

TRINITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PROJECT NAME: Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project

REPORT BY: Janice Smith, Sr. Environmental Compliance Specialist

APPLICANT: Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT)

PROJECT NUMBER: PW-16-06

LOCATION: Intersection of State Highway 299, Lance Gulch Road and Glen Road in eastern Weaverville. Caltrans and County right-of-way.

PROJECT SITE INFORMATION:

The potentially affected parcels surrounding the project include:

APN	Orientation to Intersection (NE, SE, NW, or SW + Nugget Lane)	Current Business Occupant	General Plan Land Use	Zoning	Alternatives*
024-480-3100	NW	Weaverville Market	Commercial	General Commercial (C-2)	1, 2
024-500-5100	NE	Trinity River Lumber Mill office	Commercial	C-2	Not directly affected
024-500-5200	NE	Hair salon, et al.	Commercial	C-2	Not directly affected
024-500-5300	NE	Coldwell Banker Real Estate	Commercial	C-2	Not directly affected
024-500-5700	NE	CHP/DMV	Commercial	C-2	1, 2
024-500-7100	SE	Vacant	Commercial, County Right-of-Way	C-2, County Right-of-Way	1, 2
024-500-6500	SE	CVS Pharmacy	Commercial	C-2	1, 2
024-500-4000	SW + Nugget Lane	U.S. Nails, Radio Shack, office space	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-5000	SW + Nugget Lane	The Floor Store, et al.	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-0500	SW + Nugget Lane	Owens Pharmacy	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-0600	SW + Nugget Lane	Trinity Lanes	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-6400	SW + Nugget Lane	Marino's Pizza House	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-5600	SW + Nugget Lane	Organic Juice Garden	Commercial	C-2	1, 2; Sub-Alts B, C
024-500-5500	SW + Nugget Lane	Beckett's Trails End Steakhouse	Commercial	C-2	Sub-Alt A
024-500-1000	SW + Nugget Lane	Round Table Pizza	Commercial	C-2	Sub-Alt A
024-610-2900	SW + Nugget Lane	Vacant land	Commercial	Highway Commercial (HC)	2

Project Description:

The Trinity County Department of Transportation (TCDOT) is proposing to construct a roundabout at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road, Glen Road and State Route (SR) 299. Additionally, a new opening to Nugget Lane would be constructed across from the Trinity Plaza Shopping Center. This intersection is located at the eastern end of Weaverville and serves as the southern terminus of Lance Gulch Road, the recently constructed arterial route between SR 299 and SR 3. This intersection also serves residents on Glen Road and businesses on Nugget Lane.

There are two alternative roundabout designs, and three alternative locations for the new opening to Nugget Lane. See the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) Figures 3, 4 and 5 for details on these two alternatives and three “sub-alternatives”. The intersection of Lance Gulch Road and SR 299 was originally planned for, programmed, and approved as a signalized intersection as part of the East Connector Roadway Project (now known as Lance Gulch Road). Therefore, the signalized intersection is considered the “no project” alternative. If the Planning Commission, and ultimately the Board of Supervisors, chooses not to approve any of the roundabout alternatives, the signalized intersection will be constructed as originally planned for in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the East Connector Roadway Project.

Background:

To alleviate congestion through Weaverville, the East Connector Roadway Project was approved by Board of Supervisors in 2003, based on the EIR. The project entailed construction of Lance Gulch Road, a 1.3-mile two-lane, undivided, limited-access arterial road along the east side of Weaverville, that connects SR 299 across from Glen Road, to SR 3 across from Five Cent Gulch Street in northern Weaverville. In addition to the arterial road, the project included bridge crossings, an extension of Pioneer Lane to connect with Martin Road, pedestrian/bicycle facilities, and a new traffic signal at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road and SR 299. At the time, the existing intersection of Glen Road and SR 299 had only turn lanes and stop signs on Glen Road (the minor approach of a 3-way intersection). Since the construction of Lance Gulch Road, traffic at the intersection has been controlled by 4-way stop signs. This method of traffic control is an interim solution before a permanent traffic control device is installed. Caltrans is not willing to let the 4-way stop signs remain permanently. A two-way stop intersection, with stop signs only on Glen Road and Lance Gulch Road, is not acceptable to Caltrans or the County, because numerous studies have consistently determined that the resulting Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection would violate the standards in the Circulation Element of the Trinity County General Plan.

Subsequent to project approval, TCDOT is considering a roundabout intersection as an alternative to the signalized intersection, which has not yet been constructed. The signalized intersection was a point of controversy within the community during preparation of the East Connector Roadway Project EIR. The purpose of the proposed project is to construct a roundabout in support of Lance Gulch Road that would facilitate better circulation and traffic flow than a signalized intersection, conform to the rural aesthetics of the community, and increase vehicular and pedestrian safety. A public workshop was held on August 23, 2016, to present the alternatives to the public and to answer questions and respond to comments. Minutes of the workshop and comments received were included in Appendix B of the IS/MND.

Environmental Scoping and Comments:

ENPLAN and TCDOT staff prepared the IS/MND. The IS/MND was filed with the State Clearinghouse for distribution to State agencies on September 29, 2016. All interested local and federal agencies, local emergency service agencies, people who signed in at the August 23, 2016 Public Workshop, and other interested parties received a copy of the IS/MND, or a notice telling them where the document was

available just before or on October 3, 2016. The IS/MND was posted on the County's web site and made available at the Weaverville Public Library and transportation and planning offices. The public review period began on October 3, 2016, and ended on November 2, 2016. A Notice of Availability and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted in the office of the County Clerk on September 29, 2016, and published in the Trinity Journal on September 28, 2016 and October 5, 2016. Circulation documents are included in Exhibit A. The IS/MND was sent to the Planning Commission on September 28, 2016.

No comments were received by the State Clearinghouse. Twenty-one comments were received from the public by email or mail by the close of the comment period. Most of the comments simply expressed opinions and preferences for a particular alternative or intersection design. Some comments were regarding the impacts on local businesses at the intersection. Two comments raised concerns about the adequacy and impartiality of the environmental analysis. The comments and responses are attached in Exhibit B.

The major issues that were discussed in the IS/MND included impacts on the businesses near the intersection. Although technically not considered an environmental impact under CEQA, impacts on businesses are an important consideration in the County's decision. These types of impacts were discussed in Chapter IV. *Community Impacts* in the IS/MND, and in the public comment letters and Public Workshop comments and minutes presented in Appendix B of the IS/MND. The roundabout would have impacts on adjacent businesses, ranging from more difficult access and loss of parking to complete removal of a building housing the Radio Shack and U.S. Nails. Access from the Weaverville Market to Glen Road would change, precluding their plans to add a gas station at the store. The access to the DMV would also change, eliminating an area in Caltrans right-of-way that they use for truck inspections. Various businesses on Nugget Lane would lose some parking spaces on the highway side of Nugget Lane that are actually in Caltrans right-of-way. Access to south Nugget Lane to and from Glen Road would be eliminated, so through traffic along Nugget Lane would no longer be possible, making it especially difficult for delivery trucks. The additional entrance to Nugget Lane from Highway 299 (sub-alternative A, B, or C shown in Figure 5 of the IS/MND) reduces this impact, but does not eliminate it completely for businesses close to Glen Road. This impact would vary depending on which sub-alternative access point is selected.

Other potential impacts that were discussed and mitigated included impacts on nesting migratory birds; unexpected cultural resources; potential for encountering lead paint or asbestos during demolition of buildings, signs and roadway pavement; temporary noise during construction and temporary and permanent impacts on emergency response. All of these potential impacts were determined not to be significant, or were reduced to less-than-significant levels by mitigation measures. See the IS/MND for a detailed environmental analysis.

Project Costs:

Although also not an environmental impact under CEQA, project costs are a concern that should be considered, especially by the Board of Supervisors. We are including cost information in this staff report to inform the Commission, as the subject will inevitably come up in the discussion.

Costs of constructing a roundabout alternative will total approximately \$2.5 to \$3 million dollars, depending on alternative. This includes approximately ½ million for right-of-way, another ½ million for utility relocation and \$1.5 to \$2 million for construction. There is about \$400,000 remaining in funding already allocated to the Phase 2 Lance Gulch Project. Caltrans has offered to pay \$600,000 towards construction costs. The County has obtained a Highway Safety Improvement Program grant in the amount of \$2.3 million for right-of-way and construction costs. Total funding is \$3.3 million, covering the

maximum construction costs. However, the County may have to pay the \$500,000 for utility relocation with County Road Funds, because utilities were already relocated once for the Lance Gulch Road project.

If the “no project” alternative is selected, there will be adequate funds remaining in allocation for the Phase 2 Lance Gulch Road Project to install the traffic signal as originally programmed.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program:

After the comment period, ENPLAN prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the County. The MMRP is included as Exhibit C.

Role of the Planning Commission:

Normally, the Planning Commission can adopt an IS/MND for a project that does not involve a rezone or General Plan amendment. However, due to the controversy surrounding this project, and the Board of Supervisor’s long-standing involvement in this project, the final decision on whether to approve the roundabout or revert to the traffic signal will be made by the Board of Supervisors.

The Planning Commission’s role is to review the IS/MND, hear any public comments at today’s public hearing, and then make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, including the following:

- A recommendation as to whether the IS/MND has been completed in compliance with CEQA,
- A recommendation regarding selection of an appropriate project alternative (the “proposed project” or the “no project” alternative), and
- A recommendation regarding adoption of the MMRP.

The Board of Supervisors will consider all information in the record, including the Planning Commission’s recommendations, then make formal findings and determinations as required by CEQA.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission:

A. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration finding that, on the basis of the whole record including the initial study, comments received, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment and that a mitigated negative declaration reflects the Board's independent judgment and analysis.

B. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors select Alternative 2 and sub-alternative B, as described in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, finding that the long-term safety and operational benefits outweigh the impacts on local businesses.

C. Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as identified in Exhibit C of this Report.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jan Smith, Sr. Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Department of Transportation

EXHIBIT A
CEQA CIRCULATION DOCUMENTS

Affidavit of Publication

TRINITY COUNTY DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

No.

Attention: Jan Smith
T.C. Transportation Commission
P.O. Box 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION OF
Notice of Public Meeting
Roundabout Negative Declaration
BY TRINITY JOURNAL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SS.
COUNTY OF TRINITY

Wayne R. Agner of the said County, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years and that he is not a party to, nor interested in the above entitled matter;

That he is the publisher of The Trinity Journal, a newspaper of general circulation published in the Town of Weaverville, County of Trinity, and which newspaper at all times herein mentioned had and still has a bona fide subscription list of paying subscribers, and which newspaper has been established, printed and published at regular intervals in the said Town of Weaverville, County of Trinity, for a period exceeding one year next preceding the date of publication of the notice hereinafter referred to; and which newspaper is not devoted to nor published for the interests, entertainment or instruction of a particular class, profession, trade, calling, race, or denomination, or any number of same; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

September 28, October 5, 2016

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Weaverville, California, on the 5th day of October, 2016.

Wayne R. Agner
WAYNE R. AGNER
Publisher

NOTICE OF ROUNDABOUT

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

An Environmental Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project which entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road and State Route (SR) 299. Additionally, a new opening to Nugget Lane from SR 299 would be constructed. The intersection was originally planned as a signalized intersection as part of the East Connector Roadway Project, and the signalized intersection remains the "no project alternative". Work is expected to commence as early as summer 2017.

The review period to submit written comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration begins on October 3, 2016 and ends on November 2, 2016. The Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration may be viewed on the internet at:

http://www.trinitycounty.org/index.aspx?page=82, or at the following locations:

- Trinity County Library, 351 Main Street, Weaverville
Trinity County Planning Department at 61 Airport Road, Weaverville
Trinity County Department of Transportation at 31301 State Highway 3, Weaverville

Comments may be sent to Janice Smith at the Trinity County Department of Transportation, PO Box 2490, Weaverville, CA 96093 (530) 623-1365, or via email to jsmith@trinitycounty.org.

Public Hearings on the project will be held by the Trinity County Planning Commission on November 10, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., and by the Board of Supervisors on December 20, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard. Hearings will take place at the Trinity County Library meeting room, 351 Main Street in Weaverville. Anyone desiring to make a statement may do so, either in writing or in person.

NOTE: If you challenge the action or proposed action in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearings described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing. (Comments delivered to the address above during the comment period shall be delivered to the Planning Commission.) Sept. 28, Oct 5, 2016



TRINITY COUNTY

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

P.O. BOX 2490, WEAVERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 96093

PHONE (530) 623-1365

FAX (530) 623-5312

Email: tcdot@trinitycounty.org

September 27, 2016

**Subject: Notice of Availability and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration:
Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project, Weaverville,
CA**

To Whom It May Concern:

This notice is to advise interested parties that an Initial Study has been prepared for the Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project and is available for your review. This information is being circulated in order to solicit comments from public agencies and interested members of the community on environmental issues related to the scope of the Initial Study.

Project Summary

The Trinity County Department of Transportation is considering construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road and State Route (SR) 299. Additionally, a new opening to Nugget Lane from SR 299 would be constructed. The intersection was originally planned as a signalized intersection as part of the East Connector Roadway Project, and the signalized intersection remains the "no project alternative". Work is expected to commence as early as summer 2017. The project site is not identified as a hazardous waste facility, hazardous waste property, or hazardous waste disposal site.

Project Review Period

The 30-day public review period for the Initial Study ends on November 2, 2016.

Public Hearings

Public Hearings on the project will be held by the Trinity County Planning Commission on November 10, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., and by the Board of Supervisors on December 20, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard. Hearings will take place at the Trinity County Library meeting room, 351 Main Street in Weaverville. Anyone desiring to make a statement may do so, either in writing or in person.

Initial Study Availability

A copy of the Initial Study is available for review at the following locations:

- Trinity County Library, 351 Main Street, Weaverville
- Trinity County Planning Department at 61 Airport Road, Weaverville
- Trinity County Department of Transportation at 31301 State Highway 3, Weaverville

Comment Submittal

Written comments may be sent to Janice Smith by mail or email at the following address.
Comments must be received by November 2, 2016.

Janice Smith, Senior Environmental Compliance Manager
Trinity County Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093
(530) 623-1365
jsmith@trinitycounty.org

Sincerely,


Janice Smith
Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Department of Transportation



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

October 31, 2016

Jan Smith
Trinity County
P.O. Box 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093

Subject: Lanca Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project
SCH#: 2016092063

Dear Jan Smith:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on October 28, 2016, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2016092063
Project Title Lanca Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project
Lead Agency Trinity County

Type MND Mitigated Negative Declaration
Description The project entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Lance Gulch Road and SR 299. Additionally, a new opening to Nugget Lane from SR 299 would be constructed. The intersection was originally planned as a signalized intersection as part of the East Connector Roadway project, and the signalized intersection remains the no project alternative. Work is expected to commence as early as summer 2017. The project site is not identified as a hazardous waste facility, hazardous waste property, or hazardous waste disposal site.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Jan Smith
Agency Trinity County
Phone 530-623-1365 **Fax**
email
Address P.O. Box 2490
City Weaverville **State** CA **Zip** 96093

Project Location

County Trinity
City
Region
Lat / Long 40° 43' 21" N / 122° 55' 46" W
Cross Streets Lance Gulch Rd, SR 299, Glenn Rd
Parcel No. various
Township 33N **Range** 9W **Section** 18 **Base** MDMB

Proximity to:

Highways 299, 3
Airports Lonnie Pool Field
Railways
Waterways Lance Gulch, Weaver Creek
Schools Weaverville ES, Trinity HS
Land Use Roads/Gen Commercial, highway or county ROW/Commercial or county ROW

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Fiscal Impacts; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 1; Cal Fire; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 2; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 1; Native American Heritage Commission

Date Received 09/29/2016 **Start of Review** 09/29/2016 **End of Review** 10/28/2016

055-05
November 2, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan Smith, Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Department of Transportation
PO Box 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093

FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP
Lindsay Kantor

SUBJECT: Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project
Response to Comments and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 15000 *et seq.*), and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 *et seq.*) an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project was prepared and made available to the general public and interested agencies for a 30-day public review period. The agency review period managed by the State Clearinghouse ended October 28, 2016; the general public review period ended November 2, 2016.

All written comments received during the public review period are attached, along with written responses to environmental issues raised by commenters on the IS/MND.

Response to Comments

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(b), in reviewing negative declarations, persons and public agencies should focus on the proposed finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. This can be accomplished by identifying the specific effect, explaining why the commenter believes the effect would occur, and explaining why the commenter believes the effect would be significant. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

In preparing a response to each comment, the written response must address the significant environmental issue raised and must be detailed, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted by the lead agency.

In addition to a letter from the State Clearinghouse confirming that the public review period occurred, the following individuals and representatives of organizations submitted written comments on the IS/MND. No comments were received from any public agencies. Each comment letter is reproduced in its entirety and is followed by the response(s) to the letter.

Letter	Agency, Organization or Individual	Date
1	Joan Berrien, Resident	October 6, 2016
2	Gail Goodyear, Resident	August 10, 2016
3	Stephen and Christina Hubbell, Residents	October 11, 2016
4	Steven Mackay, Cara Lon Mackay, Leon Hutchinson, Residents	October 19, 2016
5	Jill Richards, Resident	October 7, 2016
6	Mandeep Sandhu, Resident	October 6, 2016
7	Richard McAvoy, Resident	October 24, 2016
8	Everett H. Harvey, Jr., Resident	October 27, 2016
9	William F. Barnum, Attorney, Barnum Law Office	October 26, 2016
10	Judy McLaughlin, Resident	October 31, 2016
11	Angela Dills, Resident	October 30, 2016
12	Lacy Hayth, Resident	October 30, 2016
13	Gerard Lane, Resident	October 30, 2016
14	Rory Duckworth, Resident	October 31, 2016
15	Weaverville Market	October 6, 2016
16	Michael Charlton, Redwoods & Rivers	October 30, 2016
17	John Knight, Resident	October 31, 2016
18	VaLynn Crafford, Resident	October 31, 2016
19	Gerard and Dale Kaz, Residents	October 31, 2016
20	Roberta Dooley, Resident	November 1, 2016
21	Scott White, Resident	November 2, 2016

Enclosures:
Public Comment Letters
Responses
Public Comment Letter from Scott White (Attachment A)

LETTER 1

Subject: FW: NO Roundabout NO

-----Original Message-----

From: Joan B [mailto:jmnberrien@wildblue.net]

Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 12:18 PM

To: Jan Smith

Subject: NO Roundabout NO

Signals can be programmed like the ones at Eureka Way and Buenaventura in West Redding. Roundabouts cost TOO much money. The proposed one here in Weaverville is too small to accommodate the large trucks that pass through. There are too many problems to solve regarding foot traffic around this proposed roundabout, and naturally would cost even more money! The impact on the area surrounding this proposed roundabout would be a mess!

Both my husband and I are against this roundabout - this is 2 votes AGAINST the proposed Roundabout! We are long-time residents of Weaverville and we believe that this proposed roundabout would be detrimental to our mountain community. We have traveled a lot and have come upon roundabouts in various places, and we do not like them.

Thank you for reading this email.

1-1

LETTER 1 JOAN BERRIEN, RESIDENT

Response 1-1: The Commenter states roundabouts cost too much. She also expresses concerns that the roundabout is too small to accommodate large trucks and would create too many problems for foot traffic around the roundabout. She believes the roundabout would be detrimental to the community.

The issue of cost is not an environmental impact. This comment will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

As stated in under d) in Section III.C.16, "Transportation and Circulation," of the IS/MND (page 51), the roundabout would be designed and constructed in accordance with County and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) requirements and standards.

The County utilizes the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards for all design guidelines, and all specifications are drafted based on the California Department of Transportation Specifics. AASHTO includes geometric designs for roundabouts to accommodate a variety of users (truck, transit, bicycle, pedestrian). The roundabout will be designed to accommodate larger vehicles pursuant to these standards.

AASHTO: "A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets."
2001. http://nacto.org/docs/usdq/geometric_design_highways_and_streets_aashto.pdf.

According to Caltrans, roundabout intersections on the State highway system must be developed and evaluated in accordance with the following:

National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report 672 entitled "**Roundabouts: An Informational Guide – Second Edition.**" October 2010. <http://www.trb.org/Publications/Blurbs/164470.aspx>.

Traffic Operations Policy Directive (TOPD) Number 13-02. August 23, 2013. <http://dot.ca.gov/trafficops/policy/13-02.pdf>.

Signs, striping and markings at roundabouts must comply with the **California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)**: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/camutcd/>.

Section III.C.16, "Transportation and Circulation," under f) of the IS/MND (page 51) also explains pedestrian crossings would be provided on all four legs of the roundabout intersection. The roundabout's splitter islands would slow vehicle speeds and reduce crossing distances. When crossing at the roundabout, pedestrians would cross one lane of traffic at a time, coming in one direction at a time. Pedestrians could then take refuge in the splitter island, then cross another 12 feet on single lane traffic coming in a single direction.

With either stops signs or a signal, pedestrian crossings would be approximately 65 feet long and pedestrians would have to cross traffic in both directions with no refuge in the middle. In addition, due to issues with signal timing, only three legs of the signalized intersection would have crosswalks; the southern leg, closest to the Nugget Lane and Trinity Plaza Shopping Center, would not have a crosswalk.

LETTER 2

Gail Goodyear
PO Box 1120
Weaverville, CA 96093
August 10, 2016

Trinity County Board of Supervisors
Bill Burton, Keith Groves, Karl Fisher, John Fenley and Judy Morris
PO Box 1613
Weaverville, CA 96093

CC: Rick Tippett, TC Transportation

Dear Supervisors and Transportation staff:

This letter supports four-way stop at the intersection of Hwy 299, Glen Road and Lance Gulch Road.*

HUGE! Traffic stop allows drivers/passengers time to read business signs and to decide to visit local stores/restaurants.

2-1

No side roads to avoid a Weaverville Hwy 299 roundabout.

For all drivers, there are not side roads that would allow a traveler to avoid conveniently a roundabout on Hwy 299 at Glen and Lance Gulch Roads. A roundabout could significantly increase traffic, not planning to stop-shop, through the shopping center parking lots --this is a dangerous consequence.

2-2

Weaverville and Trinity County has a significant number of senior drivers.

- (1) Older drivers gradually lose ability to turn head to right or left. A roundabout requires this head turn and a driver will be in the roundabout, unable to get out or about to cause an accident....
- (2) A roundabout would disorient many (significant #) as they tried to drive around the circle and exit at their desired location.
- (3) Accommodation of Trinity County's largest population by age is needed. Let's keep folks safe and independent.

2-3

No sane Garden Club volunteer will get roundabout's center median to maintain vegetation. Too risky. Not enjoyable or affordable for our volunteers.

2-4

Weaverville walks.

The long-needed crosswalk across 299 at Glen Road/Lance Gulch Road has been constructed—keep it. This crosswalk connects two major shopping-dining areas in Weaverville. The nearest crosswalk is at Main and Washington Streets.

Connecting drivers to retail and services without use of Hwy 299.

Lance Gulch has been a benefit to many drivers and walkers who live to the *east of Hwy 299*, as they can access a grocery store and a drug store without using Hwy 299. West-side drivers lack this access benefit.

Overall

I am thankful for the Lance Gulch Road and the sidewalk along part of its course. If funds are available, I recommend the *remaining dollars be used to extend the sidewalk from Brown's Ranch Road (and the Golden Age Center) to Hwy 3* opposite Five Cent Gulch Road (and its mobile home park)—Please include this project in future transportation plans.

2-5

NO roundabout, NO closure of one end of Nugget Lane, NO further encroachment on CHP land. Current design works.

Sincerely,
Gail Goodyear



*Ask CalTrans to leave "as is" for ten years.

LETTER 2 GAIL GOODYEAR, RESIDENT

Response 2-1: The Commenter states that a traffic signal allows time for motorists to read business advertisement signs and decide to go to these businesses.

The Commenter does not raise specific issues relating to the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

Response 2-2: The Commenter states there are no side roads to allow someone to avoid the roundabout. She believes this could significantly increase traffic through the shopping center parking lots and this is a dangerous consequence.

A driver's decision to take a short cut through the shopping center parking lots could just as easily occur if a traffic signal is installed, perhaps more so than with a roundabout. A roundabout provides continuous traffic flow and may be more desirable to a driver than stopping at a traffic signal. The Commenter does not raise specific issues relating to the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

Response 2-3: The Commenter states there are a significant number of senior drivers in Trinity County and older drivers gradually lose their ability to turn their head right or left. She states a roundabout requires this head turn and a driver may be in the roundabout unable to get out or about to cause an accident.

With a four-way stop, which is the current means of traffic control at this intersection, drivers must turn their heads left and right to check for other drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. This is also true with a traffic signal.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Office of Safety (FHWA), research indicates roundabouts can enhance the safety for drivers, including older drivers, by:

- Allowing more time to make decisions, act, and react;
- Reducing the number of directions in which a driver needs to watch for conflicting traffic; and
- Reducing the need to judge gaps in fast traffic accurately.

The following technical summary provides an overview of the key considerations for planning, analysis, and design of roundabouts.

Reference:

FHWA, Technical Summary (FHWA-SA-10-006): **Roundabouts**.
2010. <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/fhwasa10006/fhwasa10006.pdf>. Accessed October 2016.

Response 2-4: **The Commenter expresses her belief that the Garden Club may be unwilling to maintain vegetation in the roundabout due to safety concerns.**

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 2-5: **The Commenter states the crosswalk across 299 at Glen Road/Lance Gulch Road should remain. She states Lance Gulch Road has been a benefit to many drivers and walkers who live east of SR 299, but west side drivers lack this benefit. She is thankful for Lance Gulch Road and the sidewalks and recommends remaining dollars be used to extend the sidewalk.**

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This comment will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 3

10-11-16

RE: ROUNDABOUT

MY WIFE AND MYSELF ARE
AGAINST HAVING A ROUNDABOUT!
A TRAFFIC SIGNAL OR THE FOUR
WAY STOP SIGNS WOULD BE OK
WITH US.

STEPHEN E. CHRISTINA
HUBBELL
P.O. BOX 344 WEAVERVILLE
6235310

3-1

LETTER 3

STEPHEN AND CHRISTINA HUBBELL, RESIDENTS

Response 3-1:

The Commenters state they are against a roundabout. Either a traffic signal or four-way stop signs are acceptable to them.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 4

10/19/16

Steven Mackay }
Cara Lon Mackay } P.O. Box 50/
Leon Hutchinson } 311 Eccentric Rd.
Lewiston, CA 96052

Director of Transportation

Re: Proposed construction of Roundabout at
Main Street / Glen Road / Lance Gulch Road Intersection

After living in Trinity County for 30 years, during which time we have made countless drives through Weaverville at many different times of day and night in all weather, we are convinced that the proposed roundabout is unnecessary. Traffic is never so heavy that that degree of traffic control is needed. If anything, the intersection of Washington Street and Main Street presents a far greater need for control to alleviate traffic back-ups.

Instead of a roundabout, all that is really called for at the proposed location is stop signs at Glen Road and Lance Gulch, leaving Main Street unblocked. Visibility is sufficiently good, as is lighting, that this "minimalist" approach would work fine.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Yours, truly,

Steven Mackay

4-1

**LETTER 4 STEVEN MACKAY, CARA LON MACKAY, LEON HUTCHINSON,
RESIDENTS**

Response 4-1: The Commenters state they believe a roundabout is unnecessary. They state they have lived in Trinity County for 30 years and traffic is never so heavy that this degree of traffic control is needed. They believe the four-way stop should remain and Main Street should be unblocked. They believe the intersection of Washington Street and Main Street has a greater need for traffic control.

As stated in the Environmental Impact Report for the East Connector Roadway project (State Clearing House No. 2001032073), Weaverville’s main traffic problems result from the large volume of vehicles using SR 299 and SR 3. Traffic is expected to increase due to slow but steady growth and increased through-traffic in the Weaverville Basin. By 2030, this growth in traffic levels in the existing roadway system would further increase congestion problems.

The Circulation Element of the Trinity County General Plan describes the East Connector project in detail and also contains findings, goals, objectives and policies relevant to the project. There include, but are not limited to:

Finding 1:
Increasing seasonal traffic congestion in Weaverville creates potential safety issues and adverse impacts to the community.

Finding 2:
State Route 299 in Weaverville operates at level of service E during peak periods. During peak periods, vehicle movements along SR 299 are slowed, while movements onto the highway experience significant delay. Conflicting traffic movements (turns from side streets, parking ingress and egress, delivery vehicles, etc.) cause additional delays.

Objective 1.6:
Identify anticipated street and road congestion/capacity problems before they become critical in order to program preventative measures and reduce the cost of correction.

Policy 1.6.A:
The minimum acceptable Level of Service (LOS) standard for roadway and intersection operation in Trinity County is “D”. No public highway or roadway should be allowed to fall to or below LOS “E”.

LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions, whereby a letter grade “A” through “F” is assigned to an intersection, or roadway segment, representing progressively worsening traffic conditions.

The traffic signal warrant analyses by Fehr & Peers (F&P) in 2002 concluded the intersection would meet the peak-hour and four-hour signal warrants. The LOS

at this four-way intersection without signalization would be “F”. With the signal, LOS would be “C”.

In addition, an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) addressing the SR 299/Lance Gulch Road/Glen Road intersection was prepared by Fehr & Peers in 2015. The evaluation utilized 2009 traffic volumes and travel demand forecasts that were prepared for the 2011 Weaverville Traffic Signalization Study, which was conducted in conjunction with Trinity County’s Regional Transportation Plan.

Supplemental field observations and traffic counts at the intersection of Glen Road and Nugget Lane were conducted in April 2015. LOS was calculated for all intersection control types using the methods documented in the Transportation Research Board Publication *Highway Capacity Manual, Fourth Edition, 2010*.

The ICE concluded that for 2040 traffic levels, both the roundabout and the signal would have a LOS of “D” or better. The peak hour intersection operations analysis showed that the signal would have longer queues of vehicles on SR 299, where the queues would block adjacent driveways leading to higher vehicle delay and a greater collision risk.

Therefore, a four-way stop is not acceptable because LOS would be inconsistent with the General Plan. Further, Caltrans has indicated that a four-way stop is not an acceptable means of traffic control. Either a traffic signal or roundabout needs to be installed.

LETTER 5

From: Jill Richards [<mailto:1jillrichards@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 07, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Jan Smith; Jill Richards
Subject: Round About on Lance Gulch / H299 / Glenn Road

Hello,

I represent a household of 2 who are vehemently against the Round About. We live on Fairway.

We have lived in a neighborhood with 2 roundabouts similar to this plan. There were many accidents as people did not wait for or even look to see if another car was waiting. Pedestrians were also "near misses" The cars would speed around the turns.

5-1

1. We LOVE the stop signs.
2. People understand how and what to do.
3. We appreciate that we can cross from Glenn onto H299.
4. The exit from Ace is dangerous, and this stop light provides a safe crossing.
5. Large Trucks park on the shoulder heading East, in front of the Weaverville Market, blocking visibility making it unsafe to cross. However, with the traffic lights, one can safely cross onto H299.

5-2

6. Lastly, we attended the planning meeting about the installation of a Round About. The "SAFER" argument is bogus. Yes, the accidents may be less severe than a head-on accident. HOWEVER, reports prove that the number of accidents at RoundABOUTS are many times higher than those at stop signs.

5-3

We sincerely hope that you consider the impact that installation of a Round About puts on residents, most of whom are Vehemently Against it.
Jill Richards & Betty Richards

LETTER 5 JILL RICHARDS, RESIDENT

Response 5-1: **The Commenter states she is vehemently against the roundabout. She previously lived in a neighborhood with a roundabout and there were many accidents and near hits of pedestrians. Cars would speed around the turns.**

The Commenter is directed to Response 5-3.

Response 5-2: **The Commenter states her household loves the stop signs and she appreciates that motorists cross from Glenn Road onto SR 299. The exit from ACE Hardware is dangerous and a stop light provides for a safe crossing. Large trucks parking on the shoulder heading east block visibility and traffic lights would allow people to safely cross onto SR 299.**

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 5-3: **The Commenter states they believe the “safer” argument is bogus. She states “reports prove that the number of accidents at Round Abouts are many times higher than those at stop signs.”**

The Commenter doesn't cite any specific reports or evidence related to roundabout safety issues.

As stated in the IS/MND, according to Transportation Research Board's 2010 *Roundabouts: An Informational Guide*, roundabouts have an observed reduction of 35 percent in total crashes, 76 percent in injury crashes and 90 percent in fatal accidents compared to conventional intersection control.

The crash reduction is due to minimizing of conflict points and the lower speeds needed to traverse the intersection. While traffic signals can reduce the likelihood of broadside crashes, rear-end crashes may increase since drivers may not expect to encounter a traffic signal, particularly on a two-lane highway in a rural county.

This information is supported by a report prepared by Caltrans: *Roundabouts: The California State Highway System Roundabouts Inventory* (July 2014).

In addition, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration Office of Safety (FHWA), roundabouts are a proven safety countermeasure because of their ability to substantially reduce the types of crashes that result in injury or loss of life. Roundabouts are designed to improve safety for all users, including pedestrians and bicycles. Most significantly, roundabouts reduce the types of crashes where people are seriously hurt or killed by 78-82 percent when compared to conventional stop-controlled and signalized intersections, per the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Highway Safety Manual.

According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Highway Loss Data Institute (IIHS), with roundabouts, potentially serious crashes essentially are

eliminated because vehicles travel in the same direction and at low speeds, generally less than 20 mph in urban areas and less than 30-35 mph in rural areas. Installing roundabouts in place of traffic signals can also reduce the likelihood of rear-end crashes and their severity by removing the incentive for drivers to speed up as they approach green lights and by reducing abrupt stops at red lights.

References:

California Department of Transportation. *“Roundabouts: The California State Highway System Roundabouts Inventory.”* July 2014. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/omsp/system_planning/Final_2014_CA_SHS_Roundabout_Inventory_Report_07082014.pdf. Accessed October 2016.

Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Highway Loss Data Institute. 2016. *Roundabouts*. <http://www.iihs.org/iihs/topics/t/roundabouts/qanda>. Accessed October 2016.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. *“Roundabouts and Mini Roundabouts.”* 2016. <http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/innovative/roundabouts/#research>. Accessed October 2016.

_____. 2014. *Proven Safety Countermeasures – Roundabouts*. http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/provencountermeasures/fhwa_sa_12_005.cfm. Accessed October 2016.

LETTER 6

Subject: FW: Roundabout VS Traffic Light

From: Mandeep Sandhu [<mailto:mani.sandhu900@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 9:08 AM

To: Jan Smith

Subject: Roundabout VS Traffic Light

To whom it may concern:

Basic Facts

Roundabout

- Cost a lot more to build it.
- It will create One Way Traffic in Nugget Lane. This change will impact our business and Reduce traffic flow in Weaverville Market.
- It will need a lot more space to build it. Which will require to take out Radio shack and Nail Salon Building.
- It will also be a lot harder for loading truck to get IN and OUT from Nugget Lane.

6-1

6-2

6-3

6-4

Traffic Light

- Cost a lot less to build it.
- 4 way stop sign gets replaced with Traffic Light.
- Entrance and Exit points stays the same.
- It may delay some traffic but not much because traffic light will be equipped with Sensor and Timer.

6-5

Therefore based on these facts I believe that we are better of with Traffic Light instead of Roundabout.

LETTER 6 MANDEEP SANDHU, RESIDENT

Response 6-1: The Commenter states a roundabout will cost more to build.

The issue of cost is not an environmental impact. This comment will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 6-2: The Commenter states a roundabout will result in one-way traffic on Nugget Lane, which will impact his business and reduce traffic flow to Weaverville Market.

Section IV, "Community Impacts," of the IS/MND addresses potential social and economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts on neighboring businesses.

As described in Sections IV.A.2 and IV.B.2 (pages 59 – 67) of the IS/MND, the Board of Supervisors will consider two alternatives and three sub-alternatives for Nugget Lane south of Glen Road. These Sections discuss impacts of each alternative and sub-alternative on local businesses. This information will be considered by the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

The Commenter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and no additional response is warranted.

Response 6-3: The Commenter states a roundabout will need more space to build which will require removal of Radio Shack and the nail salon.

Section IV, "Community Impacts," of the IS/MND addresses rights-of-way that would need to be acquired in order to construct the roundabout. Table 9 of the IS/MND (page 61) provides a summary of parcels/businesses that would be affected by each alternative and sub-alternative. This information will be considered by the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

The Commenter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and no additional response is warranted.

Response 6-4: The Commenter states loading trucks will have a harder time getting in and out of Nugget Lane.

The Commenter is directed to Response 6-2.

The alternatives and sub-alternatives take into consideration issues relating to the ability of cars and trucks to turn around on Nugget Lane. Truck maneuvering for loading/unloading at the businesses was also considered. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

The Commenter does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND and no additional response is warranted.

Response 6-5: **The Commenter states that a 4-way stop should be replaced with a traffic signal which would cost less to implement and access to Nugget Lane would be unaffected. The Commenter also states that although a signal may result in some traffic delays, the signal would be equipped with a sensor and timer.**

The Commenter does not raise specific issues relating to the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

LETTER 7



FROM: *Richard McAvoy*
TO JANICE SMITH: *[Signature]*

EVEN CONSIDERING A ROUNDABOUT AT THE LANCE GULCH + 299 INTERSECTION IS UNCALLED FOR, INSANE, RIDICULOUSLY EXPENSIVE + TOTALLY UN-NECESSARY.

THE BUCKHORN WORK IS ALMOST DONE - TRAFFIC WILL BE BACK TO NORMAL - THE EXISTING BLINKING STOP LIGHT IS WORKING LIKE A CHAMP - WHY GO INTO OVERKILL THAT WILL CONFUSE MOTORISTS, ENDANGER PEDESTRIANS, WIPE OUT BUSINESS'S, CAUSE MASS CONFUSION, NATURALLY GO OVER BUDGET, + WASTE MONEY + MAKE WEAVERVILLE RESIDENTS MADDER THAN HELL? IF WE CAN'T HAVE WHAT'S ALREADY THERE THEN PLEASE GO TO A SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION. *THANKS*

7-1

RECEIVED

OCT 24 2016

TRINITY COUNTY
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

LETTER 7 RICHARD MCAVOY, RESIDENT

Response 7-1: The Commenter states a roundabout is uncalled for, expensive, and the “existing blinking stoplight is working like a champ.” He believes a roundabout will confuse motorists, endanger pedestrians, and eliminate businesses. He prefers a signal rather than a roundabout.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 1-1, 2-3, 5-3, 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 8

October 27, 2016
PO BOX 2327
Weaverville, CA 96093

Trinity County Department of Transportation
Attn: Janice Smith (jsmith@trinitycounty.org)
PO BOX 2490
Weaverville, CA 96093

Dear Ms. Smith:

I am commenting on the “Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study concerning the Lance Gulch Road/State 299 Intersection Control Project in Weaverville, California”. I will refer this as the *Initial Mitigation Study*. We remind ourselves that *mitigation* is the action of reducing the severity, seriousness, or painfulness of something.

I support the original signalized intersection and strongly oppose the proposed roundabout. The rest of this letter provides some of the reasons I take the “no project alternative” and want to proceed with the installation of the traffic signals.

The California Highway Patrol in a letter of August 16, 2016 clearly states that “the Department does not cannot support the roundabout alternatives proposed for this location”.

8-1

Out of the 18 check boxes on the Environmental Checklist Form there are 7 boxes checked as potentially affected. Although these potentially significant impacts supposedly have mitigation possibilities, it is not clear that the proposed mitigation in every case will be sufficient to alleviate the impact.

8-2

Under Community Impacts in the section on Land Use and Businesses a total of 16 parcels or businesses are directly affected. Acquiring the land for the roundabout proposed would require funds and have an untold effect on the various businesses and their customers. Again the proposed mitigations are likely insufficient.

8-3

In the *Initial Mitigation Study* in the section called Project Objectives it states that “in 2015, during construction of Lance Gulch Road, an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) was prepared to ensure the appropriate traffic control device was installed at the new intersection”. There are at least two claims made in the *Initial Mitigation Study* ,supposedly based upon the ICE, that are at best misleading and at worse just plainly false. This means the statement “The objective of the proposed project is to construct a roundabout in support of Lance Gulch Road that would facilitate better circulation and traffic flow than a signalized intersection, accommodate the longer STTA trucks on State Highway 299 and on Lance Gulch Road, conform to the rural aesthetics of the community, and increase vehicular and pedestrian safety” is not supported by the ICE. Let us look at these two claims, one about safety and the other about traffic flow.

8-4

First Claim: The results of the ICE indicated that a roundabout would be the preferred method of traffic control to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety” and then makes an argument that the intersection has an accident rate greater than the statewide average.

The ICE has a Safety Analysis section. It is based upon 5 reported accidents during a five year period. One of these involved a bicycle. While the report correctly says that the ICE reports that the “intersection has an overall vehicle accident rate greater than the statewide average for similar” facilities. However, since the number of reported accidents is so small (less than one per year) a statistical conclusion is about the relative “danger” level of this intersection as it previously existed is not reliable. (For those with serious interest and background see “The Statistical Analysis of Crash-Frequency Data: A Review and Assessment of Methodological Alternatives”, by Dominique Lord and Fred Mannering, March 22, 2010). The ICE makes no claim about accident levels.

8-5

Also at no point in the ICE analysis does it say that a roundabout would be the preferred way to improve vehicular or pedestrian safety. The claim that it does is false. The ICE report does say that “With regard to safety, both the roundabout and signal options would improve the existing condition”.

Second Claim: Referring to the ICE done by Fehr & Peers, a transportation consulting firm, the *Initial Mitigation Study* says that “a roundabout in support of Lance Gulch Road that would facilitate better circulation and traffic flow than a signalized intersection.”

The ICE intersection capacity analysis does say that both the roundabout and signal have an acceptable capacity prediction through the year 2040 with the roundabout has more capacity. ICE considered timed operation for the signal and did not consider traffic actuated signals. (Shasta County has quite a number of these.) A traffic actuated signal uses detectors in the approaches to monitor and assign the right-of-way on the basis of changing traffic demand. This means that highway 299 could have the right-of-way much of the time while other traffic would not have to wait a seemingly inordinate time. The “Roundabout Policy and Design Practices for County of Los Angeles” (2007) includes the following statement. “For low volume roads (less than 6,000 ADT), the inclusion of a roundabout can decrease efficiency by causing unnecessary slowing and stopping, especially when cross traffic volumes are low in comparison to the primary traffic movement”. Nowhere in the ICE is there anything that states that the roundabout would facilitate better circulation and traffic flow than a signal.

8-6

Additionally the roundabout has higher initial costs and a farther out implementation time.

8-7

These are clear reasons to proceed with the traffic signal at this intersection.

Sincerely,

Everett H. Harvey, Jr.

LETTER 8 EVERETT H. HARVEY, JR., RESIDENT

Response 8-1: The Commenter states the California Highway Patrol does not support the roundabout alternatives proposed for this location.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 8-2: The Commenter references the IS/MND and states it is not clear that the proposed mitigation in every case will be sufficient to alleviate the impact.

Mitigation measures are prescribed in Section III.C.4, "Biological Resources," Section III.C.5, "Cultural Resources," Section III.C.8, "Hazards and Hazardous Materials," Section III.C.14, "Public Services", and Section IV, "Community Impacts," of the IS/MND. As described in the respective sections, these mitigation measures are sufficient to minimize potential impacts to less than significant due to compliance with existing regulatory and industry standards.

The commenter does not suggest any additional mitigation measures that could be considered. Therefore, no additional response is warranted.

Response 8-3: The Commenter states 16 parcels or businesses would be directly affected and acquiring property would require funds and have an untold effect on various businesses and their customers. He believes the proposed mitigations are likely insufficient.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 6-2, 6-3, and 6-4.

Mitigation Measure MM IV.2.1 states, *"TCDOT shall purchase the affected property and provide appropriate compensation to the property owner, building owner, and business owners in compliance with federal and state law and provide relocation assistance to the business owners, if necessary."*

The commenter does not suggest any additional mitigation measures that could be considered. Therefore, no additional response is warranted.

Response 8-4: The Commenter references the Project Objectives section of the IS/MND and the SR 299/Lance Gulch Road Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) prepared by Fehr & Peers in 2015. He believes the objectives described in the IS/MND are not supported by the ICE and he believes two of the claims are misleading or plainly false: one relating to safety and one about traffic flow.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 1-1, 2-3, 4-1, 5-3, and 8-5.

Response 8-5: The Commenter references the Safety Analysis section of the ICE and states it is based on 5 reported accidents during a five-year period, one of which involved a bicycle. He notes the ICE acknowledges this intersection has an overall vehicle accident rate greater than the statewide average for similar activities. He believes because the number of accidents is so low, a

statistical conclusion as to the danger that previously existed is not reliable.

Further, he states the ICE does not say a roundabout would be the preferred way to improve vehicular or pedestrian safety. The ICE says both the roundabout and signal options would improve the existing condition.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 1-1, 2-3, 4-1, and 5-3.

It is correct that the ICE states either a roundabout or a signal would improve the existing condition. The Summary and Conclusion section of the ICE (page 10), states:

“While the roundabout option will affect vehicle access and have a greater construction cost, this option will provide lower vehicle delay, enhanced traffic safety, and lower maintenance cost than the signal option.”

Response 8-6: The Commenter states the ICE did not consider timed operation for the signal and did not consider traffic actuated signals which uses detectors in the approaches to monitor and assign the right-of-way on the basis of traffic demand. He references a roundabout policy document from the County of Los Angeles, which states for low volume roads (less than 6,000 ADT), a roundabout can decrease efficiency, especially when cross traffic volumes are low in comparison to the primary traffic movement.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 2-2 and 4-1. It should also be noted that the Average Daily Traffic at this intersection exceeds 6,000 vehicles per day.

Reference:

State of California, California State Transportation Agency, Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Operations. 2014 Traffic Volumes on the California State Highway System. Page 208. http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/census/docs/2014_aadt_volumes.pdf. Accessed November 2016.

Response 8-7: The Commenter states a roundabout would have high initial costs and a farther out implementation.

The issue of cost is not an environmental impact. This comment will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 9

BARNUM LAW OFFICE

William F. Barnum

525 SECOND STREET, SUITE 204
POST OFFICE BOX 173
EUREKA, CALIFORNIA 95502
--
TELEPHONE: (707) 442-6405
FACSIMILE: (707) 442-1507
E-MAIL: wfb@barnumlaw.net

Kaleen S. Fisher
Legal Assistant

October 26, 2016

Janice Smith
Trinity County
Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 2490
Weaverville, California 96093
jsmith@trinitycounty.org

**Re: Comments and Objections to Proposed Roundabout Project, aka
Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project**

Our Client: Merritt D. ("Duane") Heryford

Dear Ms. Smith:

I represent Merritt D. ("Duane") Heryford of Weaverville, California and write you with comments and objections on his behalf respecting the proposed roundabout project, aka "Lance Gulch Road/State Route 299 Intersection Control Project."

Mr. Heryford owns a commercially-zoned parcel (APN: 024-500-50-00) located at 50 Nugget Lane in Weaverville. It is presently home to three (3) commercial tenants including the Owens Pharmacy, The Floor Store, and Mountain Valley Physical Therapy.

As historically configured, access to these three businesses is along Nugget Lane, which comprises two lanes of traffic and parking spaces to the north. Entry and exit points have historically been maintained and used from the intersection with Glen Road to the west and State Route 299 to the east.

Mr. Heryford, on behalf of himself and his commercial tenants objects to the proposed roundabout configurations depicted in the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study dated October 2016 (just released). Both proposed roundabout Alternatives 1 and 2 will eliminate the western access points to Nugget Lane and replace that historic access with insertion of an ingress/egress point along the north side of Nugget Lane. These proposals and the three (3) alternative depictions of the mitigations proposed will have the following adverse impacts upon Mr. Heryford's properties and tenants:

9-1

9-2

Janice Smith
Trinity County
Department of Transportation
October 26, 2016
Page 2

1. Parking spaces will be lost;
2. Convenient truck access will be lost;
3. Ease of turning into and out from Nugget Lane will be lost;
4. The combination of items 1 through 3 will significantly reduce the attractiveness of the commercial tenancies and will diminish the fair market value of the commercial properties in which he is invested with reasonable investment backed expectations.

**9-2
Cont.**

Mr. Heryford also comments and objects that the proposed roundabout configurations are less safe for residents of Weaverville and visiting tourists and customers. The historic use of stop signs has effectively controlled traffic while continuing the access which he and his commercial tenants have relied upon for their businesses. In contrast, roundabouts have the effect of delivering a steady stream of traffic in both east and west directions. Pedestrians hoping to cross State Route 299 will find that the steady stream of vehicles coming from the roundabout will inhibit their use and enjoyment of the businesses throughout the Weaverville area. People will be challenged to sprint across the highway instead of safely walking when traffic naturally slackens between vehicles which have been required to stop at the Lance Gulch intersection (whether by stop sign or stop light controls). Senior citizens and the disabled will find crossing impossible.

9-3

Mr. Heryford notes that the mitigated Negative Declaration includes depictions of the configurations of the stop sign and stop light controlled alternatives, both of which will allow eastbound access from Glen Road into Nugget Lane. While this removes 50% of the access presently and historically enjoyed there, it does mitigate the impact of cutting off access to Glen Road as proposed with the roundabout alternatives. The stop sign or stop light alternatives will both mitigate the damaging impacts on his investment property.

9-4

While a public agency, such as Trinity County, has the power to adopt and impose traffic infrastructure in the public interest, it may not do so with impunity, or without accountability to the damaging effects of such actions. Certainly some property owners will be subjected to eminent domain negotiations or litigation to permit the project to proceed to construction. Mr. Heryford is not without a remedy for the impacts to his investment-backed expectations.

California has long recognized that a “regulatory taking” may exist even when a public agency’s action does not take all economically viable use of a private person’s property. This doctrine has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court in *First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale vs. Los Angeles County, California* (June 9, 1987) 482 U.S. 304. The *First English* decision ratified a citizen’s right to bring a regulatory takings claim when, in instances such as this matter, his investment-backed expectations are damaged (though not entirely frustrated) by local government actions.

9-5

Janice Smith
Trinity County
Department of Transportation
October 26, 2016
Page 3

Our purposes in writing you now are to comment upon the proposed roundabout project, suggest preferable and less-damaging alternatives, and to put the County of Trinity on notice that if it proceeds with the planned project it will likely result in a claim by Mr. Heryford for damages arising in inverse condemnation, as authorized by the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution and §1, Article 19 of the California Constitution.

Such a claim will be based on the proof of diminution in value of the commercial properties resulting from the project and its adverse impacts on access and parking on Nugget Lane.

Please make note of our address and include our office in any future notifications concerning this project. If fees are required to be included in such notice, please advise so we may make a deposit.

Thank you.

Sincerely,


William F. Barnum

WFB:b

cc: Duane Heryford

wfb letter to Janice Smith County of Trinity Oct 26, 2016

**9-5
Cont.**

LETTER 9 WILLIAM F. BARNUM, BARNUM LAW OFFICE

Response 9-1: The Commenter states he represents Merritt D. (Duane) Heryford. He provides a brief description of the property and its configuration.

Comment noted. No further response is necessary.

Response 9-2: The Commenter states that implementation of the roundabout will result in loss of parking, loss of convenient truck access, and loss of convenient vehicle access to and from Nugget Lane. The Commenter states that these impacts will reduce the value of the commercial properties located on the parcel.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 6-2, 6-3, 6-4, and 8-3.

Implementation of a roundabout would result in loss of parking and changes to truck and vehicle access to and from Nugget Lane. In regards to truck access, Sub-Alternative B (where a new opening to Nugget Lane from SR 299 would be provided across from the driveway to CVS Pharmacy in the Trinity Plaza Shopping Center), would likely contribute to more convenient truck access to and from Mr. Heryford's property than the two other sub-alternatives. Under this sub-alternative, because the new access opening would be directly across from Mr. Heryford's property, trucks would be less likely to have to back up on Nugget Lane and maneuver around other moving and parked vehicles.

In addition, it should be noted that parking along the SR 299 side of Nugget Lane is in Caltrans and Trinity County right-of-way, and thus, not privately owned. However, it is understood that the quantity of parking spaces available along Nugget Lane could affect local businesses.

Response 9-3: The Commenter states that the roundabout would be less safe than a stop sign or traffic signal. Specifically, implementation of a roundabout will result in a steady stream of vehicles on SR 299 where pedestrians would have difficulty crossing lanes. The Commenter states that senior citizens and disabled persons would especially have difficulty crossing the intersection.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 1-1, 2-3, and 5-3.

Response 9-4: The Commenter states that although implementation of the stop sign and signal removes 50 percent of the access that currently or historically occurred at this location, access from Glen Road onto Nugget Lane is permitted which is better than eliminating access from Glen Road altogether.

The Commenter does not raise specific issues relating to the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

Response 9-5: **The Commenter states that some property owners will be subjected to eminent domain but that Mr. Heryford “is not without a remedy for the impacts to his investment-backed expectations.” The Commenter cites the Supreme Court case, *First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale vs. Los Angeles County, California*, ratifying “a citizen's right to bring a regulatory takings claim when, instances such as this matter, his investment-backed expectations are damaged (though not entirely frustrated) by local government actions.” The Commenter states that if a roundabout is approved, Mr. Heryford will likely file a claim “based on proof of diminution in value of the commercial properties resulting from the project and its adverse impacts on access and parking on Nugget Lane.”**

The Commenter does not raise specific issues relating to the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking any action on the project.

LETTER 10

From: [Judy McLaughlin](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Subject: Round About
Date: Monday, October 31, 2016 4:34:12 AM

Hi Jan, not sure if I'm allowed to give my opinion on this because I'm an employee. But if I am, I don't want a round about, it's working fine the way it is not. I would say yes to a stop light, but everyone has gotten so use to the stop and go. Have a wonderful day! Judy McLaughlin

10-1

LETTER 10 JUDY McLAUGHLIN, RESIDENT

Response 10-1: The Commenter states that they are not in favor of a roundabout. The Commenter indicates that a signal would be desired in place of a roundabout but that the existing 4-way stop is sufficient and motorists are comfortable with it.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 11

From: [Angela Dills](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 9:46:04 PM

The roundabout is the stupidest idea ever... and that four way stop is lame....town has many busy intersections ,more so that Lance& highway 299...we don't need it.. Also the driveway by CVS on back of building is so dangerous for employees leaving work who park back there, nearly get hit Everytime people's come barrelling around the rocks....If I get hit there .I will bring at suit against County and Rick Tippet personally... It should have been put in near front side of the store...it creates a pinch point for traffic.... Someone hit one of the rocks and moved 50ft...

11-1

LETTER 11 ANGELA DILLS, RESIDENT

Response 11-1: **The Commenter states that neither the roundabout nor the existing 4-way stop are necessary or good ideas. She also states that an existing driveway behind the CVS Pharmacy is dangerous for employees that park there due to the high speed of vehicles and presence of rocks. She states that if she is hit, she will file a lawsuit.**

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 12

From: [Lacy Hayth](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Subject: Roundabout
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 6:09:31 PM

I want to say that I am totally against all roundabout ideas. Personally I think there should be a stop sign on glen road and one on lance gulch road NOT on hwy 299. Save the county money and remove the stop signs on hwy 299.

Lacy Hayth

Sent from my iPhone

12-1

LETTER 12 LACY HAYTH, RESIDENT

Response 12-1: The Commenter states they are not in favor of a roundabout and that traffic control should be limited to a stop-sign on the Lance Gulch Road and Glen Road legs of the intersection.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 13

From: [Gerard Lane](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Subject: I'm against the roundabout
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2016 4:10:31 PM

I'm writing to express that I am against the proposed roundabout. Please save the money and put in signals.

Thank you.

Gerard E. Lane
20 Taylor Street
Weaverville, CA 96093

13-1

LETTER 13 GERARD LANE, RESIDENT

Response 13-1: The Commenter states he is not in favor of a roundabout and that a signal should be installed to save money.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 14

From: [Rory Lvn](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Subject: Opposed to the roundabout
Date: Monday, October 31, 2016 9:09:43 AM

I'm just wanting to voice my opinion on the roundabout, I think it's a waste of money and I would prefer signals. Thank you.

Rory Duckworth
P. O. Box 3269
20 Taylor St

| 14-1

LETTER 14 RORY DUCKWORTH, RESIDENT

Response 14-1: The Commenter states that a roundabout is a waste of money and he prefers a signal.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 15

Subject: FW: Weaverville Market

From: Jan Smith [<mailto:jsmith@trinitycounty.org>]

Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2016 9:39 AM

To: Carolyn Davis; Brian Ray; jimf@quincyeng.com; Mike Sanchez (mikes@quincyeng.com); Andrew Pence

Cc: Richard Tippett; Leslie Hubbard

Subject: Weaverville Market

Rikki from the market called and asked one more time about keeping the driveway to Glen Road where it is. He did a cost analysis on his plan to move the building and put the gas pumps out front, and it would be cost prohibitive. If the driveway could stay where it is, he could put the pumps where the car wash used to be. He would need a setback from the road, I think it is 40' for a building next to a County Road. Andy, do you know if that applies to gas pumps, and is the driveway going to be a County road?

Anyway, is there any way this could work? And also, did Caltrans say "no" to his proposed access onto 299 across from the DMV driveway, or is that something you traffic engineers said "no" to?

He asked me to check one more time during the comment period. If anyone has a brilliant idea to come to the rescue, preferably by November 3, I would include it in the Planning Commission packet.

Thanks,

Jan Smith
Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Dept. of Transportation
(530) 623-1365 ext 3405

15-1

LETTER 15 WEAVERVILLE MARKET

Response 15-1: Via a telephone conversation with Jan Smith of the Trinity County Department of Transportation, the Commenter requests that the driveway from Glen Road to North Nugget Lane be kept as is. The Commenter indicates that if the driveway is relocated farther up Glen Road, the existing building (on APN 024-480-3100) would have to be moved farther back and the proposed gas pumps would be installed out in front. This setup would be cost prohibitive. Alternatively, if the driveway was not relocated, the existing building could remain and gas pumps could be installed at the location of the former carwash.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 16

Subject: FW: roundabout

From: Michael Charlton, Redwoods & Rivers [<mailto:michael@redwoods-rivers.com>]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Jan Smith
Subject: roundabout

I am in favor of a roundabout at the new bypass and 299.

Michael Charlton
Redwoods and Rivers
21690 Hwy 299
Big Bar, CA. 96010
1-800-429-0090
michael@redwoods-rivers.com
Check out our Facebook page for news and specials [REDWOODSandRIVERS](#)

16-1

LETTER 16

MICHAEL CHARLTON, REDWOODS & RIVERS

Response 16-1: The Commenter is in favor of a roundabout.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 17

From: [john.knight](#)
To: [Jan.Smith](#)
Subject: Re: Roundabout Environmental Document
Date: Monday, October 31, 2016 7:45:51 PM

Dear Jan,

According to the Roundabout Initial Study the roundabout option offers improved vehicle and pedestrian safety and efficiency for moving traffic through the intersection.

The costs are substantially higher than the original signal plan. Supervisors are right to balk at the increased costs. The large federal and state contributions should help with this concern.

Supervisors should also keep in mind we are building something for the ages. Twenty to thirty years from now no one will care if the roundabout cost several times more than the light- if it functions well and does what other roundabouts do.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

[John Knight](#)

On Thursday, September 29, 2016 8:18 AM, Jan Smith <jsmith@trinitycounty.org> wrote:

Attached please find the Public Notice that the environmental document for the roundabout project is ready to start public review. The document will be available at the Weaverville Library, Planning Department and Transportation Department offices in Weaverville starting this afternoon. It will be posted on the web sometime tomorrow, at on the internet at:
<http://www.trinitycounty.org/index.aspx?page=82>.

See the attached notice for opportunities to provide comments, and to attend Public Hearings. The final decision is expected to be made by the Board of Supervisors on December 20, 2016.

Thank you for your interest,

Jan Smith
Senior Environmental Compliance Specialist
Trinity County Dept. of Transportation
(530) 623-1365 ext 3405

17-1

LETTER 17 JOHN KNIGHT, RESIDENT

Response 17-1: The Commenter notes that as described in the IS/MND, implementation of a roundabout offers improved vehicle and pedestrian safety and increased traffic flow. The Commenter states that the higher cost of a roundabout should be a concern to the Board of Supervisors but that Federal and State contributions should help with the costs. The Commenter states that the roundabout will be a long-standing project where the initial cost of the project will be forgotten in the future with successful operation.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 18

From: [VaLynn Ruth](#)
To: [Jan Smith](#)
Subject: Pro-Roundabout
Date: Monday, October 31, 2016 6:17:21 PM

As a citizen of Weaverville, I would like to say for the record that I am Pro-Roundabout...because the studies clearly show that they are safer than 4-Way Signals. The safety and very lives of people matter most, in my opinion. If the powers-that-be can secure the funds needed for this option, then I applaud the gift of a life-saving choice for our community (and guests). My response to the concern about the high price of a Roundabout is that it's better to pay for a Roundabout than a preventable death.

Respectfully,
VaLynn Crafford

18-1

LETTER 18 VALYNN CRAFFORD, RESIDENT

Response 18-1: The Commenter is in favor of the roundabout due to the benefits of improved safety. The Commenter states that although the roundabout is expensive, the cost is worth preventing potential deaths.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 19

19-1

19-2

19-3

19-3

19-4

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2016

TRINITY COUNTY
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
Trinity County Department of Transportation

P.O. Box 2490

Weaverville, Calif. 96093

From; Gerard and Dale Kaz

P.O. Box 224

Junction City, Calif. 96048

Re: Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lance Gulch Road/ State Route 299 Intersection Control Project
which entails construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Lance Gulch and SR 299.

LETTER 19 GERARD AND DALE KAZ, RESIDENTS

Response 19-1: The Commenters object to construction of a roundabout. The Commenters state that the signal should be constructed because it is already funded and a roundabout would present an “extra financial burden.”

The issue of cost is not an environmental impact. This comment will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 19-2: The Commenters state that the existing crosswalks at the intersection provide safe crossing for pedestrians. The Commenters note there is an increased number of people in motorized wheel chairs and that a signal would ensure the safety of pedestrians, including those in wheel chairs.

The Commenter is directed to Responses 1-1 and 5-3.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 19-3: The Commenters state that SR 299 is being “realigned and resurfaced to accommodate increase traffic which included passage of larger longer trucks,” and that these trucks would be unable to “navigate roundabouts easily or safely.”

The Commenter is directed to Response 1-1.

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

Response 19-4: The Commenters state that snow removal is more difficult in roundabouts as compared to “straight highways.”

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 20

Subject: FW: another comment please add

From: Bobbie at the Bernard Haus [<mailto:bobbie@bernardhaus.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2016 4:15 PM

To: Jan Smith

Subject: Mitigated Negative Declaration

RE: Roundabout/Traffic Signals - My \$.03

1. Stop the hemorrhaging...Call at a day...Stop beating the "dead" horse...I could go on and on...Just say "NO!"
2. Let's say "we come 'under' budget". Leave the two stop signs on Glen and Lance Gulch. There - We're Done.
3. Trinity County residents and business owners will be able to use OUR Main Street again.

20-1

Sincerely,

Roberta Dooly

20 Blue Heron Way

Del Loma, CA 96010

LETTER 20 ROBERTA DOOLY, RESIDENT

Response 20-1: The Commenter states that the project should not continue and suggests that the two stop signs on Glen Road and Lance Gulch Road be kept in place to save money and so that residents and business owners will be able to “use our Main Street again.”

This comment does not address the adequacy of the IS/MND. This information will be provided to the Board of Supervisors prior to taking action on the project.

LETTER 21

Due to the considerable length of this letter and its original attachments, please see Attachment A of this memorandum for a complete copy.

LETTER 21 SCOTT WHITE, RESIDENT

Response 21-1: Following preparation of the ICE, Kittelson & Associates, Inc., an engineering firm with expertise in roundabout design, was hired to develop the alternative designs presented in the IS/MND. Any changes to the design that have been considered during preparation of the IS/MND in order to accommodate access for emergency vehicles or businesses have been developed by these experts, not the environmental analysts. The ICE was included for complete disclosure, but the IS/MND reflects more recent design information.

The Commenter's comments during and after the July 6, 2016 Board of Supervisors meeting were not omitted because of bias. Planning staff typically does not include letters to the editor in with comments on an environmental document. Comments made to the Board are already part of the public record that will be available to the Board of Supervisors when they make the ultimate decision.

A more thorough response to this comment letter cannot be completed in time for Planning Commission agenda packets. Further response to this letter, as well as comments and responses to comments received after the public comment period of the Draft IS/MND and comments made at the Planning Commission public hearing, will be made available to the Board of Supervisors and included in their agenda packets, which will be posted on the County's website on December 16, 2016, for the December 20, 2016 Board Meeting, where the final decision is expected to be made.

Attachment A

Public Comment Letter from Scott White, Resident

