

**FINAL**  
**2016 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PLAN**  
**TRINITY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

**October 17, 2017**

*Prepared by:*

**Trinity County Transportation Commission**

**P.O. Box 2490**

**31301 State Highway 3**

**Weaverville, CA 96093**

**(530) 623-1365**

**[tcdot@trinitycounty.org](mailto:tcdot@trinitycounty.org)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
INTRODUCTION .....	i
ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS.....	ii
POLICY ELEMENT.....	iii
ACTION ELEMENT .....	iii
FINANCIAL PLAN.....	v
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of this RTP .....	1
Regional Setting .....	4
Demographic Profile .....	4
Purpose of the Plan .....	12
Report Organization .....	13
Transportation/Land Use Integration .....	13
Coordination .....	14
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms .....	21
2. ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS.....	22
Existing Roadway System .....	22
Roadway Operations .....	32
Safety.....	36
Transit.....	37
Aviation Facilities.....	45
Rail Service.....	49
Non-Motorized Facilities .....	50
Air Quality .....	52
3. POLICY ELEMENT.....	55
Statewide Issues.....	55
Regional and Local Issues .....	56
Goals, Objectives, and Policies .....	58
RTP Consistency Evaluation .....	69
4. ACTION ELEMENT .....	72
State and Regional Planning Processes .....	72
Action Element Assumptions.....	72
Program-Level Performance Measures.....	73
Project Purpose and Need .....	76
Project Programming and Selection Criteria .....	77
Completed Projects .....	78
Noteworthy Changes to Project Lists: 2011 vs. 2016 RTP .....	79
Regional and Local Action Programs .....	80
Project Priorities.....	80
State Highway Projects .....	81
Trinity County RTIP .....	81
County Road and Bridge Projects .....	82
Transit Projects.....	82

- Non-Motorized (Bicycle and Pedestrian) Projects..... 83
- Aviation ..... 83
- Unconstrained Projects ..... 83
- Transportation Systems Management ..... 83
- 5. FINANCIAL PLAN..... 86
  - Approach ..... 86
  - Summary of Revenues and Costs..... 88
  - Federal Revenues ..... 91
  - State Revenues ..... 94
  - Local Revenues ..... 96
  - Project Cost Summary..... 96
  - Project Costs vs. Total Revenues ..... 98
  - Funding Strategy ..... 98
  - Support Actions to Maximize Limited Funds ..... 99
- 6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ..... 100
- 7. REFERENCES ..... 101

**LIST OF FIGURES**

- Figure 1 – Trinity County Map..... 6
- Figure 2 – Tribal Boundaries and Ancestral Lands..... 20
- Figure 3 – Roadway Functional Classification ..... 25
- Figure 4 – Trinity Transit ..... 38
- Figure 5 – Trinity County Airports ..... 47
- Figure 6 – Trinity County Bikeways ..... 51

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Historical Population and Growth Rates .....	5
Table 1.2 Total Employment .....	7
Table 1.3 Total Labor Force.....	8
Table 1.4 Median Household Income, Trinity County.....	9
Table 1.5 Trinity County Building Permits Per Year For Residential Uses .....	11
Table 1.6 Trinity County Inter-County Commute Patterns.....	12
Table 1.7 Trinity County Indian Tribal Governments Regional Transportation Plan Contacts.....	19
Table 2.1 Historical Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes on State Facilities.....	28
Table 2.2 Truck Traffic Volumes on State Facilities .....	31
Table 2.3 Roadway Segment Level of Service Thresholds.....	33
Table 2.4 Intersection Level of Service Definitions.....	34
Table 2.5 Fatal and Injury Collisions on Trinity County Roads.....	37
Table 2.6 Trinity Transit Service Characteristics .....	39
Table 2.7 Trinity Transit Performance Measures FY 11/12 through FY 15//16.....	40
Table 2.8 Existing Bikeways in Trinity County .....	50
Table 4.1 RTP Program Level Performance Measures.....	74
Table 4.2 RTP Performance Measures, Policies, and Objectives .....	75
Table 4.3 District 2 ITS Elements .....	85
Table 5.1 Trinity County Projected Revenues .....	89
Table 5.2 Summary of Total RTP Project Costs.....	90
Table 5.3 Total Cost Vs. Total Revenues .....	98

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

- Appendix 1A Trinity County Maintained Road Mileage
- Appendix 1B Caltrans Structure Maintenance & Investigations – Trinity County
- Appendix 2 Trinity County Travel Demand Forecasting Model Development Report
- Appendix 3 Weaverville Traffic Signalization Study
  - Attachment A – Signal Warrant Analysis
  - Attachment B – Scenario 1: Unsignalized Intersections
  - Attachment C – Scenario 2: Signalized Intersections
  - Attachment D – Scenario 3: Signalized and Roundabout Intersections
  - Attachment E – Traffic Vibration Assessment: Trinity County Intersection Improvements
- Appendix 4A Caltrans State Highway Capital Improvements Projects
  - 4A1 – Caltrans STIP Projects
  - 4A2 – Caltrans SHOPP Projects
  - 4A3 – Caltrans ITS Projects
- Appendix 4B RTIP for Trinity County – 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Appendix 4C Capital Improvements County Road and Bridge Projects
- Appendix 4D Capital Improvements Transit Projects
- Appendix 4E Capital Improvements Non-Motorized Projects
- Appendix 4F Capital Improvements Aviation Projects
- Appendix 4G Future RTP Capital Improvements Unconstrained Projects
- Appendix 5 Environmental Documentation – CEQA Initial Study and Proposed Negative Declaration

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Trinity County. The TCTC consists of the entirety of Trinity County, which has no incorporated cities. The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments in the County involving local, state, and federal funding over the next twenty years. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was last updated by the TCTC in 2011. The horizon year for this 2016 RTP update is 2036. Transportation improvements are categorized as short-term (0-5 years), midrange (6-15 years) or long-term (16-20 years).

This RTP is referred to as the 2016 RTP, since RTPs are required to be completed every five years, and the last one was completed in 2011. The 2016 Trinity County RTP was due to be completed in October 2016, but at that time there were several key State transportation funding bills working their way through the State Legislature. There were several possible outcomes, which varied widely in what would be provided in the way of State funding for all modes of transportation. This resulted in a complete lack of knowledge about future funding levels, and consequently what projects could be funded over the next 20 years. Therefore, the final RTP could not reasonably be completed until after the passage of State Senate Bill 1 (SB 1). SB 1 is a \$52 billion transportation plan funded by increased taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, and vehicle license fees, including a new fee for vehicles that do not utilize fossil fuels, but do use the public roads. That new funding source will be used exclusively for transportation purposes, including maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of roads and bridges, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, and planning grants. Specific programs within SB 1 that will benefit Trinity County are described in the Financial Plan in Section 5.

### ***Regional Setting***

Trinity County is located in the northwestern portion of California (**Figure 1**). The geography of the County is defined by the Trinity Alps, South Fork Mountain and other ridges of the Klamath Mountains and Coastal Range, carved by the deep canyons and valleys of the Trinity, Van Duzen, Mad and Eel Rivers. There is an extensive wild and scenic river system, and the terrain is rugged and forested, with the highest points at around 9,000 feet. According to the 2010 Census, the county has a total area of 3,208 square miles, of which 3,179 square miles is land and 29 square miles is water. Approximately 75% of the area is under Federal management, by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or Bureau of Reclamation. There are no incorporated cities or towns in Trinity County. Trinity County's Census Designated Places (CDPs) include Hayfork, Lewiston, and Weaverville. Smaller communities include Big Bar, Burnt Ranch, Douglas City, Junction City, Salyer, Trinity Center, Hyampom, Mad River, Ruth and Coffee Creek. Trinity County is bounded by five counties:

1. Mendocino County on the south
2. Humboldt County on the west
3. Siskiyou County on the north
4. Shasta County on the east
5. Tehama County on the southeast

The county seat and largest town is Weaverville, with approximately 3,600 people. The major highways in the County include State Route 3, State Route 36, and State Route 299. Four national protected areas are found in Trinity County including part of the Mendocino National Forest, part of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, part of the Six Rivers National Forest, and part of the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

Trinity County is large and sparsely populated with the roadway system consisting of approximately 700 miles of County owned roads, as well as State Highways and Federally owned roads. The system includes a vast array of aging, narrow roads and bridges. Most of the roads are dead-end, and many isolated communities have only one access route, particularly during the winter season, which brings heavy snowfall in some parts of the county. Unstable geology and steep terrain cause maintenance problems such as erosion, landslides, and rockfall on the roads. Many of these remote roads have no shoulders and minimum travel lane widths. In addition, travel lane widths are continuously lost to erosion on steep terrain, and many roads now have less than two lanes. The roads and bridges are aging and in need of major rehabilitation. The large geographical area and sparse population of the county presents a problem for the Transit Program.

## ***Population***

Trinity County's total population in 2015 was estimated at 13,571. Between 2006 and 2015, the population in Trinity County decreased by 235 residents, which was largely the result of the greater number of deaths compared to births in the County. According to projections in the California County-Level Economic Forecast 2015-2040, "over the 2015 to 2020 period, population growth will virtually be flat. The County will neither gain nor lose a significant number of residents." Later predictions made by the State Department of Finance in 2017 anticipated a steady decline in Trinity County population until around 2050. They predicted a drop to 13,324 by 2025, and a continued decline to 13,200 by 2045 (Trinity Journal, April 5, 2017).

The Economic Forecast does not take into account the booming marijuana cultivation industry, which is creating population growth, new housing development, and seasonal employment. County licensing regulations for marijuana cultivation include a residency requirement of at least one year and a permitted residence on the premises. These requirements have driven an increase in permanent residents and residential building permits, especially in the Hayfork area and in the southern and western parts of the County. Seasonal employment opportunities during the fall harvest and processing season are often filled by a transient population.

## ***Public Participation***

The 2010 RTP Guidelines place a special emphasis on public participation and input during the RTP development process. The TCTC makes a concerted effort to solicit public input in the planning process within the County.

Public input meetings were held during October and November 2015 in Trinity Center, Mad River, Weaverville, Burnt Ranch, and Hayfork to solicit input on the Draft RTP.

The County project lists from Appendices 4C, 4D, 4E and 4F were posted at the meetings. At the conclusion of each workshop, attendees were given red and green stickers to indicate their approval (green) or disapproval (red) of the listed projects. They were also encouraged to suggest new projects to be added to the lists. The results are discussed in Chapter 1.

## **ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS**

In Chapter 2, the existing conditions of the roadway system, including pavement condition and levels of service (congestion) are described. Projections of future traffic conditions are made based on the 2011 Transportation Demand Model, prepared for the previous RTP. A new model was not prepared for this RTP because of the slow population growth, or population decline, and because the previous model made forecasts into 2040, which is beyond the time frame of this RTP. The 2011 model is included in Appendix 2. A Traffic Signalization Study for Weaverville, also done in 2011 for the previous RTP, is included in Appendix 3.

Existing conditions and future needs for transit, non-motorized facilities (bicycle lands and sidewalks) and for the County's five airports are also included in Chapter 2.

Generally needs are related to maintenance and rehabilitation of existing components of all these systems, rather than expansion. The exception is the system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, which needs to be expanded as funding allows. Congestion relief is not needed, but there are several intersections in Weaverville that would benefit from traffic control, such as signals or roundabouts, for safety reasons. Expansion of the Transit System is problematic due to the rural nature of the County and the dispersed population.

Safety needs include measures to prevent run-off-the-road accidents in steep terrain, such as guardrails, shoulders and better signage and striping. The winter of 2016-17 also brought extensive storm damage to Trinity County roads and State Highways that will require immediate repairs in the short-term.

## POLICY ELEMENT

The goals, objectives, and policies by transportation element reflect a balanced approach and focus on the most feasible desired outcome given the limited transportation dollars available. The core set of goals, objectives and policies were developed as part of the 2005 and 2011 RTPs and the collaborative planning process for this RTP. Little has changed since the 2011 RTP, except for updating some objectives that have already been accomplished, such as the Pavement Management System the County now uses to prioritize road rehabilitation projects. In the next RTP, there will be a major change to the objectives and policies concerning intersection congestion and capacity, as measured by level of service (LOS). State guidelines are shifting away from LOS as a means of measuring an effective transportation system, and moving toward vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the new standard. These same policies and objectives are included in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Therefore, to maintain consistency, the Circulation Element must also be changed, along with the next RTP update in 2021.

The overall regional transportation goal is: ***"To provide a safe, reliable, accessible, cost-effective and efficient transportation system consistent with socioeconomic and environmental needs within Trinity County."*** Goals, Objectives and Policies relating to Streets and Highways, Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian and Other Alternative Modes, Aviation, Goods Movement, Tourism, and Environment support the overall goal, and are listed in Chapter 3. A Consistency Evaluation demonstrates the RTP's consistency with other local plans and policies.

## ACTION ELEMENT

The Action Element sets forth a plan to address issues and needs identified in accordance with the RTP goals, objectives and policies from Chapter 3. The Action Element is based on a set of assumptions, enumerated in Chapter 4, regarding demographic and financial forecasts. It identifies short-range (0-5 years), mid-range (6-15 years) and long-range (16-20 years) transportation improvements by mode for inclusion in the RTP. The projects that are proposed to implement the RTP goals are listed in Appendices 4A through 4G. The Action Element also includes program level "performance measures." The program level performance measures used in the RTP are shown in **Table 4.1**. The table attempts to quantify results of implementation of the projects in the 2016 RTP over the 20 year timeframe. **Table 4.2** links the performance measures with the RTP policies, objectives and desired outcomes and some of the projects that are proposed to meet those objectives.

There are no noteworthy new projects proposed in this RTP that were not proposed in the 2011 RTP with the exception of rehabilitation of Canyon Creek Road in the long term (16 – 20 year) period. The previously proposed Traffic Signal or Roundabout at Forest Avenue/ Garden Gulch Street has been relocated to the intersection of SR 299 with Weaver Bally Road. Some new turn pockets at intersections with SR 299 in Junction City and Burnt Ranch have been added at the request of the public. A new turn pocket on SR 3 at Tom Bell Road has been added due to construction of a new County jail at that location. A new Transit Facility, including



bus storage, service and washing and office space, is proposed on County-owned property at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road with SR 3. Several new storm damage repair projects have been added after the 2016/2017 winter storms resulted in two declared disasters. Routine bridge replacement and safety projects have been added as the County continues to upgrade its structurally deficient bridges and take advantage of HSIP safety grants that come available.

Projects that have not been carried forward from the 2011 RTP include several paving and rehabilitation projects on local roads and minor collectors. It remains unclear whether these projects on off-system roads will be eligible or considered high enough priority in future STIP cycles. They may be eligible for RMRA funds, however. By the next RTP, when the effects of SB 1 are more fully understood, and the large number of storm damage repair projects have been completed, the Pavement Management System will be used to extend the pavement rehabilitation program to these minor streets. In the meantime, there are more than enough projects on on-system roads to utilize all of the available funding for the next five years. Therefore, the mid-term and long term project lists include general "Pavement Rehab & Reconstruction" projects on various roads that are yet to be identified.

The regional action program for the Trinity County RTP is a compilation of projects already proposed and/or planned for Trinity County, as well as new projects deemed necessary to provide adequate operation of the various transportation systems consistent with the County's transportation goals and policies. To provide acceptable operations along the regional road system, Trinity County proposes a series of improvements to be sponsored by the State, the County, and/or the Federal government. The highest priority improvements to the regional road system are linked to the roadway needs identified in Chapter 2, and the Goals and Objectives from Chapter 3. The type of improvement, implementation cost, proposed construction year, priority and potential sources of funding are identified in the project tables by mode in Appendix 4A through 4G.

When transportation alternatives are being considered, interregional highway corridors such as SR 299, SR 36 and SR 3 remain primary candidates because Trinity County is extremely rural, and nearly all people and commodities leave and enter the county, and travel from one community to another, via the state highway system. Alternatives involving rail are quite limited because of prohibitive development costs, steep grades and environmental concerns. Other non-auto alternatives are encouraged as funding and demand allow. Examples are public transit, bicycle and pedestrian, and air travel to and from the more populated areas. Trinity County contains no commercially viable navigable waterways.

Caltrans District 2 provided their current lists of STIP and SHOPP projects, which are shown in Appendix 4A-1 and 4A-2, respectively. Additional Caltrans ITS projects are shown in Appendix 4A-3. These lists include all the state highway improvements that have been programmed or are scheduled for future programming.

The 2016 Trinity County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) was adopted by the TCTC in March 2016 and incorporated into the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on May 18, 2016. A copy of the adopted Trinity County RTIP is shown in Appendix 4B. The 2016 STIP was a negative STIP. No new shares were programmed, and projects that were previously programmed had to be removed due to lack of funding. The Trinity County RTIP consisted only of Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds and a contribution to the Caltrans turnouts on SR 3 between Weaverville and Trinity Center.

However, with SB 1, the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate is much more promising. **\$6.1 million** is expected to be available for the 2018 STIP share period, through fiscal Year 2023/24, with an additional **\$706,000** available as an advance from future shares. Provided SB-1 remains in place, STIP funding levels are expected to continue at this level for the foreseeable future, providing approximately \$3 to \$4 million to be programmed on eligible projects every two years. The RTIP includes **\$4.7 million** in STIP projects over the short-term period, (see Appendix 4C, 4D and 4E), which is below the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate. The unprogrammed balance of \$1.4 million will carry over to the next STIP cycle.

A total of 81 local road and bridge capital projects are included in Appendix 4C. The projects total **\$156 million** through 2036. The majority of projects are road rehabilitation and bridge replacement projects.

The transit improvements proposed for Trinity County include eight short-range projects, five mid-range projects and one long-range project. The short-range capital projects total **\$1.8 million** and include bus purchases and transit passenger amenities (benches and shelters), and environmental studies and design of a new Transit Maintenance Facility in Weaverville. The mid-range projects include construction of the new Transit Maintenance Facility, upgrading fareboxes, bus purchases and shelters. The total for mid-range projects is **\$3.2 million**. In the long-range, two more bus purchases are anticipated. The total for all transit improvements is **\$5.5 million**. The transit projects are listed in Appendix 4D.

A total of 22 bicycle and pedestrian projects are proposed for the 2016 RTP. The projects are shown in Appendix 4E. Four projects are coded as short-range, 13 are mid-range, and five are coded as long-range. The improvements include **\$9.1 million** in Class I facilities; **\$5.2 million** in Class II bike lanes, and **\$1.5 million** in Class III (share-the-road) routes. The improvements for bicycle amenities (such as bicycle racks) total **\$950,000** and **\$6.45 million** is included for pedestrian facilities. Total Tier 1 improvements are **\$5 million**; Tier 2 is **\$9 million** and Tier 3 is **\$9.3 million**. The total for all non-motorized improvements is **\$23.3 million** through 2036. However, many of the proposed projects depend on funding from the ATP Program. ATP funds are grant funds that the County must compete for. Competition is state-wide, and in the first 3 cycles the County has only received one grant, to prepare an Active Transportation Plan. It is unlikely that all of the ATP funds listed in Appendix 4E will actually be received by the County. STIP funds may be used for some of the projects, and the County will actively pursue additional funds for non-motorized transportation projects as they become available.

The County's airport projects are shown in Appendix 4F. The projects are listed by airport. The projects involve system preservation, capacity enhancements and safety. All of the airports will be receiving pavement rehabilitation, reconstruction or maintenance. Airport Layout Plans and pavement Management Programs will be prepared for all five airports. In the long term, the runway at Trinity Center Airport will be extended, and parallel taxiways will be added at Hyampom and Ruth Airports. A total of **\$15 million** is proposed for all airports.

## FINANCIAL PLAN

The TCTC has taken a conservative approach in forecasting future revenues. Staff has had to make assumptions regarding the amount of funding that the County will receive from several new programs, where guidelines and fund estimates have not yet been established. In addition, as mentioned above, funds from competitive grant programs are assumed, but remain speculative.

The 2016 Trinity County RTP is fiscally constrained through 2036 based on the revenue assumptions that were used. Revenue streams have been divided into those intended for Capital projects, such as those listed in Appendix 4, and those intended for operations and maintenance, such as Highway Users Tax, Match Exchange and Forest Receipts, and for transit from the Transit Fares and Airports from Airport Income (tie-down fees, hangar rents, etc.) The anticipated revenues for the Capital Projects listed in the 2016 RTP are as follows: in the short-range (0-5 years) approximately **\$94.5 million** is assumed to be available. In the 10-year midrange period (6-15 years) approximately **\$91.4 million** is assumed. In the long-range (16-20 years) approximately **\$72.8 million** is assumed for a total of **\$258.6 million** through 2036.

Annual funds for Operations and Maintenance total approximately \$116 million in the short-term, \$125 million in the mid-term and \$84 million in the long-range, totaling approximately \$326 million in the 20 years of the RTP. These funds may occasionally be used to partly fund Capital projects, but will generally be reserved for operations and maintenance.

Tier 1 project costs for the 2016 RTP (excluding State Highway projects funded by Caltrans) total approximately **\$67.2 million**; Tier 2 costs total **\$65.7 million**; Tier 3 costs are estimated at **\$66.7 million**. The total for all RTP capital projects is approximately **\$200 million**

Overall, the RTP shows a total project cost of **\$200 million** for all modes and total revenues of **\$259 million** to pay for those costs. This leaves a **\$59 million surplus**, mostly in road and bridge revenue, as well as a smaller surplus in Transit funds. However, these road and transit funds cannot generally be used for non-motorized trails or airports, which are showing a deficit. The final numbers will change as projects advance to the construction stage and actual construction estimates are obtained and revenue sources are refined through federal and state budget allocations. The shortage of funds in the Non-Motorized category reflects the unreliability of ATP funding, although this number has been supplemented with STIP, FLAP and LTF funds. The shortage of Aviation funds may be due to the fact that only two of the County's five airports are currently federally eligible.

Based on an assessment of local and state needs, the emphasis of this RTP should be on system preservation; repair, rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing roads, bridges and runways, rather than on capacity increasing projects. This is consistent with the thinking behind SB 1 and the latest STIP Guidelines. System Preservation funding is available from the STIP and RMRA programs, and can be supplemented with Highway Users Tax, Forest Receipts and Match Exchange funds. Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds can be used to replace and rehabilitate insufficient bridges, and the county has always been successful in programming bridge projects. All of these programs are expected to produce reliable sources of funding for the foreseeable future. With SB 1, there is sufficient funding to perform all of the System Preservation projects listed in Appendix 4C, and that will be the emphasis of TCTC's efforts in this RTP cycle.

In addition to highways and roads, the County would attempt to develop multi-modal improvements including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Investment in multi-modal projects provides air quality benefits and will help the County position itself to help reduce VMT and GHG. However, the effectiveness in reducing automobile trips through mode shifting can be somewhat limited in rural areas. Termination of the TE program does not bode well for significant investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the foreseeable future. ATP funds, and other applicable funds, will be pursued for non-motorized facilities, but not all of the non-motorized projects listed in Appendix 4E are likely to be funded. Transit funds are also presently in decline. STIP may be used for transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities but this would have to be weighed against funding limitations and the required trade-offs with road rehabilitation needs.

Aviation funding has also declined, partly because the County now has only two NIPIAS airports, Ruth and Trinity Center, which are eligible for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants. Previously, there were four federally eligible airports. The strategy is to use State funding to prepare Airport Layout Plans and Pavement Management Plans for all five airports, in order to prioritize the limiting funding. FAA funding will be used to bring Ruth Airport up to current standards, and then the County will negotiate with FAA to have Ruth removed from the NIPIAS list and to have Hayfork added in its place. Then, FAA Grants can be used to make the needed improvements to Hayfork Airport. Trinity Center will be kept in NIPIAS status, however, due to its higher usage.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## PURPOSE OF THIS RTP

The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Trinity County. The TCTC consists of the entirety of Trinity County, which has no incorporated cities. The Transportation Commission is established by Section 29535 of the Government Code and organized per Chapter 3, Title 21 of the California Administrative Code. Section 29535 of the Government Code establishes a local transportation commission that is designated as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) responsible for area wide transportation planning in Trinity County. These responsibilities include:

- Administration and Management
- Transportation Planning and Regional Coordination
- Transit Programming
- Claimant Funding
- Grant Applications and Management

The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments in the County involving local, state, and federal funding over the next twenty years. The RTP was last updated by the TCTC in 2011. The horizon year for this 2016 RTP update is 2036. Transportation improvements are categorized as short-term (0-5 years), midrange (6-15 years) or long-term (16-20 years).

The overall focus of the RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multi-modal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan (2016-2036). The coordination focus brings the County, local communities, governmental agencies, Indian Tribal Governments, and citizens into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all modes including roads, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, railroad, and aviation.

This RTP is referred to as the 2016 RTP, since RTPs are required to be completed every five years, and the last one was completed in 2011. The 2016 Trinity County RTP was due to be completed in October 2016, but at that time there were several key State transportation funding bills working their way through the State Legislature. There were several possible outcomes, which varied widely in what would be provided in the way of State funding for all modes of transportation. This resulted in a complete lack of knowledge about future funding levels, and consequently what projects could be funded over the next 20 years. Therefore, the final RTP could not reasonably be completed until after the passage of State Senate Bill 1 (SB 1). SB 1 is a \$52 billion transportation plan funded by increased taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, and vehicle license fees, including a new fee for vehicles that do not utilize fossil fuels, but do use the public roads. That new funding source will be used exclusively for transportation purposes, including maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of roads and bridges, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, and planning grants. A summary of SB 1 programs statewide is shown below. Specific programs within SB 1 that will benefit Trinity County are described further in the Financial Plan in Section 5.

SB 1 created the following new and augmented programs that fall under California Transportation Commission (CTC) purview:

- Active Transportation Program (ATP) – SB 1 provides an increase of \$100 million annually for the existing Active Transportation Program. This represents an increase in the size of this on-going program by more than 80 percent. The ATP funding provided in SB 1 will begin in fiscal year 2017-18.

- Local Partnership Program – SB 1 created this new \$200 million per year program for “Self Help Counties”, Counties which assess local taxes or fees to support local transportation programs. Guidelines for this program must be adopted by the CTC on or before January 1, 2018. Trinity County is not a “Self Help County” because it does not assess local taxes for transportation.
- Local Streets and Roads – SB 1 provides an increase of \$1.5 billion annually, beginning in November 2017. Prior to SB 1, the CTC had no role in the Local Streets and Roads apportionment program. SB 1 creates new responsibilities for the CTC relative to this funding including the review of project lists submitted by cities and counties, reporting to the State Controller, and receiving reports on completed projects. This program is also known as the Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Fund, and will provide a significant new funding source for road maintenance and rehabilitation in Trinity County.
- Solutions for Congested Corridors Program – SB 1 created this new \$250 million per year program beginning fiscal year 2017-18. CTC responsibilities include developing guidelines, holding public hearings, reviewing corridor plans, scoring project nominations, programming projects, allocating funds to projects, monitoring program delivery, and reporting to the Legislature. However, Trinity County will not likely have any eligible projects in this category.
- State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) – SB 1 provides an increase of approximately \$1.9 billion annually, beginning in November 2017, along with significant expansion of the CTC’s oversight responsibilities. SB 1 requires additional CTC oversight of the development and management of the SHOPP, including allocating support staff, project review and approval, and convening public hearings prior to adopting the SHOPP. The CTC is also responsible for monitoring Caltrans’ performance and progress toward accomplishing the specific goals set out in SB 1 and other targets or performance measures adopted by the CTC. SHOPP funds are used by Caltrans for projects on State Highways, including those in Trinity County.
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – SB 1 stabilizes funding for the STIP. The impact of the stabilization of STIP funding will be included in the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate and incorporated in the 2018 STIP. This funding will restore the \$3 to \$4 million that Trinity County has historically received every two years for eligible projects, and is expected to remain at these levels into the future.
- Trade Corridor Enhancement Account – SB 1 created this new \$300 million per year account to fund corridor-based freight projects nominated by local agencies and the state. It is anticipated that additional guidance on the implementation requirements for this program will be included in the budget. However, it is unlikely that Trinity County will have any projects eligible for this program, now that the Buckhorn Grade Improvement Project has been completed by Caltrans.

SB 1 also provides intent language and other provisions with respect to accountability. The following are a few of these provisions:

*“this act presents a balance of new revenues and reasonable reforms to ensure efficiency, accountability, and performance from each dollar invested to improve California’s transportation system.”*

*“a comprehensive, reasonable transportation funding package will: 1) ensure transportation needs are addressed; 2) fairly distribute the economic impact of increased funding; and 3) direct increased revenue to the state’s highest transportation needs.”*

*“it is the intent of the Legislature that the California Department of Transportation and local governments are held accountable for the efficient investment of public funds to maintain the public highways, streets, and roads, and are accountable to the people through performance goals that are tracked and reported.”*

SB 1 bill language is available via the following link:

[http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180SB1](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB1)



The 2016 RTP update is being completed in accordance with the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines in place at the time the RTP effort began. However, the County has attempted to incorporate the 2017 RTP Guidelines (Adopted January 18, 2017) to the extent practicable. Over the last 10 years, a paradigm shift has occurred in the way traffic impacts are measured. Concerns about greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) leading to climate change have caused numerous new regulations to be passed in California over the past several years. It began with AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 set goals for statewide reduction of GHG emissions, requiring them to be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 was signed into law on September 8, 2016. It extended the AB 32 GHG reduction requirements to a reduction of at least 40 percent of 1990 levels by 2031.

In September 2008, SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 was signed into law. Among other requirements, SB 375 requires urban transportation planning agencies to prepare Sustainable Community Strategies, specifying how the GHG emissions reduction targets will be met for their regions. Strategies often involve transportation planning as well as community planning. SB 375 requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop guidelines for the use of travel demand models in RTPs that measure the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) generated by the proposed RTP. Previously, RTPs concentrated on modelling and attempting to reduce traffic congestion by calculating the projected Level of Service (LOS) of roadways and intersections. Now, the goal has shifted to reducing VMT rather than improving LOS. The two sets of goals often conflict, because strategies to improve LOS often involve adding lanes, which encourages drivers to commute by car and may take space away from sidewalks, bicycle lanes and bus stops.

Senate Bill 391, passed in 2009, required Caltrans to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), a long-range transportation plan, to reduce GHG emissions. This system must reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below the 1990 levels by 2050 as described by AB 32. The CTP 2014 demonstrates how major metropolitan area, rural areas and state agencies can coordinate planning efforts to achieve critical statewide goals. The goals of the CTP 2014 are reflected in this RTP, to the extent practicable.

Senate Bill 743 mandates a change in the way that public agencies evaluate transportation impacts of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Major changes in the CEQA Guidelines are currently being developed to implement SB 743. Level of Service will no longer be considered a significant impact under CEQA. Instead, there will be thresholds of significance related to the VMT generated by a project.

Trinity County's RTPs up to, and including, this 2016 RTP have continued the practice of assessing LOS rather than VMT. To make the switch, the County will have to hire a consultant to set up a new Travel Demand Model that generates VMT data rather than LOS results. Rural RTPAs such as the TCTC are not required to prepare Sustainable Community Strategies yet, and the 2017 RTP Guidelines do not require rural RTPAs such as the TCTC to convert their models to VMT at this time. The next RTP update, in 2021, will be prepared after the 2020 census data is available. This will be a better time to hire a consultant to do a comprehensive Travel Demand Model calculating existing VMT and the effects of proposed projects on future VMT. This will not only meet future requirements likely to be imposed on future RTPs, but will also facilitate assessing impacts of future projects under the new CEQA Guidelines.

While not required by law or RTP Guidelines, the 2011 RTP included a Travel Demand Model that assessed current travel patterns within Trinity County and made predictions for future travel patterns and resulting LOS on State and County roads to 2040. A new Travel Demand Model is not included in this RTP for the following reasons:

- It is not required by the 2017 RTP Guidelines for Rural Transportation Planning Agencies
- There has been no Census since 2011
- The 2011 model contained forecasts to 2040, beyond the 20-year period of this RTP

- Recent population projections for the County predict no growth and possibly some decline in Trinity County population, as documented below
- Future Travel Demand Models will need to calculate VMT instead of LOS

The previous 2011 RTP's Travel Demand Model is included in Appendix 2 of this document.

## REGIONAL SETTING

Trinity County is located in the northwestern portion of California (**Figure 1**). The geography of the County is defined by the Trinity Alps, South Fork Mountain and other ridges of the Klamath Mountains and Coastal Range, carved by the deep canyons and valleys of the Trinity, Van Duzen, Mad and Eel Rivers. There is an extensive wild and scenic river system, and the terrain is rugged and forested, with the highest points at around 9,000 feet. According to the 2010 Census, the county has a total area of 3,208 square miles of which, 3,179 square miles is land and 29 square miles is water. Approximately 75% of the area is under Federal management, by the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or Bureau of Reclamation. There are no incorporated cities or towns in Trinity County. Trinity County's Census Designated Places (CDPs) include Hayfork, Lewiston, and Weaverville. Smaller communities include Big Bar, Burnt Ranch, Douglas City, Junction City, Salyer, Trinity Center, Hyampom, Mad River, Ruth and Coffee Creek. Trinity County is bounded by five counties:

1. Mendocino County on the south
2. Humboldt County on the west
3. Siskiyou County on the north
4. Shasta County on the east
5. Tehama County on the southeast

The county seat and largest town is Weaverville, with approximately 3,600 people. The major highways in the County include State Route 3, State Route 36, and State Route 299. Four national protected areas are found in Trinity County including part of the Mendocino National Forest, part of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, part of the Six Rivers National Forest, and part of the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

## DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

The following demographic trends are used as planning indicators for updating the RTP. They are useful in updating the opportunities and needs for improving the transportation system.

### **Population**

The following information is derived from the 2016 Trinity County Economic and Demographic Profile, prepared by the Center of Economic Development, California State University, Chico. Information is also obtained from the California County-Level Economic Forecast 2015-2040, which was prepared for Caltrans by the California Economic Forecast. The purpose of this information is to provide a brief snapshot of local economic and demographic trends in the community. Additional demographic information such as age distribution, race and ethnicity, deaths and infant mortality, and crime rates, is also available in the Demographic Profile.

As shown in Table 1.1, Trinity County's total population in 2015 was estimated at 13,571. Between 2006 and 2015, the population in Trinity County decreased by 235 residents, which was largely the result of the greater number of deaths compared to births in the County. Between 2006 and 2015, Trinity County had an average annual net migration of 10, the average annual net migration was negative 40 between 2011 and 2015. The majority of both out-migration and in-migration occurred between Trinity County and Shasta and Humboldt

Counties. According to projections in the California County-Level Economic Forecast 2015-2040, “over the 2015 to 2020 period, population growth will virtually be flat. The County will neither gain nor lose a significant number of residents.” Later predictions made by the State Department of Finance in 2017 anticipated a steady decline in Trinity County population until around 2050. They predicted a drop to 13,324 by 2025, and a continued decline to 13,200 by 2045 (Trinity Journal, April 5, 2017).

**TABLE 1.1  
 HISTORICAL POPULATION AND GROWTH RATES, TRINITY COUNTY**

**Trinity County Population, Non-incarcerated**

Year	Trinity County	1-year change	CA 1-year change
2006	13,806	1.1 %	0.7 %
2007	13,806	0.0 %	0.8 %
2008	13,759	- 0.3 %	0.7 %
2009	13,750	- 0.1 %	0.6 %
2010	13,811	0.4 %	0.7 %
2011	13,738	- 0.5 %	0.6 %
2012	13,471	- 1.9 %	0.7 %
2013	13,391	- 0.6 %	0.9 %
2014	13,389	- 0.0 %	0.9 %
2015	13,571	1.4 %	1.0 %

*Source: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit*

### **Age of Population**

Population by age group is estimated by the DOF on a periodic basis. The age distribution in a given area affects the area’s school system, public services, and overall economy. The largest age group in Trinity County is 55 to 64 years, with 2,666 people within this age group in 2014, closely followed by the 40 to 54 year-old age group at 2,565 in 2014. The 55-64 age group is 19.7 percent of the County’s population, which is 8 percent higher than California’s average. Approximately 40 percent of the County’s residents are over 55 years, which is also higher than the State average.



**Figure 1 – Trinity County Map**

## Economic Growth and Local Work Force

Trinity County was heavily affected by the 2008 economic recession. The rate of unemployment increased between 2007 and 2010, and then decreased in four of the following five years (Table 1.2). As shown in Table 1.3, Trinity County's labor force remained mostly unchanged between 2006 and 2015. A slight drop in household income was apparent in 2009; however, it recovered quickly and surpassed pre-recession levels in 2010 and continued to increase until 2013 (Table 1.4). Poverty rates in Trinity County have remained higher than the State average since 2005, when the rate began growing steadily until 2014 when it fell slightly.

**TABLE 1.2**  
**TOTAL EMPLOYMENT, TRINITY COUNTY**

Year	Employed		1-year change	
	County	State	County	State
2006	4,570	16,821,300	- 1.7 %	1.4 %
2007	4,510	16,960,700	- 1.3 %	0.8 %
2008	4,240	16,893,850	- 6.0 %	- 0.4 %
2009	4,140	16,151,058	- 2.4 %	- 4.4 %
2010	4,140	16,063,542	0.0%	- 0.5 %
2011	4,150	16,237,300	0.2 %	1.1 %
2012	4,230	16,560,300	1.9 %	2.0 %
2013	4,220	16,933,300	- 0.2 %	2.3 %
2014	4,540	17,397,110	7.6 %	2.7 %
2015	4,810	17,798,600	5.9 %	2.3 %

*Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division*

**TABLE 1.3  
TOTAL LABOR FORCE, TRINITY COUNTY**

**Total Labor Force, Trinity County**

Year	Labor Force		1-Year Change	
	County	State	County	State
2006	5,070	17,686,700	- 2.1 %	0.8 %
2007	5,030	17,921,000	- 2.9 %	1.3 %
2008	4,860	18,207,350	- 3.4 %	1.6 %
2009	5,000	18,215,658	2.9 %	0.0 %
2010	5,080	18,330,533	1.6 %	0.6 %
2011	5,050	18,404,500	- 0.6 %	0.4 %
2012	5,020	18,494,900	- 0.6 %	0.5 %
2013	4,840	18,596,800	- 3.6 %	0.6 %
2014	5,050	18,811,480	4.3 %	1.2 %
2015	5,220	18,981,800	3.4 %	0.9 %

*Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division*

As of 2014, the industries that employed the most people in the County were government and government enterprises (approximately 25.2 percent), followed by manufacturing (approximately 5.8 percent), and construction jobs (approximately 5.7 percent). The top three fastest growing industries within the County between 2005 and 2014 were wholesale trade, utilities, transportation, and warehousing. Sixty-five percent of all Trinity County businesses were small businesses employing one to four employees.

According to the Trinity Journal, May 31, 2017, the following employers are the largest in Trinity County

- Trinity County Schools (all Districts)
- County of Trinity (all Departments)
- Trinity River Lumber Company (Weaverville)
- Mountain Communities Health Care District (Weaverville and Hayfork)
- Weaverville Ranger District USFS (Weaverville)
- Tops Super Foods (Weaverville)
- Hayfork Ranger District USFS (Hayfork)
- CVS Pharmacy (Weaverville)
- Trinity Public Utilities District (Weaverville)
- Caltrans (all maintenance stations in Trinity County, including Weaverville, Hayfork, Trinity Center)
- CalFire (permanent station in Weaverville, seasonal stations throughout the County)
- Human Response Network (Weaverville)
- Watershed Research Center (Hayfork)

In 2014, the four highest earning industries in Trinity County were government and government enterprises, retail, manufacturing, and other services. In 2013, the median household income reached its highest point since 2005 at \$35,708 (Table 1.4). County residents derived a smaller proportion of income from work earnings than the State average. However, work earnings still make up the largest percentage of income in the County.

**TABLE 1.4  
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME, TRINITY COUNTY**

**Trinity County Median Household Income (Nominal)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>California</b>
2005	\$ 31,434	\$ 53,627
2006	\$ 33,070	\$ 56,646
2007	\$ 35,439	\$ 59,928
2008	\$ 34,726	\$ 61,017
2009	\$ 33,546	\$ 58,925
2010	\$ 35,207	\$ 57,664
2011	\$ 33,163	\$ 57,275
2012	\$ 35,162	\$ 58,322
2013	\$ 35,708	\$ 60,185
2014	\$ 31,947	\$ 61,689

*Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates*

### **Forecasted Population and Economic Growth**

According to the California County-Level Economic Forecast 2015-2040, the following forecasted trends (through 2020) will likely shape the social and economic identity of Trinity County:

- Employment growth will increase by an average of 0.2 percent per year.
- Average salaries will remain below the State average, with the exception of inflation-adjusted salaries, which are expected to increase by 0.9 percent.
- Employment growth will be driven by government, education, healthcare, mining, and construction entities. Employment losses will be observed in leisure and hospitality. No employment growth will be observed in financial activities, wholesale and retail trade, manufacturing, or agriculture.
- No substantial growth in population is expected.
- Real taxable sales will increase by an average of 0.5 percent per year.
- Industrial production will increase by 2.1 percent per year.

The Economic Forecast does not take into account the booming marijuana cultivation industry, which is creating population growth, new housing development, and seasonal employment. County licensing regulations for marijuana cultivation include a residency requirement of at least one year and a permitted residence on the premises. These requirements have driven an increase in permanent residents and residential building permits, particularly in the Hayfork area and in the southern and western parts of the county. Seasonal employment opportunities during the fall harvest and processing season are often filled by a transient population.

### **Housing Stock**

In Trinity County, housing units are projected to grow at a modest rate through 2036. The small increases reflect the relative slow growth in population and employment throughout the County. **Table 1.5** displays the number of building permits issued for new residential uses (single family, multi-family, and mobile homes) over the last ten years for communities in Trinity County.

**TABLE 1.5  
 TRINITY COUNTY BUILDING PERMITS PER YEAR FOR RESIDENTIAL USES**

Location	Building Permits Issued by Year											Total Issued 2006-2016*
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016*	
Big Bar	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
Big Flat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burnt Ranch	1	1	3	3	5	0	1	1	1	0	2	18
Coffee Creek	3	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	13
Covington Mill	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8
Denny	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Douglas City	10	10	0	2	5	2	1	3	2	4	1	40
Hawkins Bar	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	10
Hayfork	17	16	7	6	0	7	4	5	11	12	12	97
Helena	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hyampom	6	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	15
Junction City	6	4	2	0	6	2	1	0	4	4	1	30
Kettenpom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Lewiston	17	7	6	2	2	0	2	5	3	1	3	48
Mad River	6	5	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	5	3	27
Peanut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ruth	6	6	1	3	2	0	3	0	3	1	0	25
Salyer	4	2	2	0	2	1	3	2	2	3	1	22
Trinity Center	2	6	2	2	15	0	1	2	1	3	2	36
Trinity Pines	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	11
Trinity Village	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Weaverville	24	13	7	10	4	3	1	5	6	9	10	92
Wildwood	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5
Zenia	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>512</b>
Notes: * Total residential building permits issued through October 2016 excluding permits for replacement or upgrading of existing structures Source: Trinity County Building Department												

## Travel Patterns

The regional movement of people within Trinity County can be classified into three broad categories: commute, recreational, and tourism. The County commute traffic consists mostly of automobile traffic from the smaller communities and rural areas to Weaverville or to destinations outside of the County. **Table 1.6** provides the inter-county commute patterns identified in the 2000 Census for Journey-to-Work data.

TABLE 1.6 TRINITY COUNTY INTER-COUNTY COMMUTE PATTERNS		
County/Location	County of Employment for Trinity County Residents	County of Residence for Trinity County Workers
Humboldt	7.7%	2.0%
Mendocino	0%	0%
Shasta	4.3%	3.7%
Siskiyou	0.2%	0.7%
Tehama	0.2%	0.4%
Trinity	83.3%	91.0%
Other locations (within California)	3.8%	1.2%
Other locations (outside of California)	0.5%	0.9%
Source: U.S. Census 2000		

## PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

As defined by the 2010 RTP Guidelines, the purpose of the regional transportation plan is to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Provide an assessment of the current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region
2. Predict the future needs for travel and goods movement
3. Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs
4. Identify guidance and documentation of public policy decisions by local, regional, state and federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing
5. Provide information for the development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
6. Help identify project purposes and needs
7. Promote consistency between the California Transportation Plan, the regional transportation plan and other transportation plans developed by cities, counties, districts, private organizations, tribal governments, and state and federal agencies in responding to statewide and interregional transportation issues and needs

8. Involve the public, federal, State and local agencies, as well as local elected officials, early in the transportation planning process so as to include them in discussions and decisions on the social, economic, air quality and environmental issues related to transportation

The TCTC has prepared this 2016 RTP update based on these objectives consistent with the 2010 RTP Guidelines (adopted April 7, 2010).

## REPORT ORGANIZATION

The RTP is divided into the following seven sections:

- 1. Introduction** – Describes demographic changes that have occurred in the County since the 2010 RTP Update, and sets the stage for consistency with the 2016 RTP guidelines, the RTIP, FTIP and the ITIP.
- 2. Assessment of Needs** – Identifies the existing and future deficiencies of the Trinity County transportation system by mode.
- 3. Policy Element** – Describes the transportation issues in the region and establishes the goals, objectives, and policies that address transportation issues by mode. Statewide and regional issues are discussed based on the financial constraints facing the County. The policy element addresses short-term (0-15-years) and long-term (16-40 years) objectives and includes a consistency evaluation, analyzing how the RTP is consistent with Statewide transportation plans and local community plans,
- 4. Action Element** – Describes the State and regional transportation planning processes, as well as the process undertaken to evaluate various improvement options. The Action Element summarizes plan assumptions, past accomplishments, modal alternatives, and the purpose, need, and scope of recommended projects. Specific improvements are identified by mode for short-range and long-range capital programs designed to meet the anticipated needs of the County's regional circulation system. Implementation cost estimates, construction dates and sponsoring agencies are also identified.
- 5. Financial Element** – Lists the costs, revenues, deficits/surpluses for each transportation mode. The 2010 and 2017 Guidelines require that the RTP be fiscally constrained to the projected revenues. In the cases where a funding deficit does exist, a discussion of those improvements that are financially feasible is presented along with an assessment of the resulting impacts of the funding shortfall and projects that must be removed.
- 6. Environmental Review** – Describes the environmental review processes and procedures, and consultation process to be followed by the County in evaluating the program level impacts of the RTP. **This section will be completed after the TCTC approves the Draft RTP for circulation to the public.**
- 7. Appendices** – Provide supplemental information including inventories of Trinity County Roads and Bridges, the 2011 Travel Demand Model, Level of Service Calculations and Weaverville Signalization Study, and lists of proposed future projects,

## TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE INTEGRATION

Transportation System Goal 1 in the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element is to *“Provide for the long-range development of the county’s roadway system that is consistent with adopted land use patterns, ensure the safe and efficient movement of the people and goods, minimizes impacts on the attractiveness of the community, meets environmental and circulation objectives, and implements funding strategies for construction, improvement, and maintenance of existing and new roadways.”* These desired outcomes are consistent with the County's overall mission to serve the public with integrity in an effective and efficient manner in order to create



and sustain a safe, healthy, and productive environment. These transportation/land use principles are reinforced in the General Plan Circulation Element through the following objectives and policies:

**Objective 1.1** – Establish consistency and/or linkages between transportation programs and land use plans

Policy 1.1.A – Update the Trinity County General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and/or Community Plans to provide consistency with the findings and/or recommendations of traffic studies, as appropriate.

Policy 1.1.B – Consider the Trinity County General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and/or Community Plans when assessing potential transportation projects.

**Objective 1.2** – Determine and, as appropriate, address the probable land use impacts of transportation projects prior to approving or funding the projects.

Policy 1.2.A – Location, design and development of transportation projects shall be consistent with the adopted land use policies of the county.

Policy 1.2.B – Identify potential impacts and/or conflicts between potential growth-inducing transportation projects and the adopted land-use policies of the county.

Policy 1.2.C – Require mitigation for transportation projects with potentially significant impacts to existing or planned land uses in the county.

The RTP promotes transportation/land use integration and recognizes that future development in Trinity County should occur in areas that will be easiest to develop without high public costs, have the least negative environmental effect, and that will not displace or endanger the county's critical natural resources and agricultural and forest activities. This approach is consistent with the California Wildlife Plan (2006), results in lower cost for improvements and increased operational efficiency of the transportation system because the system will be sized appropriately to reflect more compact growth in near proximity to existing or planned services. The advantages of compact growth extend to higher levels of mobility, connectivity, and accessibility for the elderly and disabled, and to helping manage the growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and its subsequent direct relationship to trip length and air quality.

## **COORDINATION**

The RTP Guidelines place an emphasis of coordinating with citizens, stakeholders, and government entities. As part of this RTP update, numerous community members were contacted and a variety of meetings and public workshops were held. This section provides a summary of the coordination efforts that took place during this RTP update process.

### ***Document Review***

The following documents were reviewed in conjunction with the RTP update.

1. Trinity County Transit Development Plan – Draft Final Report February 2014 (Transit Marketing, Mobility Planners, and AMMA Transit Planning)
2. Trinity County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Final Plan October 2014 (AMMA Transit Planning)
3. Trinity County Bikeways Master Plan – April 2015(TCTC)
4. Trinity County 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Final Report – November 2011 (Fehr & Peers)
5. 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program February 2016

6. Trinity County Economic & Demographic Profile – 2016 (Center for Economic Development at Chico State)
7. Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element – May 1, 2002 (LSC)
8. Negative Declaration – Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element Update – November 2001 – LSC
9. State Route 299 Transportation Concept Report – September 2009 (Caltrans District 2)
10. State Route 36 Transportation Concept Report - January 2012 (Caltrans District 2)
11. SR 3 Turnout Study – May 2012 (Caltrans District 2)
12. Trinity County General Plan Noise Element – October 21, 2003 (Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc.)
13. Weaverville Community Plan – September 1990 (adopted as part of Trinity County General Plan)
14. Caltrans Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan – June 2015 (Caltrans)
15. 2015 Rural Counties Task Force Local Roads Needs Assessment; NCE May 28, 2015
16. Trinity County Pavement Management System
17. 2040 California Transportation Plan; State of California; June 2016
18. California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment; 2014

### ***Public Participation***

The 2010 RTP Guidelines place a special emphasis on public participation and input during the RTP development process. The TCTC makes a concerted effort to solicit public input in the planning process within the County.

Public input meetings were held during October and November 2015 in Trinity Center, Mad River, Weaverville, Burnt Ranch, and Hayfork to solicit input on the Draft RTP as follows:

- Trinity Center: Thursday October 22 at 7:00 PM
- Weaverville: Tuesday, October 20 at 7:00 PM
- Hayfork: Tuesday, Monday, November 2 at 7:00 PM
- Mad River: Friday, Friday, October 16 at 1:00 PM
- Burnt Ranch: Monday. October 22 at 7:00 PM

The County project lists from Appendices 4C, 4D, 4E and 4F were posted at the meetings. At the conclusion of each workshop, attendees were given red and green stickers to indicate their approval (green) or disapproval (red) of the listed projects. They were also encouraged to suggest new projects to be added to the lists.

The posters indicate strong support (at least 4 in favor and none opposed) for the following projects:

- Replacement of Bridges 5C-048 and 5C-196 on Coffee Creek Road
- Turnouts and passing lanes on Highway 3 from Weaverville to Coffee Creek
- Burnt Ranch Rockfall Mitigation on SR 299

- Swift Creek Bridge Replacement on SR 3 at Trinity Center. (Bike lanes or at least widened shoulders will be added to the new bridge, and the county seeks funding for a Class 1 Bike Path north of the new bridge.)
- A turn lane on Highway 299 to School House road in Burnt Ranch (suggested at meeting and added to the Project list in Appendix 4C)

Other projects suggested at the public workshops included intersections improvements along Highway 299 in Burnt Ranch at Underwood Mountain Road, Hennessey Road and Veterans Hall Road; in Hawkins Bar at Wallen Ranch Road; and in Junction City at Sky Ranch Road. These projects were added to the Unconstrained Project List (Appendix 4G) for future programming when funds allow.

Wider shoulders to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists were requested along Highway 299 in Big Flat and Junction City.

Class 1 (off-road) pedestrian/bicycle trails were suggested in Junction City from the Park to Dutch Creek Road, and from Big Flat to Pigeon Point along the old Highway 299.

Some members of the public suggested mail delivery service to help reduce vehicle miles travelled by residents, but the Post Office is not offering this service, except along the main routes between post offices.

There was support for passing lanes and curve realignments at various locations on Highway 3 near Hayfork Summit, as well as:

- Bicycle lanes on Highway 3 from Trinity Center to Trinity Center KOA
- Acquiring the expansion and safety area around Trinity Center Airport from the Forest Service
- Slurry sealing the Trinity Center Airport

Strong opposition was expressed (at least 4 opposed and none in favor) for:

- Billborad VASI, re-grading the Road to the Point and Extending the Runway to relocate the threshold at Trinity Center Airport
- Replacing county-wide road signs with high-visibility signs
- Van Duzen Road bicycle path from Highway 36 to Dorothy Way

There were mixed reactions to:

- Expanding the transit system
- Adding bicycle racks
- Intersection improvements on Highway 299 in Weaverville at Forest Avenue/ Garden Gulch and at Washington Street. The Forest Avenue intersection improvement could be either a traffic signal or a roundabout. Five were in favor and three opposed. Comments at the meeting indicated some people favored a roundabout over a signal, and some did not. Two stickers were placed in opposition to the traffic signal at Washington Street, but comments made at the Weaverville meeting showed some people favored the idea.

Other verbal comments at the community workshops included requests for:

- A bicycle facility on East Fork Road to the Alpen Cellars Winery
- Adding dust palliatives to dirt roads
- Move the two-way Center Street Project to a higher priority
- Consider plans to improve Buckhorn Summit and the Humboldt Bay Port when considering long-range projects on Highway 299
- Extend the right turn pocket on Highway 299 turning onto Highway 3 at Douglas City
- Fix potholes on Sky Ranch Road
- Provide bus service once a week from Hayfork to Hyampom
- Clear trees and remove parking spaces and signs to provide better sight distance at intersections with Highway 299 in Weaverville
- Add more crosswalks on Highway 299 in Weaverville, especially near the Tops shopping center and paint them white to improve visibility, or provide warning lights
- Improve North Miner Street safety or reduce speeding
- Add bike lanes along Brady Road in Hayfork
- Install hitching posts with bike racks in Hayfork, for equestrian use
- Install more guardrails on Highway 3 between Hayfork and Douglas City
- Place signs at the Mad River Volunteer Fire Department indicating its location

In addition, the following are ongoing efforts in the County:

- Citizens are encouraged to attend and speak at TCTC meetings on any matter included for discussion at that meeting, or any other matter of public interest
- The public is notified and encouraged to participate in the Unmet Transit Needs process and hearings are held by the TCTC on transit related matters
- All studies conducted by the TCTC are either adopted or accepted following an advertised public review period and a public hearing. This process will continue by the TCTC during the RTP update process.

### ***Coordination with Trinity County Government***

The update to the RTP will continue the coordination efforts between the following governmental agencies, advisory committees, and the public:

- The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) oversees the update to the RTP. The TCTC consists of five Trinity County Supervisors and is supported by a technical staff from the County Department of Transportation.

- The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) is responsible for completing the “unmet transit needs” assessment and providing the results with recommendations to the TCTC. The SSTAC is required by the section 99238 of the Public Utilities Code and the Transportation Development ACT (TDA). Members consist of appointed citizens representing transit passengers, elderly, people with disabilities, and others with limited mobility. SSTAC meetings are open to the public, and citizens are encouraged to attend.

### **Coordination with Other Counties**

On August 17, 2010 the TCTC signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the North State Super Region. The Agreement was made between the sixteen California counties of Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Sierra, Siskiyou, Shasta, Tehama, and Trinity that share similar planning issues of a rural nature which include: a shortfall in transportation infrastructure funding, hard hit economies, and population growth. The *North State Super Region* establishes a partnership of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) for coordinated planning, to influence state and federal policy, and to support funding and grants for partner transportation agencies.

### **Coordination with Community Partners and Stakeholders**

#### Caltrans District 2

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for the design, construction, maintenance and operation of the State Highway System. Assembly Bill 69 (1972) established the basic framework for Caltrans, which has 12 district offices in California. Trinity County is located in Caltrans District 2, with offices in Redding. Various District 2 staff members serve as liaisons to the TCTC and the Trinity County Dept. of Transportation (TCDOT), depending upon the activity or project being considered.

The RTP was coordinated with Caltrans District 2 during its preparation. Potential projects from the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) as well as other planning efforts such as the Inter-regional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) were reviewed. Appendix 4A contains the State Highway Projects proposed in this RTP cycle.

#### US Forest Service

The Forest Service operates vast areas of National Forest in Trinity County, with an extensive network of roads. The County contains parts of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Six Rivers National Forest and the Shasta-Whiskeytown National Recreation Area. Communication relating to road maintenance responsibilities continues as needed throughout the year.

#### Indian Tribal Governments

The 2010 RTP Guidelines require the RTP process to meet the federal and state requirement to consult with and consider the interests of Indian Tribal Governments in the development of transportation plans and programs, including funding of transportation projects accessing tribal lands through state and local transportation programs. There are no Federally Recognized Tribal Governments in Trinity County, but several Tribes are active in the area. The Ancestral Lands of these Tribes are delineated on **Figure 2**. The Tribes are notified of County Transportation Projects being planned within their aboriginal territories, and are invited to comment on environmental planning documents, attend field review meetings and provide cultural monitors during construction if deemed necessary.

The County has a standing Memorandum of Agreement with the Nor Rel Muk Band of Wintu Indians of Northern California that formalizes notification, consultation and monitoring procedures applicable to County public works projects, particularly transportation projects.

The contact information for each tribal government is listed in **Table 1.7**.

<b>TABLE 1.7 TRINITY COUNTY INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CONTACTS</b>			
<b>Tribal Government</b>	<b>Telephone or email</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Contact Person</b>
Nor Rel Muk Nation	530.623.4940	P.O. Box 1967 Weaverville, CA 96093	Marilyn Delgado, Chair
Wintu Educational and Cultural Council	530.628.5930	P.O. Box 483 Hayfork, CA 96041	Robert Burns
The Tsnungwe Council	530.629.4758	P.O. Box 373 Salyer, CA 95563	Paul Ammon, Chair
Lassic Band of Wylacki-Winton Family Group	johnelgin@aol.com	HC62, Box 6 Zenita, CA 95595	John Elgin
Karuk Tribe	jaclyngoodwin@karuk.usc	P.O. Box 1016 Happy Camp, CA 96039	Russell Attebery, Chair
Round Valley Indian Tribe	sboggs@rvit.org	77826 Covelo Road Covelo, CA 95428	James Russ, President
Hoopa Valley Indian Tribe	530.625.4211	P.O. Box 1348 Hoopa, CA 95546	Ryan Jackson, Chair
these Tribal Governments will be contacted during environmental review of the Draft RTP Source: Native American Heritage Commission			

**Figure 2 – Tribal Boundaries and Ancestral Lands**

## FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS

AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
ATP	Active Transportation Program
BTA	Bicycle Transportation Account
BTP	Bicycle Transportation Plan
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAAP	California Aid to Airport Programs
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CFLHD	Central Federal Lands Highway Division of Federal Highway Administration
CTSA	Consolidated Transportation Service Agency
FAST Act	Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (current Federal Transportation Bill)
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FLAP	Federal Lands Access Program
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHG	Greenhouse gasses
HBP	Highway Bridge Program
HSIP	Hazard Elimination Safety Program
HUT	Highway User's Tax
ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
LOS	Level of Service (A-F)
LTC	Local Transportation Commission
LTF	Local Transportation Fund
MAP 21	Moving Ahead for Progress 2021 (former Federal Transportation Bill)
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NPIAS	National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems
OWP	Overall Work Program
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring
PSR	Project Study Report
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
RPA	Rural Planning Assistance
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
SR	State Route
STP	Surface Transportation Program
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SSTAC	Social Services Transportation Advisory Council
STA	State Transit Assistance (fund)
STAA	Surface Transportation Assistance Act
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TE	Transportation Enhancement
TCDOT	Trinity County Dept. of Transportation
TCTC	Trinity County Transportation Commission
TDP	Transportation Development Plan
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
VMT	Vehicle Miles Travelled



## 2. ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

The assessment of needs identifies the existing and future deficiencies of the Trinity County transportation system that have both regional and State significance. The information presented in this section provides the basis for improvements proposed in the Action Element (Chapter 4).

### EXISTING ROADWAY SYSTEM

#### ***Background***

The roadway system in Trinity County totals approximately 2,190 centerline miles. In addition to private roadways, the public roadway system consists of 202 miles in the State highway system, 700 miles in the County roadway system, and 1,288 owned and operated by the Federal government (largely in the National Forest). A list of County maintained roads is included in Appendix 1A.

One notable characteristic of Trinity County's roadway system is that of nearly 700 miles of County maintained roads, approximately 272 miles are single-lane roads. The majority of the single-lane roads are unpaved dirt or gravel roads.

In addition to County residents, the roadway network provides access for tourists visiting the many recreation areas in the County and to traffic that is passing through Trinity County on the way to other destinations outside of Trinity County.

Trinity County recently completed its largest capacity increasing project. Lance Gulch Road is a new two lane minor arterial connecting SR 299 on the east end of Weaverville with SR 3 at the north end. Lance Gulch Road was built to relieve congestion on SR 299 from the shopping district on the east end to the intersection of SR 299 with SR 3, the most congested section of SR 299 in Trinity County. The project makes it easier for local traffic to enter SR 299 from County side streets by reducing through traffic on SR 299. It also provides a valuable alternate route in case of emergencies or road closures on SR 299.

While not located within Trinity County, the Buckhorn Grade segment of SR 299 immediately to the east in Shasta County has been a significant constraint to interregional truck traffic. This approximately seven mile stretch of highway from Clear Creek in Shasta County to the Shasta/Trinity County line climbs approximately 1,600 feet in elevation. Over the past four years, Caltrans has improved this entire stretch, adding climbing and passing lanes, shoulders and medians, to meet current design standards and improve safety. Buckhorn is no longer a barrier to STAA (Surface Transportation Assistance Act) Trucks, which are longer than California legal trucks. The last two STAA barriers on SR 299 in western Trinity County will also be removed within the current SHOPP cycle (next five years).

Improvements to Buckhorn Grade and other STAA barriers downriver will reduce shipping times and costs between the Northern Sacramento Valley and the North Coast. These improvements could also have impacts on the economy, environment, roads and community infrastructure in Trinity County. More, and larger, trucks will likely be travelling on the SR 299 corridor through Weaverville and the downriver communities in the future.

There have been two major landslides on State Highways in the last two winters that have closed the state highways for months. In March of 2015, SR 3 failed between Weaverville and Trinity Center. Almost the entire roadway width slid down the steep embankment resulting in full closure of the highway for 2 ½ months until it could be entirely reconstructed from the bottom up. In a cooperative effort between the County, US Forest Service and Caltrans, a one-lane dirt road was converted into a detour route by way of County and Forest Service roads. The State Highway was re-opened in May 2016, with an unpaved surface and traffic control. The highway was not fully re-opened until June 2016.

In November of 2016, a major slide closed SR 299 near Big French Creek Road west of Big Bar. Rocks falling on the road had to be removed continuously for months. The entire slope above the road is unstable, and material has been being removed and hauled away from the site through May of 2017, and beyond. Through the winter of 2016-17, this major state highway was fully closed at times, sometimes open for limited times each day to controlled traffic, subject to total closure at any time due to danger of large falling rocks. The sporadic closures disrupted Trinity Transit and school bus services as well as commercial trucking between the coast and central valley. By spring 2017, a detour was constructed alongside the highway, and the route was open to one-way controlled traffic controlled by flaggers at specific times every day, according to a set schedule. As of this writing, in July 2017, the highway is still under traffic control with flaggers, subject to 15 to 30 minute delays, as Caltrans contractors continue to remove material from the slope above.

The winter of 2016-17 also brought extensive storm damage to Trinity County roads. Damage continued to be discovered through the spring of 2017 as snow continued to melt, making sites accessible and visible, and causing additional damage due to large quantities of runoff. All told, roads were damaged at over 40 sites throughout the County, ranging from rivers eroding whole sections of road to minor slumping and cracking of roads. Total damage is estimated at \$17.6 million, and State and Federal funds have been applied for through the State Office of Emergency Services and FEMA, and through Caltrans for Federal Highway Administration funds through the Emergency Relief (ER) program.

## **Road Classification**

**Figure 3** depicts Trinity County's main roadway system, along with the functional classifications of each road. A list of County maintained roads, along with their functional classifications, is included in Appendix 1A. The following provides the definition of each functional classification found in the county.

Major arterials constitute routes of interregional significance whose design provides for relatively high overall travel speeds, with minimum interference to through movement. These routes provide for travel in, out of, and through the county. In Trinity County, the major arterial is SR 299.

Minor arterials are similar to major arterials, in that they are important routes for regional circulation. While major arterials serve more interregional travel, minor arterials also help to serve the majority of intra-county regional travel. In Trinity County, the minor arterial road system consists of SR 3, SR 36, Lance Gulch Road, Rush Creek Road, and the 6.5 miles of Trinity Dam Boulevard between SR 299 and Rush Creek Road. Minor arterials are "on-system" facilities that are eligible for federal aid.

Major Collectors provide greater access to more localized destinations for regional traffic. These roads are designed to provide access for regional traffic between state routes. Narrow lanes and shoulders limit the carrying capacity of some collectors. Major collectors are also "on-system" facilities that are eligible for federal aid.

Minor Collectors are similar in character to major collectors, but are generally more rural with less traffic. Minor collectors are not eligible for federal aid, but the Highway Bridge Program will replace or repair bridges, at 100% with no local match required and the Highway Safety Improvement Program will fund safety improvements such as guardrails, signage and striping. Rehabilitation can be funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program.

Local roads classification consists of all roads not designated otherwise. In Trinity County, this includes roads within residential areas and many longer, remote roads that are often single lane and/or unpaved.

A complete list of Trinity County roads and their classifications is included in Appendix 1A. Major Roadway Network

Trinity County is served by three State highways: 3, 36, and 299. Routes 3 and 36 are lower volume highways, while Route 299 is the primary east-west highway link in Northern California between the Northern Sacramento Valley and the Northern Coast. The following describes each highway in more detail.

### State Route 3

State Route 3 runs north-south through Trinity County, beginning at SR 36 just south of Peanut and passing out of Trinity County over Scott's Mountain north of Trinity Lake. SR 3 passes through Hayfork, Douglas City, Weaverville, Trinity Center, and Coffee Creek as well as several smaller communities. It serves as the primary north-south roadway in the county, connecting central and northern Trinity County with the county seat of Weaverville. Between Douglas City and Weaverville, Routes 3 and 299 are the same route (by statute, SR 299 is the assigned route number). SR 3 carries local (intra-county) traffic as well as recreational and commercial (primarily natural resource) traffic. SR 3 has sharp curves, limited passing opportunities between Douglas City and Hayfork as well as between Slate Creek and Trinity Center, and is not maintained during winter months over Scott's Mountain. Within Weaverville, SR 3 provides access between the central commercial district and Weaverville Elementary School, residential areas, and the Weaverville Airport.

### State Route 36

State Route 36 runs east-west through the southern portion of the county, entering Trinity County near Wildwood from the east and crossing into Humboldt County west of Mad River. Other than passing through the communities of Forest Glen and Mad River, SR 36 mostly passes through undeveloped forest land. SR 36 provides access to Fortuna in Humboldt County to the west and Red Bluff in Tehama County to the east, as well as Hayfork and Weaverville (via Route 3), to Wildwood and Post Mountain, and to Southern Trinity County, including Ruth, Zenia and Kettenpom via County collector roads. SR 36 provides access for residents of Southern Trinity County who travel to Eureka for shopping opportunities. The capacity of SR 36 is limited by horizontal and vertical curves, narrow lane and shoulder widths, and by the limited passing opportunities.

### State Route 299

State Route 299 runs east-west through Trinity County, entering over Buckhorn Summit from Redding to the east and crossing into Humboldt County near Salyer to the west. SR 299 links the communities of Lewiston, Douglas City, Weaverville, Junction City, Big Flat, Big Bar, Burnt Ranch, and Salyer, as well as several smaller communities. SR 299 carries a variety of traffic including local (intra-regional), recreational, commuter, and commercial. SR 299 has been classified as a National Forest scenic byway and is heavily utilized for access to and along the Trinity River. It is also classified as a Focus Route by Caltrans because of its importance as an inter-regional route (for both auto and truck traffic) between the Northern Sacramento Valley and the North Coast.

SR 299 also serves as the major roadway within Weaverville, connecting the more established commercial and government center on the northwest with newer commercial and employment centers to the southeast. Due to the limited roadway network, virtually all trips in Weaverville use SR 299, which (in combination with through traffic) results in 299 carrying the highest traffic volumes within the County, particularly during peak summer travel periods.

SR 299 has limited passing opportunities, particularly west of Weaverville. Implementation of federally mandated barrier striping on state highways in 1988 resulted in severely restricted passing opportunities. Only six passing lanes exist (four eastbound, two westbound) on SR 299 between Willow Creek and Douglas City, a stretch of 65 miles. The distance between passing lanes for eastbound traffic is 26 miles (Hawkins Bar to Big Flat), while the distance for westbound traffic is a 52-mile gap between passing lanes (Oregon Mountain to Willow Creek).

**Figure 3 – Roadway Functional Classification**

Caltrans' 1998 *Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan* (ITSP) identifies 34 High Emphasis Routes throughout California which are key to the State's goods movement transportation system. SR 299 is considered a High Emphasis Route and is a Focus Route in the Caltrans *Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan* (1998). Focus Routes are a sub-set of the High Emphasis Routes and are the "highest priority for completion to minimum facility standards" by approximately 2020. The Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), as established by Senate Bill 45, funds projects identified in the ITSP. To meet the goal of minimum facility standards requires joint planning and programming based upon a regional agency's ability to participate as determined by its transportation commission. The Strategic Plan identifies a long term improvement for "passing lanes/various" on SR 299 in Trinity County from post-mile 11.1 to 57.7 (Salyer to SR 3 east junction), which will be included in the "2006 and Future STIPs" (Statewide Transportation Improvement Program). Several curve realignments and turnout projects on SR 299 are included in Appendix 4A.

### **Scenic Highways and Roadways**

Although Trinity County has several eligible State Scenic Highways (SR 299, SR 3 and SR 36), none are officially designated at this time.

### **Transportation Systems Maintenance**

Caltrans is responsible for the maintenance and rehabilitation of approximately 49,645 lane miles of state highways. The number of distressed lane miles (those with poor structural condition or with poor ride quality) is an important indicator of the State Highway System's pavement condition. This indicator is used by Caltrans to prioritize road maintenance and repairs. For the state, there are approximately 7,889 distressed lane miles (16 percent) based on a *2015 State of the Pavement* (Caltrans, 2015) In District 2, which includes Trinity County, there are 493 distressed lane miles, down slightly from 505 miles in 2013.

In 2015, the California Rural Counties Task Force conducted a comprehensive statewide study of local street and road systems in all of California's rural counties, meaning counties with a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) instead of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The study's objective was to fully assess the condition of the rural local systems to determine: (1) what are the pavement conditions of local streets and roads? (2) What will it cost to bring pavements to a "Best Management Practices (BMP) or most cost-effective condition? (3) What are the needs for the essential components to a functioning system? and (4) is there a funding shortfall?

The study surveyed 26 California rural counties, which collectively maintain over 24,000 miles of paved local roads and 5,000 miles of unpaved roads. Because the majority of the data came from recognized pavement management systems, the accuracy of the data was considered very high. The results showed that California's rural local streets and roads are in critical condition. On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent), the statewide average pavement condition index (PCI) is 66. For rural county roads, it is 58, which is considered "at risk category." Without additional funding, the average rural county road PCI is projected to decrease to 42 by 2034.

Trinity County roads have an overall average PCI of 59. The goal is to reach an average of 65 over the life of this RTP. The County estimates it will need \$48 to \$500 million in maintenance and rehabilitation funds over the next 10 years to meet this goal. SB 1 will provide an anticipated \$28 million in State funds for road maintenance and rehabilitation over the next 10 years. If most of these funds are dedicated to improving the condition of pavement, the PCI is still expected to fall from 59 to 49 over the next 10 years in Trinity County. This is because the pavement is now deteriorating faster than all roads can be repaired. Without the SB 1 funding however, the PCI would drop to 32 in the next 10 years.

Bridge condition is rated differently than pavement condition. Caltrans inspects all bridges in the state every two years. Appendix 1B provides the County's list of bridges from the Caltrans Structure Maintenance and Investigations Division, which summarizes the results of the inspections. The Appendix provides the Sufficiency Rating, which is a measure that indicates whether a bridge requires maintenance, rehabilitation or replacement. If

a bridge's Sufficiency Rating is less than 80, rehabilitation is needed. If it falls below 50, replacement is warranted. The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) provides a reliable source of funding for eligible bridge repairs and replacements. There are several HBP projects listed in Appendix 4C, the proposed County road and bridge project list.

### **Traffic Volumes**

Traffic volumes on the roadways throughout Trinity County have grown slowly, and in some cases have decreased over the last several years. Traffic volume fluctuations on state highways are primarily due to increases/decreases in traffic through the county and recreational traffic. Caltrans District 2 collects traffic volume data on state highways in Trinity County. Traffic counting is generally performed by Caltrans using electronic counting instruments at consistent locations throughout the State in a program of continuous traffic count sampling. The resulting counts are adjusted to reflect an estimate of annual average daily traffic by compensating for seasonal fluctuation, weekly variation and other variables that may be present. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume is defined as the total two-way traffic volume on a roadway over the year divided by 365 days. The recordation of AADT is necessary for presenting a statewide picture of traffic flow, evaluating traffic trends, computing accident rates, planning and designing highways, and other purposes.

In addition to AADT, Caltrans provides a summary of the peak month Average Daily Traffic (ADT), which is the highest monthly traffic volume divided by the number of days in the month. Caltrans Data indicates that the peak traffic season in Trinity County is in summertime, with the peak month fluctuating between May, June, July, August, and September depending on the roadway segment.

Trinity County collects daily traffic volumes on county roads. Volumes on segments throughout the county are collected every 3-6 years depending on the segment, or when special needs for data arise.

Historical and current annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes on state maintained facilities are shown in **Table 2.1**. The table shows large increases in AADT on SR 36 and SR 3 in southern Trinity County, south of Hayfork, likely due to the large influx of marijuana cultivators in that area. Other areas of the county, including Weaverville, Trinity Center and downriver, show mixed results, with some moderate increases offset by nearly equivalent decreases. Decreases in Weaverville on SR 3 north of the junction with SR 299, and on SR 299 east of Washington Street are attributable to the addition of Lance Gulch Road to the network. Generally, the high ADT on SR 299 in Weaverville reflects the fact that local traffic in Weaverville relies extensively on SR 299, since most side-streets are dead-end.

**TABLE 2.1  
HISTORICAL ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON STATE FACILITIES**

Route and Location		Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes by Year										10-year % Change*	
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014		2015
SR 3	Junction of Route 36, north	210	210	210	210	320	320	320	400	400	400	610	190%
	Morgan Hill Road, south	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,400	109%
	Morgan Hill Road, north	660	660	660	660	660	660	660	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,350	256%
	Hayfork	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,350	14.6%
	Weaverville, North Junction	4,250	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,750	3,750	1,400	3,750	-11.8%
	Rush Creek Road, south	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,500	1,050	1,050	1,050	-19.2%
	Rush Creek Road, north	590	590	590	590	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,000	800	35.6%
	Trinity Center Maintenance Station	680	660	660	660	630	630	630	500	500	500	520	-23.5%
	Siskiyou County Line	65	190	190	190	190	190	200	140	140	140	140	115%
SR 36	Lower Mad River Road, west	680	680	680	680	900	1,100	1,100	950	950	950	900	32.4%
	Lower Mad River Road, east	360	340	340	340	540	750	750	510	510	510	540	50%
	Forest Glen Maintenance Station	260	330	330	330	600	600	600	490	490	490	480	91.7%
	Jct. of Route 3, east	240	400	400	400	300	300	300	310	310	310	540	125%

	Route and Location	Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes by Year											10-year % Change*
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
	East Limits Salyer, west	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,400	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,300	-2.94%
	East Limits Salyer, east	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,400	3,400	3,400	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,800	-11.1%
SR 299	Burnt Ranch Road, west	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,150	3,400	3,650	2,650	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,600	-17.5%
	Del Loma, east	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	3,100	3,100	3,100	1,600	1,600	1,600	2,050	28.1%
	Weaverville, West City Limits, west	3,400	2,950	2,950	2,950	3,250	3,250	3,250	2,650	2,650	2,650	3,450	1.47%
	Weaverville, Washington Street, east	12,200	11,800	11,800	11,600	11,600	11,000	11,000	10,600	10,600	8,800	10,900	-10.7%
	Martin/Nugget Roads, west	7,300	7,300	7,300	7,100	6,800	6,800	6,800	7,300	8,800	8,800	9,000	23.3%
	Martin/Nugget Roads, east	6,800	6,600	6,600	6,400	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,600	6,200	6,200	6,500	-4.41%
	East Junction SR 3, west	4,600	4,450	4,550	4,350	4,450	4,450	4,350	4,450	4,050	4,400	4,800	4.35%
	East Junction SR 3, east	3,950	3,950	3,950	3,850	4,050	4,050	4,050	3,950	3,800	3,800	4,150	5.06%
	Lewiston Road, east	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,400	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,200	3,200	4,050	0.16%
	Trinity Dam Road, east	4,000	3,850	3,850	3,750	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,850	3,400	3,400	3,950	-1.25%
Source: Caltrans Traffic Census Program - Traffic Volumes on California State Highways <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/">http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/</a> *Last year minus first year divided by first year.													



## **Existing Truck Traffic Volumes/Goods Movement**

A combination of Federal roads (primarily Forest Service), State highways and County roads serve as the primary network for goods movement in Trinity County. Adequate maintenance and operation of this system is critical to the continued economic vitality of the County.

State Route 299 serves as the primary east-west route for goods movement within Trinity County. It also serves as a primary east-west route for goods movement in northern California, connecting the Pacific Coast (Route 101) to the northern portion of the Sacramento Valley (Interstate 5 in Redding). Most of the 137 miles between Redding and Arcata consists of two-lane conventional highway with limited passing lanes. The Buckhorn Grade segment of SR 299 immediately to the east in Shasta County was a significant constraint to interregional truck traffic, as a barrier to STAA (Surface Transportation Assistance Act) Trucks, which are longer than California legal trucks. Over the past five years, Caltrans has improved the Buckhorn Grade to accommodate STAA trucks. The last two STAA barriers on SR 299 in western Trinity County will also be removed within the current SHOPP cycle (next five years), so that the route between SR 101 and Interstate 5 will be free of STAA barriers.

Roads managed by the Federal and County governments are generally utilized to move resource products (timber, gravel, sand) to the State highways in the county. Reductions in timber harvests on Federal lands coupled with reduced maintenance budgets have led to deterioration and/or closure of some Federal roads. The combination of heavy truck traffic and limited maintenance funding has also adversely impacted roads in the County system.

**Table 2.2** presents the data regarding truck activity on the state highways for 2005 through 2015. (Truck Traffic on State Highways, Caltrans Traffic Census Program <http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census>.)

Similar to the total traffic numbers, there has been a large increase in truck traffic in Southern Trinity County, particularly in Hayfork, that may be attributed to the marijuana cultivation industry. In addition to marijuana itself, numerous new suppliers of soil, irrigation pipe and other garden amenities have opened in the area, and these businesses take deliveries by large trucks. There are steep drops in truck traffic on SR 299, which could be because the many years of construction and long delays on Buckhorn Summit project have lead truckers to find alternate routes. If that is the reason, than truck traffic can be expected to increase in the near future, as the construction is complete and the road is now improved for trucking. On the other hand, the number of trucks may decrease slightly because the larger STAA trucks can now be used on SR 299, allowing more freight to be hauled in a single truck.

**TABLE 2.2  
TRUCK TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON STATE FACILITIES**

Route and Location		Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic						10-year % Change*	2015	
		2005	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015		AADT	Percent Trucks
SR 3	Junction of Route 36, north	25	25	18	18	17	26	4.0%	610	4.25%
	Morgan Hill Road, south	58	58	38	24	54	58	0.0%	1,400	4.15%
	Morgan Hill Road, north	94	94	37	37	237	253	169%	2,350	10.79%
	Hayfork	114	114	89	89	237	253	122%	2,350	10.79%
	Weaverville, North Junction	149	140	187	187	155	155	4.03%	3,750	6.06%
	Rush Creek Road, south	109	109	112	225	48	73	-33.0%	1,050	6.95%
	Rush Creek Road, north	64	64	101	112	80	37	-42.2%	800	4.63%
	Trinity Center Maintenance Station	78	76	58	58	39	38	-51.3%	520	7.31%
	Siskiyou County Line	56	56	24	10	10	17	-69.6%	140	12.14%
SR 36	Jct. of Route 3, north	39	35	30	22	19	27	-30.8%	790	3.42%
	Shasta County Line, south	25	27	22	22	10	14	-2.24%	450	3.03%
SR 299	Humboldt/Trinity County Line, west	544	692	730	287	234	214	-60.7%	3,600	5.94%
	Weaverville, West City Limits, west	429	372	410	277	247	321	-25.2%	3,450	9.32%
	Weaverville, West City Limits, east	413	338	273	273	247	295	-28.6%	3,450	2.50%
	Weaverville, Washington Street, east	378	366	360	290	265	273	-27.8%	10,900	2.5%
	Martin/Nugget Roads, west	375	375	350	260	336	345	-8.0%	9,000	3.82%
	Martin/Nugget Roads, east	360	394	376	250	245	258	-28.3%	6,500	3.97%
	East Junction SR 3, west	312	409	239	245	291	372	19.2%	4,800	7.75%
	East Junction SR 3, east	431	431	442	250	233	256	-40.6%	4,150	6.17%
	Lewiston Road, east	476	476	521	255	233	295	-38.0%	4,050	7.29%
	Trinity Dam Road, east	497	479	472	260	388	451	-9.25%	3,950	11.41%
Trinity/Shasta County Line, east	500	481	318	260	388	451	-9.8%	3,950	11.41%	

Notes: Truck traffic includes all vehicles in the two-axle class and above (including 1½ ton trucks with dual rear tire and excludes pickups and vans with only four wheels)

\*Last year minus first year divided by first year.

Source: Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/docs/2015\\_aadt\\_truck.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/docs/2015_aadt_truck.pdf)

## ROADWAY OPERATIONS

### *Level of Service Methodology*

Up until recently, roadway operations were measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). Level of Service is a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as delay and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, and convenience. LOS is defined for each type of facility that has analysis procedures available in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000. Letters designate each LOS from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F representing the worst. Safety is addressed through other measures.

- **Level of Service A** represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.
- **Level of Service B** is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.
- **Level of Service C** is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
- **Level of Service D** represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
- **Level of Service E** represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
- **Level of Service F** is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion. Level of Service F is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow which causes the queue to form, and Level of Service F is an appropriate designation for such points.

## Roadway Segment LOS

The following tables define LOS for roadway segments including segments of two lane highways and intersections, which are typical of the facilities within Trinity County.

The Highway Capacity Manual categorizes two-lane highways as either Class I or Class II. The definitions are as follows:

- Class I – Two-lane highways with relatively high speeds and that are major intercity routes, primary arterials connecting major traffic generators, daily commuter routes, or primary links in state or national highway networks. They often serve long-distance trips or provide connecting links between facilities that serve long-distance trips.
- Class II – Two-lane highways with lower expected travel speeds that function as access routes to Class I facilities, serve as scenic or recreational routes that are not primary arterials, or pass through rugged terrain. They most often serve relatively short trips, the beginning and ending portions of longer trips, or trips for which sightseeing plays a significant role.

The level of service measures for Class I and Class II two-lane highways are as follows:

*On Class I highways...LOS is defined in terms of both percent time-spent-following and average travel speed. On Class II highways...LOS is defined only in terms of percent time-spent-following, without consideration of average travel speed (HCM 2000, Page 20-3).*

LOS for rural highways is largely determined by roadway geometry factors, such as grades, vertical and horizontal curves, and the presence of passing opportunities. In mountainous topography and particularly through canyons, roadway LOS can be relatively poor, even absent substantial traffic volumes. Roadway LOS can also be impacted in developed areas by pedestrian, bicycle and parking activity.

**Table 2.3** displays the LOS criteria thresholds developed using the HCM 2000 methodology for typical two-lane highway and county roadway segments. These tables provide daily volume thresholds for each level of service and provide ease in estimating level of service. Since the thresholds are based on typical conditions, they should be used cautiously for a roadway segment that has extreme characteristics.

<b>TABLE 2.3 ROADWAY SEGMENT LEVEL OF SERVICE THRESHOLDS</b>					
<b>Facility Type</b>	<b>Upper Limit Daily Traffic Volume Threshold</b>				
	<b>LOS A</b>	<b>LOS B</b>	<b>LOS C</b>	<b>LOS D</b>	<b>LOS E</b>
<b>Class I Two Lane Highway</b> (SR 299 except in Weaverville)	1,200	2,900	7,900	16,000	20,500
<b>Class II Two Lane Highway</b> (SR 3, SR 36, SR 299 in Weaverville)	900	2,000	6,800	14,100	17,400
<b>County Roadways (Two Lane)</b> (County Minor Arterials and Collectors)	900	2,000	4,000	7,000	10,000
Notes: LOS F applies whenever the flow rate exceeds the segment capacity. Source: HCM 2000, Chapter 20, Two-Lane Highways; Fehr & Peers, 2010					

## Intersection LOS

Intersections are analyzed using the methodology contained in Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 (Transportation Research Board, 2000). For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the level of service by comparing the average control delay for all vehicles approaching the intersection to the delay thresholds shown in **Table 2.4**. Unsignalized (side-street stop-controlled) intersection level of service calculations were conducted using the method in Chapter 17 of the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual. The LOS rating is based on the average control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle. At side-street stop-controlled intersections, the control delay (and LOS) is calculated for each controlled movement, the left-turn movement from the major street, and for the entire intersection. For controlled approaches composed of a single lane, the control delay is computed as the average of all movements in that lane. Trinity County analyzes level of service at unsignalized intersections based on the average delay (in seconds/vehicle) of the worst movement.

<b>TABLE 2.4 INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE DEFINITIONS</b>			
<b>Level of Service</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Signalized Intersections</b>	<b>Unsignalized Intersections</b>
A	Represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by others in the traffic stream.	≤ 10	≤10
B	Stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable.	> 10 to 20	> 10 to 15
C	Stable flow, but the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream.	> 20 to 35	> 15 to 25
D	Represents high-density, but stable flow.	> 35 to 55	> 25 to 35
E	Represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level.	> 55 to 80	> 35 to 50
F	Represents forced or breakdown flow.	> 80	> 50

Notes: Values are shown for average control delay in seconds/vehicle.  
Sources: HCM 2000, Chapter 16, Signalized Intersections and HCM 2000, Chapter 17, Unsignalized Intersections.

## Local Conditions

As mentioned in the introduction, this RTP marks a transition between the old LOS model of assessing the efficiency of a transportation system, and the new Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) method. The two methods are very different, analyze completely different parameters, and are sometimes opposed in their assessment of what is a positive or negative impact on the transportation system. For example, as mentioned above, roadway LOS can be adversely impacted in developed areas by pedestrian and bicycle facilities and activities. Therefore, addition of a bicycle lane or sidewalk could be considered an adverse impact on the transportation system under the old LOS approach, but would be seen as a clearly positive impact when viewed in terms of VMT. Another example is infill development. Building new businesses or residences closer to the urban core is problematic when assessing transportation impacts using LOS, because these are areas of highest traffic congestion, and adding any trips to these urban cores further degrades an already poor level of service. However, this practice is considered beneficial from a VMT perspective, because bringing services and residences closer together reduces vehicle miles and encourages people to walk, ride a bicycle or take transit to their destinations.

Future RTP's will assess transportation impacts in terms of VMT. For this RTP, the previous level of service analysis from the 2011 RTP will be used, since traffic conditions in the more congested areas of the County, such as Weaverville, have not changed significantly.

A Travel Demand Forecasting Model (TDM) was developed for the 2011 RTP using LOS methodology. The 2011 RTP presented LOS for County State Highway roadways and intersections under "existing" (2009) conditions and projected 2040 conditions. Projected conditions were developed in the TDM by applying growth projections to areas of the County where growth was expected and performing computer modelling to determine future travel patterns. The 2011 TDM is attached to this RTP as Appendix 2.

Because the 2011 TDM projected traffic patterns out to 2040, and the required range of this 2016 RTP is to 2036, and also because traffic appears to be growing more slowly than forecasted in the 2011 TDM, a new TDM is not considered necessary at this time. The next TDM will be done with the 2021 RTP, and will use VMT modelling rather than LOS. In the meantime, refer to Appendix 2 for forecast levels of service on County and State facilities in Trinity County.

Although there has been little traffic growth in the Weaverville area, in 2040, SR 299 in Weaverville will continue to operate below Caltrans Standards, and the deficiency will extend east of Martin Road.

The previous TDM noted several intersections that were already experiencing poor Level of Service, or projected to have very poor levels of service by 2040. These are all local side streets that intersect with SR 299, where drivers experience long delays at stop signs before they can enter the highway. Examples of these poorly functioning intersections include the intersections of Washington Street, SR 3, Forest Avenue and Weaver Bally Road with SR 299 in downtown Weaverville.

When the new Lance Gulch Road was constructed, the intersection with SR 299, directly across from Glen Road, was expected to be controlled by a traffic signal. During construction, an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) was conducted to determine if a traffic signal, roundabout, 4-way stop or 2-way stop (stop signs only on Lance Gulch Road and Glen Road) was the best design to control the intersection. The study determined that a roundabout would be the best control option, followed by the traffic signal. Both would provide acceptable LOS D or better. The stop sign alternatives produced very poor level of service results, particularly the two-way stop alternative, which would result in an unacceptable LOS F immediately and in the future. The 4-way stop has been installed at least temporarily, resulting in LOS D currently. The forecast for 2040 with the 4-way stop is LOS E, which is currently considered unacceptable in the Policy Element of this RTP and the Circulation Element of the General Plan. **[This paragraph will be concluded before the Final RTP is adopted, based on a pending decision by the Trinity County Board of Supervisors.]**

The lengthy delays at side street approaches in Weaverville represent a safety hazard as well as a level of service issue, because drivers tend to get impatient and may decide to enter the highway when it is not safe to do so. In addition, these poorly functioning intersections do not provide adequate protection for pedestrians. Notwithstanding the current philosophy of level of service, these poorly functioning intersections in Weaverville are still an issue to be addressed.

Therefore, the 2011 RTP included a Traffic Signalization Study for the downtown Weaverville area, which analyzed the Glen Road/Lance Gulch Road, Washington Street, SR 3 and Garden Gulch Street/Forest Avenue intersections with SR 299 for LOS with two-way stop signs (unsignalized), with signals, and with roundabouts at the Glen Road and Garden Gulch intersections. In addition, the Weaverville Traffic Signalization Study includes analysis of the effects of converting Center Street between Court Street and SR 3 from a one-way section to a two-way section. It concluded that delays on SR 299 would not be noticeably reduced by converting Center Street to two-way traffic.

That study is reproduced in this RTP as Appendix 3.

Intersection Control Evaluations and possible future improvements are proposed in this RTP at the Washington Street intersection and at the intersection of Weaver Bally Road with SR 299, which is further west than the Garden Gulch/Forest Avenue intersection that was analyzed in the 2011 Signalization Study.

## SAFETY

Collision data is collected for State highways and county roads by the California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)

The SWITRS database has individual accident reports as well as summaries for the entire state, state highways only, and for specific counties. It has tallies of injuries, fatalities, property damage, and various accident causes such as DUI. However, it tends to report numbers of accidents, rather than accidents per capita or per vehicle miles travelled. This data actually tends to make the situation in a rural area like Trinity County appear better than it is. With a low population and low traffic counts on roads within the County, compared to more urbanized areas, sheer numbers of accidents, injuries or fatalities will naturally be much smaller. Actually, the rate of accidents, injuries and fatalities per capita or per vehicle miles traveled within Trinity County, on both State Highways and County Roads, far exceeds State averages. The main cause of this discrepancy is hazardous road conditions, particularly narrow roads with steep embankments and no shoulders. Some of these roads are not a full two lanes wide, leading to conflicts with oncoming traffic. A run-off-the-road incident could result in minor property damage in flatter areas or areas where there are wide shoulders. In Trinity County, running off the road can often lead to plunging down a steep cliff for 100 feet or more, leading to severe injuries or even fatalities.

The main safety need in Trinity County is for wider roads and shoulders, guardrails and high visibility striping. There are several of these types of projects proposed in Appendix 4C. As mentioned above, poorly functioning intersections in Weaverville are another safety hazard for which projects are proposed in Appendix 4C.

### ***Collisions on County Roads***

**Table 2.5** provides a five year summary of the number of collisions resulting in injuries and fatalities that occurred on Trinity County roads from 2009 through 2013. As **Table 2.5** shows, total collisions have declined overall since 2009, with the exception of 2012. There were no fatalities reported in 2010, compared to five that were reported in 2012.

The cause of the majority of collisions is reported to be single vehicle collisions that ran off the road and/or hit an object. This trend is similar to other rural areas where roads tend to be two-lane and are bordered by trees and other stationary obstacles, or surrounded by steep terrain.



**TABLE 2.5  
 FATAL AND INJURY COLLISIONS ON TRINITY COUNTY ROADS**

Year	Total Fatal and injury Collisions	Total Injuries	Total Fatalities
2013	16	19	1
2012	27	43	5
2011	24	33	3
2010	28	56	0
2009	33	54	7

Source: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)

## TRANSIT

### *Trinity Transit*

Trinity Transit is the public transit operator for Trinity County. Trinity Transit commenced operations in 1988 with service to Hayfork, Douglas City, Weaverville, Lewiston and Junction City. The service was originally operated by the Human Response Network under contract with Trinity County. In 1997 the employees of Trinity Transit became Trinity County employees. The principal sources of revenue for the county's transit system are: Local Transportation Fund, State Transit Assistance Fund, Federal Transit Administration 5311 and 5311F grants; passenger fares and package delivery. In an effort to serve more people and enhance public transit service between Willow Creek in Humboldt County and Redding in Shasta County, intercity bus service began in January of 2010. Trinity Transit currently operates four fixed-route services (Lewiston to Weaverville, Hayfork to Weaverville, and two intercity routes between Weaverville and Redding and Weaverville and Willow Creek). All routes operate Monday through Friday and the first and third Saturday of the month. **Table 2.6** provides schedules and other transit service characteristics. **Figure 4** provides a map of the routes and service areas.



**Figure 4 – Trinity Transit**

<b>TABLE 2.6 TRINITY TRANSIT SERVICE CHARACTERISTICS</b>			
<b>Service Route</b>	<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Service Days</b>	<b>Hours of Operation</b>
Hayfork – Weaverville	Hayfork, Douglas City , Weaverville, via SR3/SR299	Monday – Friday & 1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Saturday	6:45 AM – 6:00 PM (two round trips)
Lewiston – Weaverville (PR*)	SR 299 Corridor: Lewiston, Douglas City, Weaverville	Monday thru Friday, & 1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Saturday	Lewiston to Weaverville: 6:55 AM – 6:40 PM (two round trips Mon, Wed, Fri and One round trip on Tues and Thursday)
Weaverville – Willow Creek (Down River)	SR 299 Corridor: Weaverville, Junction City, Big Bar, Del Loma, Burnt Ranch, Trinity Village, Salyer, Willow Creek	Monday-Friday & 1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Saturday	7:35 AM – 6:00 PM (two round trips)
Weaverville-Redding	SR 299 Corridor: Weaverville, Douglas City, Redding	Monday thru Friday & 1 <sup>st</sup> & 3 <sup>rd</sup> Saturday	7:30 AM -5:15 PM (two roundtrips)
Source: TCTC staff			

### Administration and Staffing

The TCTC allocates funding to Trinity Transit and provides coordination among other transportation functions in the County. The TCTC approves grant applications for transportation needs within the County while approval for annual department budgets and capital spending for transit is the responsibility of the Trinity County Board of Supervisors. Trinity Transit is managed by a Transit Coordinator who supervises three full-time drivers and two part-time drivers. The Coordinator reports directly to the Senior Transportation Planner. The Coordinator completes scheduling for the drivers, manages bus maintenance, assists with drug testing, and also serves as one of the drivers. The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) provides advisory oversight of Trinity Transit and provides support for paratransit and other public transportation service providers in the County.

### Trinity Transit Fleet

Trinity Transit operates a fleet of eight lift-equipped vehicles, which are rotated among the routes. Transit vehicles are stored in Weaverville, Lewiston, and Hayfork. Minor and/or routine transit maintenance is provided by the County Department of Transportation or service stations in Weaverville, Hayfork, or Redding. Major repairs or warranty work are performed at a dealer outside of the County. The effective service life span of the cutaway buses operated by transit vehicle is 7 years or 200,000 miles, whichever comes first. The lowest mileage bus, as of June 2017, has approximately 33,871 miles. The highest mileage bus has approximately 205,104 miles.

### Trinity Transit Fare Structure

The Trinity County Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance adjusting Trinity Transit Fares in September, 2015, which was put into effect in November, 2015. Trinity Transit fares are charged for passengers 5 years and older and are based on distance traveled.

Trinity Transit Performance Summary for FY 11/12 through FY 15/16

**Table 2.7** shows a summary for the Weaverville and Hayfork routes performance data updated from Fiscal Year 11/12 through / Fiscal Year 15/16.

The performance indicators in **Table 2.7** are comprised of cost efficiency measures, cost effectiveness measures and service effectiveness measures.

**Cost efficiency** – These measures compare service inputs to service outputs, and measure the efficiency of resource allocation with Trinity Transit. Examples are operating cost per revenue hour and per revenue mile.

**Cost Effectiveness** – These measures compare service inputs to service consumption to show how well the service is being utilized. Examples are operating cost per passenger and fare box ratio.

**Service Effectiveness** – These measures compare service consumption to service outputs and measures how well the capacity of the service is being utilized. Examples are passengers per revenue hour and passengers per revenue mile.

<b>TABLE 2.7 TRINITY TRANSIT PERFORMANCE MEASURES FY 11/12 THROUGH FY 15/16</b>					
<b>Operating Category</b>	<b>Trinity Transit</b>				
	<b>FY 11/12</b>	<b>FY 12/13</b>	<b>FY 13/14</b>	<b>FY 14/15</b>	<b>FY 15/16</b>
Ridership	11,852	16,112	15,688	17,159	16,694
Operating Cost	\$365,471	\$555,964	\$607,574	\$483,372	\$707,776
Revenue Hours	4,457	5,165	5,111	5,482	5,667
Cost per Revenue Hour	\$113.27	\$122.97	\$118.86	\$106.55	\$113.31
Revenue Miles	134,669	152,442	159,735	164,000	168,645
Cost per Revenue Mile	\$2.71	\$3.64	\$3.80	\$2.94	\$4.20
Operating Cost per Passenger	\$42.60	\$39.42	\$38.73	\$33.56	\$38.47
Farebox Revenue	\$55,147	\$74,779	\$87,122	\$92,562	\$90,258
Farebox Recovery Ratio	12.71%	9.95%	13.02%	13.96%	12.25%
Average Fare per Passenger	\$5.70	\$3.50	\$6.00	\$5.21	\$5.41
Average Subsidy per Passenger	\$36.89	\$44.47	\$32.73	\$28.35	\$33.06
Passenger per Revenue Hour	2.66	3.12	3.07	3.17	2.95
Passenger per Revenue Mile	.09	.11	0.10	0.11	.10
Source: Trinity County 2016					

The general transit trends for Trinity Transit are described below:

Farebox Ratio – Other than FY 2012/13 the overall farebox ratio has been above the Transit Development Act (TDA) mandated 10 percent. The Redding (17.76%) and Willow Creek (16.33%) routes achieve the highest percentage, followed by the Hayfork Route (10.99%). The Lewiston route averages a 5.28% farebox recovery, far below the 10% state mandate.

Operating Cost per Passenger – This indicator has increased for all fixed-route services. The increase has been attributed to overall operating cost increases in salaries and benefits, insurance costs, and fuel.

Operating Cost per Revenue Hour – This indicator has increased due to increased route service and miles. Again, increases in salaries and benefits, insurance, and fuel contributed the most to the increase, not service expansion.

### ***Social Service Transportation Providers***

The following information summarizes transportation services offered by social service providers in the County to complement the fixed-route service provided by Trinity Transit. Most of the services have eligibility requirements and focus more on older adults, disabled, or low-income individuals. A detailed description of each service is provided in the Trinity County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan prepared by AMMA Transit Planning in 2014.

#### **American Cancer Society**

The American Cancer Society's Shasta County Chapter offers transportation to cancer patients in Trinity County as part of their Road to Recovery program. Approximately 90 percent of the medical trips are to and from Redding and is provided by volunteer drivers. Patients and/or drivers can be reimbursed \$0.14 per mile for making the trip.

#### **Far Northern Regional Center (FNRC)**

The FNRC provides services for persons with developmental disabilities in nine northern California counties including Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama and Trinity. The services range from education, health, welfare and recreation. The day program in Weaverville has approximately 8-10 participants. Funding is provided primarily from the State of California Department of Developmental Services.

#### **Human Response Network (HRN)**

The HRN has over 25 programs ranging from personal empowerment to transportation assistance. The transportation function subsidizes non-emergency medical and social service trips for qualified persons living in Trinity County who cannot drive by providing Trinity Transit bus passes and gas vouchers. Drivers in the program are reimbursed on a mileage basis at \$0.25 per mile. Trinity County is responsible for distributing transportation funding for the program through a contract with the Human Response Network.

#### **Golden Age Center (GAC)**

The GAC (senior center in Weaverville) provides demand responsive service Monday through Friday to eligible clients (55 years or older or disabled) to participate in the lunch program or for any other trip purpose within Weaverville. The GAC has one full-time paid driver and one small 10 passenger bus.

### Roderick Senior Center (RSC)

The RSC is located in Hayfork and provides services to seniors 60 or older. Services include home delivered meals, meals in house, and Health Insurance Counseling Advocacy Program (HICAP) to assist the elderly with health insurance questions. Transportation services include home-delivered meals, shopping, and banking and hair appointments. Demand-responsive service is available for medical appointments locally and to Weaverville or Redding when absolutely necessary. Transportation is free of charge but the RSC does have a suggested donation of \$0.50 each way for service within Hayfork, \$25.00 for a roundtrip to Weaverville, and \$35.00 for a roundtrip to Redding. The center operates in-house with one vehicle and relies on volunteer drivers and vehicles to provide service to Weaverville and Redding. Funding comes from several sources including federal AAA, State of California AAA, and fundraisers and donations.

### Southern Trinity Health Services (STHS)

The STHS is a medical facility in the southern Trinity County community of Mad River. Trips for all purposes (medical, shopping, social) are provided on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday between Mad River and Fortuna/Eureka. Service is also provided between Mad River and Hayfork on Tuesday's and every 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Friday. The medical clinic in Mad River operates Monday through Friday and has one 17 passenger vehicle devoted to regularly scheduled Mad River to Fortuna/Eureka service for persons who have no other means of transportation. The facility operates the program using funds from its general budget.

### Trinity Cab Service

Trinity Cab offers general public taxi service in Weaverville and the surrounding areas Monday – Thursday from 9AM to 11PM; Friday and Saturday 9AM to 2AM, and on Sundays by appointment only. The regular fare within a five-mile radius of Weaverville is \$8.00. Fares to other portions of the County are based on \$2.75 per mile.

### Trinity County Behavioral Health (TCBH)

TCBHS provides mental health and substance abuse programs throughout the County. Services for mental health are provided to Medi-Cal eligible recipients. For those with substance abuse issues, Medi-Cal and private pay source is welcomed. Funding comes from Mental Health Realignment dollars, which are allocated by the State of California. Transportation services are directly provided using ten vehicles (one wheelchair-accessible van and several jeeps). Serving the community with one full-time driver, and three part-time drivers, they also provide emergency out of county transport for crisis stabilization. On occasion, gas vouchers are available to clients who have their own vehicle to ensure appointments are not interrupted. They also offer bus passes as appropriate, for those able to make use of public transportation.

### Trinity County Health and Human Services (HHS)

The HHS provides services to qualified members of the community for health, employment, public assistance and social services. The primary location of clients is Weaverville and Hayfork. Transportation assistance is provided in the form of transportation directly, transit tickets, or transportation reimbursement. Direct transportation services are provided through a fleet of 16 cars ranging in size from sub-compacts to large SUVs. Most trips are on an “as needed” basis except for the CalWORKS program, where a transportation aid transports three to five clients a day to various job functions. The Child and Adult Protective Services (CPS) program within HHS provides two to three rides per day and monthly trips to destinations outside of Trinity County.

## **Regional Transportation Connections**

Opportunities for regional transportation services and connections are discussed below.

### Greyhound

Greyhound bus connections are available in Redding at the RABA Transit Center near Interstate 5 and at the Arcata Transit Center near Highway 101. The Trinity Transit intercity bus schedule to Redding maintains a coordinated connection with the Greyhound schedule to provide reasonable transfers for riders traveling north and south on I-5. The bus schedule to Willow Creek connects with the Redwood Transit Service (RTS) in Willow Creek. RTS departs Willow Creek within a 1/2 hour to Arcata where passengers have an opportunity to go north or south on SR-101. Greyhound departs Arcata daily to the Bay Area, and Redwood Coast Transit departs daily to destinations north on SR-101.

### Amtrak

There is no Amtrak service to or within Trinity County. The closest station is located in Redding, however Capital Corridor buses provide service for Amtrak passengers from the RABA Transit Center in Redding and the Transit Center in Arcata, CA to Amtrak trains.

## **Transit Needs Assessment**

The discussion of transportation needs and service gaps is based on information developed in the Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (October 2014), the Trinity County Transit Development Plan (2014), and the “Unmet Transit Needs” process and hearing (April 18, 2017). The transit needs from these documents were identified from a series of in-person interviews, telephone interviews, on-board surveys, and input from stakeholders and the SSTAC.

### Definitions

#### *Unmet Transit Needs*

In Trinity County, unmet transit needs are defined as:

1. Those public transportation or specialized transportation services that are identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and that have not been implemented or funded;
2. Those public transportation service needs that have been identified in a Transit Development Plan (TDP) identifying and assessing the needs of the general public and other groups; or as identified by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC); or as identified during a public hearing on unmet needs, which will be referred to SSTAC for review and future recommendation.

#### *Reasonable to Meet*

The reasonable to meet criteria is defined as those unmet transit needs that the TCTC finds are within the ability of the claimant to satisfy or reduce based on: a Commission authorized assessment of alternative methods of meeting said unmet transit needs (this may be included in the TDP or through an advisory assessment of the SSTAC); and the ability of the claimant to provide for identified unmet transit needs. The Commission shall consider such factors as equity, cost effectiveness, community acceptance, financial and operational feasibility, coordination efforts and other factors related to transit services in evaluating proposals. The following are definitions used for each term:

- Equity: The proposed transit service is designed to serve the public. Transit service will not be provided favoring one group at the exclusion of any other.
- Cost Effectiveness: Supporting data demonstrates sufficient ridership and revenue potential exists for the new, expanded or revised transit service to meet or exceed the required farebox revenue to operating cost ratios on a stand-alone basis. Furthermore, cost per passenger is reasonable when compared to the level of service provided; benefit accrued to the community and to existing service cost per passenger.
- Community Acceptance: There is public support for the proposed transit service.
- Feasibility, Financial: 1) The proposed transit service, if implemented or funded, would not cause the responsible operator or service claimant to incur expenses in excess of the maximum allocation of Transportation Development Act funds, State Transit Assistance, FTA Section 5311 funds, and other transit-specific grants as may become available. 2) The proposed transit service, if implemented or funded, would allow the responsible operator or service claimant to meet the required farebox revenue to operating cost ratio of 10%. 3) Proposed transit system expansion must be monitored and evaluated after 6 months of operation (or other approved period of review) by the Transportation Commission. *(Note: The fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available financial resources shall not be the sole reason for finding that a need is not reasonable to meet. [PUC, Sec 99401.5(c)] For example: alternatives such as volunteers or funding from sources not dedicated to transit could be used to close the financial gap.)*
- Feasibility, Operational: There are adequate roadways and turnouts to safely accommodate transit vehicles.
- Coordination Efforts: Transit services designed or intended to address an unmet transit need shall in all cases make efforts to coordinate with transit services currently provided by other public or private organizations.

The finding from the April 18, 2017 Public Hearing was there are no “unmet transit needs” that are “reasonable to meet” at the present time. However, there is a general consensus of patrons that Trinity County has significant transportation needs, but because the County is sparsely populated, with a density of five people per square mile and mountainous terrain, the provision of effective public transportation is difficult. The following socio-economic findings contribute to the continued demand for improved transit service.

- Transit ridership is less than optimal because of the large percentage of people that have access to personal vehicle transportation. The transit dependent population is small compared to the availability of vehicles for transportation purposes.
- The rural nature of Trinity County and the dispersed population require many residents to travel long distances for services. The 2010 Census showed the poverty rate in Trinity County (18.4%) to be higher than the State (15.8%) meaning that more of the people without access to a vehicle reside in the outlying areas which are hardest to serve by transit.
- Transit travel demand for employment is less than significant for Trinity County due to the fact that in 2010 70 percent of the population in the County was not in the labor force. In 2010 the

unemployment rate was at 18.4%, however in 2013 it was at 12.8%. There are a large number of retirees living in the County.

- In 2010 adults 65 or older comprised approximately 16% of the population and this percentage is anticipated to increase in the future. The older population generally has greater need for transit or specialized services which increase transit demand throughout the County.
- Many residents in the County are not aware of the transit services provided so they do not avail themselves of transit opportunities.

## **AVIATION FACILITIES**

The isolated, rural nature of Trinity County has contributed to a strong commitment by local aircraft owners, and the County for maintaining and improving its airport facilities. The County believes that efficient functioning airports are critical for the safety, security, and economic vitality of the northern region. The five publicly-owned airports in Trinity County are shown in **Figure 5**. These airports provide significant contributions to the County's economy by attracting tourists, businesses and seasonal residents, and commuters who live in Trinity County and work elsewhere. Aviation as a mode allows remote communities quick access to medical and business centers, and is an important resource in managing emergencies such as fire, flood or medical rescue. The closest commercial air services for Trinity residents are located in Redding and McKinleyville.

The following summarizes information about each airport. The information was compiled from the 2005 Trinity RTP, the Airport Layout Plans prepared for four of the airports by Coffman and Associates in 2007/2008 and the most recent Airport Master Records compiled by the Federal Aviation Administration and Caltrans.

### ***Hayfork Airport***

The following information was compiled from the 2005 RTP and the Hayfork Airport Layout Plan (ALP) prepared by Coffman Associates, Inc. in 2007. The Hayfork Airport is located in central Hayfork and is classified as a Community Airport. The airport is rated for visual flight rules only. The airport is unattended and there is currently no fixed-based operator. Security fencing was installed in 2009. Hayfork has a single, two-way asphalt runway measuring 4,115 feet long by 60 feet wide. The runway is equipped with a pilot-keyed, medium intensity lighting system on Runway 7-25. There are 18 chained tie-downs for the based and transient aircraft on the apron. Aircraft storage facilities include two box hangars located on the west ends of the apron. There are no fueling facilities at the airport and there are no aircraft rescue and firefighting services. Emergency services are provided by the Hayfork Volunteer Fire Department. Hayfork can serve aircraft with up to a 49-foot wing span (Design Group 1). The latest ALP estimates approximately 1,500 annual flight operations at the facility, calculated based on Order 5090.3c from the "Field Formulation of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems". However, the Airport is not currently included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and is therefore not eligible for Federal funding.

The capacity of the airport is considered adequate for immediate needs; however, the airports' capacity is limited by airspace encroachments, hangar and tie down facilities, and lack of fueling infrastructure. Current needs include:

- Install Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI).
- Extend parallel taxiway for full length of runway.



- Continue efforts for removal of trees to reduce obstructions in airspace.
- Provide additional hangars and shade hangers (these will be developed as the need and funding allow).
- Provide for additional vehicle parking near the pilot's lounge (the Airport Layout Plan projects a need of seven spaces short-term and 10 spaces long-term).

### ***Hyampom Airport***

The Hyampom Airport is located within the community of Hyampom in the western portion of the County. The airport is classified as a Community airport and meets the FAA requirements for Aircraft Design Group 1. Hyampom Airport is not included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and is therefore not eligible for Federal funding. An Airport Layout Plan was prepared by engineer Reinard Brandley in 2004. A single, two-way runway exists, consisting of a 2,280 foot by 60 foot asphalt surface. Approximately 17 tie-downs are available. The Airport Master Record (July 2009) shows one single engine based aircraft and approximately 2,000 annual flight operations. The airport is expected to continue to meet existing and future demand. Existing needs include:

- Extend current runway to ensure future safety requirements.
- Continue routine maintenance of the facility.
- Provide additional hangars and shade hangars (these will be developed as need and funding allows).
- Accomplish land acquisition to develop a taxiway and extend the apron area.

### ***Ruth Airport***

Ruth airport is located in the southern portion of the County near Ruth Lake. The airport is classified as a Community – Recreation Airport. The airport is unattended and there is no fixed-based operator. An Airport Layout Plan was prepared by Coffman & Associates in 2007. Ruth airport has a single two-way asphalt runway measuring 3,500 feet long and 50 feet wide. No lighting is available for the runway. There are 10 tie-down spaces. The Airport Layout Plan estimates approximately 750 annual flight operations calculated based on Order 5090.3c from the "Field Formulation of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems". The Airport is not included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and is therefore eligible for Federal funding.

The airport meets current demand but will need some improvements to meet future demand. These improvements include:

- Widen the runway to 60 feet to meet current standards.
- Provide routine maintenance of the facility including clearing vegetation from safety zones.
- Provide additional hangars and shade hangars (these will be developed as need and funding allows).

**Figure 5 – Trinity County Airports**

## **Trinity Center Airport**

The Trinity Center airport is located in Trinity Center off of SR 3 in the northern portion of the County. The airport is classified as a Community – Recreation airport and is visual flight rules rated. The airport is unattended and there is no fixed-based operator. An Airport Layout Plan was prepared by Coffman & Associates in 2008. Security fencing was completed in 2009. The runway is a single, two-way asphalt runway approximately 3,215 feet long. The surface includes relocated thresholds of 200 feet on each end. The runway width varies between 50 and 60 feet throughout its length and is not lighted. There are approximately 50 tie-downs for based and transient aircraft on the apron. There is additional aircraft parking available along the west side of the runway, north of the apron. There are 35 owner built hangars currently. The airport has no fueling service or repair facilities on site. There are currently 17 vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the airport vehicle entrance. The long-term need is for 60 vehicle spaces by 2030. The Airport Layout Plan estimates approximately 5,500 annual flight operations calculated based on Order 5090.3c from the “Field Formulation of the national Plan of Integrated Airport Systems”. This represents a significant increase from the 3,600 operations reported in the 2005 RTP. The airport is included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and is therefore eligible for Federal funding.

Trinity Center Airport does not meet the FAA design standards for Aircraft Design Group 1. The following improvements are needed to meet minimum standards for the FAA designation:

- Acquire the Federally-owned, special-use-permitted lands that are improved and slated for continuing airport development.
- Extend runway 14 to offset relocation of the threshold to provide the required runway and safety areas for Runways 14 and 32 without extending the total length of the runways.
- Widen a portion of the runway surface from 50 to 60 feet.
- Relocate the service road located at the north end of the airport.

The following additional needs have been identified:

- Continue to remove obstructions within airspace encroachment areas.
- Add an Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS) and a Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI)
- Provide additional hangars and tie-down areas.
- Provide drainage improvements.
- Provide a fueling system.
- Add runway lighting.
- Resurface runways and taxiway as funding allows.
- Add a helipad at the south end.

## **Weaverville – Lonnie Pool Airport**

The following information was compiled from the 2005 RTP and the Weaverville Airport Master Plan/new site feasibility study prepared by Coffman Associates, Inc. in 2007. The Weaverville – Lonnie Pool Airport is located in Weaverville, the county seat, business center, and population center for Trinity County. The facility is classified as a Community – Recreation Airport. The airport has no fixed-based operator. The airport runway is a single directional, consisting of a 3,380 foot by 50 foot asphalt surface. All planes must take off to the south and land from the south due to the surrounding terrain. The terrain to the north and east of the airport penetrates the horizontal and conical surfaces of the runway. The runway is further constrained by gradient and obstructions in the approach and departure zones. Runway operations are supplemented by a wind indicator and an automated weather observation system (AWOS).

The airport has 16 marked tie-downs and nine hangars. An aircraft parking apron is located on both sides of the runway, at midfield. There are currently no fueling facilities on the site. The airport serves Aircraft Design Group 1. The Airport Layout Plan estimates approximately 3,800 annual flight operations calculated based on Order 5090.3c from the “Field Formulation of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems”. The airport is not included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) and is therefore not eligible for Federal funding.

The existing airport is constrained by non-aviation uses and lacks expansion area. Improvements to the facility to allow two-way or night operations are not considered feasible.

The 2007 Airport Master Plan/Site Analysis study identified several options for a replacement airport site for Weaverville. However, the study found that there are no sites near Weaverville that offer clear advantages from an engineering or environmental perspective, and most would require extensive mitigation. The Trinity County Board of Supervisors has decided not to relocate the airport. Instead, they will continue operation of the existing Weaverville Airport without any additional improvements other than:

- Security fencing (installed in 2009)
- Addition of an Automated Weather Observation System (AWOS) (installed in 2010)
- Routine pavement maintenance and tree removal
- Addition of hangers and shade structures as need and as funding becomes available

## **RAIL SERVICE**

There is no east-west rail service available in California north of San Francisco. The North Coast Railroad Authority operates a shortline freight rail service from Eureka/Arcata to south of Willits. A small portion of this rail line crosses the southwestern-most portion of Trinity County. Operation of the rail line has been unreliable due to unstable geological conditions in the Eel River valley and it is currently closed.

## NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES

The 2015 Bikeways Master Plan indicates there are 7.6 miles of existing bikeways in Trinity County, however, in 2016 the completion of Lance Gulch Road added 2 lane miles of additional bikeway. Weaverville has a good spine bikeway network with bike lanes on SR 3 and SR 299 through town and on Washington Street and Lance Gulch Road. The County also has numerous recreational trails that are not designed or expected to meet Caltrans Class I standards consistent with the Highway Design Manual, Chapter 20.

Existing and proposed bikeway and pedestrian trails are located in Hayfork, Junction City, Lewiston, Douglas City, and Weaverville. **Table 2.8** lists the existing bikeway facilities by classification and length. **Figure 6** displays the existing bikeways.

<b>TABLE 2.8 EXISTING BIKEWAYS IN TRINITY COUNTY</b>					
<b>Community</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Length (Miles)</b>
Hayfork	Oak Street/Bridge	SR 3	Morgan Hill Rd.	I	0.5
Hayfork	Morgan Hill Rd.	Oak Street	Kyler Avenue	II	0.4
Hayfork	SR 3	Hyampom Road	Brady Rd.	II	0.5
Hayfork	Morgan Hill Rd.	SR 3	Oak Street	III	1.0
Junction City	Red Hill Rd.	Junction City Elementary School	Dutch Creek Rd.	II	0.5
Weaverville	SR 299	N. Miner St.	Cox Rd.	II	1.8
Weaverville	SR 3	Airport	Elementary School	II	1.4
Weaverville	Washington St.	SR 3	SR 299	II	0.5
Weaverville	Lance Gulch Rd	SR 299	SR 3	II	1.5
<b>Total Miles</b>					<b>8.1</b>

**Figure 6 – Trinity County Bikeways**

Adopted community plans aid the Trinity County Transportation Commission when considering non-motorized improvement priorities and guide the Board of Supervisors in reviewing land divisions and other county-issued entitlements to determine the extent of right-of-way necessary to provide bicycle routes and preserve important recreational trails. Cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service, other public agencies, private landowners and civic groups can contribute to the necessary maintenance of regional trails.

The 2015 Bikeways Master Plan's main purpose is to encourage development of a unified bicycle system throughout Trinity County that serves the needs of bicycle commuters, students, users of non-motorized rolling modes of transportation, seniors and recreational bicyclists with safe connections to other regional non-motorized systems. Improvements for three Class I facilities were identified for Weaverville. Other Class III improvements were recommended for various Caltrans, County, and community facilities. These improvements are listed in the Action Element, Chapter 4, and in Appendix 4E. Additional bikeway needs are described below:

- "Share the Road" signs are needed on SR 3, SR 36, and SR 299 to alert motorists that bicycles may be on the roadway. These signs should be installed every two to three miles and at the County boundaries.
- "Share the Road" signs and the Trinity County bike route logo should be posted on County roads that serve as spur bikeways from the State route network. These spur routes are used by bicyclists to reach remote communities, campgrounds, and other places of interest. The list of County roads needing signs are included in the Action Element Chapter 4 and also listed in the 2004 Bikeways Master Plan

## AIR QUALITY

Under State Law, local and regional air pollution control districts have the primary responsibility for controlling air pollutant emissions from all sources other than vehicular emissions. Control of vehicular air pollution is the responsibility of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In California, State standards are more stringent than Federal standards. The three primary pollutants prevalent within the County are listed below:

- *Ozone ( $O_3$ )* – smog formed through a chemical reaction of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides and sunlight;
- *Carbon Monoxide (CO)* – a colorless, odorless gas that is considered toxic because of its tendency to reduce the carrying capacity of oxygen in the blood; and,
- *Suspended Particulate Matter less than 10 microns ( $PM_{10}$ )* – solid or liquid matter that can penetrate into the lungs and affect sensitive population groups such as children, the elderly, and people with respiratory diseases.

These pollutants are all emitted by motor vehicles. Motor vehicles also release fugitive PM10 dust that is re-entrained from road surfaces. Fugitive PM10 dust release is substantially higher on unpaved roads compared to paved roads.

Air quality is a significant consideration in planning for and evaluating the transportation system. The CARB divides the State into air basins and adopts standards of quality for each air basin. Trinity County is part of the North Coast Air Basin, with air quality managed by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD).

The NCUAQMD has a monitoring station located in Trinity County on the roof of the Courthouse in Weaverville. The only pollutant monitored at this site is Particulate Matter 10 (particulate matter ten microns

in diameter or less) or PM<sub>10</sub>. Airborne Particulate Matter is caused by a combination of sources including fine fugitive dust, combustion from automobiles and heating, road salt, conifer pollen, and others. Constituents that comprise suspended particulates include organic, sulfate, and nitrate aerosols which are formed in the air from emitted hydrocarbons, and chloride, sulfur oxides, and oxides of nitrogen. The 24-hour Federal PM<sub>10</sub> Standard is 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, while the State Standard is 50 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The low population density, limited number of industrial and agricultural installations, and minimal problems with traffic congestion all contribute to Trinity County's generally good air quality. During the last three years of data (2014-2016), the North Coast Air Basin was in attainment with the Federal PM<sub>10</sub> standard, but was in non-attainment for the State PM<sub>10</sub> standard for 2 days during that period, in August 2015, by 7.6 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This is likely due to numerous wildfires in the region. This is generally the case. In Trinity County, the primary sources of pollutants contributing to the non-attainment designation for PM<sub>10</sub> are wood stoves, wind-blown dust from dirt roads and agriculture, and open burning such as backyard burns, prescribed burning and wildfire.

An air quality conformity determination is not required for adoption of this RTP, as Trinity County is not within a designated Federal non-attainment or maintenance area for air quality and is therefore exempt. However, since the County and other areas in the North Coast District occasionally exceed the State PM<sub>10</sub> standard, The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District has established a PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan, which includes Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) and land use measures affecting motor vehicles. Some of the projects proposed in this RTP, such as improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities, would lead to reduced vehicle miles travelled, resulting in slightly lower emissions. In addition, some projects to surface unpaved roads are in compliance with the PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan being implemented by the NCUAQMD. Therefore, this RTP is consistent with the District's PM<sub>10</sub> Attainment Plan.

### ***Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32 known as the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Section 38560.5 of the Health and Safety Code). The bill establishes a cap on statewide greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and sets forth the regulatory framework to achieve the corresponding reduction in statewide emissions levels back to 1990 levels.

In January 2007, the Legislature asked the CTC to review the RTP guidelines to incorporate climate change emission reduction measures. The request emphasized that RTPs should utilize models that accurately measure the benefits of land use strategies aimed at reducing vehicle trips and/or trip length. The CTC staff established an RTP guidelines work group to assist in the development of "best practices" for inclusion in the RTP Guidelines. The Addendum to the 2007 RTP Guidelines (May 29, 2008) provided several recommendations for consideration by rural RTPAs to address GHG. The following strategies from the guidelines have specific application to Trinity County.

- Emphasize transportation investments in areas where desired land uses as indicated in a general plan may result in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction or other lower impact use.
- Recognize the rural contribution towards GHG reduction for counties that have policies that support development within their cities, and protect agricultural, forest and resource lands.
- Consider transportation projects that increase connectivity, emphasize non-auto modes or provide other means to reduce VMT.

The transportation planning literature recognizes three interrelated components that contribute to transportation emissions reductions. Those components include changes in vehicle technology (cleaner burning engines), alternative fuel sources, and reduced vehicle use. The first two components are typically the responsibility of industry and national governmental interests. RTPAs and local governments have the ability to affect vehicle use by promoting transportation alternatives to the automobile, and by managing the



demand for transportation. These efforts typically involve goals and policies and/or projects and programs focused on getting people out of their cars and into non-auto modes of travel (mode shifting). The following RTP goals and objectives are established for Trinity County to lessen dependence on the automobile and to promote mode shifting to other forms of transportation.

- Goal 2: To provide safe and cost effective public transportation services that increase mobility and improve the quality of life for Trinity County residents.
- Goal 3: Increase the proportion of bicycling trips; Increase safety for all types of non-motorized users; Increase mobility for all types of non-motorized users; Support reduction in greenhouse gases; Promote public health; Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in program benefits; Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of bicyclists.

In recent years, Trinity County has experienced a slow decline in population and employment and is forecast to continue this trend through 2045. Based on this trend and the 2017 RTP guidelines, the County is not required to run a network travel demand model to estimate VMT at this time. However, the County is committed to implementing policies and strategies that reduce reliance on the automobile and contribute to the reduction of GHG.

### 3. POLICY ELEMENT

The purpose of the Policy element is to identify legislative, planning, financial and institutional issues and requirements within Trinity County. Consistent with the 2017 RTP Guidelines, this Policy Element is intended to:

- Describe the transportation issues in the region
- Identify regional needs for both short-term (0-10 years) and long-term (11-20 years) planning horizons (Government Code Section 65080 (b) (1))
- Maintain internal consistency with the Financial Element and STIP fund estimates
- Relay how the policies were developed
- Identify any significant changes in the policies from previous RTPs, and explain the reason for any changes in policies
- Include “unmet transit needs” procedures and policies for public transportation

In addition this RTP also addresses consistency with the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element (2002) and existing community plans.

## STATEWIDE ISSUES

### ***Transportation and Climate Action: Implementation of SB 375***

As California is leading the nation in addressing the issues of climate change, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is closely working with other state agencies and the Legislature to promote a coordinated approach to strategic infrastructure decisions. The CTC supports the Strategic Growth Council created by Senate Bill (SB) 732 (Chapter 729)

Recognizing that the transportation sector is the largest contributor to GHG, the Commission has moved quickly to develop early action and long term strategies to reduce GHG emissions in transportation decisions. Most recently the Commission adopted the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines to address climate change and GHG emissions during the RTP process by promoting smart growth/ land use and modeling strategies to be considered in the preparation of RTPs. Separate Guidelines were developed for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), depending on their population and growth patterns. This RTP has been prepared using the 2010 RTP Guidelines, but incorporated the 2017 RTPA Guidelines where possible.

### ***Preservation of the State’s Transportation System***

California’s current transportation system is deteriorating while demand is increasing, adversely affecting the operational efficiency of key transportation assets, hindering mobility, commerce, quality of life and the environment. California lacks sufficient funding to preserve and maintain this asset, and the cost of maintaining and preserving this asset is increasing due to the cumulative effects of an aging system, growing traffic demands, and rising costs. The state’s existing transportation system, consisting of state highways, local streets and roads, airports, public transit and rail, is critical to the safety, mobility and economic vitality of California, yet without sufficient funding, these assets are currently deteriorating.

As vital links in the state's transportation network, local streets and roads represent approximately 81 percent of California's roads. In 2015, the California Rural Counties Task Force conducted a comprehensive statewide study of local street and road systems in all of California's rural counties, meaning counties with a RTPA instead of a MPO. The study surveyed 26 California rural counties, which collectively maintain over 24,000 miles of paved local roads and 5,000 miles of unpaved roads. On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent), the statewide average pavement condition index (PCI) is 66. For rural county roads, it is 58, which is considered "at risk category." Without additional funding, the average rural county road PCI is projected to decrease to 42 by 2034. Trinity County roads have an overall average PCI of 59. The goal is to reach an average of 65 over the life of this RTP. The County estimates it will need \$48 to \$500 million in maintenance and rehabilitation funds over the next 10 years to meet this goal.

### ***Reliable Transportation Funding***

California's current transportation funding system is based primarily on user fees such as fuel excise tax, sales tax on fuel, weight fees, bridge tolls and transit fares. For many years, the motor vehicle fuel excise tax was an adequate user fee proxy for a driver's road usage. However, increased automobile fuel efficiency, the emergence of alternate technologies, and fixed taxation rates have eroded the fuel excise tax's ability to approximate road usage and fund critical improvements and rehabilitation. In addition, the state's repeated diversions of transportation funds to meet General Fund shortfalls create even greater funding gaps and chronic instability. In April 2017, the State passed Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), a \$52 billion transportation plan funded by increased taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, and vehicle license fees, including a new fee for vehicles that do not utilize fossil fuels, but do use the public roads. That new funding source will be used exclusively for transportation purposes, including maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of roads and bridges, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transportation, and planning grants. SB 1 creates several new and augmented programs, including a new source for maintenance and rehabilitation projects on local streets and roads, as well as augmentation of the Active Transportation Program (ATP). SB 1 will augment and stabilize the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), a key source of funding for County transportation projects. The STIP has dwindled away to nearly zero in the last (2016) cycle. SB 1 will restore it to previous levels, creating a reliable \$3 million or more every two years for capital transportation projects in Trinity County. Going forward, SB 1 will provide a critically needed reliable source of transportation funding. Without it, transportation funding would continue to decline to unsustainable levels over the next few years, and most of the projects proposed in this RTP would not be possible.

## **REGIONAL AND LOCAL ISSUES**

Trinity County is large and sparsely populated with the roadway system consisting of a vast array of aging, narrow roads and bridges. Most of the roads are dead-end, and many isolated communities have only one access route, particularly during the winter season, which brings heavy snowfall in some parts of the county. Unstable geology and steep terrain cause maintenance problems such as erosion, landslides, and rockfall on the roads. Many of these remote roads have no shoulders and minimum travel lane widths. In addition, travel lane widths are continuously lost to erosion on steep terrain, and many roads now have less than two lanes. The roads and bridges are aging and in need of major rehabilitation.

Many roads are built on old logging roads, stagecoach routes, and on solid rock or uncompacted earth without the benefit of engineered structural sections and adequate subsurface drainage. Maintaining these roads and bridges requires constant work, and several crews and maintenance stations are needed to adequately cover maintenance needs and emergency response throughout this large geographical area.

Many bridges along these routes are single-lane, resting on deteriorating abutments of wood or steel I-beams. Twenty-four of the 77 County-maintained bridges are currently rated Functionally Obsolete and/or

Structurally Deficient (“Functionally Obsolete” refers to bridges with access limits such as the presence of only one travel lane, the lack of proper bridge rails, or lack of appropriate clearances. “Structurally Deficient” indicates that a bridge has a loading limit and a permit is required prior to crossing with loads exceeding the limit). An overall “Sufficiency Rating” of 0 to 100 is also applied to each bridge. Bridges with Sufficiency Ratings of 50 or less are eligible for replacement under the HBP program. Trinity County currently has 10 bridges with a sufficiency rating of 50 or less. All 10 are already programmed for replacement. A complete list of County maintained bridges is included in Appendix 1B.

The large geographical area and sparse population of the county presents a problem for the Transit Program as well. It is very difficult to serve such a sparse population with transit services in a cost-effective manner. The Mills-Deddeh-Alquist Act was passed in 1971 (Transportation Development Act). The TDA requires revenues generated by bus fares to equal at least 10 percent of operating costs. Meeting the state required fare-box requirements for Article 4 transit service has become a significant challenge, particularly in very rural, frontier counties such as Trinity County. Performance measures based solely on operating costs do not consider dispersed populations, topography or long distances between communities.

An issue somewhat unique to Trinity County is that over 70% of the land in the County is Federal land, which is not subject to property taxes. These lands include vast areas of National Forest, National Wilderness and Bureau of Land Management land, as well as lands flooded by the Trinity and Lewiston dams. To mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues, the Forest Service historically paid the County a share of all revenue generated by timber sales on National Forest land to supplement local funding for education services and roads. However, environmental restrictions have reduced timber revenues substantially since the mid 1980’s. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (SRSCA) was passed in 2000 to provide a steady source of revenue to rural schools and roads, based on the historic levels received during the 1980’s. A portion of the funds could be used by the County Department of Transportation for road-related costs, including operations and maintenance. The Act sunset in 2006, but was extended for five additional years in 2008, with annual receipts declining by 10% each year and ending in 2012. Another short-term reauthorization kept the funds coming, at a declining rate, until the last payment in January of 2016. Further reauthorizations of the bill are not likely in the current economic and political climate. The “safety net” payments are probably discontinued for the foreseeable future, and annual operating revenues from Forest Receipts will return to the previous formula, resulting in a loss of approximately 60% of the County Department of Transportation’s recurring revenues. However, some of this loss will be made up with increased revenues from SB 1.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities need to be upgraded and expanded to provide a safe environment for non-motorized modes of transportation and to assist in attracting visitors.

Factors in adjacent counties may very well impact the county’s regional transportation system in the future. Specifically, the population of Shasta County is projected to increase by 36.7 percent over the next 20 years, and increase by 8.6 percent in Humboldt County. In addition, there are proposals to develop a deep-water port in Humboldt County, and recent improvements to SR 299 over Buckhorn Grade in Shasta County has made the drive easier and safer between the Central Valley and the Coast, while also allowing for larger trucks to utilize SR 299. These factors will likely increase future tourism traffic and truck traffic on the Trinity County regional transportation system.

## **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES**

An important element of the regional transportation planning process is the development of valid and appropriate goals, objectives, and policies. The RTP guidelines define goals, objectives, and policies as follows:

- A goal is general in nature and characterized by a sense of timelessness. It is something desirable to work toward, the end result which effort is directed. In that sense, all goals are considered long-term.
- An objective is a measurable point to be attained. It is capable of being quantified and realistically attained considering probable funding and political constraints. Objectives represent levels of achievement in movement toward a goal. Objectives are identified as either short term or long range.
- A policy is a direction statement that guides decisions in a direction that will accomplish the long term objective or goal.

This RTP sets forth policies that provide the framework to guide decision makers so that short-range actions and decisions are made toward implementation of the long-range plan. Some policies are specific by their very nature, while others provide guidance that is more general. The TCTC established policies in this RTP that support implementation of its goals and objectives. These policies support each transportation mode to ensure the effectiveness of a comprehensive regional transportation system. The following goals, objectives and policies are consistent with the transportation goals and policies presented in the adopted Trinity County General Plan. They are also consistent with the financial resources available to the region, as presented in the Financial Element.

Trinity County is typical of many rural counties in California in that the county's existing transportation system and widely scattered population limit alternative solutions to transportation-related problems. The automobile is the primary mode of moving people in the county, and the truck is the primary mode of moving goods and commodities. The use of other modes of transportation has been limited because of lack of facilities, distance between communities, and lack of an economic base to provide support.

A transportation system provides mobility to sustain social, economic, and recreational activities. An improperly developed transportation system can result in ineffective mobility, and cause adverse and undesirable conditions such as safety hazards, long delays, air pollution, and unnecessary energy consumption. The goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures of this RTP are intended to guide the development of a transportation system that will maintain and improve the quality of life in Trinity County.

The goals, objectives, and policies for each component of the Trinity County transportation system are provided below. They cover both short range and long range desired outcomes. They are consistent with the policy direction of the Trinity County General Plan (GP) Circulation Element (May 2002), the 2011 Trinity County Regional Transportation Plan (October 2011), the various Community Plans, and the financial realities facing the State and Trinity County.

The goals, objectives, and policies by transportation element reflect a balanced approach and focus on the most feasible desired outcome given the limited transportation dollars available. The core set of goals, objectives and policies were developed as part of the 2005 and 2011 RTPs and the collaborative planning process for this RTP. Little has changed since the 2011 RTP, except for updating some objectives that have already been accomplished, such as the Pavement Management System the County now uses to prioritize road rehabilitation projects. In the next RTP, there will be a major change to the objectives and policies below concerning intersection congestion and capacity, as measured by level of service (LOS). State guidelines are shifting away from LOS as a means of measuring an effective transportation system, and

moving toward vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the new standard. These same policies and objectives are included in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Therefore, to maintain consistency, the Circulation Element must also be changed, along with the next RTP update in 2021.

## **Goal 0: Overall Regional Transportation**

***To provide a safe, reliable, accessible, cost-effective and efficient transportation system consistent with socioeconomic and environmental needs within Trinity County.***

### **Goal 1: Streets and Highways**

***Develop and maintain an efficient and safe system of streets, highways, and bridges that is sensitive to existing and future needs and promotes preservation of the environment, reliable access to communities and enhancement of the economy.***

Short Term Objective 1.1 - Identify anticipated roadway and intersection congestion/capacity problems before they become critical in order to allow time to plan, program, and design preventative or corrective measures.

*Policy 1.1.A* – The minimum acceptable Level of Service (LOS) standard for county roadway and intersection operation in the Weaverville Community Plan Area is “D”. For unsignalized intersections, LOS is calculated based upon the average peak hour delay for the worst movement (using the current version of the Highway Capacity Manual). No public highway or roadway within the Weaverville Community Plan Area should be allowed to fall to or below LOS “E”.

*Policy 1.1.B* – The minimum acceptable Level of Service (LOS) standard for county roadway and intersection operation in all other parts of Trinity County is “C”. For unsignalized intersections, LOS is calculated based upon the average delay for the worst approach (using the current version of the Highway Capacity Manual). No public highway or roadway outside of the Weaverville Community Plan Area should be allowed to fall to or below LOS “D”.

*Policy 1.1.C* – The Level of Service (LOS) standard for state highway roadway segments and intersections is defined in the Caltrans Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for the facility.

*Policy 1.1.D* – Traffic analysis, engineering judgment and/or special studies should be utilized to assess whether roadways or intersections are operating near, at or below the applicable LOS standard. If a roadway or intersection is near, at or below the applicable LOS standard, improvements or other strategies to remedy the condition should be considered a priority.

Long-Term Objective 1.2 – Develop a Transportation Demand Model that can compute the Vehicle Miles Travelled that would result from various proposed public and private development proposals, including transportation projects.

*Policy 1.2.A* – Once an appropriate model is developed, the impact of future transportation projects on total Vehicle Miles Travelled shall be assessed and considered when approving each project.

*Policy 1.2.B* – Once an appropriate model is developed, the impact of future private and public development projects on total Vehicle Miles Travelled shall be assessed and considered when approving each project.

Long-Term Objective 1.3 – Rehabilitate and/or reconstruct existing road and bridge facilities where necessary, and continue to maintain existing facilities.

*Policy 1.3.A* – Pursue Federal and State grant funding for major rehabilitation and reconstruction of County roads and bridges.

*Policy 1.3.B* – Maintenance of existing facilities should be one of the primary uses of discretionary Road Funds.

*Policy 1.3.C* – Continue to use the Pavement Management System to prioritize maintenance needs of roads. Strive to maintain an overall PCI of 65 or better, averaged over all County roads.

*Policy 1.3.D* – Use sound engineering judgment in determining road design and construction in order to reduce long term maintenance costs.

*Policy 1.3.E* – Support legislation that will strengthen and solidify discretionary funding sources for transportation system maintenance as well as additional funding for transportation improvements.

Long-Term Objective 1.4 – Enhance operation and safety of existing county roads and State Highways by providing adequate width and safe passing zones where necessary and feasible.

*Policy 1.4.A* – Strive to provide two safe travel lanes on county roadways.

*Policy 1.4.B* – Construct turnouts and passing lanes on county roads where feasible and necessary and as transportation funding allows.

*Policy 1.4.C* – Support Caltrans' efforts to install turnouts and passing lanes on state highways in Trinity County.

Long-Term Objective 1.5 – Maintain a uniform road classification system throughout the county to assure consistency in the application of development and road standards.

*Policy 1.5.A* – Apply the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials classification system of arterials, collectors, and locals to county roads, as identified in Trinity County Code Section 12.10.010.

*Policy 1.5.B* – Periodically review and update individual road classifications based on current land use and population projections.

Long-Term Objective 1.6 – Provide reliable all-weather access to all developed communities of the county.

*Policy 1.6.A* – Identify communities with a history of access problems of isolation due to roadway failures and facilitate efforts to eliminate those conditions.

*Policy 1.6.B* – When feasible, provide more than one access route into residential areas.

*Policy 1.6.C* – Motorist safety, emergency vehicle access, roadway use/purpose and climate/weather conditions are all factors that should be considered when existing roads are improved or new roads are developed.

Long-Term Objective 1.7 – Maximize motorists' access to telephone services to aid in response to accidents and vehicle breakdowns.

*Policy 1.7.A* – Support efforts to expand cell phone coverage of the regional major roadway system.



Long-Term Objective 1.8 – Establish consistency and/or linkages between transportation needs and land use plans.

*Policy 1.8.A* – Consider the Trinity County General Plan and/or Community Plans when assessing potential transportation projects. Location, design and development of transportation projects should be compatible with the adopted land use policies of the county.

*Policy 1.8.B* – Determine and, as appropriate, address the probable land use impacts of transportation projects prior to constructing the projects.

*Policy 1.8.C* – Perform traffic studies and community informational meetings prior to determining the need for new roads or significant expansion of existing roads.

*Policy 1.8.D* – New roads and reconstruction of existing roads should be designed for anticipated traffic volumes and weight loads.

*Policy 1.8.E* – Identify road segments where existing right-of-way is inadequate to accommodate road width needed at projected community build-out and take steps to obtain necessary right-of-way. The county road and state highway right-of-way needs should be met in conjunction with development project approvals.

*Policy 1.8.F* – The current Transportation Demand Model shall be used to determine and, as appropriate, address the probable transportation impacts of proposed land use projects.

*Policy 1.8.G* – The costs of street and highway improvements necessitated by new development should be borne by the responsible developers.

Long-Term Objective 1.9 – Coordinate plans, programs and projects for the county, state and federal transportation systems.

*Policy 1.9.A* – Provide state and federal agencies the opportunity to comment on transportation plans and projects proposed by the County, as appropriate.

*Policy 1.9.B* – Seek opportunities to review and comment on transportation plans and projects proposed by state and federal agencies.

*Policy 1.9.C* – Attempt to develop partnerships with Caltrans and other Regional Transportation Planning Agencies when considering large transportation projects with multi-jurisdictional benefits and/or impacts.

## **Goal 2: Transit Goals and Performance Standards**

***Provide affordable, reliable and efficient public transportation options that are consistent with demand and available resources.***

Long-Term Objective 2.1 – Support public transit programs that are determined to be “reasonable to meet” as determined by the unmet transit needs process.

*Policy 2.1.A* – Continue to aggressively pursue federal, state, local and private funds for transit capital and operational expenses.

*Policy 2.1.B* – Continue to update the Transit Development Plan to identify transit needs and opportunities to better serve transit users of all ages.



*Policy 2.1.C* – Continue to meet with the Social Service Transportation Advisory Council to receive input on potential unmet transit needs and ways to meet unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, particularly for residents who have limited mobility for their basic travel necessities and social wellbeing.

*Policy 2.1.D* – Conform to the recommendations made in the Triennial Performance Audits and annual Fiscal Audits, which includes considering operating transit under Article 8.

Long-Term Objective 2.2 – Maximize county-wide transportation service and inter-county connections.

*Policy 2.2.A* – Consider bus service in areas of the county where ridership can support adopted farebox recovery ratios.

*Policy 2.2.B* – Support volunteer driver reimbursement programs or other innovative services that effectively meet the needs of transportation dependent persons residing beyond the Trinity Transit service area.

*Policy 2.2.C* – Encourage development of a multimodal transportation network (taxi services, transit) between airports and communities that would provide for better connectivity to community services (such as: restaurants, hotels/motels, community events, points of interest).

*Policy 2.2D* – Support transit services that provide connections to regional services outside of the County.

Short-Term Objective 2.3 – Implement recommendations of the current Short Range Transit Development Plan (2014) as feasible, where necessary resources can be identified and minimum service measures of effectiveness and efficiency can be met.

*Policy 2.3.A* – Improve Trinity Transit circulation within Redding

*Policy 2.3.B* – Implement service changes regarding Junction City and local trips within Weaverville, as appropriate in terms of funding and utilization levels.

*Policy 2.3.C* – Implement Saturday service for Hayfork, Redding and Down River routes if funding can be secured.

*Policy 2.3.D* – Ensure a Lewiston-Weaverville transportation solution that is sustainable.

*Policy 2.3.E* – Maintain Trinity Transit coordination for connections with neighboring transit agencies in Shasta and Humboldt Counties and regional carriers of Greyhound and Amtrak.

*Policy 2.3.F* – Examine rideshare capabilities to support commuting, work-trips into Redding.

### **Goal 3: Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Other Alternative Modes**

***Increase the proportion of non-motorized trips; Increase safety for all types of non-motorized users; Increase mobility for all types of non-motorized users; Support reduction in greenhouse gases; Promote public health; Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in program benefits; Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of bicyclists and pedestrians.***

Long-Term Objective 3.1 – Complete a network of bikeways and pedestrian facilities that are feasible and fundable, and that serve bicyclists’ and pedestrian needs, especially for travel to employment, schools, commercial sites, transit, civic locations, and recreational destinations.

*Policy 3.1.A* – Seek funding for bikeway and pedestrian projects through regional, state and federal funding programs, and encourage multi-jurisdictional funding applications.

*Policy 3.1.B* – Develop and implement a destination-based signing system for the bikeway network.

*Policy 3.1.C* – Coordinate with responsible agencies and developers in Trinity County to ensure appropriate opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian connections are planned, constructed, and maintained.

*Policy 3.1.D* – Design and construct bikeways for 20-year surface for maintenance.

*Policy 3.1.E* – Encourage agencies to design and construct new bicycle and pedestrian improvements so that they do not negatively impact the environment.

Long-Term Objective 3.2 – Maintain and improve the quality, operation, and integrity of the bikeway network and facilities.

*Policy 3.2.A* – Encourage responsible agencies to undertake routine maintenance of the bikeway network and facilities, such as sweeping and clearing brush overgrowth from bicycle lanes and routine surface repair, as funding and priorities allow.

*Policy 3.2.B* – Encourage agencies that are responsible for repair and construction of transportation facilities to minimize disruption to the cycling environment to the extent practical.

*Policy 3.2.C* – Work with Caltrans to close shoulder gaps on the State Highway System where economically and environmentally feasible to improve bicycling conditions.

*Policy 3.2.D* – Each fiscal year allocate to the County of Trinity that portion of Local Transportation Funds designated for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicycles, particularly Class I bicycle paths, signage and parking facilities that are not eligible for streets and roads funding (PUC, Sec 99233.3); or for the maintenance of bicycling paths used for transportation purposes which are closed to motorized traffic (PUC, Sec 99234).

Long-Term Objective 3.3 – Provide short- and long-term bicycle parking and amenities in the employment and commercial areas, in multifamily housing, at schools, and at recreation and transit facilities.

*Policy 3.3.A* – Encourage the installation of short- and long-term bicycle parking in the public right-of-way.

*Policy 3.3.B* – Encourage local communities to work with area schools to promote bicycle commuting and to assist in purchasing and siting long- and short-term bicycle parking. Work with private commercial enterprises to add bicycle parking facilities, where appropriate.

*Policy 3.3.C* – Consider adopting zoning code standards requiring that safe, secure bicycle parking facilities be built as part of new development projects.

Long-Term Objective 3.4 – Support bicycle-transit integration to improve access to major employment and other activity centers and to encourage multimodal travel for longer trip distances.

*Policy 3.4.A* – Support the development of bicycle facilities that provide access to regional and local public transit services wherever possible.

*Policy 3.4.B* – Coordinate with transit providers to ensure bicycles can be accommodated on all transit vehicles and that adequate space is provided for their storage on board whenever possible.

*Policy 3.4.C* – Coordinate with transit agencies to install and maintain convenient and secure short-term and long-term parking facilities at major transit stops and terminals.

Long-term Objective 3.5 – Develop and implement education and encouragement plans aimed at youth, adult cyclists, and motorists. Increase public awareness of the benefits of bicycling and of available resources and facilities.

*Policy 3.5.A* – Coordinate with California Highway Patrol (CHP) and area school districts to provide students with bicycle education material and occasional bicycle clinics, especially those schools most at-risk for accidents.

*Policy 3.5.B* – Bi-annually or more often, if necessary, coordinate with the CHP to place a large display ad in the Trinity Journal or Advertiser explaining the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists.

*Policy 3.5 C*– Produce a Trinity County Bikeways Map for public use that identifies commuter and recreational routes and includes bicycle safety and promotional information.

*Policy 3.5 D*– Develop adult and youth bicycle education, encouragement and safety programs.

*Policy 3.5 E*– Market the health benefits of bicycling.

Long-Term Objective 3.6 – Improve the connectivity and quality of the regional bicycle network.

*Policy 3.6.A* – Support bicycle improvement projects that close gaps in the regional bicycle network

*Policy 3.6.B* – Encourage bicycle projects that connect local facilities to the regional bicycle corridors.

*Policy 3.6.C* – Promote consistent way fare signage that directs bicyclists to destinations and increases the visibility of the regional bicycle network.

Long-Term Objective 3.7 – When acquiring right-of-way, include additional area for eventual development of Class I or II bicycle lanes or paths when designing new arterial or collector roads or approving subdivisions which abut or include arterial or collector roads.

*Policy 3.7.A* – Coordinate with Caltrans and County road design planners, engineers and right-of-way agents to expand the right-of-way acquired for new, realigned or reconstructed roadways to accommodate bike lanes/paths, even if funding for construction is unavailable at the time.

*Policy 3.7.B* – Amend the County Subdivision Ordinance to include a provision for additional easement or right-of-way width to accommodate bicyclists for subdivisions which abut or include arterial or collector roads.

Long-Term Objective 3.8 – Increase safety by providing wayfinding signage, traffic control devices, elimination of hazardous conditions and preventative maintenance of bikeways and walkways with the primary goal of increased safety, but also extending the service life of the facility.

*Policy 3.8.A* – Encourage the California Highway Patrol to set up targeted enforcement, as opposed to general enforcement, activities around high bicycle injury and/or fatality locations (intersections or corridors).

*Policy 3.8 B* – Support, as appropriate, efforts of law enforcement agencies to set up targeted enforcement activities around high bicycle injury and/or fatality locations in the county.

Long-term Objective 3.9 – Complete a network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities with particular focus on ADA compliant, senior friendly, and safe routes for children – especially for travel to employment, schools, commercial sites, transit, civic locations, and recreational destinations.

*Policy 3.9.A* – Include organizations and agencies that work with disadvantaged, low income, senior and/or disabled persons when designing and implementing bikeway projects.

*Policy 3.9 B* - Where terrain will allow, design bicycle routes within communities as Class I routes and include measures that assist disabled persons, including areas to rest on long routes with slopes; senior needs, pull-outs with shaded benches; and child safety.

*Policy 3.9 C* – Where possible all multi-modal projects should be designed and constructed to meet the standards of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Long-Term Objective 3.10 – Reduce childhood obesity through the planning, design and construction of projects eligible for Safe Routes to Schools Program funding.

*Policy 3.10.A* – Coordinate with the Trinity County Department of Public Health and area schools to expand bicycle routes and pedestrian facilities that will encourage more students to ride bikes or walk to school.

*Policy 3.10.B* – Apply for Safe Routes to Schools Program funding (within the ATP Program) for projects to expand the network of bicycle facilities designed to encourage students to safely ride bicycles or walk to school.

Long-Term Objective 3.11 – Consider “Health” as well as safety in the selection and development of non-motorized projects.

*Policy 3.11.A* – Continue to include “Health in All Policies” (HiAP) as a basis for policy development and decision making.

*Policy 3.11B* – Include the County Department of Public Health in projects affecting the built environment to consider project planning and design approaches that can enhance public health opportunities.

*Policy 3.11.C* – Coordinate with school officials to develop and rank a list of safety improvements that could be eligible for Safe Routes to School funding.

Long-Term Objective 3.12 – Ensure that communities having a median household income of less than 80% of the statewide median, based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey, have an equal chance of having bicycle projects developed within their community.

*Policy 3.12.A* – Demonstrate equity by applying for grants and other funding for projects within disadvantaged communities, particularly where safety is a concern or recreational opportunities are lacking and when scoring criteria for funding would be equal to any other project.

Long-Term Objective 3.13 – Provide a coordinated and, where possible, interconnected regional system of both transportation paths and recreation trails.

Performance Measure:

*Policy 3.13.A* – Coordinate with the Trinity County Resource Conservation District, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and other agencies to expand the amount of recreational trails and/or recreational and transportation paths in the County.

*Policy 3.13.B* – When possible, expand transportation related non-motorized projects to include connections with existing and proposed recreational trails.

*Policy 3.13.C* – When planning and developing additional recreational trails consider including equestrian interests.

Long-Term Objective 3.14 – Consult and, where appropriate, coordinate with Native American Nations, Councils and/or Tribes to develop bikeway projects.

*Policy 3.14 A* – Maintain contact notification, correspondence, sign-in sheets, meeting notes or other measures to document that Native American interests have been provided a genuine opportunity to participate in the bikeway plans and processes.

## **Goal 4: Aviation**

***Provide a safe aviation system that meets the community's needs and values through effective use of financial resources.***

Long-Term Objective 4.1 – Ensure that existing or proposed airports and heliports are safe for aircraft to use.

*Policy 4.1.A* – Support efforts of the county to evaluate and implement security and safety measures at airports.

*Policy 4.1.B* – Support efforts of the county or special districts to develop heliports for emergency medical transportation.

*Policy 4.1.C* – Support county proposals to install runway lighting and navigational aids, and other airport safety improvements as needed at qualifying airports.

Long-Term Objective 4.2 – Improve public safety through compatible development surrounding airports.

*Policy 4.2.A* – Support the county Airport Land Use Commission and its activities, including efforts to maintain Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans and making safety recommendations on proposed development activities within Airport Influence Areas.

*Policy 4.2.B* – Support Trinity County's efforts to reduce safety conflicts, such as removal of obstructions that are in conflict with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77 (including, but not limited to, trees on lands managed by federal agencies for uses that may conflict with aviation safety).

Long-Term Objective 4.3 – Employ strategies to develop a collaborative planning approach to identify existing and future aviation needs in a comprehensive manner.

*Policy 4.3.A* – Coordinate with the Federal Aviation Administration, State Division of Aeronautics, Trinity County, and other local and regional planning agencies that influence aviation related decisions.

*Policy 4.3.B* – Support county efforts to develop additional funding sources that would improve the county and regional role in developing and maintaining an efficient and effective aviation system.

*Policy 4.3.C* – Support efforts to develop or enhance air service between county airports and larger airports in the region or state consistent with community needs.

*Policy 4.3.D* – Conduct, participate in or comment on aviation related studies that could influence this plan's aviation goals (e.g. ICASP).

Long-Term Objective 4.4 – Effectively use financial resources to preserve airport infrastructure and expand capacity to stimulate economic growth.

*Policy 4.4.A* – Coordinate with Trinity County to efficiently and effectively manage grant and loan programs available for county airports.

*Policy 4.4.B* – Support and participate in efforts to provide/allow appropriate compatible on-site land uses at airport facilities, including aviation services such as fuel and maintenance as well as cottage industries that use air service for deliveries; ground delivery services; and airport compatible light industrial uses at airports.

Long-Term Objective 4.5 – Integrate community values into airport land use decisions.

*Policy 4.5.A* – Encourage early and ongoing public participation in the planning and decision making process for airport projects, in order to identify problems and explore solutions.

## **Goal 5: Goods Movement**

***Support and promote economic development through the efficient movement of freight to, and through Trinity County.***

Long-Term Objective 5.1 – Support efforts to maintain and improve Trinity County's highway system as important inter-regional trucking routes, as well as connecting highways in adjacent counties.

*Policy 5.1.A* – Support efforts to improve State Route 299 from Interstate 5 (in Redding) to US 101 (in Eureka) to allow passage of STAA standard trucks.

*Policy 5.1.B* – Support federal, state and local policies that enhance facilities involved in the transportation of commodities.

Long-Term Objective 5.2 – Coordinate the development and use of the goods movement system with other infrastructure and community service needs in the county.

*Policy 5.2.A* – Solicit review and comment on goods movement proposals by businesses, citizens, agencies, and special districts that may be affected by the proposal.

*Policy 5.2.B* – Review land use and transportation projects for potential impacts to goods movement facilities.

*Policy 5.2.C* – Encourage use of county airports by commercial freight delivery services, including development of air freight service facilities at the airports.

*Policy 5.2.D* – Improve ground access between airports and community business districts, such as through provision of shuttle and delivery services.

## **Goal 6: Tourism**

***Support tourism throughout the County by developing and maintaining a safe and efficient transportation system.***

Long-Term Objective 6.1 – Provide efficient and safe transportation systems with clear signage.

*Policy 6.1.A* – Provide transportation related information to the Chamber of Commerce, when necessary, to keep tourist and marketing material updated.

*Policy 6.1.B* – Maintain transportation connections to tourist attractions in a safe and efficient condition.

*Policy 6.1.C* – Provide safe, convenient, and well marked parking areas for tourists, including parking for recreational vehicles and vehicles pulling trailers.

## **Goal 7: Environment**

***Consider the environmental impacts of transportation projects including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and reduce, minimize or mitigate all impacts to the maximum extent feasible without sacrificing public safety.***

Long-Term Objective 7.1 – Develop a Transportation Demand Model that is capable of calculating the Vehicle Miles Traveled that will result from proposed development projects.

*Policy 7.1.A* – Consider potential increases in vehicle miles travelled early in the planning and design of transportation facilities.

*Policy 7.1.B* – Consider potential increases in vehicle miles travelled when considering approval of private development proposals.

Long-Term Objective 7.2 – Consider environmental issues early in the planning and design of transportation facilities.

*Policy 7.1.A* – Minimize environmental impacts, project delays and added costs or procedures for transportation projects through early and continued resource agency consultation and public involvement.

*Policy 7.1.B* – Work with local, state and federal agencies and committees responsible for setting environmental policies and procedures, to provide the county's experience and perspective.

*Policy 7.1.C* – Participate in efforts to streamline the environmental process and reduce conflicts between environmental policies and the practicalities of construction, operation and maintenance of transportation facilities.



*Policy 7.1.D* – Encourage inclusion of mixed land uses, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian improvements in development proposals (and/or public projects) whenever practical to reduce vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions.

**Objective 7.2** – Incorporate aesthetics into transportation projects

*Policy 7.2 A*– Apply aesthetic treatments such as textures and colors to concrete faces such as bridge abutments and retaining walls, and use decorative bridge rails where practicable.

*Policy 7.2 B* – When relocating utilities for road and bridge expansion or realignment projects, endeavor to place overhead utilities underground, where practicable.

*Policy 7.3 C* – Where space and funding allow, add landscaping to new or expanded roadway projects, but not at the expense of pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

**Objective 7.2** – Support and participate in local efforts to protect and maintain the county’s natural resources, such as fish and wildlife habitat and water quality.

*Policy 7.2.A* – Continue to take advantage of training programs and funding for sediment reduction and fish barrier removal projects.

**Objective 7.3** – Perform road maintenance practices in a way that minimizes and/or mitigates degradation of environmental quality.

*Policy 7.3.A* – Continue to educate county road maintenance crews in best management practices and perform such practices to minimize erosion, sedimentation, water pollution, unnecessary vegetation removal and other adverse environmental effects.

*Policy 7.3.B* – Discourage the use of herbicides along state highways and prohibit County road crews and contractors from using herbicides along county roads.

*Policy 7.3.C* – Surface unpaved (dirt) roadways, improve drainage systems, and correct stream diversions on roadways that are adjacent to waterways that are habitat to aquatic species as funding allows.

## **RTP CONSISTENCY EVALUATION**

The following section describes the 2016 RTP’s consistency with the Community plans for Weaverville, Hayfork, Mad River, Lewiston, and Ruth, as well as the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element (2002). In addition, consistency with the California Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements for Storm Water and Low Impact Development are provided.

### ***Consistency with the Existing Community Plans for Weaverville, Hayfork, Mad River, Lewiston, and Ruth.***

A general review of each plan shows that the goals and policies for each community are consistent with the overall direction of the 2016 RTP and include references to each mode of travel and with existing land use efforts. All plans express a desire to maintain an adequate LOS on state and county facilities in their plan area. Aviation, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements are considered important for each



community and many of these proposed community improvements are included in Appendix 4A – 4F of the 2016 RTP. Specific needs findings for each community are addressed:

**Hayfork Community Plan** – The plan identifies the need for improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities, improved maintenance facilities at the Hayfork airport, continued land use restrictions around the airport, road and parking improvements along SR 3 in the downtown, and general improvement of roads. The established goals and policies address these issues and the direction of the 2016 RTP is consistent with the Community Plan’s policies.

**Mad River Community Plan** – The plan identifies the improvement and maintenance of county roads as major concerns. Improvement of Mad River Road (County Road 501), Van Duzen Road (County Road 511) and SR 36 are important to improve economic development opportunities in the southern portion of Trinity County. These needs are expressed as goals in the plan and are addressed in the RTP needs section and Action Element

**Ruth Community Plan** – The needs identified in the community plan parallel many of the needs identified in the Mad River plan. Specific improvements to Mad River Road, Van Duzen Road and SR 36 are called out. The lack of public transit is identified as a need, and listed as a specific goal of the community plan. The RTP does not include transit service at this time to the Ruth area and a previous local route (provided by Southern Trinity Transit) that originated at the Ruth Community Center was discontinued due to lack of ridership; however, the RTP does include goals and policies related to transit. Appendix 4C identifies projects to improve roads in Southern Trinity, and several projects on these roads, and SR 36, are recently completed or currently underway.

**Lewiston Community Plan** – The plan established goals to maintain the community’s circulation system by improving safety, providing for bicycle and pedestrian travel, coordinating the transportation system with planned land uses and providing for specialized transit needs of the community. Access to the community is provided by three main roadways including Trinity Dam Boulevard, Lewiston Road, and Rush Creek Road. These roads provide vital connections to SR 299 and SR 3. Improvements to Lewiston Road and a Class 1 bicycle trail are included in the RTP Action Element. Daily transit service is being provided to the community. Goals and Policies address all modes and are consistent with the RTP.

**Weaverville Community Plan** – Weaverville is the largest population center in the County. The plan includes several goals that are consistent with the RTP. The Community Plan strives to maintain an efficient and effective road system, provide a safe and adequate airport, and increase non-auto travel by developing a convenient system of bicycle routes, trails, and pedestrian paths, keeping air quality at safe levels, and coordinating transportation improvements with planned land uses. The County, as part of the 2011 RTP, employed the services of a traffic consulting firm to to prepare *Weaverville Traffic Signalization Study* is included in Appendix 3. The general conclusions of the Consultant study was that signals or other traffic control, such as roundabouts, would improve access to SR 299 at four locations in downtown Weaverville.. One of these intersection control improvements is underway at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road and Glen Road with SR 299. This RTP includes enhanced traffic control (traffic signal) on SR 299 at Washington Street and a traffic signal or roundabout at the intersection with Weaver Bally Road on the west end of town. This, combined with the recently completed Lance Gulch Road provides acceptable level of service on SR 299 and other roadways in Weaverville. Therefore, while several specific recommended improvements in the community plan were not included or were modified in the RTP, the overall goal of improving circulation in the downtown is consistent with the direction of the Weaverville Community Plan.

### ***Consistency with the Circulation Element of the Trinity County General Plan***

Several of the major goals of the Circulation Element, prepared in 2002, have been accomplished, and many of its policies have been continued in this RTP, with updates. The policy regarding LOS has been continued, verbatim, but, as mentioned above, the next RTP will eliminate the LOS policy in favor of updated policies regarding VMT. At that time, the Circulation Element will have to be amended to reflect VMT policies as well, in order to remain consistent.

### ***California Regional Water Quality Control Board LID Policy Consistency***

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board North Coast Region requires the use of Low Impact Development (LID) and best management practices (BMPs) that treat and retain storm water runoff on the project site. LID is a development site design strategy with a goal of maintaining or reproducing the pre-development hydrologic system through the use of design techniques to create a functionally equivalent hydrologic setting. LID emphasizes conservation and the use of on-site natural features integrated with engineered, small-scale hydrologic controls to reflect pre-development hydrologic functions (infiltrate, capture, evapotranspire and store). Several recent transportation projects in the County have successfully implemented these practices. Future development in the County will include “best practices” for maintaining water quality in accordance with LID standards for new or expanded road projects involving one acre or more.

## 4. ACTION ELEMENT

The Action Element sets forth a plan to address issues and needs identified in accordance with the RTP goals, objectives and policies from Chapter 3. It identifies short-range (0-5 years), mid-range (6-15 years) and long-range (16-20 years) transportation improvements by mode for inclusion in the RTP. The projects that are proposed to implement the RTP goals are listed in Appendices 4A through 4G. The Action Element also includes a discussion on the State and regional planning processes, and the application of program level “performance measures.”

The Action Element is consistent with the adopted RTP goals, policies and objectives and conforms to the revenues and costs identified in the Financial Element (Chapter 5). In addition, the first five years of projects identified in the RTIP and Financial Element are consistent with the STIP Draft Fund Estimate presented at the June the California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting. Other revenue projections are based on information received to date on the implementation of the various programs in SB 1.

### STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESSES

The State and regional planning processes are defined by legislation at the Federal and State level. SB 1, MAP-21 and the FAST Act have had significant effects on the RTP planning process recently, with new requirements for transportation planning, air quality conformity, project selection and delivery responsibility, development and implementation of transportation system performance measures, decision making, and the allocation of federal funds. In addition, the 2016 RTP Guidelines place significant emphasis on showing linkages between projects in the RTP and the RTIP/STIP process, as well as reducing green house gases (GHG) by reducing vehicles miles traveled (VMT). SB 1 establishes several new funding programs that have their own processes for applying for funds, and for documenting and reporting expenditures and completed projects.

### ACTION ELEMENT ASSUMPTIONS

The RTP is a document that contains both policy and action direction for the future implementation of transportation system improvements. The proposed RTP actions are based on the following assumptions.

#### ***Financial Assumptions:***

- State Match Exchange funding will remain stable at existing levels throughout the term of this RTP.
- The first 2 years RMRA funding from SB 1 will not go toward the pavement maintenance program. Instead, it will be used as local match for storm damage repairs from the 2016/2017 winter storms and for areas that were damaged during recent fires.
- Secure Rural Schools funding will not be reauthorized. Forest Receipts will return to a percentage of actual timber sales.
- Existing sources of federal, state and regional revenues, including those generated by SB 1, will continue throughout the 20-year life of the RTP.
- Local road maintenance will continue to be a major issue. The available transportation funding for projects at the local, State and Federal levels will not keep pace with the needs of the County.

### **Demographic Assumptions:**

- Recreation-oriented travel will continue to affect State highways and major County roadways, particularly during peak travel months. Tourism will continue to drive the economy with the retail trade, government, and service industries creating most of the new jobs.
- The growth in population and employment will remain very modest to slightly declining, consistent with California Department of Finance projections.
- Only limited minor commercial development is anticipated within the County. However, marijuana cultivation will continue to cause increased population and traffic, at least in the short-term, particularly in southern and western Trinity County.
- Transit service demand will continue to grow, primarily due to the number of elderly and disabled persons residing in the County, and rising fuel prices causing people to consider alternate modes of transportation.
- Any increases in population of adjacent counties (Shasta and Humboldt) will potentially affect both through and recreational traffic to Trinity County.
- Fuel prices will continue to have only a marginal effect on people's driving choices due to the rural nature of the County and distances traveled.
- The small population, distributed over a large land area with long distances between residences, services, and employment, will continue to make trips largely dependent on the automobile, therefore the automobile will continue to be the primary mode of travel by residents of Trinity County.

## **PROGRAM-LEVEL PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

In 2015, the California Transportation Commission, with input from the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF), recognized that rural transportation agencies may have different priorities and issues than urban areas, and should be allowed to use different performance measures. In September 2015, the RCTF developed *Performance Monitoring Indicators for Rural and Small Urban Transportation Planning*. A preliminary version of these new performance measures was incorporated into the California Transportation Commission's *2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines* for rural counties to use in preparing their 2016 RTIPs for the 2016 STIP. The *2017 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies* was adopted by the CTC on August 27, 2015 to assist rural counties with developing more applicable performance measures for their RTPs. The new performance measures more closely address the transportation goals and objectives of rural RTPAs and take into account the limited availability of resources for performance monitoring in these RTPAs.

During preparation of the 2016 STIP, the County used a combination of the rural and urban performance measures provided in the 2016 STIP Guidelines. The rural measures did not include parameters considered critical to the County, in particular, highway bridge lane-miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation, and fatalities and serious injuries per capita.

The program-level performance measures used in the Trinity County 2016 RTIP are shown in **Table 4.1**. The table attempts to quantify results of implementation of the projects in the 2016 RTP over the 20 year timeframe. **Table 4.2** links the performance measures with the RTP policies, objectives and desired outcomes and some of the projects that are proposed to meet those objectives.

<b>TABLE 4.1 RTP PROGRAM LEVEL PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>			
<b>Goal</b>	<b>Indicator/Measure</b>	<b>Current System Performance (Baseline)</b>	<b>Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe: 20 years 2016-2035)</b>
Congestion Reduction	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.	34.35 per day	33.00 per day
	Percent of congested VMT (at or below 35 mph)	0%	0%
	Commute mode share (travel to work or school)	Car, truck or van: 84.2% Public transportation: 2.1% Walk: 5.4% Bike: 1.5% Taxi: 1.4% Work at home: 5.4%	Car, truck or van: 82.2% Public transportation: 2.5% Walk: 6.0% Bike: 2.5% Taxi: 1.4% Work at home: 5.4%
Infrastructure Condition	Percent of distressed highway lane-miles	24%	33.7%
	Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads)	59	49
	Number of highway bridges in need of replacement or rehabilitation (sufficiency rating of 80 or below)	34	13
	Percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period	25%	20%
System Reliability	Number of locations subject to catastrophic road failure due to flooding, landslides or erosion	12	6
Safety	Fatalities and serious injuries per capita	0.00765	0.00690
	Fatalities and serious injuries per VMT	0.00023	0.00020
	Mean commute travel time (to work or school)	18.3 minutes	No Change
Environmental Quality	Number of miles of bike lanes	7.5	15.75
	Number of miles of pedestrian facilities	16	20
	Number of barriers to fish migration	33	Reduce by 6

<b>TABLE 4.2 RTP PERFORMANCE MEASURES, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES</b>			
<b>Performance Measure*</b>	<b>Projects Proposed</b>	<b>RTP Policy</b>	<b>RTP Desired Outcome</b>
Congestion Reduction	Intersection improvements on SR 299 at Washington Street and Weaver Bally Road 3 turn lane or turn pocket projects.	Objective 1.1 and supporting Policies 1.1 A through 1.1 D; Objective 1.4, Policy 1.4 A through 1.4 C.	Improve Level of Service and safety at poorly functioning intersections with SR 299 in Weaverville
Infrastructure Condition:  Pavement Condition	5 storm damage projects to repair cracks, 2 FLAP projects and 3 multi-phase STIP projects to rehabilitate or reconstruct roads; Pavement repairs at all airports.	Objective 1.3, Policy 1.3 A, through, 1.3 E; Objective 4.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve and maintain pavement condition on County roads and airports</li> </ul>
Bridge condition	19 HBP projects and one FLAP project to replace or repair bridges	Objective 1.3, Policy 1.3 A, •	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain and maintain sufficiency ratings of 80 or above on all County bridges.</li> </ul>
Transit system	7 new bus purchases; New transit maintenance facility; Bus stop improvements	• Objective 2.1; Policy 2.1 A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to improve and maintain the Transit system.</li> </ul>
System Reliability	6 projects to repair landslides, slipouts and erosion and/or restore eroding roads to two full lanes	• Objectives 1.4, Policy 1.4 A, Objective 1.6, Policy 1.6 A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize service disruptions by identifying potential road failures and addressing them as quickly as possible.</li> </ul>
Safety	6 HSIP projects to install guardrail, high visibility signage and striping, high friction surface treatments or roundabouts.	• Objective 1.4, Policy 1.4 A through 1.4 C; Objective 1.6, Policy 1.6 A through 1.6 C; Objective 1.7, Policy 1.7 A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor the number, location and severity of collisions. Recommend improvements to reduce their incidence and severity.</li> <li>Recommend RTP projects to maintain the condition of roads at or above the minimum acceptable maintenance condition as set by the County.</li> </ul>

<b>TABLE 4.2 RTP PERFORMANCE MEASURES, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES</b>			
<b>Performance Measure*</b>	<b>Projects Proposed</b>	<b>RTP Policy</b>	<b>RTP Desired Outcome</b>
Environmental Quality	12 bike lane projects totaling approximately 8 lane miles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 3.1, Policy 3.1 A through 3.1 E; Policy 3.2 C; Policy 3.2 D; Objective 3.4, Policy 3.4 A, Objective 3.6, Policy 3.6 A and 3.6 B</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the proportion of non-motorized trips; Increase safety for all types of non-motorized users; Increase mobility for all types of non-motorized users; Support reduction in greenhouse gases; Promote public health; Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in program benefits; Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of bicyclists and pedestrians..</li> </ul>
	3 pedestrian facility projects totaling 4 miles.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 3.1, Policy 3.1 A, 3.1 C &amp; 3.1 E; Objective 3.10 Policy 3.10 C; Objective 3.11 Policy 3.11 A &amp; B</li> </ul>	
	6 fish passage improvement projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 7.2, Policy 7.2 A, Objective 7.3, Policy 7.3 A and 7.3 C.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigate legacy impacts of existing infrastructure on fish passage, and avoid such impacts when designing future projects.</li> </ul>

## PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The RTP guidelines adopted by the CTC require that an RTP “provide a clearly defined justification for its transportation projects and programs.” This requirement is often referred to as the Project Intent Statement or Project Purpose and Need. Caltrans’ Deputy Directive No. DD 83 describes a project’s “Need” as an identified transportation deficiency or problem, and its “Purpose” is the set of objectives that will be met to address the transportation deficiency. For Trinity County each table of projects by mode includes a qualitative assessment of purpose and need indicating a projects contribution to system preservation, capacity enhancement, safety, and/or multi-modal enhancements. These broader categories capture the intended outcome for projects during the life of the RTP and serve to enhance and protect the “livability” of residents in the County. The following definitions are used in this document.

**System Preservation** – This category of improvement indicates a project that serves to maintain the integrity of the existing system so that access and mobility are not hindered for travelers. Improvements may include bridge repairs, pavement repair, rehabilitation and reconstruction, airport runway repairs, and maintenance of signs and traffic control devices. In recent years, the lack of maintenance funding has resulted in a large amount of “deferred maintenance” that has actually lapsed into a serious need to “rehabilitate” roadways to maintain system preservation. Rehabilitation entails primarily overlay and/or chip seal work that can also be considered a safety improvement. The majority of road projects listed indicate either “rehabilitation” or “reconstruction” to maintain system preservation.

**Capacity Enhancement** – A capacity enhancement indicates a project that serves to increase traffic capacity and to help alleviate congestion and improve Level of Service. This result may be achieved by adding an additional lane of traffic, adding alternative routes, adding a passing lane, adding a turn-out for slow moving vehicles or adding improved intersection control. Because Trinity County experiences large volumes of truck and recreational traffic on many of its roadways, the ability of vehicles to travel at desired speeds is restricted. Traffic on the state highways through local communities makes it difficult to enter the highway from local side streets. Capacity enhancement projects are designed to increase travel speeds and provide for opportunities to pass slower vehicles safely. Additional capacity can also apply to airport projects where runways are added or extended. The desired outcome is to maintain acceptable levels of LOS on State and regionally significant roads, and acceptable capacity at the County's airports.

**Safety Projects** – Safety improvements are intended to reduce the chance of conflicts between vehicles, keep vehicles on the road in their designated lane and to generally prevent injury to motorists using the transportation system. Safety improvements may include roadway and intersection realignments to improve sight-distance, guardrails, rumble strips, pavement or runway resurfacing to provide for a smooth travel surface, signage to clarify traffic and aviation operations, sidewalks, crosswalks, and traffic control for pedestrian safety, and obstacle removal along streets and highways and around airports. The desired outcome is to reduce the incident of accidents on County facilities and the societal costs in terms of injury, death or property damage.

**Multi-modal Enhancement** – These type of improvements focus on alternative modes of travel such as bicycling, walking, transit and air travel. Projects that are designated as multi-modal are designed to enhance travel by one or more of these alternative modes, provide for better connectivity between modes, and to improve non-auto access to major destinations and activity centers.

## **PROJECT PROGRAMMING AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

In addition to general system considerations for purpose and need, RTP projects recommended in Trinity County consider the following criteria (not necessarily in order of priority).

- Safety
- Project Effectiveness
- Project Cost
- Congestion
- Caltrans District 2 priority
- Local Agency priority
- Road Classification
- Pavement conditions (utilizing the pavement management system)
- Emergency, commercial, and recreational importance of the road
- Funding constraints
- Percent of heavy trucks



## **COMPLETED PROJECTS**

Aside from maintenance and minor rehabilitation projects, the following noteworthy projects from the 2011 RTP have been completed to date:

### ***State Highway Projects***

- Buckhorn Grade – all Phases (9 STAA barrier removals)
- All but two curve realignments for STAA Access:
  - Whole Enchilada Curve Improvement – Salyer
  - Horseshoe Curve Improvement
  - China Slide Curve Improvement
- West Weaverville Traffic Calming
- Weaverville to west County line Pavement Rehabilitation
- Hayfork II TE Bike Lane to Forest Avenue
- Sidewalk on SR 3 from SR 299 to Weaverville Elementary School

### ***County Projects***

- Lance Gulch Road (East Connector) Phases 1 and 2; Sr 299 to SR 3, including sidewalk and Class II bike lanes
- East Fork Road Replace Bridge 5C-086
- Wildwood Road – Replace Bridge 5C-086
- Trinity Mountain Road – Shasta – Contribution to multi-county rehab
- Peak Road – Humboldt - Contribution to multi-county rehab
- Hall City Creek – Replace Culvert and Pave Relocated Road segment
- Hyampom Road rehabilitation Segment 3 (PM 6.8 – 8.3)
- Summit Creek Road – replace wet ford with new 6' culvert
- Dutch Creek Road – Sediment Reduction Project
- Mad River Road – Rehabilitation PM 19 - End
- Ruth Zenia Road – Rehabilitation of 8.1 miles
- Van Duzen Road – replace Bridge 5C-181, 182 & 206
- Mad River Road – Replace Bridge 5C-152, 154

- County-wide – Replace signs with high-visibility
- Trinity Dam Boulevard – Flashing Icy signs at Mountain View Rd and 1.3 miles south Trinity Dam Boulevard – Guardrail 2.4 miles north of Rush Creek Road
- Ruth – Zenia Road – Guardrail at PM 3.4
- Douglas City Park-and-ride Bus Stop
- County-wide Bus Stop Sign Installations

Projects currently in design or construction include:

- Corral Bottom Road – Replace Bridge 5C-162
- Price Creek Road – Replace Bridge 5C-164
- East Fork Hayfork Creek – Replace Bridge 5C-157
- Ramshorn Road – Replace Bridge 5C-061
- Jordan Road – Replace Bridge 5C-187
- Coffee Creek Road – Replace Bridge 5C-048 and 196
- Van Duzen Road – rehabilitate 3.6 miles
- Ruth-Zenia Road – rehabilitate 1.6 miles

## **NOTEWORTHY CHANGES TO PROJECT LISTS: 2011 VS. 2016 RTP**

New projects have been added to the lists of short, medium and long-range projects proposed in the 2011 RTP. Projects have been suggested by Caltrans and Transportation Commission staff and by members of the Board of Supervisors/ Transportation Commission, or requested by the public. Some long-range or Unconstrained projects included in the 2011 RTP have been deleted due to lack of support or loss of the proposed funding source.

There are a few noteworthy new projects proposed in this RTP that were not proposed in the 2011 RTP. These include rehabilitation of Canyon Creek Road in the long term (15 – 20 year) period. The previously proposed Traffic Signal or Roundabout at Forest Avenue/ Garden Gulch Street has been relocated to the intersection of SR 299 with Weaver Bally Road. Some new turn pockets at intersections with SR 299 in Junction City and Burnt Ranch have been added at the request of the public. A new turn pocket on SR 3 at Tom Bell Road has been added, due to construction of a new County jail at that location. A new Transit Facility, including bus storage, service and washing and office space, is proposed on County-owned property at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road with SR 3. Several new storm damage repair projects have been added after the 2016/2017 winter storms resulted in two declared disasters. Routine bridge replacement and safety projects have been added as the County continues to upgrade its structurally deficient bridges and take advantage of HSIP safety grants that come available.

The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) of replacing or rehabilitating bridges would continue routinely, prioritized based on the Caltrans bi-annual bridge inspections. Safety projects under the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) are competitively awarded based on accident records. Programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the new RMRA Program started under SB 1 provide the opportunity for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to develop eligible projects based on transportation needs identified by the Pavement Management System or desires expressed by the community.

Projects that have not been carried forward from the 2011 RTP include several paving and rehabilitation projects on local roads and minor collectors. It remains unclear whether these projects on off-system roads will be eligible or considered high enough priority in future STIP cycles. They may be eligible for RMRA funds, however. By the next RTP, when the effects of SB 1 are more fully understood, and the large number of storm damage repair projects have been completed, the Pavement Management System will be used to extend the pavement rehabilitation program to these minor streets. In the meantime, there are more than enough projects on on-system roads to utilize all of the available funding for the next five years. Therefore, the mid-term and long term project lists include general "Pavement Rehab & Reconstruction" projects on various roads that are yet to be identified.

## **REGIONAL AND LOCAL ACTION PROGRAMS**

The regional action program for the Trinity County RTP is a compilation of projects already proposed and/or planned for Trinity County, as well as new projects deemed necessary to provide adequate operation of the various transportation systems consistent with the County's transportation goals and policies. To provide acceptable operations along the regional road system, Trinity County proposes a series of improvements to be sponsored by the State, the County, and/or the Federal government. The highest priority improvements to the regional road system are linked to the roadway needs identified in Chapter 2, and the Goals and Objectives from Chapter 3. The type of improvement, implementation cost, proposed construction year, priority and potential sources of funding are identified in the project tables by mode in Appendix 4A through 4G.

When transportation alternatives are being considered, interregional highway corridors such as SR 299, SR 36 and SR 3 remain primary candidates because Trinity County is extremely rural, and nearly all people and commodities leave and enter the county, and travel from one community to another, via the state highway system. Alternatives involving rail are quite limited because of prohibitive development costs, steep grades and environmental concerns. Other non-auto alternatives are encouraged as funding and demand allow. Examples are public transit, bicycle and pedestrian, and air travel to and from the more populated areas. Trinity County contains no commercially viable navigable waterways.

## **PROJECT PRIORITIES**

All RTP projects are assigned the following Tier designation to reflect its anticipated construction and funding time frame.

*Tier 1* projects represent projects that are fully fundable from anticipated revenue sources or are already programmed in the 0-5 Year (2016/17 – 2021/22) time frame.

*Tier 2* projects represent projects that are short-term and would be fundable from anticipated revenue sources and are planned for programming in the 10 years from 2022/23 – 2031/32 of the RTP.

Tier 3 projects represent projects that are longer-term (2032/33 – 2036/37) and should have full funding during the life of the RTP (by 2036) given current revenue assumptions and projections.

*Unconstrained Projects* are long-term projects that do not have reasonable anticipated funding identified through the life of the RTP. However, these “unconstrained” projects do represent some high priority long-term projects for the State, County, and Federal Governments.

## STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Three lists of Caltrans sponsored state highway projects are shown in Appendix 4A: Appendix 4A1 shows the Caltrans proposed ITIP projects; Appendix 4A2 shows the SHOPP Projects, and Appendix 4A3 show the ITS projects. Many of the ITIP projects are long-range, and costs and scheduling is unknown. The short-range projects that do have cost information are also listed on the County’s project list in Appendix 4C. The SHOPP Projects are mostly short-term, through 2022. Tentative costs are listed in Appendix 4A-2. The ITS Project list from Caltrans does not include dates or costs.

A major source of funding for State Highway Projects is the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The ITIP is the part of the STIP that is for State Highways that are considered interregional facilities. Due to the dramatic reduction of STIP funding in 2015-16, no new projects were proposed in the 2016 ITIP. However, it is anticipated SB 1 will restore the STIP balance to previous levels. The projects in Appendix 4A1 assume funding for the STIP and the ITIP will be available in future cycles, starting with the 2018 STIP cycle. The general goals and performance indicators of this RTP are consistent with those of the ITIP.

The purpose of the SHOPP program is to maintain the integrity of the State highway system. Funding for this program is provided through gas tax revenues. Projects are nominated within each Caltrans District office and are sent to Caltrans Headquarters for programming on a competitive basis statewide. Final project determinations are subject to review by the California Transportation Commission. Individual districts are not guaranteed any minimum level of funding; SHOPP projects are based on statewide priorities within each program category (i.e., safety, rehabilitation, operations, etc.) within each Caltrans District. SHOPP funds cannot be used for capacity-enhancing projects, nor can they be used for facilities off the State highway system. Although Caltrans is responsible for the SHOPP, the County is encouraged to have input in those projects through coordination and consultation.

## TRINITY COUNTY RTIP

The 2016 Trinity County RTIP was adopted by the TCTC in March 2016 and incorporated into the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on May 18, 2016. A copy of the adopted Trinity County RTIP is shown in Appendix 4B. The 2016 STIP was a negative STIP. No new shares were programmed, and projects that were previously programmed had to be removed due to lack of funding. The Trinity County RTIP consisted only of Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds and a small amount for right-of-way for Segment 1 of the Wildwood Road Reconstruction Project. .

However, with SB 1, the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate is much more promising. **\$6.1 million** is expected to be available to Trinity County for the 2018 STIP share period, through fiscal Year 2023/24, with an additional **\$706,000** available as an advance from future shares. Unprogrammed balances carry over to the next STIP cycle. Provided SB-1 remains in place, STIP funding levels are expected to continue at this level for the foreseeable future, providing approximately \$3 to \$4 million to be programmed on eligible projects every two years. The RTIP includes **\$5.4 million** in STIP projects over the short-term period, including three road projects, one transit project and two non-motorized projects (see Appendices 4C, 4D and 4E), which is below the 2018 STIP Fund Estimate. Unprogrammed STIP shares will be carried over to future STIP cycles, when several large road rehabilitation projects are anticipated.

## COUNTY ROAD AND BRIDGE PROJECTS

A total of 83 local road and bridge capital projects are included in Appendix 4C. The projects total **\$156 million** through 2036. The capital projects by Tier are described below.

### ***RTP Short-Range (0-5 Years) Road and Bridge Projects***

The short-range roadway and bridge projects for Trinity County are shown in Appendix 4C. The construction year is coded with a 1 to reflect construction within the 5 year time frame. The total for short-term capital improvements is **\$57.5 million**. Improvements include mainly storm damage repairs from the 2016/2017 winter storms, funded by State OES, Federal FEMA and the Federal Highway Administration ER program, all matched with State RMRA funds from SB 1. Several bridge replacement and repair projects are also included in Tier 1, including some that are already in various stages of development. Short term STIP projects include road reconstruction and rehabilitation projects on Wildwood and Lewiston Roads, which were previously programmed in the STIP and delayed by lack of funding in the previous two STIP cycles. Two new projects, a turn pocket on SR 3 at Tom Bell Road, site of the new County jail, and an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) for the intersection of Weaver Bally Road and SR 299 are also included in Tier 1.

### ***RTP Mid-Range (6-15 Years) Road and Bridge Projects***

The mid-range roadway and bridge projects are shown in Appendix 4C. The construction year is coded with a 2 to reflect the 6-15 (10 year) year time frame. Mid-term projects total **\$50.8 million** and include four more bridge replacements (including one FLAP project), continued road reconstruction and rehabilitation on Wildwood and Lewiston Roads, implementation of the recommendations of the ICE at Weaver Bally Road and SR 299, guardrails, fish passage and sediment reduction projects, a turnaround at the end of Oregon Street and making Center Street a 2-way street from Court Street to SR 3.

### ***RTP Long-Range (16-20 Years) Road and Bridge Projects***

The Tier 3 long-range projects (16-20 years) are included in Appendix 4C. Funding for these projects is anticipated by 2036. Long-range projects total **\$47.4 million** and include four more bridge replacements, reconstruction of Canyon Creek Road, a merge lane on SR 3 at Trinity Center, a turn lane on SR 299 at School House Road, the final phase of the Lewiston Road reconstruction project, , and improved intersection control (possible traffic signal) on Washington Street at SR 299.

## TRANSIT PROJECTS

The transit improvements proposed for Trinity County include eight short-range projects, five mid-range projects and one long-range project. The short-range capital projects total **\$1.7 million** and include bus purchases and transit passenger amenities (benches and, shelters), and environmental studies and design of a new Transit Maintenance Facility in Weaverville. The mid-range projects include construction of the new Transit Maintenance Facility, upgrading fareboxes, bus purchases and bus stop improvements. The total for mid-range projects is **\$3.2 million**. In the long-range, two more bus purchases are anticipated. The total for all transit improvements is **\$5.5 million**. The transit projects are listed in Appendix 4D.

## NON-MOTORIZED (BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN) PROJECTS

A total of 22 bicycle and pedestrian projects are proposed for the 2016 RTP. The projects are shown in Appendix 4E. Four projects are coded as short-range, 13 are mid-range, and five are coded as long-range. The improvements include **\$9.1 million** in Class I facilities (separated from the road); **\$5.2 million** in Class II bike lanes (on road shoulders), and **\$1.5 million** in Class III (share-the-road) routes. The improvements for bicycle amenities, such as signage and parking, total **\$950,000** and **\$6.45 million** is included for pedestrian facilities. Total Tier 1 improvements are nearly **\$5 million**; Tier 2 is nearly **\$9 million** and Tier 3 is **\$9.3 million**. The total for all non-motorized improvements is **\$23.3 million** through 2036. However, many of the proposed projects depend on funding from the ATP Program. ATP funds are grant funds that the County must compete for. Competition is state-wide, and in the first 3 cycles the County has only received one grant, to prepare an Active Transportation Plan. It is unlikely that all of the ATP funds listed in Appendix 4E will actually be received by the County. STIP funds may be used for some of the projects, however.

## AVIATION

The County's airport projects are shown in Appendix 4F. The projects are listed by airport. The projects involve system preservation, capacity enhancements and safety. All of the airports will be receiving pavement rehabilitation, reconstruction or maintenance. Airport Layout Plans and Pavement Management Programs will be prepared for all five airports. In the long term, the runway at Trinity Center Airport will be extended, and parallel taxiways will be added at Hyampom and Ruth Airports. A total of **\$15 million** is proposed for all airports.

## UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS

The list of unconstrained (not funded) projects is shown in Appendix 4G. These are projects that are both needed and desired by the County but do not have funding identified. The list includes several projects that would contribute to system preservation, safety and multi-modal operations. The total for unconstrained projects is approximately **\$57.6 million**, but may be subject to an unknown amount of inflation before the funding is identified.

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

Transportation systems management (TSM) is a term used to describe low-cost actions that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and systems. In urbanized areas, strategies using various combinations of techniques can be implemented. However, in rural, less-populated areas like Trinity County, many measures that would be taken in metropolitan areas are not practical.

With limited funding, Trinity County must look for the least capital-intensive solutions. On a project basis, TSM measures are good engineering and management practices. Many are already in use to increase the efficiency of traffic flow and movement through intersections and the durability of County roads and bridges. Additional long-range TSM considerations could include:

- Signing and striping modifications
- Paving and re-striping parking areas to facilitate off-street parking
- Installing signals or roundabouts
- Providing alternate circulation routes for residents
- Re-examining speed zones on certain streets

### ***Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)***

ITS, as defined in law, refers to the employment of “electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.” The implementation of ITS is a priority for the U.S. Department of Transportation. A key component of that nationwide implementation is the National ITS Architecture, a framework devised to encourage functional harmony, interoperability, and integration among local, regional, State and Federal ITS applications.

On State Highways in Trinity County, ITS consists of Closed Circuit TV cameras (CCTV) and Roadside Weather Information Systems (RWIS) to monitor and report snow conditions on passes, and Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) and Changeable Message Signs (CMS) to alert drivers of road delays, road closures and chain requirements ahead. **Table 4.3** was obtained from Caltrans District 2 and shows the types of ITS improvements that exist or are planned for Trinity County. Table 4.3 is also included in Appendix 4A3, the list of State Highway Projects.

**TABLE 4.3  
DISTRICT 2 ITS ELEMENTS**

Location	Type	County	RTE	PM	Status
<b>State Route 3 ITS Elements</b>					
North of SR 36/SR 3 intersection	HAR Flasher	TRI	3	0.40	P
Hayfork Summit	CCTV	TRI	3	18.67	P
Hayfork Summit	RWIS	TRI	3	18.67	P
Douglas City	CMS	TRI	3	29.5	P
Douglas City	CMS	TRI	3	30.50	P
5 Cent Gulch Road	HAR Flasher	TRI	3	31.74	E
Scott Mountain Summit	RWIS	TRI	3	83.00	P
Scott Mountain Summit	CCTV	TRI	3	83.00	P
<b>State Route 36 ITS Elements</b>					
East of SR 36/SR 3 intersection	HAR Flasher	TRI	36	29.00	P
SR 36/SR 3 intersection	HAR	TRI	36	28.65	P
West of SR 36/SR 3 intersection	HAR Flasher	TRI	36	28.25	P
South Fork Mountain	RWIS	TRI	36	10.26	P
South Fork Mountain	CCTV	TRI	36	10.30	P
<b>State Route 299 ITS Elements</b>					
Burnt Ranch	CCTV & hillside lighting	TRI	299	11.80	P
Oregon Mountain	HAR Flasher	TRI	299	48.10	E
Oregon Mountain	RWIS	TRI	299	48.12	EU
Oregon Mountain	CCTV	TRI	299	48.12	E
Weaverville (Maintenance Station)	HAR	TRI	299	51.20	E
East Weaverville	HAR Flasher	TRI	299	52.82	E
Douglas City	CMS	TRI	299	57.40	P
Douglas City	CMS	TRI	299	58.27	P
Buckhorn Sandhouse	RWIS	TRI	299	69.70	EU
Buckhorn Sandhouse	CCTV	TRI	299	69.70	E
<b>District or County Wide</b>					
District Wide	CCTV Lighting	VAR	VAR	VAR	P
Various Locations	Microwave, TMS wireless backbone				P
Notes:					
C = Construction, D = Design, E = Existing, P = Planned, EU = Upgrade Existing Element, O = Fully Operational, T = Not Operational					
CCTV = Closed Circuit Television, CMS = Changeable Message Sign, HAR = Highway Advisory Radio, EMS = Extinguishable Message Sign, LED = Light Emitting Diode, TMS = Traffic Monitoring System, RWIS=Roadside Weather Information System					
All post mile locations for the proposed sites are approximate.					
Data Updated 7/21/2017					



## 5. FINANCIAL PLAN

Fiscal constraint is one of the foundational concepts of the 2016 RTP. As such, the financial plan is a key component of the document. Transportation funding sources at the State and Federal level have become very scarce in the past few years. The new Federal Transportation bill, the FAST Act, has cut many Federal programs and made funding more difficult to access, especially for small rural areas. At the State level, the State Transportation budget has been running a deficit in some areas, because of reduced gas tax revenue due to lower gas prices and more fuel efficient vehicles. However, the recent passage of State Senate Bill 1, the “Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017”, will restore and enhance many important transportation programs in the years to come. The Guidelines for implementing SB 1 are still being developed, so there is still some uncertainty in the amounts that Trinity County will receive from each program. Therefore, assumptions have been made using the most recent available information.

Needs will always exceed available funding; however, it is smart planning to maximize benefit of each available dollar and to prioritize projects based on the funding availability, not strictly need. To this degree, project lists in Appendices 4B through 4F reflect fiscal constraint, meaning that these lists only include projects that are already programmed, or were previously programmed but removed in the 2016 negative STIP (Tier 1 projects); or have a reasonable chance of being funded from programs that are currently producing revenue, (Tier 2 projects) or can be reasonably expected to obtain funding in the next 20 years (Tier 3 projects). The “unconstrained” projects that are desired and needed but not funded are included in the Unconstrained List in Appendix 4G.

### APPROACH

The typical RTP approach is to determine transportation improvement needs based on an analysis of travel demand, identify needed projects, and then determine available funding. This approach typically results in a fiscal deficit, as needs generally outweigh revenue. In addition, recent trends in transportation planning are shifting away from travel demand (congestion) as the top priority for selecting projects. Due to a combination of the shift away from Level of Service toward Vehicle Miles Traveled, as explained in Section 2, *Assessment of Needs*, and recent studies such as California State Association of Counties (CSAC); *California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment - 2014 Update* and California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans); *2015 State of the Pavement Report*; (June 2016), the need for greater emphasis on road maintenance and rehabilitation over system expansion and congestion relief has been recognized by state transportation planning agencies such as the CTC. A large part of the new SB 1 funding is dedicated to this need. This new trend fits perfectly with the needs of Trinity County, and this RTP will strongly reflect the new emphasis on System Preservation.

### **Revenue Assumptions**

Investment priorities for local, state and federal funds are embodied in the RTP. The RTP describes the short-range Tier 1 (0-5 years), the mid-range Tier 2 (6-15 years), and long-range (16-20 years) investment strategies in the County’s transportation system, indicating how all funding sources are to be utilized to meet the RTP goals and objectives. This chapter further provides a summary of the projected transportation-related revenues for Trinity County over the life of the plan and an accounting of the estimated project costs necessary to implement the goals of the RTP.

As a necessary condition of fiscal constraint, the financial plan contains assumptions about the availability of future funding from existing and new sources. It is assumed that the identified federal and state funding sources will continue to be available over the life of the RTP even if funding amounts are reduced. No new funding source or existing funding source has been included that is not “reasonably anticipated.” The following is a summary of the major revenue assumptions.

- Overall Federal funding will remain stable through September of 2020, when the FAST Act is set to expire.
- The Highway User's Tax (HUT), consisting of State fuel taxes and excise taxes will increase significantly in Fiscal year 17/18, due to implementation of SB 1, and continue to increase with inflation. This funding is used for salaries, overhead, routine maintenance, snow plowing and as match for grant funds. Average annual total funding for maintenance and road rehabilitation, from HUT and RMRA will average **\$3.9 million** annually through Fiscal Year 2026-27
- Additional state revenues from the new Transportation Improvement Fee and the New Zero Emissions Vehicle License Fees will begin to be distributed in Fiscal Year 2019/20.
- RMRA funding from SB 1 will become a reliable source of State funding for road maintenance and repair, providing at least **\$2.3 million annually** through 2026. Local road maintenance and rehabilitation projects can be funded, subject to approval by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) of an annual list of projects submitted by the County.
- The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 will not be reauthorized. Forest Receipts will revert to the Pre-2000 levels, which are calculated as a percent of actual timber receipts. Only \$75,000-\$100,000 per year will replace the typical \$3 million in Secure Rural Schools revenue. An average of \$85,000 per year is assumed.
- Beginning with State Fiscal Year 2019/20, the STIP will return to previous levels, generating approximately **\$3 to \$4 million every two years** for qualifying projects. Local Road Rehabilitation projects and bicycle/pedestrian projects along public roads are assumed to qualify for future STIP funds.
- Revenues from competitive grant programs such as the Active Transportation Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program and the Federal Lands Access Program are assumed, but are subject to being selected from a statewide pool of projects every two years, so cannot be guaranteed.
- Highway Bridge Program funds for specific eligible bridge maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement projects are included in the revenue estimate, and assumed to be available based on current funding levels.
- Revenues from sources that can be used for operations and maintenance will be used for those purposes, rather than for Capital projects. These sources include: Transit fares, airport income, Highway Users Tax, Forest Receipts and Match Exchange.

Given these assumptions, the identified revenues from federal, state and local sources are consistent with the total Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 project costs, creating a fiscally constrained RTP.

### ***Unconstrained Needs***

Transportation needs will always exceed available funding; therefore, the RTP includes an "unconstrained" list which identifies the needs beyond the revenues that are available. The inclusion of these unfunded projects reflects improvements and rehabilitation that are desired by the region, but require funding outside of anticipated revenues. The total estimate of "unfunded needs" is approximately **\$57.6 million** as shown in Appendix 4G. This number is subject to inflation beyond the time period of this RTP, if funding is not identified before then. The costs of several Caltrans projects that were added at the request of the Office of Freight Planning were not provided by Caltrans, and are not included in the Unconstrained total.

## SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND COSTS

The following information summarizes revenue projections from all available sources and provides a recap of RTP project costs. A discussion of individual sources and programs is also provided in the rest of the chapter.

### ***Total Revenue Summary***

The TCTC has taken a conservative approach in forecasting future revenues. Staff has had to make assumptions regarding the amount of funding that the County will receive from several new programs, where guidelines and fund estimates have not yet been established. In addition, as mentioned above, funds from competitive grant programs are assumed, but remain speculative. Funds for operations and maintenance are tabulated below, but are not included in the estimated revenue available for the capital projects listed in the RTP. The anticipated revenues for Capital projects anticipated during the life of the 2016 RTP are as follows: in the short-range (0-5 years) approximately **\$94.5 million** is assumed to be available. In the midrange (6-15 years) approximately **\$91.4 million** is assumed. In the long-range (16-20 years) approximately **\$72.7 million** is assumed for a total of **\$258.6 million** through 2036.

**Table 5.1** summarizes the projected revenues for all sources.

**TABLE 5.1  
TRINITY COUNTY PROJECTED REVENUES**

<b>Revenue Source</b>	<b>Short-Range (0-5 years)</b>	<b>Mid-Range (6-15 years)</b>	<b>Long-Range (15-20 years)</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Local</b>				
Local Transportation Fund (LTF)	\$1,140,000	\$2,280,000	\$1,500,000	<b>\$4,920,000.00</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,140,000</b>	<b>\$2,280,000</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>	<b>\$4,920,000.00</b>
<b>State</b>				
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	\$6,143,000	\$18,500,000	\$11,000,000	<b>\$35,643,000</b>
State Aviation funds	\$250,000	\$500,000	\$250,000	<b>\$1,000,000.00</b>
Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation funds (RMRA)	\$11,140,000	\$38,300,000	\$20,000,000	<b>\$69,440,000</b>
Storm Damage (ER & FEMA)	\$35,263,000	unknown	unknown	<b>\$35,263,000</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$52,796,000</b>	<b>\$57,300,000</b>	<b>\$31,250,000</b>	<b>\$141,346,000</b>
<b>Federal</b>				
Federal Lands Access Program	\$8,417,000	\$10,853,000	\$18,000,000	<b>\$37,270,000</b>
Federal Transit (5311)	\$375,000	\$750,000	\$400,000	<b>\$1,525,000.00</b>
Federal Transit (5311F)	\$780,000	\$1,795,000	\$995,000	<b>\$3,570,000.00</b>
State and/or Federal Aviation (AIP)	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,500,000	<b>\$6,000,000.00</b>
Active Transportation Program (ATP)	\$3,062,000	\$8,384,000	\$6,816,000	<b>\$18,262,000.00</b>
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	\$21,427,000	\$6,702,000	\$6,316,000	<b>\$34,445,000.00</b>
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	\$5,000,000	\$297,000	\$6,000,000	<b>\$11,297,000.00</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$40,561,000.00</b>	<b>\$31,781,000.00</b>	<b>\$40,027,000.00</b>	<b>\$112,369,000</b>
<b>Total Revenue for Capital Projects</b>	<b>\$94,497,000</b>	<b>\$91,361,000</b>	<b>\$72,777,000</b>	<b>\$258,635,000</b>

<b>Funds for Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M)</b>				
		Transit O&M		
Transit Fares	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$450,000	<b>\$1,650,000.00</b>
State Transit Assistance (STA)	\$540,000	\$1,400,000	700,000	<b>\$2,640,000</b>
		Airport O&M		
Airport Income	\$295,840	\$739,602	\$369,800	<b>\$1,405,242.00</b>
		Road and Bridge O&M		
Highway Users Tax (HUT)	\$13,328,452	\$26,656,904	\$13,528,378	<b>\$53,513,734</b>
Forest Receipts	\$425,000	\$850,000	\$425,000	<b>\$1,700,000</b>
Match Exchange (STP)	\$1,759,560	\$3,519,120	\$1,759,560	<b>\$7,038,240.00</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$16,748,852</b>	<b>\$33,965,626</b>	<b>\$17,232,738</b>	<b>\$67,947,216</b>
<b>Total all Sources</b>	<b>\$116,288,852</b>	<b>\$125,326,626</b>	<b>\$84,326,738</b>	<b>\$325,942,216</b>

### Total Cost Summary

In line with Year of Expenditure (YOE) requirements, Trinity County has escalated all project costs to the year of construction. YOE ensures that 'total' project costs are assumed (including inflation). The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the RTP project list is as realistic as possible. For example, a project that costs \$1M today will probably cost more than \$1M in 2030. Therefore, the RTP needs to estimate what that true project costs are likely to be in the year of construction.

**Table 5.2** provides a summary of all capital project costs proposed by the County. Projects are categorized as Roads/Bridge, Transit, Non-Motorized (bike and pedestrian), and Aviation. Tier 1 project costs for the 2016 RTP (excluding Caltrans highway expenditures countywide) total approximately **\$67.2 million**; Tier 2 costs total **\$65.7 million**; Tier 3 costs are estimated at **\$66.7 million**. The total for all RTP capital projects is approximately **\$200 million**.

<b>TABLE 5.2 SUMMARY OF TOTAL RTP PROJECT COSTS</b>					
<b>Costs</b>	<b>Short-Range (2017-2022)</b>	<b>Mid-Range (2023-2032)</b>	<b>Long-Range (2033-2037)</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Roads/Bridge	\$57,546,000	\$50,852,000	\$47,416,000	\$155,814,000.00	78.0%
Transit Capital	\$1,770,000	\$3,250,000	\$530,000	\$5,550,000.00	2.8%
Non-Motorized	\$4,989,000	\$8,984,000	\$9,283,000	\$23,256,000	11.6%
Aviation	\$2,935,000	\$2,650,000	\$9,445,000	\$15,030,000.00	7.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$67,240,000</b>	<b>\$65,736,000</b>	<b>\$66,674,000</b>	<b>\$199,650,000</b>	
Source: Trinity County, 2017					

## FEDERAL REVENUES

### ***Federal Transportation Authorization Bill, the FAST Act (Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act)***

The FAST Act was signed into law on December 4, 2015. The 5-year bill authorizes \$305 billion in spending for Federal surface transportation programs, including \$205 billion for highways and \$48 billion for transit projects over the five year term. The bill re-authorized an 18.4 cent per gallon Federal gas tax, used to pay for transportation projects.

Before the FAST Act, the prior MAP-21 Funding bill made a number of changes in funding programs. The Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, which provided a set amount of funds every two years for bicycle and pedestrian trails and lanes within the County's STIP shares, was terminated. The Forest Highways Program, which provided funds and assistance from the Federal Highway Administration for designated Forest Highways, was replaced with the Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP), a competitive program where the County is required to submit grant applications for projects on roads that serve revenue-generating Federal Lands. The FAST Act continued this new system, making it more difficult for the County to rely on Federal funding for trails and County roads through the National Forests.

The Highway Trust Fund (HTF) is the source of funding for most of the programs in the FAST Act. The HTF is composed of the Highway Account, which funds highway and inter-modal programs, and the Mass Transit Account. Federal motor fuel taxes are the major source of income into the HTF. In Trinity County, federal motor fuel tax monies are exchanged with Caltrans (Match Exchange). Caltrans uses the Federal dollars primarily for state highway projects and sends state money to the County as discretionary funds for county road operation and maintenance. There are also Federal programs that provide grant funding for specific projects, including emergency repairs (ER), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and bridge maintenance, rehabilitation and replacement (Highway Bridge Program – HBP). Federal funds can also be used to rehabilitate or reconstruct rural major collectors and minor arterials in the county road system and rural major and minor arterials in the state highway system. In a recent development, California has received approval to obtain toll credits from its toll revenues. Toll credits can be used as matching funds for certain federal-aid projects. For example, the HBP (Highway Bridge Program) requires a state or local match of 11.47% for most bridge projects. For "on-system" bridges (bridges on major collectors or minor arterials), the County must provide the match or use State funds, such as STIP. However, for "off-system" bridges, (bridges on minor collectors or local roads) toll credits can be used for the match, making those projects 100% funded.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHA) administers the Highway Trust Fund. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) processes these funds through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as outlined by SB 45. The federal highway funds matched with state highway funds are also used to pay for the Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). The remaining funds are split 25% for the State Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) and 75% for the STIP.

The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Trinity County. The RTPA is responsible for programming projects for the STIP in their region by developing a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) every two years. The RTIP is based upon the amount of funding allocated to the Trinity County Region for a particular 5-year STIP cycle. Projects are programmed over a 5-year period, but new funds are received every two years. Unused funds may be carried over to the next RTIP. The RTPA may program funding for state highway projects in its region, and for local road system, transit and bicycle/pedestrian needs. The California Transportation

Commission (CTC) approves the RTIP, incorporates it into the STIP, and then approves the RTPA's requests to allocate the money for projects in accordance with the program.

To be programmed in the STIP, all projects must be included in the RTP, and are required to have a Project Study Report (PSR) that identifies scope, schedule and cost prior to the project being programmed in the STIP. The PSR can be prepared using Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) STIP funds.

Subject to an agreement with the Office of Local Assistance, local agencies can also have their Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) funds included in the Overall Work Program (OWP) work elements. Per AB 608, effective January 1, 2002, Section 14527(g) of the Government Code was amended to permit rural RTPAs to use up to 5 percent of their Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds towards planning, using PPM funding.

The following information summarizes each source available to Trinity County.

### ***Match Exchange (Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP))***

The RSTP guarantees counties 110 percent of their allocation under the old Federal Aid Urban/Federal Aid Secondary (FAU/FAS) program. These funds may be spent on streets and roads. Jurisdictions may also use the funds for bikeway and pedestrian, transit, safety, ridesharing, traffic management, parking, environmental enhancements, and transportation control measures (TCMs). Trinity County has historically exchanged its STP funds for operations and routine maintenance on local facilities. The match exchange rate has remained steady for many years, and it is assumed to remain so over the period of this RTP. The region expects to receive \$351,912 every year, totaling approximately **\$7.0 million** in exchange funds through 2036.

### ***Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)***

This program allows states to target funds to their most critical safety needs. The State receives a block grant from the Federal Highway Administration, which it distributes to State and local agencies every two years using a competitive grant system. Trinity County has been very successful in obtaining HSIP funds in recent years, to construct a variety of safety projects such as striping, signage and guardrails. Assuming the HSIP grants listed in Appendix 4C are all received, the County estimates they will receive **\$11.2 million** through 2036.

### ***Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 (Non-urbanized Transit)***

Under this section, 75% of the funding share is apportioned to non-urban areas based on the size of the rural population. This apportionment is distributed to Transportation Planning Agencies (TPA) whose county or region contains a non-urbanized area as identified by the United States Census Bureau. 15% of 5311 funding is apportioned to the Rural Intercity Bus Program (known as FTA 5311F), and 10% is apportioned to Caltrans to administer the program. During the life of the RTP, it is anticipated that the region will receive approximately **\$1.5 million** in formula funds through 2036.

### ***Intercity Bus (5311(f))***

The 5311F Intercity Bus program under FTA's non-urbanized Area formula grant program supports connections between non-urbanized areas and the larger regional or national system of intercity bus service. Emphasis is placed on mobility between rural and urbanized areas, addressing the intercity travel needs of residents in rural areas of the state. The 5311F program pays up to 55.33 percent of operations, however, funding was reduced statewide in fiscal year 2017/18 because the Tahoe Transportation District was designated as a 5307 agency and removed from the 5311 rural program. This reduced the amount of



funding for the 5311F discretionary program, which is 15% of the total amount of 5311. Additionally, more agencies applied to the 5311F program with success in 2016/17, which further reduced available 5311F funds. This meant that Trinity County received less than what was applied for in 2016/17, and the total amount for 2017/18 was further reduced. In 2017 Caltrans began an Intercity Bus Study for the entire state. Critical routes will be identified in the study, which should provide more funding guidance in future years.

## ***FTA Partnership Planning and 5304 Transit Planning***

### ***Senate Bill 1 Climate Adaptation and Sustainable Communities Grants***

Over the next decade SB 1 will provide 270 million in planning grants for local communities. It is envisioned that these planning grants will provide funding to support regional sustainable communities' strategies and ultimately achieve the State's greenhouse gas reductions targets of 40 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 2050, respectively.

The planning grant funds will encompass the following:

**Transportation Planning:** Caltrans will provide \$25 million in annual grants for local and regional planning to support the goals and best practices cited by the California Transportation Commission in its regional transportation plan guidelines. This funding will be divided between the Sustainable Communities Competitive Grant, which the TCTC will be eligible to apply for, and the Sustainable Communities Formula for Metropolitan Planning Organizations only.

Eligible planning projects must have a transportation nexus, therefore, successful planning projects are expected to directly benefit the multi-modal transportation system. Sustainable Communities Grants will also improve public health, social equity, environmental justice, and provide other important community benefits.

**Climate Change Adaptation Planning:** Caltrans will provide \$20 million over the next three years to local and regional agencies to support resilient transportation infrastructure planning for areas that are potentially vulnerable to climate change. This funding will help agencies conduct adaptation planning in a way to ensure transportation assets are resilient in the face of climate change. The overarching goal of this grant program is to support planning actions at local and regional levels that advance climate change adaptation efforts, especially efforts that serve the communities most vulnerable to climate change impacts.

### ***Active Transportation Program (ATP)***

The ATP program incorporates former bicycle and pedestrian programs, including the Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program, Safe Routes to Schools, and recreational trail programs. The ATP program is administered by the CTC, similar to the STIP Program, with a couple of major differences. Funding becomes available every two years, like the STIP, but the cycle is only three years instead of five. The projects are awarded competitively every two years from several statewide pools of applicants. It is very difficult to compete for this funding, and Trinity County has not been very successful, obtaining only one grant, to prepare an overall Active Transportation Plan for the County, which may make future applications more favorable once completed. Another factor that introduces uncertainty is the three-year cycle. It is almost impossible to develop and implement an all-new construction project in three years. From start to finish, an agency must first allocate funds for the Federal and State environmental processes. Only when those are complete may they request allocation for design, then right-of-way. When right-of-way is complete and certified, they may request allocation for construction. A project that is programmed in the ATP has only three years to complete all these steps, sequentially. If they cannot, they lose the construction programming and have to reapply in the next cycle, with no guarantee that construction will be funded. If 10 years passes without construction funds being allocated, the agency may be required to pay back the funds spent on environmental, design and right-of-way acquisition. Therefore, the program is very uncertain and carries risk



for local agencies. The TCTC has estimated approximately **\$18.2 million** in possible ATP funding through 2036. However, this may be an over-optimistic number, and it is assumed other funding sources, such as STIP, may be needed to complete some of these projects. The County will continue to explore additional funding sources besides the ATP for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

### ***National Forest Receipts***

Forest Receipts are federal funds that come from Federal property located within the county. Twenty-five percent of all revenue generated by the use of National Forest land, such as timber sales, is returned to the county. These funds can only be used for county road and school purposes. The roads portion can be used for general operations and maintenance of County roads, and that is how these revenues will be used; not for specific Capital projects. Due to reduced timber sales on federal lands, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (S1608/HR2389) provided federal funding to help replace lost timber revenue through 2015. However, with the current economy, it is highly unlikely that this program will be reauthorized. Instead, Forest Receipts will revert to the Pre-2000 levels, which are calculated as a percent of actual timber receipts. Only \$75,000-\$100,000 per year will replace the typical \$3 million in Secure Rural Schools revenue. For 2017, \$85,000 is anticipated. Assuming actual forest receipts remain at approximately current levels (\$85,000 per year), the funding estimate through 2036 is approximately **\$1.7 million** in forest receipts.

### ***Federal Lands Access Program***

The Federal Lands Access program is another competitive program managed by a committee that includes Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans, federal lands managers (Forest Service, BLM, etc.) and local agency representatives. Grant applications are submitted every two years and reviewed by the committee. Trinity County has been more successful with this program, perhaps because the County is approximately 75% federal lands. Since the program began, Trinity County has received nearly **\$7.5 million** in project funding. Like the previous Forest Highways Program, the Federal Highways Administration Central Federal Lands Highway Division not only funds the program, but also implements the projects, running the federal environmental process, providing full design, and obtaining and overseeing the construction contract. The County only has to meet the State environmental requirements (CEQA) and obtain any needed right-of-way. When the project is complete, the FHWA turns operation and maintenance of the facility back over to the County. The County anticipates approximately **\$37.2 million** in this type of assistance through 2036.

### ***Highway Bridge Program (HBP)***

HBP provides for construction, replacement, rehabilitation and maintenance of local and state bridges. The County can nominate eligible projects through Caltrans Office of Local Assistance. The program is not competitive. Eligible bridge projects will be funded whenever funds are available. The County has been very successful in obtaining these funds and implementing various bridge projects. The range of HBP funds typically awarded to the region is between \$4 and \$7 million annually, when funding is available. In an innovative new program, Trinity County has handed five HBP-funded bridge projects over to the FHWA Central Federal Lands Highway Division for implementation, similar to the Federal Lands Access Program described above. FHWA is using a design-build method to expedite construction of these five bridges. The County anticipates approximately **\$34.4 million** in HBP funds over the life of the RTP.

## STATE REVENUES

The TCTC anticipates approximately **\$204 million** from all State programs (excluding Caltrans Projects) through 2036. For Capital projects, **\$141 million** in State funds is anticipated.

### ***State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)***

Biennially, Caltrans is required to prepare a SHOPP for expenditure of transportation funds for major capital improvements that are necessary to preserve and protect the state highway system. Projects included in the SHOPP are limited to capital improvements relative to maintenance, safety, and bridges that do not increase capacity. Projects can also include bridge replacement and seismic retrofitting. RTPAs are encouraged to coordinate with Caltrans on the SHOPP prior to its submission to the CTC. Caltrans District 2 has provided a list of programmed and non-programmed SHOPP projects for Trinity County. The list is included in Appendix 4A-2. SHOPP projects programmed for Trinity County include slope stability projects, drainage improvements, bridge repairs, curve realignments and pavement rehabilitations, and an electric vehicle charging station at Moon Lim Lee Rest Area in Douglas City.

### ***State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)***

As described above, the STIP is a five-year planning document adopted every two years that displays commitments of transportation funds for improving operations for local roads and the State highway system. The STIP contains federal and state funding sources, but is administered at the State level by the CTC. The 2016 STIP was negative, meaning no new projects were programmed and most projects already programmed were delayed or deleted. With the passage of SB 1, revenues in the STIP are expected to return to normal, which for Trinity County means approximately \$3 to \$4 million per cycle. However, the funds are not expected to appear until the 2019/20 State Fiscal Year. The draft Fund Estimate for the 2018 STIP indicates that Trinity County will receive **\$6.1 million** in the 2018 STIP cycle (2018/19 through 2023/24, which coincides with the short-term Tier 1 of this RTP. This draft Fund Estimate is assumed to be correct for this RTP. For the medium and long-term periods of this RTP, an average of \$3.7 million every 2 years is assumed, for a total of approximately **\$35.6 million** through the 2036 cycle.

### ***Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)***

The Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) is a new program established by SB 1. This program would provide a steady annual income of State funds to the County for road maintenance and rehabilitation, safety projects, some pedestrian and bicycle safety projects, transit facilities and drainage projects in conjunction with other allowable road projects, and for matching funds toward other state or federal grants. The County would have to provide a list of proposed projects, and a list of completed projects, to the CTC each year. Trinity County can expect approximately **\$2.3 million per year**, indexed to inflation. Over the 20-year time frame covered by this RTP, assuming a 1.5% inflation rate overall, over **\$69 million** can be expected from this program.

### ***State Transit Assistance (STA)***

State Transit Assistance (STA) funds are derived from the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Half of the funds (50%) are allocated to Caltrans, and the other half to RTPAs. The region typically receives approximately \$60,000 in STA funds annually, however, with SB1 an increase of \$80,000 annually is estimated with full amounts (\$140,000 annually) beginning in FY 2018/19. Over the life of the RTP the County anticipates approximately **\$2.6 million** in STA funding for operations and maintenance. These funds are not usually used for Capital improvements.

### **Highway User Tax (State Gasoline Tax)**

Highway User Tax (HUT) are used primarily for the maintenance of county roads. With SB 1, Trinity County can expect over \$1.6 million per year in HUT, with future years indexed to inflation. Over the 20-year period, assuming 1.5% annual inflation, the Trinity region anticipates over **\$53 million** from the HUT through 2036. These funds will be used for operations, salaries and routine maintenance, rather than for Capital projects.

### **Aviation Funding**

Aviation funding for Trinity County is provided mainly by two sources – The Federal Aid Improvement Program (AIP) and the California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP). The FAA provides 90% federal funding, with 10% local funding, for general aviation airports. FAA funds are derived from user charges, such as taxes on aviation fuels, taxes on civil aircraft, and a surcharge on air passenger fares. These funds can be used for most capital expenditures. However, if an airport does not qualify to be in the Federal National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NIPIAS), FAA funding can only be used for runway rehabilitation. Trinity County currently has only two NIPIAS Airports that can access these funds: Trinity Center and Ruth.

The California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP) can be used to pay a portion of the match for the FAA grants, and also makes state-only grant funds available for airport development and operation. The TCTC anticipates approximately **\$1 million** in State Aviation Funds and **\$6 million** available for eligible FAA projects through 2036. Income from airports for tie-downs, hanger rents, etc. will be used for airport operations and maintenance.

## **LOCAL REVENUES**

The TCTC anticipates approximately **\$7.9 million** from all local sources for roads, transit and aviation through 2036.

### **Transit Fares**

Trinity County receives revenues from various subsidies as well as transit fares on its fixed route systems. The TCTC estimates future revenues from all transit fares is approximately **\$1,650,000** through 2036. These funds will be used for operations and maintenance rather than capital expenditures.

### **Airport Income**

Trinity County receives revenues from its airport operations for hanger and tiedown rent, storage and services. During the life of the RTP, the TCTC estimates approximately **\$1.4 million** in airport revenues. This money is generally used for airport maintenance and operations.

### **Local Transportation Fund (LTF)**

Existing law requires that ¼ percent of statewide sales and use tax money be transferred to the local transportation fund of the county for allocation, as directed by the RTPA, to various transit projects and programs. The LTF also provides limited funds (2 percent set aside) for the construction and maintenance of pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The TDA also allows local agencies to use LTF funds on local streets and roads or non-motorized facilities, provided that all unmet transit needs that are found “reasonable to meet” are funded. Under current law, Trinity County anticipates approximately **\$4.9 million** in LTF funding through 2036.

## PROJECT COST SUMMARY

### *Funding Sources by Mode*

#### Roadway/Bridges

The funding for Tier 1, 2 and 3 roadway and bridge projects comes from several sources. Capacity enhancement or major rehabilitation projects on the regional road network are primarily funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Bridge projects are normally funded through the HBP with the required match funded by the STIP or Toll Credits. Safety projects are funded by the HSIP. The Federal Lands Access Program implements major bridge replacement and road rehabilitation projects for the County. The SHOPP is available to Caltrans to fund non-capacity increasing projects on State Highways.

#### Transit

Funding for transit and transportation planning come from six sources. Over the past few years the largest amount has been from federal 5311F and toll credits, however, funding shortages that have developed during FY 2016/17 have reduced the amount by more than 50%. Beginning in 2017/18 and for the foreseeable future, the largest share will come from LTF, followed by 5311F, STA, 5311, and fares. In 2018/19 there will be a clearer picture of how much funding will be available through 5311 and STA.

#### Non-Motorized (Bicycle and Pedestrian)

Funds for non-motorized projects are available from the ATP, the STIP and local sources. It is important to note that off-road trails, not directly connected to the County road system, cannot be funded with local Road Funds or STIP. The majority of funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities along County Roads and State Highways is anticipated from the STIP, which can be used for projects that are part of the road system using State Highway Account funds. Some projects may be funded by the ATP, but due to the competitive nature of that program, and Trinity County's success to date, this cannot be considered a reliable source. On occasion, non-transportation agencies, such as the Weaverville Basin Trails Committee and the Resource Conservation District obtain grants for recreational trails from the California Department of Recreation, US Forest Service, ATP and other sources. Matches are usually provided with volunteer labor, if allowed by the granting agency.

#### Aviation

Each Airport receives \$10,000 per year in state funding for operations, maintenance and for matching state and federal grant funds. Unused amounts can be carried over to up to three future years, and can, in certain circumstances, be used on other airports. The Federal Aid to Airports (AIP) program provides \$150,000 for each airport in the Federal National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NIPIAS) System that can be programmed for eligible projects. Trinity County currently has only two NIPIAS Airports that can access these funds: Trinity Center and Ruth. However, these funds can be used for runway rehabilitation on non-NIPIAS airports.

## PROJECT COSTS VS. TOTAL REVENUES

The 2016 Trinity County RTP is fiscally constrained through 2036 based on revenue assumptions in this Chapter. **Table 5.3** provides a comparison of total costs and revenues through 2036.

TABLE 5.3 TOTAL PROJECT COST VS. TOTAL REVENUES FOR PROJECTS (NON-O&M)			
Modes	Total Costs	Total Revenues	Capacity (+/-)
Roads/Bridges	\$155,814,000	\$219,569,000	+\$63,755,000
Transit Capital	\$5,550,000	\$9,916,600	+\$4,366,600
Non-Motorized*	\$23,256,000	\$22,149,400	-\$1,106,600
Aviation	\$15,030,000	\$7,000,000	-\$8,030,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$199,650,000</b>	<b>\$258,635,000</b>	<b>+\$58,985,000</b>
Source: Trinity County 2017 *Non-motorized revenues include 2% of LTF, \$2,857,000 of STIP and \$932,000 of FLAP Note: Funds for operations and maintenance are not included in total revenues.			

Overall, the RTP shows total project costs of nearly **\$200 million** for all modes and total revenues of **\$258.6 million** to pay for those costs. This revenue estimate excludes funds typically used for operations and maintenance such as Highway Users Tax, Match Exchange and Forest Receipts for roads and Transit Fares for transit. Road and transit funds cannot generally be used for non-motorized trails or airports, which are showing a deficit. The final numbers will change as projects advance to actual construction stage and actual revenue and cost sources are refined through federal and state budget allocations. The shortage of funds in the Non-Motorized category reflects the unreliability of ATP funding, although this number has been supplemented with STIP, FLAP and LTF funds. The shortage of Aviation funds may be due to the fact that only two of the County's five airports are currently Federally eligible.

## FUNDING STRATEGY

Based on an assessment of local and state needs, the emphasis of this RTP should be on system preservation; repair, rehabilitation and reconstruction of existing roads, rather than on capacity increasing projects. This is consistent with the thinking behind SB 1 and the latest STIP Guidelines. System Preservation funding is available from the STIP and RMRA programs, and can be supplemented with Highway Users Tax, Forest Receipts and Match Exchange funds. Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds can be used to replace and rehabilitate insufficient bridges and the county has always been successful in programming bridge projects. All of these programs are expected to produce reliable sources of funding for the foreseeable future. With SB 1, there is sufficient funding to perform all of the System Preservation projects listed in Appendix 4C, and that will be the emphasis of TCTC's efforts in this RTP cycle.

For the first two years, the County will attend to the numerous storm damage projects from the 2016/2017 storm events, using RMRA to match FEMA, OES and ER funding. Once all of the storm damage repairs are complete, provided there are no new damaging disaster events, RMRA funds will be used on other road rehabilitation projects, primarily pavement rehabilitation and maintenance such as chip sealing, patching and crack sealing. Meanwhile, major road rehabilitation projects will be programmed in the STIP, and FLAP grants will be pursued for rehabilitation of roads that access public lands. HSIP grants will be continuously sought during each cycle to enhance the safety of existing roads with better signage and striping, guardrails

and high-friction surfacing. HBP funding will continue to be programmed for the replacement of structurally deficient bridges.

In addition to highways and roads, the County would attempt to develop multi-modal improvements including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Investment in multi-modal projects provides air quality benefits and will help the County position itself to help reduce VMT and GHG. However, the effectiveness in reducing automobile trips through mode shifting can be somewhat limited in rural areas. Termination of the TE program does not bode well for significant investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the foreseeable future. ATP funds, and other applicable funds, will be pursued for non-motorized facilities, but not all of the non-motorized projects listed in Appendix 4E are likely to be funded. Transit funds are also presently in decline. STIP may be used for transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities but this would have to be weighed against funding limitations and the required trade-offs with road rehabilitation needs.

Aviation funding has also declined, partly because the County now has only two NIPIAS airports, Ruth and Trinity Center, which are eligible for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grants. Previously, there were four federally eligible airports. The strategy is to use State funding to prepare Airport Layout Plans and Pavement Management Plans for all five airports, in order to prioritize the limited funding. FAA funding will be used for runway rehabilitation at all airports, and to bring Ruth Airport up to current standards, and then the County will negotiate with FAA to have Ruth removed from the NIPIAS list and to have Hayfork added in its place. Then, FAA Grants can be used to make the needed improvements to Hayfork Airport. Trinity Center will be kept in NIPIAS status, however, due to its higher usage.

### ***Support Actions to Maximize Limited Funds***

The following actions are recommended to help maximize the use of limited transportation funds, regardless of the specific funding strategy.

- The Pavement Management System should be used to direct STIP and RMRA funds from the State to local road rehabilitation and reconstruction in the most cost-effective manner. This sometimes means high-use roads that are in fair shape may be prioritized over lower use roads that are in poor shape, because fixing roads that are in fair condition costs significantly less per mile than the complete pavement rehabilitation that will be needed on the poorer roads. The TCTC should implement the highest priority projects from the Action Element based on purpose and need, and consistent with the policy direction described in the Policy Element in Section 3. The TCTC should pursue all discretionary and grant-based programs available so that non-road projects such as transit, aviation, bike and pedestrian, can also be implemented to the extent possible.
- The TCTC and County should partner with Caltrans and neighboring Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, wherever possible, to attract additional ITIP and SHOPP projects in the County. Even though the SHOPP is a Caltrans' managed program earmarked for non-capacity increasing projects on the State highway system, local agencies should be encouraged to partner with Caltrans on important SHOPP funded projects that have regional significance.

## **6. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

For the purposes of this assessment, the project is the RTP itself, not the improvements identified in Chapter 4: Action Element of this document. Each improvement listed in the Action Element will have an appropriate environmental analysis conducted to determine potential impacts to the environment prior to implementation.

The environmental assessment of the Trinity County RTP is based on CEQA guidelines for initial studies/negative declarations. All projects listed in this RTP that fall under CEQA's definition of a project will undergo independent environmental review prior to project construction.

The Initial Study/ Negative Declaration for the Trinity County 2016 RTP is provided in Appendix 5. The CEQA document was circulated to state agencies and the public for 30 days, from August 9, 2017 through September 8, 2017. The TCTC adopted the CEQA document and the RTP in a Public Hearing on October 17, 2017.



## 7. REFERENCES

- AMMA Transit Planning; *Trinity County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan*; 2014.
- California Dept of Transportation (Caltrans) Local Development Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR); *Local Development – Intergovernmental Review Program Interim Guidance*; revised November 9, 2016
- California Dept of Transportation (Caltrans) *California Transportation Plan 2040 – Integrating California’s Transportation Future*; June 2016
- California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans); Division of Maintenance Pavement Program; *2015 State of the Pavement Report*; December 2015
- California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans); *Draft 2016 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program* December 2015.
- California Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans) Division of Aeronautics; *2015 Capital Improvement Plan California Aviation System Plan 2016-2025*; August 2015
- California Office of the Governor; *2017-18 Governor’s Budget Summary*; to the California Legislature Regular Session 2017-18; January 10, 2017
- California Rural Counties Task Force; *2015 Rural Counties Pavement Needs Assessment*; February 2015
- California Rural Counties Task Force; *Rural Counties Task Force Local Roads Needs Assessment*; May 28, 2015
- California Rural Counties Task Force; *Performance Monitoring Indicators for Rural and Small Urban Transportation Planning*; September, 2015
- California State Association of Counties (CSAC); *Summary of key SB 1 Provisions of Interest to Counties*; amended on April 3, 2017
- California State Association of Counties (CSAC); *California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment*; 2014 Update
- California Transportation Commission; *2017 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies*; Final Draft adopted January 18, 2017
- California Transportation Commission; *2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines*; adopted August 27, 2015.
- California Transportation Commission; *2010 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines*; Final adopted April 7, 2010
- Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico; *2016 Trinity County Economic and Demographic Profile*
- Fehr & Peers; 2015; *Intersection Control Evaluation State Route 299/ Lance Gulch Road*; May 2015.
- Platinum Advisors; *Legislative Update*; April 4, 2017



Transit Marketing LLC; *Trinity County Short Range Transit Development Plan and Coordinated Plan Update*  
October 2014

Trinity County Transportation Commission; *Trinity County Regional Transportation Plan*; October 2011

Trinity County Transportation Commission; *Trinity County Bikeways Master Plan*; May 2015

The Trinity Journal; *Small Population Decline Forecast for Several Decades*; April 5, 2017.

The Trinity Journal; *County Receives Clean Audit Report*; May 31, 2017.