

**TUOLUMNE COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
COMMENT RESPONSE**

**Comments on Public Draft ATP - August 2020**

**Consolidated Comments and Response Actions**

**Comment, or summary of comment**

**Response**

**Report Revisions:**

1. Page 13 Correct the name from Dori Reitz to Dore Bietz	Changed Table 1.3.
2. The MLBC suggests the ATP should include a discussion of modifying the existing traffic impact mitigation fee to include bike and pedestrian projects that will mitigate VMT growth impacts from new development. I agree, this is something that has been discussed with the project team and it needs to be included in the final ATP.	Added policy 3.1.5 to include funding and mitigation fees. Also added paragraph 4 under section 7.2.3 "County of Tuolumne Funding" that recommends changes to the TIF.
3. The MLBC requests Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange funds be prioritized for bike and Pedestrian projects. I agree, we have discussed the need for the ATP to recommend policy prioritizing RSTP exchange funds for small safety projects, shoulders or sidewalks that are tied to other local projects. We have discussed this with the project team previously.	Added RSTP recommendation to consider active transportation projects in eligibility and distribution. Section 7.2.3
4. MLBC recommends a focus study of needed short term improvements in Sonora and East Sonora be included in the ATP. I believe this is beyond the scope of work of the ATP. The report should include a strategy to make TCTC funding available to the City and County for local engineers to conduct traffic analysis and perform preliminary engineering of needed improvements on Safe Routes to School, Urbanizing areas and locations with high accident rates.	The ATP supports the pursuit of planning study funding. See Policy 1.1.4 and section 7.2.3.
5. Its unclear why attachment C "Guide to Census Data for existing conditions" is included in the report. Please remove it unless its truly needed.	Removed
P. 3- Introduction, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, please remove SONORA from Sonora Police officer.	Removed
For Twain Harte community maps, include line work for TH Comm. Service District projects (previously shared)- see attached	Done

**Delineation of response to comment already in the ATP**

1. MLBC requests the ATP prioritize projects heavy traffic areas. Please provide a response listing high priority projects in high traffic areas with associated page number.	Existing conditions emphasizes downtown Sonora in Map 3.1 and collision analysis was done for Downtown Sonora. Future improvements were included in the prioritized projects including: 8 City of Sonora priority projects and 4 Eastern Sonora projects (pages 80-89)
2. MLBC requests the ATP prioritize small projects. Please provide a response listing small projects that improve safety with associated page number.	Smaller ADA and mobility projects are often covered during roadway project construction as required by the State of California to afford ADA accessibility and path of travel. Additionally, smaller bike/ped projects are included in the ATP project lists 5.1 and 5.2; ATP-Sonora02, ATP-Sonora04, ATP-Sonora08, ATP-County09, ATP-County10, ATP-County13, ATP-County16, ATP-County24, ATP-County26.
3. MLBC requests prioritization of projects in East Sonora. Please provide a response listing projects in East Sonora with associated page number.	This Mono Way section is mentioned as a priority project on PG 84 (ATP-County 16 & ATP-County 17)
4. MLBC requests special study of Junction, Mono Way, Sanguinetti Road including the Law and Justice Center. Please reference the policy in #4 above which will allow the County and City to receive funding for the requested purpose.	TCTC encourages planning studies and will assist when appropriate. See Policy 1.1.4 and section 7.2.3. Priority ATP-County 19 project includes proposed a complete streets improvement south of HWY 108 to Jacobs and Tannin.
5. MLBC request a thorough evaluation of past successes and failures of past plans. Please respond that such an evaluation is not included in the project scope of work.	Proposed performance monitoring for to ensure that projects proposed in this Active Transportation Plan meet their objectives after implementation. See section 5.5 on PG 97. A specific evaluation of planning projects was not part of this project scope.
6. MLBC suggests prior ATP projects were not successful due to their large size and recommends submittal of funding applications for smaller sized projects to be more competitive. Disagree, prior projects were not large in comparison to projects funded in prior ATP funding cycles. Due to the cumbersome and costly nature of using ATP funding for projects, small projects are better suited to local funding programs.	Projects pursuing funding from the Active Transportation Program are considered competitive and ready by eligible applicants.
7. MLBC requests various traffic engineering improvements such as pavement markings, signage, share roads and geometric improvements be addressed with local funds rather than ATP funding. Agree, see notes 3 and 4 above.	Smaller ADA and mobility projects are often covered during roadway project construction as required by the State of California to afford ADA accessibility and path of travel. Additionally, smaller bike/ped projects are included in the ATP project lists 5.1 and 5.2; ATP-Sonora02, ATP-Sonora04, ATP-Sonora08, ATP-County09, ATP-County10, ATP-County13, ATP-County16, ATP-County24, ATP-County26.
8. MLBC recommends longer sections of 4' shoulder over shorter sections of 8' shoulder on the state highway system. In the past, the California Highway Patrol has demanded 8' shoulders for safety reasons when improvements are made. We support the Highway Patrol's position.	Current standards for State Highways are defined by design and safety guidelines.
9. The MLBC takes issue with District 10's current policy regarding rumble strips. This policy was developed with input from local engineers from the City, County and Caltrans as well as the California Highway Patrol. The process considered vehicular accident history on the state highway system and typical causes possible remediation of such accidents. The TCTC supports Caltrans current policies regarding rumble strips.	Rumble strips are a proven and effective safety countermeasure and the State prioritizes safety projects. The ATP supports cooperative planning, community engagement and project review when developing projects within the region. This goes for State projects as well as at which point special circumstances for rumble strip installation can be discussed.
10. Mr. Baker stated support for a rails with trails project being planned in East Sonora. Please reference the page where this project can be found.	See section 3.11.2 where the project is referenced.
11. Mr. Baker supported consideration of the VMT benefits of the Columbia Bypass. The Columbia Bypass is not included in the RTP's funded project list. Further consideration of the Columbia Bypass project is beyond the scope of work of the ATP.	This is not a part of the ATP development scope of work.