mark Twain Road –LOS D is acceptable to the County.

4.13-13

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-158
Cont'd

- SR 49 from Mark Twain Road to Bret Harte Road – LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 Bret Harte Road to SR 4 (S) Vallecito Road- LOS D is acceptable to the County.
- SR 49 from SR 4 (S) Vallecito Road to Tuolumne County Line – LOS D is acceptable to the County.

As depicted in Table 4.13-2, the range of traffic on a Major Two Lane Highway under LOS D goes from 935 to 1554 peak hour trips. Thus, although the County may insist on allowing roads to breach LOS C, the County need not raise the LOS to the entire range of LOS D. Page 4.13-24 notes that many of the State Highways will only slightly surpass LOS D (by 40 to 80 peak hour trips) at general plan buildout, and the maximum exceedance is 150 peak hour trips.

In the Final EIR, rather than moving the LOS Standards to LOS D for 13 State Highway segments, consider raising the LOS to a specified peak trip amount WITHIN LOS D (e.g. 1100 peak hour trips), so that drivers will not unnecessarily experience near LOS E conditions.

In the Final EIR, for roadways that exceed LOS C by 80 or fewer peak hour trips, please consider modifications to the Land Use Map in those areas to reduce the trip generation at general plan buildout. This is a way to actually mitigate the traffic.

Pages 4.13-31 to 4.13-32

IM S-3G Coordinated Fire Prevention and Response Planning Efforts.

....."Coordination efforts should include evaluations of proposed road improvements in the County's Circulation Element and Regional Transportation Plan that may improve emergency evacuation routes. Support may be in the form of hosting a strategic planning session for emergency response personnel and planners. Coordination may also be achieved in the form of sharing GIS database layers and fire modeling data.

11-160

~~As these comments are being written, there are about 19 very large fires burning in California. 33,000 firefighters from a wide area are fighting the fires, and yes, there have been fatalities. The hills in a wide area are obscured by smoke and warnings have been distributed to the residents to be mindful of the effects of the smoke. We are almost 2 years out from the Butte Fire, but the County and the fire victims are far from recovered. It is very difficult to read the words may, or may be, or should, when talking about how this county is going to do a better job in the~~

4.13-14

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-161

~~future when it is faced with the next huge fire or storm event. Please make a more definitive statement here. Suggestion: will~~

Although this measure is a positive step forward, IM S-3G defers mitigation efforts but does not commit the County to achieve any level of impact mitigation, thus it is not a valid mitigation measure. (*Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Association of Governments* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 413, 443 [Lead agency cannot defer mitigation without committing to meet performance standards]; *California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland* (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 197, 199 [A promise to prepare a plan in the future, without any commitment to mitigate the impact, is an inadequate mitigation measure under CEQA].) In addition, there is no explanation why this coordination did not happen over the last 12 years of this planning process, so that concrete mitigation measures would now be available for adoption. (*San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 670-671 [Mitigation deferral is improper unless there is a reason for the deferral and mitigation performance standards are set forth]; *Communities for a better Environment v City of Richmond* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 70, 95 [The time to formulate mitigation measures is during the EIR process, before final project approval].) Please make this a more definite effort with specified tasks and outcomes.

11-162

IM S-3V Evacuation Routes.~~IF~~ a Battalion Evacuation Plan is prepared as recommended in the Calaveras County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

~~DO NOT USE THE WORD "IF" IN THIS INSTANCE - NOT ACCEPTABLE. Please use "WHEN" instead.~~

Page 4.13-33

11-163

Regarding Policy C 3.1, Policy C 3.2, Policy C 3.3 and possibly Policy C 3.4. and Policy C 3.6. ~~Will these transit related policies still be accurate as presented in this DEIR, given that as reported on March 9, 2018, in the Calaveras Enterprise, "County relinquishes control of the public transit system"? (Exhibit 5) See excerpt below:~~

4.13-15

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-163
Cont'd

"City and county lawmakers have entered into an agreement with the Calaveras Council of Governments (CCOG) to allow the agency to take over management of the county's transit program.

The agreement will allow both county and Angels Camp representatives to have a say in the program through a Joint Powers Authority board, but will relieve the county of its burden of managing the system, said Amber Collins, executive director of CCOG."

~~The citizens of Calaveras County are fortunate to have a transit system. It is very positive that CCOG will be managing the operation of the transit.~~

Page 4.13-34

IM C-2B Transportation Alternatives in Impact Fees

Consider transit capital improvements and non-auto travel improvements necessary to serve new development in impact fee programs to fund public transportation infrastructure, park-and-ride lots, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities associated with the new development.

This was a recommendation of Caltrans on page two of its response to the NOP.

11-164

"Caltrans recommends that the DEIR consider the need to review traffic impact fee programs and their associated capital improvement programs to ensure that the cumulative impacts of development are adequately mitigated. Incorporating active transportation, goods movement, and transit facilities into the fee programs would help improve funding of Complete Streets and provide improved transportation choices to reduce reliance on private vehicles. Upon implementation of anticipated SB 743 CEQA Guidelines changes, these change might also act to mitigate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts."

~~Again, while this is a positive step forward, it is not mitigation. Consider is not acceptable. Source: Identity. (California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 197, 199 [A promise to prepare a plan in the future, without any commitment to mitigate the impact, is an inadequate mitigation measure under CEQA]; California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 198-199~~

4.13-16

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

11-164
Cont'd

[Deferral of a fair share fee mitigation program is invalid when there is no evidence it would be practical and the lead agency as not committed to creating the plan.]

Page 4.13-35

IM C-3A Park-and-Ride Facilities --

As funding allows, designate and implement appropriate "Park and Ride" facilities, and promote ridesharing programs.

11-165

~~As funding allows, isn't going to cut it. If growth is allowed, these impacts need to be planned for and a legal funding mechanism developed.~~ In the Final EIR identify the funding need in dollars annually, the available funding sources, efforts that will be made on an annual basis to secure those funds, targets for the number and locations of park and ride facilities (e.g. one in each Supervisor district), list the feasible means of promoting ridesharing, and the number of means that will be selected in the future. (*City of Maywood v. Los Angeles Unified School District* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 362, 412 [Selection of specific mitigation measures may be deferred when the lead agency has evaluated the impact, identified feasible mitigation measures, and has committed to mitigating those impacts].)

IM C-5A Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

~~This plan will have to be more than updated, isn't there a formal procedure to accept this plan, involving the Board of Supervisors that must take place?~~

11-166

Caltrans also proposed this mitigation measures on page 2 of its comments on the NOP.

"The DEIR should consider whether policies requiring discretionary approval including identification and mitigation of project-specific impacts for commercial, industrial, and high-density residential projects generating in excess of an appropriate threshold of vehicle trips would be a feasible way to reduce the severity of any significant and unavoidable transportation impacts of the Plan."

4.13-17

Letter 11
Cont'd

Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation

Please consider this impact mitigation measure in the Final EIR. If you do not accept it, please explain why, based upon substantial evidence, the measure is infeasible. (Banning Ranch Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach (2017) 2 Cal.5th 918, 94["[M]ajor environmental issues raised when the lead agency's position is at variance with recommendations and objections raised in the comments must be addressed in detail." (Guidelines, § 15088, subd. (c).)]; Sierra Club v. County of San Diego (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th 1152, 1175-1176 [It is an abuse of discretion to reject alternatives or mitigation measures that would reduce adverse impacts without supporting substantial evidence].)

Exhibits:

Exhibit 1- Caltrans Officials Admonish County For Lack of Road Planning, Sierra Sentinel, April 12, 1990

11-166
Cont'd

Caltrans Officials Admonish County For Lack of Road Planning

Patty Shires, Editor

Sierra Sentinel News - April 12, 1990

Arnold, California

Obviously and visibly frustrated, Caltrans officials bluntly told Planning Commissioners on April 5 that all developments being approved by the county are impacting the highways and Caltrans has no money to improve roads.

Of specific concern was the rapid growth taking place along Highway 26. District 10 Permit Engineer John Gagliano told Commissioners that he is "really concerned about what's happening." He said Caltrans is seeing more and more development front on the highway and the roads will soon no longer have the ability to carry the increased traffic load. "We're concerned and you ought to be concerned," he declared.

Another Caltrans representative Gene Coleman displayed some maps to illustrate the problems caused by approving developments with small lots fronting on Highway 26. Even 40 acre and

4.13-18

For the Circulation
Element, Please
consider the
Mitigation Measures
and Policies in our
Scoping Comments
on pages 2.6-3
to 2.6-7.

The County had the 55th worst ranking out of the State's counties in deaths due to motor vehicle crashes. The County had the 53rd worst ranking in alcohol involved fatal and injury motor vehicle crashes. (From 2005 MSR, Calaveras County LAFCO, Page III-2.) Calaveras County roads are very unforgiving and many are also no longer safe for the motorist or pedestrian or bicyclist. LOS figures do not reflect that danger. We may look like a rural county but along with a 45,000+ population we have a growing tourist industry which brings 10, 20 or maybe 30 thousand people on a weekend to travel these unsafe roads. Accident rates are a measure of the level of safety on county roads. We can no longer accept the failure to fund our roads.

II. Impacts and Mitigation

A) Vague policies do not mitigate impacts.

The analysis of general plan impacts is complicated by the vagueness of the project description. It is particularly disappointing that policies that otherwise could mitigate the impacts are too vague to do so.

C 1.5 Actively seek all possible financial assistance, including grant funds available from regional, state, and federal agencies, for street and highway improvements and other transportation projects when compatible with General Plan policies and long term local funding capabilities.

Please explain “long term local funding capabilities.” It could be helpful if the reference meant an increased TOT tax & a gas tax & a sales tax. Maybe then we could start paring down that \$672 million circulation backlog the RTP mentions. Of course, another option is to limit future development to the capacity of the roadways that are actually on the ground or funded, and to direct development to those locations.

C 1.7 Safety shall be the primary factor in prioritizing circulation system improvements and evaluating the ability of the County-maintained roadway system to accommodate traffic growth from new development.

When a segment of road is experiencing a significant accident rate any new project should be denied until mitigation can remedy the problem. If a developer chooses to pay for that mitigation, an agreement would allow that developer to recover any amount above his “fair share” as future development occurs. In addition, if a project lowers the safety level of a road segment, the project should be denied.

B) Evaluate Butte Fire Road Damage and its repair.

The Butte Fire and tree mortality issues have dramatically increased stress on a large area of county roads and state highways in the area. The recovery process may address these extraordinary maintenance issues, but if not, that will be very challenging for Calaveras County to absorb. Please address this cumulative impact in the General Plan Draft EIR. How will this impact the overall road maintenance program in the County in the future?

C) Evaluate the new access road for Pardee Reservoir.

Residents of Valley Springs have expressed concern about large tanker trucks traveling down Daphne Street and traveling out to Paloma Road, delivering water treatment related chemicals to Pardee Reservoir. The fumes/emissions and noise are their concern. There has been some discussion at the County about a new access road, west of Castle Rock Mobile Home Park from Hwy 12/26, left for about 1 mile to Paloma Road, thus avoiding the residential area. This road, as any new road planned, should be evaluated in the General Plan EIR. The noise analysis section of the EIR should address the mitigation of these noise concerns as well.

D) Relieve heavy truck traffic in residential neighborhoods.

Another point of concern is the Hogan Quarry traffic on Silver Rapids Road, traveling to Hwy 26. The issues are time-of-day of traffic, noise (truck, jake brakes), and emissions from trucks. To mitigate these impacts in those neighborhoods where they will occur, consider policies that would allow specific

neighborhoods to reduce the impact of future truck traffic. The noise section of the EIR should address these concerns.

E) Valley Springs Bypass

The community of Valley Springs has known of a prospective bypass for over 42 years. We are glad to see that noted in the General Plan Draft.

F) Effective Evacuation Routes

During an emergency, such as to Pattison Fire (2004 ?), it becomes very apparent that we have a problem: a lack of connector roads. That fire came from West of Valley Springs, crossed Hwy 12 into Quail Oaks subdivision and burned all the way to Olive Orchard Road. At the same time a transformer exploded about a half mile East of Valley Springs adjacent to Hwy 12/26. People were stuck in town, some for the night. Some longtime residents were able to move around in a limited fashion because of their knowledge of back roads. Any visitors had no choice but to stay where they were until Hwy 12/26 opened again. These incidents show us the importance of evacuation routes and having the public informed. These routes need to be marked so visitors can effectively utilize them.

The Pattison happened on a very hot windy September day. It moved a mile in under 10 minutes. The Butte fire was totally different in scope.

To mitigate the impacts of the increased population on emergency evacuations, the General Plan EIR should identify means to improve our road system to help the residents and emergency responders of this county to survive, and to save as much value as possible.

G) Directing growth in the amounts and to the locations where the roads are.

Calaveras County has used State Highways as county roads for over 40 years. Caltrans has continually told county representatives how unproductive this is. The population went from 15,000 to 45,000 in that time frame. Two lane county roads with no shoulders or drainage and with limited safety features are no longer adequate. To successfully attract more businesses and jobs, we need to direct new growth to areas where road infrastructure is in place or is funded.

H) Each of the unique small towns has their own unique issues.

1) San Andreas

San Andreas has significant traffic congestion issues, pedestrian safety issues, vehicle emission issues, parking and connectivity issues. As the County Seat, San Andreas has the traffic and pedestrian traffic of county government, CHP, Cal Fire, several schools, a significant amount of commercial traffic traveling to the east and timber trucks moving west. They have an un-adopted mobility plan that could begin to improve conditions. Please consider adopting the mobility plan as a means to mitigate the impacts of future traffic from buildout of the general plan.

2) The Highway 4 corridor

The Highway 4 corridor is made up of several small towns that experience the winter recreation traffic and tourist recreation for the other three seasons. They also live with logging truck traffic and all the traffic associated with their communities. Many residences are vacation homes and/or used as rentals. This area is also in a high fire danger area. The General Plan EIR should include mitigation measures to ensure that with future growth there will be well-maintained roads, adequate pull-outs to accommodate traffic flow, and well-identified evacuation routes from the subdivisions and other development in this mountainous region.

3) The D2 area

The D2 is made up of scattered towns and subdivisions in another mountainous area and was the primary site of the Butte Fire. Highway 26 traverses some of this district but the remaining roads are county or privately maintained. Fire hazard is very high here. Evacuation routes are critical. People who live here are used to coping but we have many tourists frequenting the county for fishing, hunting, camping, and hiking. In General Plan EIR, please identify mitigation measures so that, despite future growth, this area will have effective evacuation routes, safe roads, and more pull-out and turn lanes where needed to manage traffic flow and safety.


4) Copperopolis

Copperopolis is projected to experience a significant amount of growth from the subdivision permitted but unbuilt, and from several that are planned for the future and designated on the General Plan Update land use map. There are already serious congestion and safety issues with the existing circulation and these conditions have existed for many years. Cumulative impacts on regional roads were not properly mitigated as projects were being approved. Additional road funding only started happening after several lawsuits emanating from citizens were successful. In the General Plan EIR, identify the major collectors in Copperopolis that must be expanded to accommodate the additional development. New development must not be allowed to degrade the quality of the roads.

D) Transit

The residents of Calaveras County are very fortunate to have their transit system. This service has struggled against many odds and some Supervisors. There is a continuous effort to evolve the transit system and adapt to challenges and new needs. Depending on its density and location, new growth under the general plan may help to better fund the transit system, or it may degrade the systems effectiveness. In the General Plan EIR please explain what mitigation efforts decision-makers can do to continue to evolve the system. Please be open to unique possibilities and solutions.

Students from the Earth Club at Calaveras High School suggested that there is a need for early and late busses to the high school to help students participate more fully in after school activities, organizations and opportunities which help them achieve their long term goals. This need will increase as the student population increases from new development under the General Plan Update. Their request is that the transit service consider this possibility. Please consider this as a transit impact mitigation measure in the General Plan EIR.



For the circulation
Element, please
consider the policy
suggestions on pages
CEC-4 to CEC-9, of
our comments on
the 2014 Draft
Plan.

Comment: The public and developers might find it helpful to have the Circulation Chapter from the 2008 Baseline Report included in the Circulation Element Background Report.

Please include this information in the next draft of the Background Report.

As the old saying goes,

if you want to get out of a hole--

STOP DIGGING!!!!

2) Goals and Policies

CIR-1 A balanced circulation system that provides for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods while maintaining the county's rural and historic character.

Add, "energy, water, wastewater, storm drainage, and communications" to the list of things we want safely and efficiently moved.

CIR 1.5 Actively seek all possible financial assistance, including grant funds available from regional, state, and federal agencies, for street and highway improvements and other transportation projects when compatible with General Plan policies and long term local funding capabilities.

While this is a nice general statement, it does not address the systemic and chronic road funding shortage. The Circulation Element needs to confront these unanswered questions regarding funding of roadways taken from the Calaveras 2012 RTP Update Final Report, October 3, 2012:

"The following questions remain critical to the County's transportation system:

How should limited transportation funds continue to be prioritized to meet the needs of motorists, transit riders, goods movement, bicyclists, pedestrians, and visitors over the next 20 years while maintaining fiscal constraint?

What should the share of Federal vs. State dollars be for transportation projects?

Should local governments assume a greater role in funding local projects?

What type of funding strategy should Calaveras County adopt to provide the needed transportation improvements to its transportation system while maintaining the existing system? "

Comment: This is déjà vu. (See the quote at beginning of comments from *Concerned Citizens of Calaveras County v. Board of Supervisors* (1985) 166 Cal.App.3d 90.)

Please consider goals and policies and implementation measures that will have meaningful results in the future and answer the four questions from the Calaveras 2012 RTP Update Final Report printed above.

For your consideration we offer sample policies from Nevada County:

Nevada County GP V1 PG 78

Policy 4.10

In the absence of an approved plan and funding program to provide needed roadway improvements, and where the County has determined that there is no feasible project mitigation, the County may deny those amendments to the General Plan that exacerbate an identified deficiency in local or State roads or highways.

Objective 4.4

Implement funding strategies for the development and maintenance of circulation facilities and services that will allow the development and expansion of the transportation system concurrent with County Growth.

Action Policy

Policy 4.11

Implement a comprehensive program that imposes development fees in amount sufficient to mitigate the cumulative impact of development on the regional (non-local) highway and roadway network as defined in the Nevada County Road Functional Classification Plan and as shown on the Nevada County Circulation Plan Maps.

The comprehensive development fee structure shall ensure that future growth fully mitigates its direct and cumulative impacts upon the County and, where possible, the State transportation system.

Additional sample policies to consider from Mariposa County:

Page 9-9

Timing: Ongoing review standard

Responsibility: Mariposa County Planning Department, Public Works Department.

Fiscal Impact: Ongoing review.

Consequences: This is an up-front environmental threshold.

Implementation Measure 9-1c(3): The capacity of a county road must be assessed for its capability to meet existing and new uses when the aggregate potential development will increase the utilization of the road by more than 25%

Timing: Ongoing review standard

Responsibility: Mariposa County Planning Department, Public Works Department.

Fiscal Impact: Ongoing review.

Consequences: This is an up-front environmental threshold.

Policy 9-1d: Road improvement requirements shall be based on road capacity.
Implementation Measure 9-1d(1): No subdivision or discretionary project shall be approved if the traffic generated by the proposed project will exceed the capacity of the road systems which provide access from the nearest County major collector or State highway unless mitigation is required.

Timing: Ongoing review standard

Responsibility: Mariposa County Planning Department, Public Works Department.

Fiscal Impact: Ongoing review.

Consequences: This is an up-front environmental threshold.

Policy 9-1e: Adopt comprehensive standards for all County roadways.

Implementation Measure 9-1e(1): The County shall incorporate standards and specifications applicable to roads under County jurisdiction, which will include:

- a requirement that all roads serving road systems shall have an allweather surface,
- all new roads shall be constructed to fire safe standards,
- all new non-County maintained roads shall be contained within mandatory road maintenance associations or zones of benefit,
- all road construction shall be inspected and approved by the Public Works Department, and
- road circulation within a system shall be designed to be interconnecting and cul-de-sac or dead-end roads shall be designed to be safe.

Timing: Short-term

Responsibility: Public Works Department.

Fiscal Impact: Staff time.

Consequences: These standards provide a basis for the road ordinance Update.

Comment: Traffic/road issues have been “put off” for years in Calaveras County. If we are to get out of the hole we have dug for ourselves, and continue to move forward, we require more accountability. We want to know who will be responsible, what the time frame might be, and how we will achieve needed funding.

On Page CIR 12, the Circulation Element states:

“Cir 2.3 Road impacts created by new development shall not reduce the minimum level of service of (LOS) D or better for roadways and intersections in Community Areas (as indicated on the General Plan Land Use Diagram-Figure LU-1) and LOS C or better on County-maintained roadway outside of Community Areas...”

It is important to note the information on Page V, Calaveras 2012 RTP Update Final Report, October 3, 2012:

Future Roadway Deficiencies

The future (2035) roadways with LOS D or higher are shown in Table E.4. The list includes six local facilities (county/city roadways) that moved from LOS C to LOS D based on the capacity thresholds. In addition, eleven new segments on state facilities were forecast to be LOS D or higher through 2035. The County and City have proposed several capacity projects and operational improvements at intersections to help facilitate local circulation. Due to funding constraints, several of these projects have moved to the “unfunded list” in Appendix M. The remaining projects from the Benefit Basin, Road Impact Mitigation (RIM), and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) will help with local circulation. The capacity improvements proposed by Caltrans for State Highways as reflected in the Transportation Concept Reports (TCR) identify needs. **If funding were available to implement the improvements, projects could be conceived and included in the RTP. Unfortunately, funding is not available to implement these improvements at this time (See Appendix 2A).**

Comment: Given Policy CIR 2.3, how will the County be able to stop this deterioration of the LOS ratings given the existing and projected funding challenges?

It is also useful to recall the criticism of the 1996 General Plan that the new general plan is supposed to address:

- In 2005, County Resolution No. 05-158 (approving General Plan Amendment 2004-174) removed the Circulation Element Appendix from the General Plan and designated the contents of the Appendix as a separate road service classification system to be maintained by the Public Works Department and capable of being updated by resolution. This was done in an attempt to facilitate the updating of road LOS ratings. To date, no updates have occurred. The LOS ratings appears to date back to the early 1980s and have not been updated since originally adopted. (Calaveras County General Plan Evaluation, October 12, 2006, Page 32.)

The old LOS ratings that date back to the 1980's are not acceptable. The LOS ratings need to be updated. This calls for an implementation measure.

We note that the plan calls for a maintenance of a road impact mitigation fee:

CIR 2.20 Maintain a program of proportional road improvement mitigation fees for general transportation improvement projects. General improvement mitigation requirements shall be appointed on an equitable basis, based on the projected cumulative impact for a 20-year horizon.

Comment: Will this road mitigation fee for general transportation improvement projects be collected in addition to the RIM and Benefit Basin fees? Who has the responsibility to implement this fee program?

On page CIR 14, the plan addresses airports. We would add a policy that calls for the County to amend the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan when needed for it to comply with current regulations or new transportation or land use circumstances.

On page CIR 15, Program CIR-1.A calls for, "Balanced design to accommodate walking, cycling, transit, driving, parking, drainage, stormwater management, emergency vehicle access, snow removal and deliveries." We would add to the list "wheelchairs."

On page CIR 17, Program CIR-5.A deals with Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans. Please note that the following plans have been adopted by the CCOG, but have not been accepted by the Board of Supervisors, nor have they had their Environmental Review. Calaveras County is missing funding opportunities by not having these plans ADOPTED. This should be resolved immediately.

- **Calaveras County Pedestrian Master Plan, 2007**
- **Calaveras County Bicycle Master Plan, 2007**
- **Arnold Rural Livable Community-Based Mobility Plan, 2007**
- **San Andreas Rural Livable Mobility Plan, 2009**

As pointed out in the OPR General Plan Guidelines, the best general plans consider implementation up front, during plan development. We at the CPC encourage the County to identify in the GPU the necessary implementation items, their timeline for completion, and their potential funding sources. This will help the County to promptly implement the GPU and thereby promptly reap its benefits.