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Hello! My name is [REDACTED]. I wanted to comment on the roundabout.

At first, I thought it was out of place and should be reserved for larger cities to solve bigger volume traffic issues than Weaverville. I also thought what about the big logging trucks that are headed west? Cumbersome?

Apparently, roundabouts save the city money in power usage that would be incurred from a traffic light, reduce bad emissions by 20%, improve fuel economy due to not stopping and waiting, reduce intersection collisions and keep traffic flowing smoothly. The logging trucks have to lower their speed anyway and a roundabout will be easier than completely stopping.

We should give it some positive consideration and not dismiss it outright.  
https://priceonomics.com/the-case-for-more-traffic-roundabouts/

https://www.theurbanist.org/2014/08/15/roundabouts/
The above links are where I found my info. You may have to copy and paste them into your browser. I am unable to come to the meeting Tuesday.

[REDACTED]
Weaverville, CA
August 17, 2016

Trinity County Dept of Transportation
PO Box 2490
Weaverville CA 96093

RE: Traffic signal or roundabout Public Workshop

I am disabled and cannot attend the workshop, but wanted to indicate that I support a roundabout instead of a traffic signal. The roundabout keeps traffic moving which is important on a highway and main street. It isn't difficult to negotiate, especially if you've done it before. There are several in Humboldt County and they're used frequently in Britain.

A traffic light would necessitate a right turn lane, in my opinion. Otherwise, what is the significant importance for building the spur that now causes the need for a traffic signal or roundabout?

Once construction is completed on Buckhorn Summit of Highway 299 (if it ever is), there will be more traffic coming through Weaverville. It is important to keep traffic moving, and cross-traffic at the intersection in question isn't enough to necessitate a traffic signal. The stop sign, however, has resulted in the backup of 7-12 cars and semi-trucks at busy times, especially due to the long delays/wait time due to construction near Buckhorn Summit.

Weaverville CA 96093
I am emailing your dept as my husband and myself cannot attend the public meeting and we do want to put in our 2 cents worth on the subject of the stop light VS roundabout. There is no public transportation available in the evenings. We are 80 and 81, and do not drive anymore (my contribution to keeping Weaverville safer :)..) and we have some disabilities. Most important of these is that Ben is vision impaired and does walk in town. I have never attempted to cross 299 in that particular area as I regard it highly dangerous for a pedestrian and those in wheelchairs.

We both are 100% in favor of the four way traffic signal. We both are 100% against the roundabout. When I was driving, roundabouts were not pleasant to maneuver. The difference in the cost of the roundabout and the light constitutes a "no brainer" in my book.

I do not want anyone to lose any portion, or all, of their property just to make this project work.

If the roundabout does become the choice, I hope there will be a shaded rest area in the middle as there is no way I will be able to get across 299 in one try! :) Sometimes we need to get from Nugget Lane to CVS, et al., or the reverse.

Thanks for listening.

--

Happy trails! :)}
August 16, 2016

File No.: 078.A08170

County of Trinity
Attn: Jan. Smith, Environmental Compliance Specialist
31301 State Highway 3
Weaverville, CA 96093

Dear Ms. Smith:

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) has reviewed the proposed Weaverville Roundabout project proposals and respectfully submit the following comments regarding this project:

1. The alternatives will require the CHP and Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to lose 3-5 public parking spaces. On average, 180 customers visit the DMV and CHP offices on a daily basis. Some of the DMV customers are towing trailers that require inspection and take up more than one parking space. Losing any parking spaces will severely limit the level of service the DMV and CHP can provide to the members of the public.

2. This option poses limitations to CHP’s ability to respond to emergency calls, as the only egress from the Commander’s parking space will require the emergency vehicles to make a right turn from the DMV parking lot and then U-turn into oncoming traffic. Additionally, on-coming traffic approaches from a blind corner on northbound State Route (SR) 299.

3. The DMV traffic will be required to exit the parking lot by making a forced right turn. The only option for exiting vehicles to head southbound is to make a u-turn into oncoming traffic approaching from a blind corner or to make a left turn into a shopping center parking lot and then exit right onto the northbound lane of SR 299.

4. The entrance into the DMV/CHP parking lot will be removed and visitors will be forced to enter through another business’s parking lot. This requires a sharp, right turn, which will restrict truck/trailer visitors from entering into the parking lot because of the tight turn radius and limited maneuverability.
5. The alternatives will remove the existing DMV Vehicle Information Number (VIN) and CHP truck inspection lane. The alternatives do not provide any space for this to be conducted in the DMV/CHP parking lot. These are critical services that are performed daily.

6. The alternatives also call for a sidewalk, which will encroach onto the side of CHP’s secured yard creating a security issue. Because of the grade of the adjacent road and proposed sidewalk, the windows of the CHP office would be vulnerable to projectile attacks. This poses a safety and security risk for the CHP personnel. The CHP is not agreeable to release any more of its property to this project.

While the CHP supports the use of roundabouts as they typically increase pedestrian safety and decrease traffic collisions, because the CHP is an essential services agency, the Department does not cannot support the roundabout alternatives proposed for this location.

The CHP would however support a four-way traffic signal at this intersection. A four-way traffic signal with an emergency vehicle preemption system that would allow the CHP to respond to code-3 calls for service almost immediately. This option would also maintain the entrance to the DMV/CHP office and not affect the VIN/truck inspection lane, which allows essential services to be provided by the DMV and CHP. Additionally, having a four-way traffic signal will allow traffic exiting traffic the DMV/CHP parking lot to exit either to the north or south instead of making an unsafe U-turn as proposed in the roundabout alternatives.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at (530) 623-3832.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

R. D. HAM, Lieutenant
Commander
Trinity River Area

cc: Jan Mayer, CalTrans
Facilities Section
From: VaLynn Crafford  
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:05 AM  
To: Jan Smith  
Subject: Call in "Comment"

I requested I take down his comment and forward it to the person in charge (he missed the meeting). He is a disabled vet who uses the crosswalk often (as well as people he knows who use wheel chairs there), and witnesses many vehicles running the stop sign. His “vote” is for no signal nor roundabout – instead install cameras (which will also capture drug runners).

VaLynn Crafford  
Trinity County Department of Transportation  
(530) 623-1365  
vcrafford@trinitycounty.org
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)
From: (home town - optional)
Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

Weaverville

I prefer a:  □ Roundabout  □ Traffic Signal  □ NO TRAFFIC LIGHT  □ I am requesting translated material

Comments:  □ continued on reverse

You could leave us small towns people alone.  We live here for a reason.

You will.  Don't think you won't.  Both should be.

[Handwritten note: You could leave us small towns people alone.  We live here for a reason.]

[Handwritten note: You will.  Don't think you won't.  Both should be.]

[Handwritten note: Prefer 4 way stop or Traffic light.]

[Handwritten note: No - Roundabout!]

[Handwritten note: Other]
Roundabout Workshop  
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)  From: (home town - optional)  Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

I prefer a:  ☐ Roundabout  ☐ Traffic Signal  ☐ I am requesting translated material

Comments:  ☑ continued on reverse
(backside blank)

DESTROYS FAMILY BUSINESSES, WASTES OF MONEY.
MONEY COULD BE USED FOR OTHER RESOURCES.
SKATE PARK, MORE LEO, DRUG PREVENTION.

causes complications with the Businesses on Nugget Ln
for A roundabout.
My Business will be destroyed and will have to
relocate or close down.
Stoddard Satellite Radio Shack
I have had more than 1 near miss when crossing streets in roundabout in Brentwood CA. People do not observe right of way.

I feel a roundabout would bring an important gateway and unique element to our beautiful town.
I had seen my first roundabout at home. First time scary, now I'm a big fan. Something that folks might come to Weaverville to see and show their young drivers.
What is the accident rate for 4-way traffic
controlled signals vs roundabouts for similar
traffic?
Comments:  

Just does not work for our community. Lights will work for us. Cost for county not justifiable for roundabout.
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)  From: (home town - optional)  Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

I prefer a:  Roundabout  Traffic Signal  I am requesting translated material

Comments:  continued on reverse

Will not leave it as is?
The stop sign seems to work just fine.
Save the money or use it for more worth while projects.
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)  From: (home town - optional)  Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

I prefer a:  □ Roundabout  ☒ Traffic Signal  □ I am requesting translated material

Comments:  □ continued on reverse

No Roundabout - Cause Traffic issues
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional) From: (home town - optional) Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

Traffic Signal

Comments: □ continued on reverse

Roundabout would be stupid for this area. It would cause a lot of accidents because people don't know how to use them. That bypass road was unnecessary. Too bad and should not have been built. I hope a 4-way stop is installed and not a roundabout.

Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional) From: (home town - optional) Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

Traffic Signal

Comments: □ continued on reverse

Roundabout would be awful & expensive.
As a 7-year U威尔 resident, daily user of the Glen/Lance Gulch intersection, and starting a new family in U威尔, I urge the County to pursue a roundabout. I want to raise my family in a beautiful, safe, and functional community. A roundabout contributes to all those factors, a signal achieves none of those conditions.

The short-term costs of a roundabout are far outweighed by the near and long-term benefits.
- While I respect new constraints for local businesses, the impacts can be largely mitigated. Shipping trucks having to back up is not a significant impact when compared with societal benefits.

- I've lived in two towns as they've had their first roundabouts installed. In both instances, local opposition was substantial. People, especially elders, dislike change. However, in both instances the community quickly embraced the roundabout once they experienced it.

- The existing businesses are of marginal benefit to the community. The roundabout would have substantial community benefits for generations to come.
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)  From: (home town - optional)  Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

I prefer a:  Roundabout  ALT. #2  Traffic Signal  I am requesting translated material

Comments:  continued on reverse

Stick with the safety and congestion facts; roundabout alternative 2 is the best choice.

Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional)  From: (home town - optional)  Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

I prefer a:  Roundabout  Traffic Signal  I am requesting translated material

Comments:  continued on reverse

Do not want Roundabout.
The benefits out weigh the losses. Please put it in.
I prefer a: □ Roundabout  □ Traffic Signal  □ I am requesting translated material

Comments: □ continued on reverse

Impact on businesses & money being spent is a waste.

I think this may be a moot point. But I am in favor of a traffic signal due to its simplicity, cost & the safety aspect (or lack thereof) at this intersection may be overstated.
I just want there to be as much safety for our police officers as for our pedestrians. If our C.H.P. officers need to get out of the parking lot, they should have a kill switch to stop traffic so that they can respond to the emergency A.S.A.P.
Roundabout Workshop
August 23, 2016

Name: (optional) From: (home town - optional) Email (if you want to be on our contact list)

Weaverville

I prefer a: □ Roundabout □ Traffic Signal □ I am requesting translated material

Comments: □ continued on reverse

Thank you Rick & Bryan, for your patience & good humor! Thanks for explaining these projects clearly to this very rude group.
An open mind could find many new concepts.

Safety First - chance of fatality is reduced by 90% for a round about vs. stop signal

Quality of life - I do not live in this small mountain community. To sit at a stop light and store at a strip mall every

corning

Setting the community vibe - People tend to speed up at traffic signals to "beat the yellow." Roundabouts force people to slow down before entering the community.
Demand right like the one going into Reading, we don't want to waste $ on a Roundabout.
Roundabout Workshop  
Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT)  
Tuesday, August 23, 2016  
Meeting 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm

5:30 pm – 6:00 pm Informal individual review of displays with TCDOT project team  
6:00 pm – 7:00 pm Presentation, two films  
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm Questions and comments from the public

Approximately 60 people from the public in attendance

County staff:  
Richard Tippett, Director of Transportation, TCDOT  
Andrew Pence, Senior Engineer, TCDOT  
Janice Smith, Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist, TCDOT  
Leslie Hubbard, Environmental Compliance Specialist, TCDOT

Consultants:  
Brian Ray, Senior Principal Engineer, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.  
Lindsay Kantor, Environmental Planner, ENPLAN

Comments and Questions from the Public: (Speakers were not required to identify themselves. The following is not intended to be an exact dialogue between the public and TCDOT project team, but a summary of the main points that were exchanged.)

1: A citizen poll was conducted at the County Fair. Approximately 90 people were against the roundabout and wanted a 2-way stop. There were 4 people for the roundabout, 2 for a stoplight, and 2 for the 4-way stop. (actual poll with actual numbers was presented later and is included with the comment cards).

2: The 4-way stop now backs up traffic across from the Ace Hardware driveway. Vehicles can’t get out safely; have to wait a long time. We should just have a 2-way stop like the other intersections in town.  
Brian Ray responded: Suggest checking out the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672. It’s an informational guide about roundabouts. It’s available online and discusses everything about roundabouts.

3: An extra exit and entrance on Nugget Lane is important for occasional higher volume traffic associated with the bowling alley on Nugget Lane. In-only access to Nugget Lane will affect businesses on Nugget Lane such as Radio Shack, carpet store, physical therapy, and the pharmacy. Affects approximately 20 employees in all. I like the possible tie-in of Nugget Lane to Fairway Drive.

4: People brake when they see a CHP or a CHP sign. If people brake entering the roundabout because they see the CHP sign, that could be an impact that should be addressed in the environmental document. If there is a stop sign or a traffic light, people will stop, and look around and see the businesses. Better for businesses.  
Brian Ray responded: If people brake when they see a CHP car or sign going in to a roundabout, they will do the same thing at a traffic signal.
5: You said the speed at a traffic signal is higher than a roundabout. Why? Why not just move the 30 MPH sign down to Martin Road, slow people down that way. Moving some signs is a lot cheaper than putting in a roundabout.

Rick Tippett responded: Speed limit signs don’t really slow people down. You have to slow down for a roundabout because it is in the road and you have to navigate it.

Brian Ray responded: People don’t slow down at a traffic signal when they see a green light. With a roundabout, people slow down when the sight distance is limited because of the bump in the middle of the roundabout.

6: If a roundabout is safer, does that make it easier to access the businesses?

Brian Ray responded: There are two separate issues: A roundabout is safer because vehicles drive slower, and because there are fewer points of conflict. Driving slower makes it easier to see the businesses. However, failure to yield crashes do occur in a roundabout.

7: For pedestrians, is it easier to cross at a roundabout?

Brian Ray responded: The plan for the signalized intersection has crosswalks on only three of the four legs. The roundabout has them on all four legs. You only have to cross 1 lane, with traffic coming from only one direction, then wait in the splitter island, then cross the other lane. Vehicles are slower.

8: What if a handicapped person is crossing the street and someone runs a red light?

Brian Ray responded: For safety, a roundabout is a “slam-dunk”. It also changes your mind-set coming into town. You feel you have arrived in a new place. A lot of places like to put them at both ends of a town to make motorists feel they are in a town now.

9: In your presentation, you said the possible connection of Nugget Lane onto Fairway Drive was not significant. Some of us feel it is very significant. The majority of Glen Road traffic goes to and from Nugget Lane.

Brian Ray responded: What I said was, that was just an idea. We are not sure it would work, and therefore, we should not focus on it at this stage of the project.

10: It would create a “spaghetti bowl” at the three way intersection of Nugget Lane, Fairway Drive, and Glen Road, near Coast Central Credit Union.

11: Would eastbound and westbound vehicles [traveling on SR 299] have safe access to/from the CHP/DMV property?

Brian Ray responded: Yes, you can make a right turn in from the east, or from the west you could go around the roundabout and make a right turn in. Coming out of the DMV is the problem. As drawn, you could not make a left turn out of there. But we can shorten the splitter island on SR 299 so a left turn out could be allowed.

12: Radio Shack gets deliveries from the biggest FedEx trucks, full size tractor-trailers. Also the carpet store has large truck deliveries. If you close one end of Nugget Lane, and they can’t turn around, how will they be handled?

Brian Ray responded: That is something that would have to be resolved.

Rick Tippett responded: The carpet store could be a problem. There will be a driveway from 299 to Nugget Lane mid-block, across from Burger King, but trucks at the carpet store or Radio Shack may have to back up.
12, cont.: We bought the Radio Shack and then we just found out about this only 3 weeks ago when the County people came to talk to us. The project will be determined by the end of the year. This does not show sensitivity towards business owners on Nugget Lane.

Brian Ray responded: The County wanted to look at alternatives and work out as many details as possible, before talking to you.

13: So, the traffic signal wouldn’t cost the County anything?
Rick Tippett responded: We have the money for the signal already programmed and available. The roundabout will cost more, about $2 to $3 million. But accidents cost money. Signalized intersections have bad, expensive accidents. There is a long-term, life-time social cost. And signals cost more to maintain. This is why we have some money from the Highway Safety Program.

14: Any safety improvement is good. The roundabout would improve safety at that one intersection, but what does it do for the other intersections in town? Merging onto SR 299 from collector streets poses a challenge due to the amount of steady traffic on SR 299. There are more accidents now at the Washington Street and SR 3 intersections with SR 299. There is more traffic now. I think we need traffic signals at all of the intersections.

Brian Ray responded: Neither a roundabout nor a signal will address needs at other intersections. The new Connector Road is a benefit that takes traffic away from those intersections. A signal stops traffic, but there is a lot going on between this intersection and the one at Washington Street. A lot of cars coming in between there, so there would not be much benefit to Washington Street from a signal at Glen Road.

15: Who maintains the landscaping in the middle of the roundabout? What about snow removal?
Brian Ray responded: Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, Colorado, Alaska, Maryland, and Truckee all have a lot of snow and a lot of roundabouts. Snow removal is not a problem, but sometimes snow storage is. If there is a lot of snow they have to move it and put it someplace else.

Rick Tippett responded: Regarding maintenance, Caltrans would plow, but maintenance of the center would be the County’s responsibility. We could ask the Garden Club to maintain landscaping (some in audience object). If not, we could use hardscape, concrete or rock, or low water use, low maintenance landscaping. It will be a gateway. We could put in a statue, a Welcome to Weaverville sign, it is up to us.

16: Where would the money come from?
Rick Tippett responded: Caltrans is contributing $600,000 to the roundabout. We have a Highway Safety Program grant for another $500,000 or so. We have some STIP money left from Lance Gulch Road that we can use. We are meeting with Caltrans to see if we can get more. STIP funds are made available to counties to spend on particular highways or local roads that qualify, but it has to be spent on roads. They can’t be spent on the Hospital, for example. You probably remember propositions at the ballot over the years. Gas tax is for roads only. Projects in the STIP are selected from the County’s Regional Transportation Plan which is prepared every 5 years. For example, once Lance Gulch is done, we have Wildwood Road programmed. There will probably be a match to the Federal Funds, 11.43%. The County will have to put in $200,000 to $300,000 of our Road Funds as a match.

17: Is the truck apron associated with the roundabout typical? Usable for trucks?
Brian Ray responded: Yes, the trailers are supposed to go up on the truck apron, especially the larger trucks. That is how it is designed.
18: Earlier you said moving the speed signs out won’t work. I used to be CHP. You must have never been stopped by my guys. I question your statistics.
Brian Ray responded: Changing a traffic control device won’t work without enforcement. You were good enforcement, and that is what is needed.

19: Can the CHP express our opposition to the roundabout? CHP in Weaverville can’t lose any more property. The Department cannot support a roundabout at this location. There is not enough room for it.
Brian Ray responded: We are not going to take any property from CHP. We are not taking anything away from the DMV parking lot, but the access could be affected, but we can probably get that to work.
19, cont.: Our driveway entrance to SR 299 was already moved. Will we still be able to use it with the roundabout?
Brian Ray responded: You will be able to make a right turn out. We think we can shorten the splitter island to allow a left turn out, as well. We are looking at that.
19, cont.: The DMV and CHP vehicle inspection station will be lost. This is an impact to our property. Trucks park on the highway to be inspected. The roundabout will block that off. There is no other place for trucks to park for inspections.
Brian Ray responded: We are not taking away from the parking lot. That area is on the highway. That is one of the things we need to work out.

20: The project will cost $2 to $3 million and take the Stoddard building. Why can’t you move the roundabout over to the vacant lot across the street?
Brian Ray responded: We would have to realign and rebuild a lot of SR 299. It would cost too much.
20, cont.: You are already wasting $2 million anyway.
Brian Ray responded: It would cost two to three times as much to move the highway. It would not be feasible.
Many people: then put in the traffic light!

21: The Mini Mart, nail salon, Radio Shack, Duane’s building all separate property owners, building owners and business owners. The property is owned by Glen Mitchell’s land trust, then there is the building and three businesses. What about future development? Ricky at the Weaverville Market wants to put in a gas station. What would you do, eminent domain?
Rick Tippett responded: Not eminent domain. We have to go by the Relocation Act. We appraise the building, the property, the business, negotiate with the owners and come to a resolution. We compensate for physical loss and what we call “goodwill”. If there is enough land left, the owner could take the money for the building and build a smaller building on there.
21, cont.: Where does that money come from?
Rick Tippett responded: Roundabout construction is only $1.2 to $1.5 million. The rest of the $2 to $3 million is for right-of-way and utility relocation.
21, cont.: No eminent domain? What if I don’t want to sell?
Rick Tippett responded: The Board of Supervisors decides. You can hire your own appraiser. If we can’t reach an agreement, the Board decides. If it is for the good of the community, they would do eminent domain.
20, cont.: Who makes the final decision?
Rick Tippett responded: The Board of Supervisors. This is a public workshop so you can ask questions because the Board does not have time for all these questions. You can talk to your Board member or write a letter.
22: The contract amendment for Quincy was for $400,000. How much has been spent between the Intersection Control Evaluation and where we are now?
Jan Smith responded: To get to the decision point this fall will take about $153,000. The remainder of the $400,000 will take us all the way through final design.

23: I have some facts from a group of people who couldn’t be here. According to CHP, there was only one accident this year at this intersection, which is very low. The Insurance Journal did a collision study. It says an intersection that had 7-8 crashes a year without a roundabout and had 45 crashes a year after a roundabout was installed. Another one went from 9 crashes to 38. There are more crashes due to more points of mergers in a roundabout.
Brian Ray responded: Are these single-lane or double-lane roundabouts? You can’t compare the two.
23, cont.: Single lane roundabouts are worse due to more mergers. More bicycle accidents too. Merging is stressful, and we have log trucks here. Traffic signals have fewer accidents. Spending $2 to $3 million is not fiscally sound in a County with severe budget restrictions.

24: How do Brian Ray’s profits change with this decision, and where do you live, Brian?
Rick Tippett responded: The Board recommended hiring an expert so we can make this decision. Once we decide, he is no longer employed by us.
24, cont.: And where do you live?
Rick Tippett responded: Redding
24, cont.: Seems like all the people who want the roundabout don’t live here.

25: I live on Glen Road. I ride a bicycle. I use that intersection 2 times a day or more. If there are 90% less accidents with a roundabout it is worth $2 to $3 million. I did some research on roundabouts. I agree with all that Brian has said in his presentation.

26: I also live on Glen Road and I disagree with what Brian says. I don’t see a problem with the intersection now.

27: I appreciate the Road Department and Board of Supervisors having investigated this option for those of us who don’t want a traffic light. How many people die at traffic signals per year?
Brian Ray responded: 3,000 to 7,000.

28: National Transportation Safety Board says 750. A roundabout may not be appropriate for this town. How much does it cost to maintain a signal per year?
Rick Tippett responded: An LED bulb will last 7-10 years and cost $150 to $300 per bulb. About $10,000 per year for the power.
28 cont.: I’m not good at math, but it would take a lot of years to make up for the cost of the roundabout.
Rick Tippett responded: Maintenance savings won’t pay for the capital costs of the roundabout. Savings is in accidents.

29: I thought there had been talk of other traffic calming measures. A welcome sign, etc. Will there be any other traffic calming measures or are we relying on the roundabout?
Rick Tippett responded: There are many different traffic calming methods. They all work independently. We did some on the west side of Weaverville; curb bulbouts, landscaping, etc. Another roundabout on the west side at the bottom of the grade would change driver’s behavior. They would stay at the same speed rather than speeding up when they come into town.
29, cont.: I have a bad vision of people coming down that grade on Oregon Street and running into a roundabout!

30: Would this money be coming into our community if we didn’t build the roundabout?
Rick Tippett responded: No. This money is just for this project.

31: I come from Petaluma. They keep putting roundabouts in. It’s excellent. These roundabouts have had positive results, such as slowing traffic speeds but not causing vehicles to come to a stop.

32: I have lived in two communities going through their first roundabout. Generally people are opposed at first, but then they are happy with them once they are installed. Is there any research on that phenomenon?
Brian Ray responded: There are articles by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Commonly there is strong negative reaction, and after installation, very positive reaction. There are a lot of published studies of before and after.

33: Presented a copy of the poll taken at the fair. Most people wanted a two-way stop. (results included with comment cards). One County supervisor wanted a roundabout, one wanted a signal, and one walked by but did not participate.

34: I heard some communities are removing roundabouts.
Brian Ray responded: They are mostly older and poorly designed. Some are too big. Some are going from multi-lane to single-lane.
Rick Tippett responded: Modern roundabouts are not like the ones back east. In 1995 to 1999, modern guidelines for roundabouts were established. There are a couple hundred in California, and only one fatality. In Truckee a bicyclist fell into traffic.

35: How many times have people put $2 to $3 million into a roundabout and then taken it out? The Supervisors don’t listen when we tell them we don’t want something, like Lance Gulch Road, they do it anyway.

36: Roundabouts are statistically safer, but our other intersections will have to be dealt with sooner or later. Will we have three roundabouts? Or traffic signals? The Board says “no traffic signals no matter what, because it is Trinity County.”
Brian Ray responded: Roundabouts can work in a series.
Rick Tippett responded: Highway 20, past Clearlake, has a roundabout now. It used to be a 10 minute wait at an all-way stop.

37: Why are there no Board members here, or someone who is pro-signal, to provide a professional opinion?
Brian Ray responded: I have tried to be objective and candid. I suspect that another civil engineer would probably agree with me that a roundabout is a good option in this setting.

38: When the bypass goes in will the roundabout work better or worse?
Rick Tippett responded: There is no bypass on the radar. It is not happening, not in my career or probably my lifetime.
Jan Smith responded: At this point, if a bypass was proposed, it would be Caltrans. It is not in their long range plan or the County’s Regional Transportation Plan. Besides, there is no money for it.
39: Demographics are important. Weaverville is an aging community. The eastside of Weaverville could avoid the roundabout but the westside could not. Need to consider people who want to drive as long as possible.

40: What are the maintenance costs associated with a roundabout? What about snow removal, and maintaining the plants in the middle?
Brian Ray responded: You will have to maintain the lighting. Snow is a unique issue, it depends on how much you get. Also, pavement markings and landscaping must be maintained, and sometimes the big trucks drive on the curb and break it up. But maintenance is relatively little. Maintaining a traffic signal is more. You have to maintain the timing, the power and equipment, as well as the bulbs.

41: You mentioned lighting. Would the lighting shine into motorist’s faces?
Brian Ray responded: Of course not. The lighting would shine from above, like streetlights, at conflict points, the splitter island, etc.

42: If you do a signal, you could put in a camera and make money. It could have face recognition. They should have those in the National Forest, too.

43: Roundabouts I have seen in other communities have tall, solid structures that visually obstruct views across the roundabout. I would rather see what is coming. Why do they do this?
Brian Ray responded: They want to restrict site distance across the roundabout. When approaching, first you see the pedestrian in the crosswalk, then the yield line as you enter, then just the conflicts coming from the left, upstream. You see one conflict at a time. It is called “terminal vista”. It brings your vision up to the short distance. It makes you pay attention.

44: I have seen roundabouts with a plethora of signage. Too much information, bad for the view shed.
Brian Ray responded: They used to over-sign roundabouts. New NHRP and MUTCD Guidelines now reduce the required signs. You start with the minimum number of signs, then add more only if necessary.