



COMMISSIONERS

Council Members Representing the City of Placerville

Patty Borelli, Kara Taylor, Dennis Thomas

Supervisors Representing the County of El Dorado

Shiva Frentzen, John Hidahl, Lori Parlin, Brian Veerkamp

Contact the EDCTC: 2828 Easy Street, Placerville, CA, 530.642.5260 www.edctc.org

AGENDA

Regular Meeting

Thursday, November 5, 2020, 2:00 PM

(or immediately following the Transit meeting, if after 2:00)

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

Those that would like to observe or listen to the meeting may access it either on a computer or by phone. If you are using a computer or mobile device with video, you can make a comment by using the “raise your hand” option. If you are joining the meeting by phone, press *9 to indicate a desire to make a comment. The Secretary to the Commission will call you by the last three digits of your phone number when it is your turn to speak. Note that your comments must pertain to the subject at hand and are limited to no more than three minutes.

If you would like to remain anonymous and not have your name or phone number posted in this public forum, you may use the “more” button to rename yourself.

By participating in this meeting, you acknowledge that you are being recorded.

If you choose not to observe or listen to the meeting but wish to make a comment on a specific agenda item, please submit your comment via email by 4:00 p.m. Monday, November 2nd to the Secretary to the Commission dkeffer@edctc.org. Your comment will be placed into the record and forwarded to the Commissioners. They may or may not be read at the meeting on your behalf.

The meeting will begin 15 minutes early. If you need assistance before 2:00, please call the Secretary to the Commission 530.642.5260.

[This is your Meeting Link](#)

Webinar ID: 825 2700 5890

Passcode: 584834

Phone: 1-669-900-6833

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioners or staff may request that an item be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion. Items requested to be removed from the Consent Calendar shall be removed if approved by the Commission. The Commission will make any necessary additions, deletions, or corrections to the agenda, and determine matters to be added to, or removed from, the Consent Calendar.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 1, 2020 COMMISSION MEETING (KEFFER)
REQUESTED ACTION: The Secretary to the Commission requests correction to, or approval of, the Draft Action Minutes for the October 1, 2020 Commission meeting.
2. SEPTEMBER 2020 CHECK REGISTER (THOMPSON)
REQUESTED ACTION: Receive and file the September 2020 Check Register.
3. OVERALL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FISCAL YEAR 2020/2021 REPORT (THOMPSON)
REQUESTED ACTION: Receive and file the Overall Work Program Budget vs. Actual Comparison Fiscal Year 2020/2021 July-September Report.
4. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL AND TRAINING (DELORIA)
REQUESTED ACTION: Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a professional services agreement between El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Regional Analysis and Planning Services to update the Regional Transportation Planning Agency Administrative Manual and conduct training for the California Rural Counties Task Force for a not-to-exceed amount of \$9,500.
5. EL DORADO HILLS BUSINESS PARK COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT, AMENDMENT #1 (BARTON)
REQUESTED ACTION: Authorize the Executive Director to sign El Dorado Hills Community Transportation Plan Professional Services Agreement, Amendment #1.

OPEN FORUM

At this time, any person may comment on any item that is not on the agenda that is within the jurisdiction of the Commission. Please voluntarily state your name for the record. Action will not be taken on any item that is not on the agenda. Items requiring action will be referred to staff and/or placed on the next meeting agenda. Your comments will be limited to no more than three minutes.

NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING – 2:00 PM Allotted Time

6. ADOPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2020-2040 (BARTON)
REQUESTED ACTION: Hold a Public Hearing to consider adoption of Resolution 20/21.18 (Attachment A) certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report, adopting the CEQA Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program for the El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2020-2040.
7. ADOPTION OF THE EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2020-2040 (BARTON)
REQUESTED ACTION: Hold a Public Hearing to consider the Adoption of Resolution 20/21.19 (Attachment A) approving the Final El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2020-2040.

BUSINESS ITEM

8. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY ZERO EMISSION BUS FLEET CONVERSION PLAN (BOLSTER)
REQUESTED ACTION: Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a professional services agreement between the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and Stantec, to develop the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan for a not-to-exceed amount of \$195,000.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CALTRANS – COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

NOTE: The next regular meeting is scheduled for 2:00 PM on December 3, 2020; an online meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: DANA KEFFER, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT/SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 1, 2020 COMMISSION MEETING

REQUESTED ACTION: The Secretary to the Commission requests correction to, or approval of, the Draft Action Minutes for the October 1, 2020 Commission meeting.

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

Attachment: October 1, 2020 Minutes



2828 Easy Street, Suite 1, Placerville, CA 95667 www.edctc.org 530.642.5260

Councilmembers Representing City of Placerville: Patty Borelli, Kara Taylor, Dennis Thomas
Supervisors Representing El Dorado County: Shiva Frentzen, John Hidahl, Lori Parlin, Brian Veerkamp
 Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

ACTION MINUTES

Regular Meeting, Thursday, October 1, 2020, 2:00 PM

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

In Response to Coronavirus COVID-19 California Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 on March 17, 2020, relating to the convening of public meetings in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission convened this regularly scheduled meeting using an online conference service and was not held at 330 Fair Lane, Placerville. Notice of the location change was made at least 72 hours in advance. All votes were completed with a roll call vote and public comment was accepted.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Frentzen called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM and led the Pledge of Allegiance

ATTENDANCE: Chair Frentzen, Vice Chair Taylor, and Commissioners Borelli, Hidahl, Parlin, Thomas, Veerkamp, and Caltrans Ex Officio Kevin Yount. ABSENT: None

ADOPTION OF AGENDA AND CONSENT CALENDAR

ACTION: Commissioner Borelli made a motion to adopt the agenda and to approve or adopt items 1-5 on the Consent Calendar. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Veerkamp which unanimously carried as follows:

MOTION/SECOND: Borelli/Veerkamp
AYES: Borelli, Frentzen, Hidahl, Parlin, Taylor, Thomas, Veerkamp
ABSTAIN: None
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. MINUTES FOR THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2020 COMMISSION MEETING
 REQUESTED ACTION: The Secretary to the Commission requests correction to, or approval of, the Draft Action Minutes for the September 3, 2020 Commission meeting.
2. AUGUST 2020 CHECK REGISTER
 REQUESTED ACTION: Receive and file the August 2020 Check Register.
3. OVERALL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 REPORT
 REQUESTED ACTION: Receive and file the Overall Work Program Budget vs. Actual Comparison Fiscal Year 2019/2020 July-June Report
4. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 STATE OF GOOD REPAIR FUNDS FINAL ALLOCATION AND CLAIM
 REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt Resolution 20/21.15 to approve the Transportation Development Act Fiscal Year 2019/2020 State of Good Repair Funds Final Allocation and Claim.

5. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FISCAL YEAR 2019/2020 ACTUAL APPORTIONMENT AND ALLOCATION FOR STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS

REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt Resolution 20/21.16 approving the Transportation Development Act Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Revised Apportionment and Allocation for State Transit Assistance Funds

OPEN FORUM

There were no public comments.

BUSINESS ITEMS

6. FISCAL YEAR 2020/2021 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM, BUDGET, AND GOALS AND OBJECTIVES, AMENDMENT #2

REQUESTED ACTION: Adopt Resolution 20/21.17 approving the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Overall Work Program, Budget, and Goals and Objectives, Amendment #2.

ACTION: Commissioner Hidahl made a motion to approve the Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Overall Work Program, Budget, and Goals and Objectives, Amendment #2 as requested. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thomas which carried as follows:

MOTION/SECOND: Hidahl/Thomas

AYES: Borelli, Frentzen, Hidahl, Parlin, Taylor, Thomas, Veerkamp

ABSTAIN: None

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

INFORMATION ITEMS

9. EL DORADO HILLS BUSINESS PARK COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECT AND PUBLIC OUTREACH UPDATE

REQUESTED ACTION: None. This item is for information only.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CALTRANS – COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 PM.

NOTE: The next regular meeting is scheduled for 2:00 PM on November 5, 2020; an online meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR

STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: KAREN THOMPSON, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES OFFICER
SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER 2020 CHECK REGISTER

REQUESTED ACTION

Receive and file the September 2020 Check Register (Attachment A).

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The attached check listing includes six payments that merit further explanation:

- AIM Consulting, Inc* \$5,494.09
 August professional services for the US 50 Recreation Travel Hot Spot Transportation Management Study Placerville Public Engagement, Work Element 254. This contract was approved at the November 1, 2018 EDCTC meeting.
- David Turch & Associates*..... \$10,834.00
 July – August Federal advocacy services, Work Element 410. This contract was approved at the April 2, 2020 EDCTC meeting.
- De Novo Planning Group*..... \$30,057.61
 July-August professional services for the Regional Transportation Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Work Element 200. The contract with De Novo Planning Group was approved at the August 1, 2019 EDCTC meeting.
- Fehr & Peers* \$1,466.92
 July professional services for the El Dorado County Travel Demand Model Update for compliance with Senate Bill 743, Work Element 202. This contract was approved at the November 7, 2019 EDCTC meeting.
- Fehr & Peers* \$8,431.60
- Fehr & Peers* \$2,288.13
 July - August professional services for the El Dorado Hills Business Park Community Transportation Plan, Work Element 261. This contract was approved at the April 4, 2019 EDCTC meeting.

Approved for Agenda:

 Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

Attachment A: September 2020 Check Register

El Dorado County Transportation Commission
Check Register
September 2020

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>Memo</u>
09/01/2020	Ameritas Life Insurance Corp.	703.64	September 2020 Dental and Vision Premiums
09/01/2020	AT&T	125.23	August 2020 Office Phones
09/01/2020	Benefit Coordinators Corporation	232.71	September 2020 Life/Disability Premiums
09/01/2020	CalPERS Fiscal Services Division	350.00	2019/20 GASB-68 Reports & Schedules
09/01/2020	CalPERS Health	6,624.87	September 2020 Health Premiums
09/01/2020	Carbon Copy	33.60	August 2020 Copy Machine Maintenance/Copies
09/01/2020	Fehr & Peers	8,431.60	* July 2020 El Dorado Hills Business Park Transp Plan
09/01/2020	Imperial Printing	80.05	Business Cards
09/09/2020	CalPERS Retirement System	3,781.27	September 2020 Contribution #1
09/10/2020	Century Building Maintenance	450.00	August 2020 Building Maintenance
09/10/2020	David Turch and Associates	10,834.00	* Federal Advocacy July-August
09/10/2020	De Lage Landen Financial Services	203.78	August 2020 Copy Machine Lease Payment
09/10/2020	Fehr & Peers	1,466.92	* July 2020 SB743 Travel Demand Model Update
09/10/2020	Roberts & Company, Inc.	95.00	August 2020 Accounting Oversight
09/10/2020	Sierra Office Supply & Printing	130.40	August 2020 Office Supplies
09/18/2020	Cardmember Service - Visa JR	855.49	August 2020 Office Exp including webcams for meetings
09/18/2020	Cardmember Service - Visa KT	220.90	Office Exp August 2020
09/21/2020	AIM Consulting, Inc.	5,494.09	* August 2020 Hot Spot Study Placerville Public Engagement
09/21/2020	Cal.net	64.92	October 2020 Internet Service Provider
09/21/2020	De Novo Planning Group	30,057.61	* El Dorado County Regional Transp Plan Environmental Impact Report
09/21/2020	Fehr & Peers	2,288.13	* August 2020 El Dorado Hills Business Park Transp Plan
09/21/2020	Mountain Democrat	105.90	Public Notices
09/21/2020	Rimrock Water Company	50.00	Jul-Aug 2020 Water
09/21/2020	RTS IT, Inc.	552.50	October 2020 ITCare Silver Service Plan
09/21/2020	Steele Building Offices	4,517.00	October 2020 Office Rent
09/23/2020	CalPERS Retirement System	3,781.27	September 2020 Contrib #2
09/23/2020	Umpqua Bank	64.90	August Analyzed Checking Fee
09/24/2020	QuickBooks Payroll Service	10.00	August 2020 Payroll Fee
	Total	<u>81,605.78</u>	

CONSENT CALENDAR

STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: KAREN THOMPSON, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES OFFICER
SUBJECT: OVERALL WORK PROGRAM BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FISCAL YEAR 2020/2021 REPORT

REQUESTED ACTION

Receive and file the Overall Work Program Budget vs. Actual Comparison Fiscal Year (FY) 2020/2021 July-September Report (Attachment A).

BACKGROUND

This budget vs. actual comparison is for the first quarter of FY 2020/2021. The purpose of this report is to compare the budgeted revenues and expenditures to the actual for the fiscal year by work element and to provide information relative to the financial position of the agency.

DISCUSSION

This attached summary report shows the budget vs. actual expenditures by work element.

A summary of the Commission’s total funds on hand, disbursements, and receipts for July through September are provided in the table below.

Fiscal Year Cash Balances

Public Funds Money Market and Checking Account Balances at July 1, 2020	\$762,404
Receipts	\$463,059
Disbursements	\$380,609
Public Funds Money Market and Checking Account Balances at September 30, 2020	\$844,854

Approved for Agenda:

 Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

Attachment A: OWP Budget vs. Actual Comparison FY 2020/2021 July-September

**EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OWP BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FY 2020/2021 JULY-SEPTEMBER**

	WE 50		WE 100		WE 110		WE 111		WE 112		WE 120	
	Indirect Costs		Overall Work Program Administration & Implementation		Intergovernmental Coordination		Rural Counties Task Force		Rural Counties Task Force Administrative Guidebook Training		Transportation Development Act & Transit Administration	
	Budget 50	Actual 50	Budget 100	Actual 100	Budget 110	Actual 110	Budget 111	Actual 111	Budget 112	Actual 112	Budget 120	Actual 120
Income												
Local Transportation Funds (LTF)			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52,510.15	8,448.02
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)			66,707.38	12,265.49	149,989.41	28,922.66	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Grants									10,000.00			
STIP Planning, Programing & Monitoring (PPM)			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surface Transp Block Grant Prog (STBGP)			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Airport Land Use Commission Fees												
Sustainable Communities FTA 5304												
FHWA-State Planning & Research												
SB1 Sustainable Communities												
State Highway Account (SHA)												
Freeway Service Patrol												
Rural Counties Task Force							42,853.00	9,073.10	-	-		
El Dorado Transit Matching Funds for ZEB Conversion Plan												
Misc Income/EDH CSD/El Dorado County		52.29										
Total Income	-	52.29	66,707.38	12,265.49	149,989.41	28,922.66	42,853.00	9,073.10	10,000.00	-	52,510.15	8,448.02
Expense												
Permanent Employees/Benefits	195,901.28	52,621.73	41,577.69	7,644.91	90,712.48	18,027.09	23,437.37	5,508.04	311.64	-	22,756.22	5,265.53
Temporary Employee	-	-										
Building Lease & Utilities	65,004.00	20,150.83										
Office Expense	44,866.00	8,094.35	-	-	4,450.00	-	5,250.00	236.00	-	-	100.00	-
Professional Services	27,650.00	445.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,500.00	-	15,900.00	-
Indirect Cost Allocation	(336,344.07)	(73,738.45)	25,129.69	4,620.58	54,826.93	10,895.57	14,165.63	3,329.06	188.36	-	13,753.93	3,182.49
Indirect Costs Carryover from Prior Year	7,922.79											
Interest-Indirect Credit	(5,000.00)											
Total Expense	0.00	7,573.46	66,707.38	12,265.49	149,989.41	28,922.66	42,853.00	9,073.10	10,000.00	-	52,510.15	8,448.02
Current Year Retention												-
Prior Year Retention												
OWP Budget vs. Actual Expenses			18.4%		19.3%		21.2%		0.0%		16.1%	

**EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OWP BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FY 2020/2021 JULY-SEPTEMBER**

	WE 125		WE 130		WE 200		WE 202		WE 221		WE 228	
	Airport Land Use Commission		Freeway Service Patrol		Regional Transportation Plan		El Dorado County Travel Demand Model Update to SB743 Compliance		Transit Planning		El Dorado Transit Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan	
	Budget 125	Actual 125	Budget 130	Actual 130	Budget 200	Actual 200	Budget 202	Actual 202	Budget 221	Actual 221	Budget 228	Actual 228
Income												
Local Transportation Funds (LTF)	11,670.58	1,268.72			86,927.35	8,568.14	-	-	27,122.64	8,459.24	25,000.00	1,533.93
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)	-	-	-	-	49,838.07	8,802.64	1,100.57	399.10	-	-	-	-
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Grants					11,189.70	11,189.70	3,112.29	3,112.29				
STIP Planning, Programing & Monitoring (PPM)	-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-
Surface Transp Block Grant Prog (STBGP)	-	-	-	-	116,905.51	30,057.61	-	-	-	-	-	-
Airport Land Use Commission Fees												
Sustainable Communities FTA 5304												
FHWA-State Planning & Research												
SB1 Sustainable Communities											180,000.00	
State Highway Account (SHA)												
Freeway Service Patrol			189,035.25	45,237.12								
Rural Counties Task Force												
El Dorado Transit Matching Funds for ZEB Conversion Plan											20,000.00	
Misc Income/EDH CSD/El Dorado County		-										
Total Income	11,670.58	1,268.72	189,035.25	45,237.12	264,860.63	58,618.09	4,212.86	3,511.39	27,122.64	8,459.24	225,000.00	1,533.93
Expense												
Permanent Employees/Benefits	4,157.67	790.78	25,638.97	5,663.82	67,777.27	17,762.08	692.95	855.00	16,873.96	5,272.53	18,698.54	929.34
Temporary Employee												
Building Lease & Utilities												
Office Expense	-	-	900.00	-	1,500.00	63.00	-	-	50.00	-	-	42.90
Professional Services	5,000.00	-	147,000.00	36,150.08	154,618.56	30,057.61	3,101.09	2,139.63	-	-	195,000.00	-
Indirect Cost Allocation	2,512.91	477.94	15,496.28	3,423.22	40,964.80	10,735.40	418.82	516.76	10,198.68	3,186.71	11,301.46	561.69
Indirect Costs Carryover from Prior Year												
Interest-Indirect Credit												
Total Expense	11,670.58	1,268.72	189,035.25	45,237.12	264,860.63	58,618.09	4,212.86	3,511.39	27,122.64	8,459.24	225,000.00	1,533.93
Current Year Retention						3,339.73		-				
Prior Year Retention						-		-				
OWP Budget vs. Actual Expenses	10.9%		23.9%		23.4%		83.3%		31.2%		0.7%	

**EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OWP BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FY 2020/2021 JULY-SEPTEMBER**

	WE 253		WE 254		WE 261		WE 300		WE 310	
	US 50 Corridor System Analysis, Investment Strategy and Access Control Action Plan		US 50/Placerville Hot Spot Study Public Engagement		El Dorado Hills Business Park Community Transportation Plan		State & Federal Programming		Transportation Project Delivery & Oversight	
	Budget 253	Actual 253	Budget 254	Actual 254	Budget 261	Actual 261	Budget 300	Actual 300	Budget 310	Actual 310
Income										
Local Transportation Funds (LTF)	-	-	10,754.43	-	-	-	28,911.70	9,329.06	39,489.46	5,070.84
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Grants			12,070.87	7,259.54						
STIP Planning, Programing & Monitoring (PPM)	-	-			-	-	47,000.00	12,882.99	47,000.00	15,212.53
Surface Transp Block Grant Prog (STBGP)	46,260.00	-	-	-	10,334.00	1,283.89	-	-	-	-
Airport Land Use Commission Fees										
Sustainable Communities FTA 5304										
FHWA-State Planning & Research	185,040.00				82,671.96	10,271.12				
SB1 Sustainable Communities										
State Highway Account (SHA)			393.24	393.24						
Freeway Service Patrol										
Rural Counties Task Force										
El Dorado Transit Matching Funds for ZEB Conversion Plan										
Misc Income/EDH CSD/El Dorado County					10,334.00	1,283.89				
Total Income	231,300.00	-	23,218.54	7,652.78	103,339.96	12,838.90	75,911.70	22,212.05	86,489.46	20,283.37
Expense										
Permanent Employees/Benefits	28,858.08	-	2,078.84	660.39	4,689.59	1,320.85	47,252.27	13,844.46	53,845.24	12,642.34
Temporary Employee										
Building Lease & Utilities										
Office Expense	-	-	-	-	1,100.00	-	100.00	-	100.00	-
Professional Services	185,000.00	-	19,883.25	6,593.25	94,715.96	10,719.73		-	-	-
Indirect Cost Allocation	17,441.92	-	1,256.45	399.14	2,834.41	798.32	28,559.43	8,367.59	32,544.22	7,641.03
Indirect Costs Carryover from Prior Year										
Interest-Indirect Credit										
Total Expense	231,300.00	-	23,218.54	7,652.78	103,339.96	12,838.90	75,911.70	22,212.05	86,489.46	20,283.37
Current Year Retention				732.59		1,191.09				
Prior Year Retention										
OWP Budget vs. Actual Expenses	0.0%		36.1%		13.6%		29.3%		23.5%	

**EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OWP BUDGET VS. ACTUAL COMPARISON FY 2020/2021 JULY-SEPTEMBER**

	WE 330		WE 400		WE 410					
	Active & Alternative Transportation Programs		Public Education & Outreach		Transportation Advocacy		Caltrans Indirect Cost Allocation Plan (ICAP) Excluded Costs		OWP Total	Total
	Budget 330	Actual 330	Budget 400	Actual 400	Budget 410	Actual 410	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
Income										
Local Transportation Funds (LTF)	39,157.96	-	-	-	91,342.56	33,984.94	4,000.00	149.70	416,886.83	76,812.59
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)	-	-	69,364.57	14,181.45	-	-	-	-	337,000.00	64,571.34
Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Grants									36,372.86	21,561.53
STIP Planning, Programing & Monitoring (PPM)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94,000.00	28,095.52
Surface Transp Block Grant Prog (STBGP)	11,065.77	12,549.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	184,565.28	43,891.02
Airport Land Use Commission Fees									-	-
Sustainable Communities FTA 5304									-	-
FHWA-State Planning & Research									267,711.96	10,271.12
SB1 Sustainable Communities									180,000.00	-
State Highway Account (SHA)									393.24	393.24
Freeway Service Patrol									189,035.25	45,237.12
Rural Counties Task Force									42,853.00	9,073.10
El Dorado Transit Matching Funds for ZEB Conversion Plan										
Misc Income/EDH CSD/El Dorado County	2,500.00	3.64			39,000.00	9,750.00		-	51,834.00	11,089.82
Total Income	52,723.73	12,553.16	69,364.57	14,181.45	130,342.56	43,734.94	4,000.00	149.70	1,800,652.42	310,996.40
									-	0.00
Expense										
Permanent Employees/Benefits	32,643.74	7,824.21	43,171.55	8,839.10	31,315.42	9,152.29	-	-	752,390.77	174,624.49
Temporary Employee									-	0.00
Building Lease & Utilities									65,004.00	20,150.83
Office Expense	350.00	-	100.00	-	15,100.00	3,050.00	4,000.00	149.70	77,966.00	11,635.95
Professional Services	-	-			65,000.00	16,251.00			922,368.86	102,356.30
Indirect Cost Allocation	19,729.99	4,728.95	26,093.02	5,342.35	18,927.14	5,531.65			(0.00)	0.00
Indirect Costs Carryover from Prior Year									7,922.79	-
Interest-Indirect Credit									(5,000.00)	0.00
Total Expense	52,723.73	12,553.16	69,364.57	14,181.45	130,342.56	33,984.94	4,000.00	149.70	1,820,652.42	308,767.57
Current Year Retention										5,263.41
Prior Year Retention										0.00
OWP Budget vs. Actual Expenses	23.8%		20.4%		26.1%		3.7%		17.2%	
	25% of FY Complete									

CONSENT CALENDAR**STAFF REPORT**

DATE: November 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: WOODROW DELORIA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT: REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE MANUAL AND TRAINING

REQUESTED ACTION

Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a professional services agreement between the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and Regional Analysis and Planning Services to update the RTPA Administrative Manual and conduct training for the California Rural Counties Task Force for a not-to-exceed amount of \$9,500.

BACKGROUND

The State of California contains 26 rural counties, which generally have populations of less than 250,000 and do not have a single urbanized area greater than 50,000. In order to provide a direct opportunity for the rural counties to remain informed, have a voice, and become involved with changing statewide transportation policies and programs, a task force was formed in 1988 as a joint effort between the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the rural counties. There are 26 rural county Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) or Local Transportation Commissions represented on the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF).

EDCTC staff has been involved in the leadership of the RCTF for many years; Executive Director Woodrow Deloria is the current Chair. The member agencies of the RCTF identified a need for standardized guidance and templates for several administrative tasks performed in the operations of a rural RTPA. On behalf of the RCTF, EDCTC coordinated with the Caltrans Office of Regional and Interagency Planning to utilize carryover Rural Planning Assistance funds to support the development of "Regional Transportation Planning Agency Administrative Support Manual and Training" for the benefit of the member agencies. EDCTC staff, under contract with Regional Analysis and Planning Services, completed the manual in Fiscal Year 2015/16. The completed manual is currently available on the Rural Counties Task Force web page.

DISCUSSION

RCTF members have recently indicated a need for training to support them in the utilization of the many processes and procedures included in the RTPA Manual. Working with the RCTF, EDCTC was able to procure Rural Planning Assistance Carryover funds from Caltrans, to engage in a contract with a consultant to conduct the training. The Administrative Support Manual was completed by Regional Analysis and Planning Services, a nonprofit entity composed of staff from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. EDCTC staff completed the appropriate forms for sole source contracting, as outlined in the Administrative Support Manual, and the justification for a sole source contract under these circumstances are listed below:

- The need for a sole source is not due to failure to plan or a lack of advanced planning
- The need for sole source is not due to concern about the amount of Federal assistance available to support the procurement
- Only one contractor/consultant/vendor who can provide unique/highly specialized item/service
- Economy or efficiency supports award to existing contractor/consultant as a logical follow-on to work already in progress under a competitively awarded contract

- The item or service is essential in maintaining research or operational continuity
- The item/service is one with which staff members who will use the item/service have specialized training and/or expertise and retraining would incur substantial cost, in time and money

Based on these criteria, EDCTC staff determined that a contract with Regional Analysis and Planning Services is appropriate.

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

CONSENT ITEM**STAFF REPORT**

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: JERRY BARTON, SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
SUBJECT: EL DORADO HILLS BUSINESS PARK COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT, AMENDMENT #1

REQUESTED ACTION

Authorize the Executive Director to sign the El Dorado Hills Business Park Community Transportation Plan Professional Services Agreement, Amendment #1.

BACKGROUND

Beginning in early 2017, the El Dorado Hills (EDH) Business Park Owners Association started pursuing a new vision for the business park to effectively compete for and attract a variety of employment uses and instill a renewed business energy. As a result, the Business Park Owners Association approached the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) with a desire to revisit the planning of transportation as it relates to the existing and future uses and economic prosperity of the EDH Business Park. In collaboration with El Dorado County's planning and economic development divisions, and with the support of the Business Park Owner's Association, EDCTC prepared a Caltrans grant application. In 2018, EDCTC was awarded \$144,000 in Caltrans Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) State Planning & Research grant funding to develop the EDH Business Park Community Transportation Plan.

DISCUSSION

On April 4, 2019, EDCTC authorized the Executive Director to enter into a professional services agreement between EDCTC and Fehr & Peers, to develop the El Dorado Hills Business Park Community Transportation Plan, for a not-to-exceed amount of \$155,000. Early work started on the project in fall 2019 with land use and transportation project review and kick off meetings with the project team and core partners. In early 2020, a survey was distributed to the business park just as the statewide COVID-19 shelter in place orders were issued by the Governor. The limited responses to the survey, and uncertainty related to in person engagement, were a signal to the project team that we need to determine another method for public outreach.

EDCTC and the project team had to pivot to virtual public outreach for the EDH Business Park Community Transportation Plan. The setback related to COVID was a significant enough delay that EDCTC had to request that Caltrans extend the grant deadline by five months. Caltrans approved the extension through June 30, 2021 and the project is moving forward, albeit with a new approach to public outreach (<https://www.edctc.org/edh-business-park>). Additionally, the term for the Professional Services Agreement between EDCTC and Fehr and Peers for the project originally set to expire on January 30, 2021 must be extended to June 30, 2021.

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING
Allotted Time: 2:00 PM

STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: JERRY BARTON, SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2020-2040

REQUESTED ACTION

Hold a Public Hearing to consider adoption of Resolution 20/21.18 (Attachment A) certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report, adopting the CEQA Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program for the El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2020-2040.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Plan is a long-range (20-year) transportation funding plan that identifies future transportation improvements, associated costs, projected revenues, and the timing for implementation of projects through 2040. The RTP is the mechanism by which local projects demonstrate eligibility to receive federal and state funding. El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) is required to prepare and adopt an RTP every five years. The last RTP was adopted in 2015. The projects contained in the El Dorado County RTP 2040 are integrated into the larger six-county regional planning efforts led by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) through our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) meets the federal planning requirement and the state's requirement to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) pursuant to Senate Bill 375. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment.

The Draft EIR evaluates the RTP 2020-2040 on a programmatic level with respect to policies, programs, and projects' potential impact on the environment. The Draft EIR also serves as a programmatic-level environmental document to evaluate planning and permitting actions associated with the RTP 2040. Many subsequent actions will require additional and/or supplemental analysis as the details of the action become clear from the development of detailed project planning, design, and engineering. EDCTC, as the RTP 2020-2040 preparer, is also the CEQA lead agency responsible for preparing the EIR. EDCTC contracted with the De Novo Planning Group to prepare the EIR for the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040.

DISCUSSION

The 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR started on September 4, 2020 and concluded on October 19, 2020. Two comment letters were received during the public review period. One letter was from Friends of Clay Street/Friends of Historic Hangtown, the other was from the Vice Chair of the Wopumnes Tribal Council of El Dorado County. *An evaluation of the comment letters and written responses to the comment letters have been prepared and have been incorporated into the Final EIR.* The comments *did not* alter the conclusions of the Draft EIR. The Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR identifies potentially significant, and significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts to reduce or eliminate the impact to a less than significant level.

However, significant and unavoidable impacts remain on agricultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, including transportation and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) greenhouse gas emissions, under both existing and cumulative settings. EDCTC has reviewed the significant and unavoidable impacts and weighed those findings against the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits provided by the RTP. The following actions define the steps necessary to approve the Final RTP 2020-2040 and to certify the EIR.

- CEQA Findings Regarding Significant Impacts and Project Alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091) – These findings are presented in Attachment A, Exhibit A-1 to the resolution and explain how EDCTC addressed each identified significant impact, including the mitigation measures adopted or an explanation of why such measures are infeasible. These findings also explain how EDCTC addressed the use of project alternatives to reduce or avoid the significant impacts of the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040.
- Statements of Overriding Considerations (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093) – These findings are presented in Attachment A, Exhibit A-1 to the resolution and document EDCTC's decision to adopt the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040 despite the fact that unavoidable significant impacts will result based on the overriding benefits of the RTP.
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program – When a lead agency makes findings on significant effects identified in an EIR, that agency must also adopt a program for reporting or monitoring mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d), 15097). The Mitigation Monitoring program is included in Attachment B, Final EIR.

EDCTC staff, with the concurrence of the EDCTC Technical Advisory Committee, recommends that the Board approve Resolution No. ## certifying the Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR (Attachment B), adopting the CEQA Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040. The full Final RTP and EIR are available on the project website <https://www.edctc.org/rtp2040>

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

- Attachments:
- A) EDCTC Resolution No. 20/21.18, including Exhibit A-1, CEQA Findings and Statements of Overriding Considerations and Exhibit A-2, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
 - B) Final Environmental Impact Report
(*Provided on CD, online, and at the EDCTC office*)



2828 Easy Street, Suite 1, Placerville, CA 95667 www.edctc.org 530.642.5260

Councilmembers Representing City of Placerville: Patty Borelli, Kara Taylor, Dennis Thomas

Supervisors Representing El Dorado County: Shiva Frentzen, John Hidahl, Lori Parlin, Brian Veerkamp

RESOLUTION NO. 20/21.18

RESOLUTION OF THE EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, ADOPTING CEQA FINDINGS, A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Government Code, Title 7.95, Section 67950, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) was created as a local planning agency to provide regional transportation planning for the area of El Dorado County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 29532.1(g) identifies EDCTC as the designated regional transportation planning agency for El Dorado County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and is responsible for the planning, allocating and/or programming of funds; and

WHEREAS, the EDCTC is required by state law to adopt and submit a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission and the State Department of Transportation every five years (Government Code, Section 65080[c]); and

WHEREAS, EDCTC is the lead agency for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040; and

WHEREAS, EDCTC issued and distributed an Initial Study and Notice of Preparation for the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040 Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2020019055) including to the State Office of Planning and Research on January 21, 2020, which was circulated for a 30-day review period; and

WHEREAS, EDCTC publicly noticed and held a public scoping meeting on February 5, 2020 to solicit comments from the public and potential responsible and trustee agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Environmental Impact Report was completed and filed with the State Office of Planning and Research and a 45-day public review period commenced on September 4, 2020; and

WHEREAS, EDCTC received two comment letters; one from Friends of Clay Street/Friends of Historic Hangtown, the other from the Vice Chair of the Wopumnes Tribal Council of El Dorado County during the 45-day public review period; and

WHEREAS, EDCTC evaluated all comments on environmental issues received during the comment period on the Draft EIR and prepared written responses to the comments, which are included in the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Final Environmental Impact Report identified certain significant and potentially significant adverse effects on the environment caused by the Project (RTP);

WHEREAS, EDCTC desires, in accordance with CEQA, to declare that, despite the occurrence of significant environmental effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided through the

adoption of feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives, there exist certain overriding economic, social, and other considerations for approving the Project that the EDCTC believes justify the occurrence of those impacts; and

WHEREAS, EDCTC specifically finds that where one reason for approving the Project and rejecting alternatives is given in its findings or in the record, where more than one reason for rejecting or modifying mitigation measures is given in the record, and where more than one reason is given for adopting the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the EDCTC would have made its decision on the basis of any one of those reasons.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission as follows:

1. Pursuant to Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines, the EDCTC hereby certifies that:
 - a. The Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
 - b. The Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR was presented to the EDCTC, and the EDCTC reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR prior to taking action on the Final RTP 2020-2040 EIR; and
 - c. The Final RTP EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the El Dorado County Transportation Commission.
2. As set forth in Section 15043 of the CEQA Guidelines a public agency may approve a project even though the project would cause a significant effect on the environment if the agency makes a fully informed and publicly disclosed decision that:
 - a. There is no feasible way to lessen or avoid the significant effect; and
 - b. Specifically identified expected benefits from the project outweigh the policy of reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts of the project. The EDCTC hereby makes that decision as set forth more fully in Exhibit A-1, attached hereto.
3. Exhibit A-1 of this Resolution provides the findings required under Section 15043 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines relating to accepting adverse impacts of the project due to overriding considerations. EDCTC has reviewed the findings and determines that the economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project have been balanced against the unavoidable environmental risks that may result, and finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. The EDCTC, therefore, after reviewing the record and hearing the comments provided, finds the adverse environmental effects of the project to be outweighed by the benefits provided to the County by the project. EDCTC hereby makes the findings as set forth in Exhibit A-1 and adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations attached hereto as Exhibit A-1 (CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations).
4. Exhibit A-1 of this Resolution provides CEQA Findings required under Section 15043 and 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines for significant effects of the project, feasibility of mitigation measures, and feasibility of alternatives. EDCTC, after reviewing the record and hearing the comments provided, hereby finds and adopts the various findings attached hereto as Exhibit A-1.
5. After considering the EIR and in conjunction with making these findings, the EDCTC hereby finds that, pursuant to Section 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines, approval of the adopted El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040 will result in significant effects on the environment; however, EDCTC has eliminated or substantially lessened these significant effects where feasible, and as set forth in Exhibit A-1 has determined that remaining significant effects are found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 and acceptable under Section 15093.

6. EDCTC has considered the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040 alternatives and concludes, based on substantial evidence in the record that only the adopted RTP alternative (Financially Constrained) can be feasibly implemented in light of economic, legal, social, technological, and other reasons, as discussed herein, and therefore adopts the Financially Constrained alternative as the Project.
7. These findings made by EDCTC are made after independent consideration and are supported by the documents provided and comments received which taken together demonstrate substantial evidence in the record.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission that:

1. EDCTC hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (Included in Final EIR) attached hereto to ensure implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR. EDCTC finds that these mitigation measures are fully enforceable as policies and/or Implementation measures of the Project and shall be binding upon the affected local jurisdictions.
2. EDCTC hereby directs staff to immediately commence to: a) file of a Notice of Determination documenting these decisions; and b) retain a copy of the certified Final EIR as a public record.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission governing body at the regular meeting held on November 5, 2020 by the following vote:

Vote Pending

Attest:

Shiva Frentzen, Chairperson

Dana Keffer, Secretary to the Commission

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE EL DORADO COUNTY 2020-2040 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE REQUIRED UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq)

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) requires El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC), as the CEQA lead agency, to: 1) make written findings when it approves a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, and 2) identify overriding considerations for significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR.

This document explains EDCTC's findings regarding the significant and potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR prepared for the El Dorado County 2020-2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP or Project). The statement of overriding considerations in section VIII identifies economic, social, technical, and other benefits of the Project that override any significant environmental impacts that would result from the project.

As required under CEQA, the Final EIR describes the project, adverse environmental impacts of the project, and Mitigation Measures and alternatives that would substantially reduce or avoid those impacts. The information and conclusions contained in the EIR reflect EDCTC's independent judgment.

The Final EIR (which includes the Draft EIR, comments, responses to comments, and revisions to the Draft EIR) for the Project, examined the proposed project and several alternatives to the project including the: (1) No Project Alternative; (2) Road Emphasis Alternative; (3) Transit Enhancement Alternative; and (4) Financially Unconstrained Alternative.

The Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are presented for adoption by EDCTC Board, as EDCTC's findings under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., title 14, § 15000 et seq.) relating to the project. The Findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of this Board regarding the project's environmental impacts, Mitigation Measures, alternatives to the project, and the overriding considerations, which in this Board's view, justify approval of the project, despite its environmental effects.

II. GENERAL FINDINGS AND OVERVIEW

Background

EDCTC is required to adopt and submit an updated RTP (Regional Transportation Plan) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The RTP is a long-range, 20-year minimum, comprehensive transportation plan for all modes including: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, rail and goods movement. The purpose of the RTP is to serve as a foundation for the development of the shorter "action" plans called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which satisfies California transportation planning requirements, and the federal counterpart referred to as the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for all transportation projects that require federal approval. The 2020-2040 RTP Program EIR covers Planned, Programmed, or Project Development Only. Planned projects are projects currently planned for future development. Programmed projects have some level of funding already committed, and are ready for completion in the event they are fully funded. Lastly, Project Development Only represents projects that are still in the development phase, exceed the available funding for the fiscally constrained alternative, and may be developed only on a long-term time horizon (i.e. Post-2040).

The 2020-2040 El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) introduces a planning framework that is updated from the prior RTP, to reflect current priorities and practices at the regional, State, and federal levels. This framework provides guidance to policy makers as they make decisions impacting the region's transportation system. Over the 20-year time horizon of this long-range plan, the goals, policies, and objectives will produce a more coordinated and comprehensive transportation system that effectively and efficiently utilizes the region's resources to the benefit of the citizens of El Dorado County. The goals, policies, and objectives reflect the desired outcomes of the 2040 RTP.

Project Overview

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the updated El Dorado County RTP that has been prepared to address the 2020 to 2040 timeframe. The RTP has been prepared to fulfil the state requirements of AB 402 (Government Code Title 7, Chapter 2.5 Sections 65080-65082) using specific guidance from the California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines. More specifically, the RTP is a twenty-year, comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan, including, but not limited to; highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, and goods movement. EDCTC is required to adopt and submit an updated RTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every five years. The RTP is action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (10 year) and long-term (10- to 20-years and beyond) periods.

The purpose of the 2020-2040 RTP is to provide a clear vision of the regional transportation goals, objectives, and policies in the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) planning area.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The 2020-2040 RTP provides short-term and long-term strategies for implementation, which includes realistic and fiscally constrained alternatives.

The 2020-2040 RTP, pending review by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), will become the El Dorado County portion of the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). As the MPO for the Sacramento Region SACOG, is responsible for the development of the MTP and Sustainable Communities strategies and related air quality conformity as directed under SB 375.

The RTP contains eight specific goals, each with supporting policies and objectives, for integrated land use, air quality, and transportation planning; sustainability; highways, streets, and regional/inter-regional roadways; public transit; aviation; active transportation; transportation systems management; and funding. The goals reflect the region's transportation needs and priorities while the objectives represent a specific need or priority. The following goals and objectives, by transportation mode and strategy, have been identified for the 2020-2040 RTP.

The **Policy Element** presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, opportunities, and foreclosed options that will result from implementation of the RTP, as well as identifies mobility goals, objectives, and policies of the region. California law (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) states that each RTP shall include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons; and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

The **Action Element** identifies short- and long-term actions needed to achieve the RTP's objectives and implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element.

The institutional and legal actions needed to implement the Regional Transportation Plan and action plans are also discussed in this section, followed by a detailed assessment of all transportation modes. Priorities for regional transportation programs are established within the Action Element.

The **Financial Element** identifies the cost of implementing projects in the RTP within a financially constrained environment. All anticipated transportation funding revenues are compared with the anticipated costs of the transportation programs and actions identified in the Action Element. If shortfalls are identified, strategies are developed to potentially fund the otherwise unfunded projects. It includes regionally significant multimodal projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in the future (Fiscally Constrained), while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding (Fiscally Unconstrained). It also identifies potential funding shortfalls and sources for the unconstrained project list.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

NOP Public Circulation and Initial Study: EDCTC circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project on January 22, 2020 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2020019055), and the public. A scoping meeting was held on February 5, 2020 at 4:00-6:00 PM at the EDCTC Office in Placerville. A copy of each letter is provided in Appendix A of this Draft EIR and the comments are summarized below.

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). The CVRWQCB noted that a Construction Storm Water General Permit would be required, if the project were to disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres. The letter noted that this would require a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. The comment letter also noted that Phase 1 and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permits may also be required. The CVRWQCB also noted that other permits may be required for the proposed project, including an Industrial Storm Water General Permit, a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit, a Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit, and/or a Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit. The letter also lists Waste Discharge Requirements that may be necessary and includes language describing requirements under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program.

Native American Heritage Commission. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided guidance for and lists many of the requirements of AB 52 consultation. The comment requests AB 52 consultation, as necessary, to avoid any damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource, as feasible. The letter describes that AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. The comment also includes a discussion of SB 18 and how and when it applies, as well as some of its provisions. The comment advises that legal counsel should be sought to ensure compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

EDC Air Quality Management District. The EDC Air Quality Management District recommends that, if asbestos is deemed present, an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan should be prepared to ensure that adequate dust control and asbestos hazard mitigation measures are implemented during project construction.

California Department of Fish & Wildlife. The California Department of Fish & Wildlife requested that, to the extent possible, the DEIR should identify wildlife migration routes, movement corridors, and existing or potential barriers to wildlife movement that may be affected by Project activities. The comment also requests that DEIR should clearly identify and describe all foreseeable short-term, long-term, permanent, and temporary impacts to biological resources, including both direct and indirect impacts. The comment also requests the DEIR should define the threshold of significance of each impact and describe the criteria used to determine whether the impacts are significant. The

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

comment also identifies that the DEIR should discuss the project's cumulative impacts to natural resources and determine if that contribution would result in a significant impact.

Notice of Availability and Draft EIR: The EDCTC published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on September 4, 2020, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2020019055) and the County Clerk, and was published in the adjudicated newspaper pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from September 4, 2020 through October 19, 2020. The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. This Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant and unavoidable impacts. Comments received in response to the NOP were considered in preparing the analysis in the Draft EIR.

Final EIR: EDCTC received two (2) comment letters during the Draft EIR public review period. The Wopumnes Tribe submitted a letter stating that the Wopumnes have the right to be Tribal Consultation/Monitor on any project engaged in their aboriginal territory of El Dorado County. Jennifer Chapman, of the Friends of Clay Street & Friends of Historic Hangtown requests that the comment period be extended by another 30 days, that EDCTC should consult with the Wopumnes Tribe on this plan, requests additional alternatives analysis, disagrees with some impacts identified as significant and unavoidable, and suggests additional mitigation including more protection for the historic district(s) such as the district(s) in Placerville. No additional oral or written comments were received. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this Final EIR responds to the written comments received.

Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Each response is provided in the Final EIR.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD

For purposes of CEQA and the findings set forth herein, the record of proceedings for EDCTC’s findings and determinations consists of the following documents and testimony, at a minimum:

- The NOP, comments received on the NOP, and all other public notices issued by EDCTC in relation to the Project (e.g., Notice of Availability).
- The Draft EIR and Final EIR, including comment letters, and technical materials cited in the documents.
- All non-draft and/or non-confidential reports and memoranda prepared by EDCTC and consultants in relation to the EIR.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- Minutes and transcripts of the discussions regarding the project and/or project components at public hearings held by EDCTC.
- Staff reports associated with EDCTC Board meetings on the project.
- Those categories of materials identified in Public Resources Code Section 21167.6.

These documents are not specifically included in the Final EIR, but they are available by the custodian of the administrative record. EDCTC is the custodian of the administrative record. The documents and materials that constitute the administrative record are available for review at the El Dorado County Transportation County, 2828 Easy Street, Suite 1, Placerville, CA 95667.

FINDINGS REQUIRED UNDER CEQA

Public Resources Code section 21002 provides that “public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible Mitigation Measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects[.]” Further, the procedures required by CEQA “are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible Mitigation Measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.” (*Id.*) Section 21002 also provides that “in the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such Mitigation Measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.”

The mandate and principles established by the Legislature in Public Resources Code section 21002 are implemented, in part, through the requirement in Public Resources Code section 21081 that agencies must adopt findings before approving projects for which an EIR is required.

CEQA Guidelines section 15091 provides the following direction regarding findings:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

(1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the Mitigation Measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(See also Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a)(1)-(3).)

As defined by CEQA, “feasible” means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21061.1; see also CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6(f)(1) [determining the feasibility of alternatives].) The concept of “feasibility” also encompasses the question of whether a particular alternative or Mitigation Measure promotes the underlying goals and objectives of a project. (See *Association of Irrigated Residents v. County of Madera* (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 1383, 1400 [court upholds findings rejecting a “reduced herd” alternative to a proposed dairy as infeasible because the alternative failed to meet the “fundamental objective” of the project to produce milk]; *Sierra Club v. County of Napa* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1508 [agency decision-makers, in rejecting alternatives as infeasible, appropriately relied on project objective articulated by project applicant].) Moreover, “‘feasibility’ under CEQA encompasses ‘desirability’ to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, legal, and technological factors.” (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; see also *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 1001-1002.

With respect to a project for which significant impacts cannot be feasibly avoided or substantially lessened, a public agency may nevertheless approve the project if the agency first adopts a statement of overriding considerations setting forth the specific reasons that the project’s benefits outweigh its significant unavoidable adverse environmental effects. (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21001, 21002.1(c), 21081(b).)

CEQA Guidelines section 15093 provides the following direction regarding a statement of overriding considerations:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”

(b) When the lead agency approves a project, which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

A Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared for the Project and has been adopted concurrently with these Findings. (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6, subd. (a)(1).) EDCTC will use the Mitigation Monitoring Program to track compliance with Project Mitigation Measures.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CONSIDERATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

In adopting these Findings, this Board finds that the Final EIR was presented to this Board, the decision-making body of the lead agency, which reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the Project. By these findings, this Board ratifies, adopts, and incorporates the analysis, explanation, findings, responses to comments, and conclusions of the Final EIR. The EDCTC Board finds that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA. The Final EIR represents the independent judgment of EDCTC.

SEVERABILITY

If any term, provision, or portion of these Findings or the application of these Findings to a particular situation is held by a court to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of these Findings, or their application to other actions related to the project, shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or modified by EDCTC.

III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

A. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

1. IMPACT 3.2-1: CONVERSION OF FARMLANDS, INCLUDING PRIME FARMLAND, UNIQUE FARMLAND, AND FARMLAND OF STATEWIDE IMPORTANCE, TO NON-AGRICULTURAL USES, OR CONFLICT WITH EXISTING ZONING FOR AGRICULTURAL USE OR A WILLIAMSON ACT CONTRACT.
 - (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to cause a conversion of farmlands or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract is discussed on pages 3.2-17 through 3.2-18 of the Draft EIR.
 - (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 would reduce farmland impacts to the greatest extent feasible. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
 - (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:
 - (1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. Due to the importance of the region's agricultural resources, any impacts on Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program (FMMP) designated farmland are considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 would reduce impacts to existing farmlands to the greatest extent feasible, including compensation for unavoidable conversion at a 1:1 ratio, if necessary. However, even after implementation of

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Mitigation Measures included in the RTP and EIR, the proposed project will still contribute to a net loss of agricultural land in El Dorado County. Therefore, this is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- (2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with impacts to farmland impacts in the region, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VII.

B. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

1. IMPACT 3.5-1: GENERATE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THAT MAY HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT

(a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment is discussed on pages 3.5-19 through 3.5-22 of the Draft EIR.

(b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measures 3.5-1, 3.5-2, 3.5-3, 3.5-4, and 3.5-5.

(c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:

(1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. While Mitigation Measure 3.5-1, 3.5-2, 3.5-3, 3.5-4, and 3.5-5 would reduce per capita VMT levels throughout El Dorado County, thereby reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions beyond what would be expected without mitigation, the proposed project would still contribute to an overall significant increase in GHG emissions generated by the County. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

(2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VIII.

C. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

2. IMPACT 3.7-2: SUBSTANTIALLY INTERFERE WITH ACHIEVEMENT OF THE VMT REDUCTIONS SET FORTH IN CARB'S 2017 SCOPING PLAN

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- (b) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to substantially interfere with the achievement of VMT reductions set forth in the 2017 scoping plan may have a significant impact on the environment is discussed on pages 3.7-32 through 3.7-38 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measures 3.7-1.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:
 - (1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. While Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 would support implementation of regional and local-level strategies and measures to achieve further VMT reductions. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
 - (2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VIII.

C. CUMULATIVE

1. IMPACT 4.2: CUMULATIVE IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST LAND AND USES

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to result in a cumulative impact on agricultural land and uses is discussed on pages 4.0-3 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 (as previously described in Impact 3.2.1).
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:
 - (1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. Due to the importance of the region's agricultural resources, any impacts on farmland are considered significant and unavoidable. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-1 and Mitigation Measure 3.202, would reduce impacts to existing farmlands to the greatest extent feasible, including compensation for unavoidable conversion at a 1:1 ratio, if necessary. However, even after implementation of Mitigation Measures included in the RTP and EIR, the proposed project will still contribute to a net loss of agricultural land in El Dorado County. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this is a cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable impact.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- (2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the Project associated with a conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VIII.
2. IMPACT 4.5: INCREASED TRANSPORTATION GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS MAY CONTRIBUTE TO CLIMATE CHANGE
- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a cumulative impact on the environment is discussed on pages 4.0-4 through 4.0-5 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. Mitigation Measures 3.5-1, 3.5-2, 3.5-3, 3.5-4, and 3.5-5 (as previously described in Section 3.5).
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:
- (1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. While Mitigation Measure 3.5-1, 3.5-2, 3.5-3, 3.5-4, and 3.5-5 would reduce per capita VMT levels throughout El Dorado County, thereby reducing overall greenhouse gas emissions beyond what would be expected without mitigation, the proposed project would still contribute to an overall significant increase in GHG emissions generated by the County. There is no additional feasible mitigation available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore, this is a cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable impact.
- (2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the project associated with an increase in cumulative greenhouse gas emissions, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VIII.
3. IMPACT 4.7: CUMULATIVE IMPACT ON THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK.
- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a cumulative impact on the environment is discussed on pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-7 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 (as previously described in Section 3.7).
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that:
- (1) Effects of Mitigation and Remaining Impacts. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant for some

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

projects, although additional state policy actions and funding would be required to close the gap at the state level. For projects proposing to streamline environmental review, lead agencies must conduct project-level analysis for each project to analyze whether, based on substantial evidence in the record, the proposed mitigation would reduce the impact to less than significant. However, the EDCTC cannot require El Dorado County and the City of Placerville to adopt this mitigation measure, and it is ultimately the responsibility of these agencies to determine and adopt project-specific mitigation.

- (2) Overriding Considerations. The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override any remaining significant adverse impact of the project associated with the transportation network, as more fully stated in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section VIII.

IV. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WHICH ARE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

A. AESTHETICS

IMPACT 3.1-1: SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS ON SCENIC VISTAS AND SCENIC RESOURCES, OR SUBSTANTIAL DEGRADATION OF VISUAL CHARACTER OF PUBLIC VIEWS OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the project to adversely affect scenic vistas and resources or substantially degrade the visual character is discussed on pages 3.1-12 and 3.1-14 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 and 3.1-2.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the potential for adverse effects on scenic resources or substantial degradation of visual character will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 and 3.1-2 would require projects to include design measures to avoid or reduce removal of scenic features and scenic views. Any remaining impacts related to this environmental topic after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-1 and 3.1-2 would not be significant.

IMPACT 3.1-2: CREATION OF NEW SOURCES OF LIGHT AND GLARE

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the project to adversely affect scenic vistas and resources or substantially degrade the visual character is discussed on pages 3.1-14 and 3.1-15 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measures are hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.1-3.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the potential for adverse effects on scenic resources or substantial degradation of visual character will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 would require projects to include design measures to avoid or reduce removal of scenic features and scenic views. Any remaining impacts related to this environmental topic after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-3 would not be significant.

B. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES

- 1. IMPACT 3.2-2: POTENTIAL TO CONFLICT WITH FOREST OR TIMBER ZONING OR RESULT IN THE CONVERSION OF FOREST LANDS OR TIMBER LANDS.
 - (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the project to adversely affect scenic vistas and resources or substantially degrade the visual character is discussed on pages 3.2-18 and 3.2-19 of the Draft EIR.
 - (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.2-2.
 - (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the impacts to forest or timber will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 would require that a qualified arborist, forester, and/or biologist to assess the potential impacts of tree removal. Any remaining impacts related to forestlands or timberlands after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 would not be significant.

C. AIR QUALITY

- IMPACT 3.3-2: SHORT-TERM - CONFLICT WITH, OR OBSTRUCT, THE APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY PLAN, OR RESULT IN A CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE NET INCREASE OF A CRITERIA POLLUTANT IN A NON-ATTAINMENT AREA
- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to have short-term air quality impacts is discussed at pages 3.3-22 through 3.3-23 of the Draft EIR.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

(b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.3-1.

(c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the short-term air quality impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 would ensure that a dust control plan shall be prepared in accordance with APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust Emissions). Any remaining impacts related to short-term air quality after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 would not be significant.

2. IMPACT 3.3-3: OCCASIONAL LOCALIZED CARBON MONOXIDE CONCENTRATIONS FROM TRAFFIC CONDITIONS AT SOME INDIVIDUAL LOCATIONS

(a) Potential Impact. The potential for the project to impact occasional localized carbon monoxide concentrations from traffic conditions at individual locations is discussed on pages 3.3-23 through 3.3-24 of the Draft EIR.

(b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.3-2.

(c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the localized CO impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 would ensure individual RTP projects will be screened at the time of design in order to reduce the potential for the formation of CO hot spots. Any remaining impacts related to CO concentration after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-2 would not be significant.

IMPACT 3.3-5: POTENTIAL TO RELEASE ASBESTOS FROM EARTH MOVEMENT OR STRUCTURAL ASBESTOS FROM DEMOLITION/RENOVATION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES

(a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to result in impacts from the release asbestos from earth movement, or structural asbestos from demolition/renovation of existing structures is discussed on pages 3.3-24 through 3.3-25 of the Draft EIR.

(b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.3-3.

(c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the asbestos impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 would ensure that the implementing agency will assess the site for the presence of asbestos, and, in the event that asbestos is present, the implementing

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

agency will comply with state and local regulations, including ARB's ACTM and El Dorado AQMD Rule 223-2. Any remaining impacts related to asbestos after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-3 would be less than significant.

E. CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

1. IMPACT 3.4-1: POTENTIAL TO CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE TO A SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL RESOURCE, AS DEFINED IN CEQA GUIDELINES §15064.5

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to have an impact on significant historic resources is discussed at page 3.4-13 to 3.4-14 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.4-1.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that impacts to significant historical resources will be mitigated to a less than significant level, as Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 would first require projects to perform a site-specific study to identify the potential for significant historical resources to be present, and, if present, to avoid, preserve, or otherwise mitigate potentially significant impacts to the resources. Any remaining impacts related to historical resources after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-1 would not be significant.

IMPACT 3.4-2: POTENTIAL TO CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE TO A SIGNIFICANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE, AS DEFINED IN CEQA GUIDELINES §15064.5, OR A SIGNIFICANT TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCE, AS DEFINED IN PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21074

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to have a significant archaeological resource is discussed at page 3.4-14 through 3.4-15 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.4-2.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that impacts to archaeological resources will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.4-2 would ensure consultations with Native American organizations and a records search shall be conducted. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Central California Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the archaeological sensitivity of the project areas. Additionally, implementing agencies and contractors performing improvements to the projects shall adhere to project-specific

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

requirements. Any remaining impacts related human remains after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-2 would not be significant.

2. IMPACT 3.4-3 POTENTIAL TO DISTURB HUMAN REMAINS, INCLUDING THOSE INTERRED OUTSIDE FORMAL CEMETERIES

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project to have an impact on significant paleontological resources is discussed at pages 3.4-15 through 3.4-16 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.4-3.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that impacts to significant human remains will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 would ensure that all individual projects, in the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction or excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, project-specific measures will be taken. Any remaining impacts related to disturbance of humans after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4-3 would be less than significant.

I. LAND USE AND POPULATION

1. IMPACT 3.6-1: PHYSICAL DIVISION OF AN ESTABLISHED COMMUNITY.

- (a) Potential Impact. The potential for the Project result in the physical division of an established community is discussed on pages 3.6-7 through 3.6-8 of the Draft EIR.
- (b) Mitigation Measures. The following Mitigation Measure is hereby adopted and will be implemented as provided by the Mitigation Monitoring Program: Mitigation Measure 3.6-1.
- (c) Findings. Based upon the EIR and the entire record before this Board, this Board finds that the potential for the Project to physically divide an established community will be mitigated to a less than significant level as Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 would ensure that all individual projects are designed to maintain the cohesiveness of the existing communities to the greatest extent feasible, and where full design mitigation is not feasible, measures would be incorporated into the design to minimize the impacts associated with project implementation. Any remaining impacts after implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.6-1 would not be significant.

V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THOSE IMPACTS
WHICH ARE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN
CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE

Specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects were found to be less than significant as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR.

Air Quality: The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant: 3.3-1 and 3.3-4.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant: 3.5-2 and 3.5-3.

Land Use and Population: The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant: 3.6-2, 3.6-3, and 3.6-4.

Traffic and Circulation: The following specific impacts were found to be less than significant: 3.7-1, 3.7-3, 3.7-4.

Wildfire: The following specific impact was found to be less than significant: 3.8-1.

The project was found to have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to specific impacts within the following categories of environmental effects as set forth in more detail in the Draft EIR.

Aesthetics: The following specific impact was found to be less than cumulatively considerable: Impact 4.1.

Air Quality: The following specific impact was found to be less than cumulatively considerable: Impact 4.3.

Cultural and Tribal Resources: The following specific impact was found to be less than cumulatively considerable: Impact 4.4.

Land Use and Planning and Population: The following specific impact was found to be less than cumulatively considerable: 4.6.

The above impacts are less than significant or less than cumulatively considerable for one of the following reasons:

- The EIR determined that the impact is less than significant for the project.
- The EIR determined that the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative impact.
- The EIR determined that the impact is beneficial (would be reduced) for the project.

VI. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THOSE IMPACTS DETERMINED IN THE INITIAL STUDY TO HAVE NO IMPACT, A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT, OR A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH MITIGATION

An Initial Study was prepared and circulated with a Notice of Preparation at the beginning of the process. The Initial Study found that there were a variety of environmental topics that would have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with certain measures that would avoid, minimize, or mitigate the impact to an insignificant level. The Initial Study concluded that the environmental topics did not warrant more detailed analysis in the EIR. The Initial Study was circulated for public comment, and no public comments received conflicted with these determinations. As such, the following environmental topics were scoped out of the EIR: Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities and Service Systems. The findings of fact for each topic is presented below:

IV. Biological Resources: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce Impact a) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measures BIO-2, BIO-3, and BIO-4 would reduce Impacts b) and c) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would reduce Impact d) to a less than significant level. Lastly, Mitigation Measure BIO-6 would reduce Impacts e) and f) to a less than significant level.

VII. Geology and Soils: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce Impacts a.i) and a.ii) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-2 would reduce impact b) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would reduce Impacts a.iii), a.iv), and c) to a less than significant level. Lastly, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would reduce Impact d) to a less than significant level.

IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would reduce this impact d) to a less than significant level. All other impacts were less than significant.

X. Hydrology and Water Quality: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have less than significant and less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measures HYDRO-1, HYDRO-2, HYDRO-3, and HYDRO-4 would reduce Impacts a) and e) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measures HYDRO-5, HYDRO-6, and HYDRO-7 would reduce Impacts c.i), c.ii), c.iii.), and c.iv) to a less than significant level. All other impacts were less than significant.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

XII. Mineral Resources: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact.

XIII. Noise: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measure NOISE-1 would reduce Impact a) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure NOISE-2 would reduce Impact b) to a less than significant level.

XV. Public Services: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact.

XVI. Recreation: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact.

XIX. Utilities and Service Systems: The Initial Study found that impacts within this topic would have a less than significant impact with mitigation. Mitigation Measures UTILITIES-1, UTILITIES-2, UTILITIES-3, UTILITIES-4 would reduce Impact a) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure UTILITIES-5 would reduce Impact b) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure UTILITIES-6 would reduce Impact c) to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure UTILITIES-7 would reduce Impacts d) and e) to a less than significant level.

VII. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

A. IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES

An EIR is required to identify a range of reasonable alternatives to the project. The “range of potential alternatives to the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic purposes of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c).) “Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent).” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1).)

Chapter 2.0 (page 2.0-1 through 2.0-3) of the Draft EIR identifies the project’s goals and objectives. The purpose of the 2020-2040 El Dorado County RTP is to provide a clear vision of the regional transportation goals, objectives, and policies in EDCTC Planning Area. The 2020-2040 El Dorado County RTP provides short-term and long-term strategies for implementation, which includes realistic and fiscally constrained alternatives. The following goals and objectives, by transportation mode and strategy, have been identified for the 2020-2040 El Dorado County RTP.

The RTP contains eight specific goals, each with supporting policies and objectives, for integrated land use, air quality, and transportation planning, sustainability, highways, streets, and

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

regional/inter-regional roadways, public transit, aviation, active transportation, transportation systems management (TSM), and funding:

1. Integrate local and regional land use, air quality, and transportation planning to create a transportation system which supports the needs of the system user, enhances the economy, preserves the environment, and protects the community character.
2. Encourage sustainable transportation options, embrace new technologies and develop climate adaptation and resiliency strategies.
3. Optimize the existing local, interregional and regionally significant roadway system to support improved maintenance, increased throughput, improved safety and multi-modal mobility.
4. Promote a convenient, desirable, and reliable regional and interregional public transit system for residents and visitors travelling within, to, and beyond El Dorado County.
5. Promote and preserve aviation facilities and services that complement the regional transportation system, support emergency response, and enhance economic activities.
6. Promote a safe, convenient, and efficient active transportation system for all users.
7. Develop and support an integrated transportation system that incorporates corridor-based solutions and public awareness programs which support alternative transportation modes and reduce the impacts of single-occupant vehicle travel.
8. Secure maximum available funding and pursue new sources of funds for maintenance, expansion, and improvement of all modes of transportation facilities and services.

B. ALTERNATIVE CONSIDERATION

1. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-2 through 5.0-3 and 5.0-4 through 5.0-7 of the Draft EIR. As required by CEQA, this alternative assumes that the adopted existing RTP would remain in place and would guide improvements to the transportation network.

Findings: The No Project Alternative is rejected as an alternative because it would not achieve the project's objectives. Environmental benefits of this alternative over the proposed project including the reduction of impacts to aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, and cultural and tribal resources, while impacts to air quality, greenhouse gases and climate change impacts, land use planning & population, transportation, and wildfire are worse than the project.

Explanation: This alternative would not realize the benefits of the project nor achieve the project objectives. The improvements under the prior RTP would not be funded because there would be a lapse in the requirement to update the RTP as required by the CTC.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

2. ROAD EMPHASIS ALTERNATIVE:

The Road Emphasis Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-3 and 5.0-7 through 5.0-9 of the Draft EIR.

Findings: The Road Emphasis Alternative is rejected because it would require shifting funds from the Financially Unconstrained Alternative to fund roadway improvements, operation, and maintenance. However, funding under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative is not anticipated to be available at this time and it is not known if any funds identified under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative will become available under this alternative. Environmental benefits of this alternative over the proposed project include traffic/circulation impacts, while impacts that are worse than the Project include impacts related to aesthetics, agricultural and forest resources, air quality, cultural and tribal resources, greenhouse gases, land use and population, and wildfire.

Explanation: This alternative focuses investments, and implements projects based on a road emphasis that are included in the Financially Constrained (programmed and planned projects), and would require shifting funds from the Financially Unconstrained Alternative to fund roadway improvements, operation, and maintenance. It should be noted that funding under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative is not anticipated to be available at this time and it is not known if any funds identified under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative will become available under this alternative.

3. TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT ALTERNATIVE

The Transit Enhancement Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-3 and 5.0-9 through 5.0-11 of the Draft EIR.

Findings: The Transit Enhancement Alternative is rejected because it is not considered fiscally feasible and because it will not achieve the Project's objectives. Environmental benefits of this alternative over the proposed project include the reduction of cultural and tribal resources, while there would be an equal level of environmental impact related to aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality, and greenhouse gases, while impacts that are worse than the Project include land use and population, transportation and circulation, and wildfire.

Explanation: The Transit Enhancement Alternative focuses investment into transit modes, while also funding the locally-funded transportation improvements included in the Financially Constrained Alternative. This alternative would require shifting funds from the Financially Unconstrained Alternative to fund transit capital, operational, and maintenance. It should be noted that funding under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative is not anticipated to be available at this time and it is not known if any funds identified under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative will become available. It should also be noted that the increase in transit service under this alternative would not

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

result in a proportionate increase in ridership, particularly in the smaller communities and more rural areas.

4. FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE

The Financially Unconstrained Alternative is discussed on pages 5.0-3 and 5.0-4 and 5.0-11 through 5.0-13 of the Draft EIR.

Findings: The Financially Unconstrained Alternative is rejected because it is not considered fiscally feasible. Environmental benefits of this alternative over the proposed project include land use and population and transportation and circulation, while impacts would be worse than the Project for aesthetics, agricultural and forestry resources, air quality, cultural and tribal resources, greenhouse gases, and wildfire.

Explanation: The Financially Unconstrained Alternative includes all of the individual projects identified under the Financially Constrained Alternative (discussed above and in Section 2.0 Project Description) plus numerous additional projects that are needed but not yet funded over the planning horizon. This alternative includes all projects without regard to whether or not they can be funded. It should be noted that funding under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative is not anticipated to be available at this time and it is not known if any funds identified under the Financially Unconstrained Alternative will become available.

5. ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE:

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives that are analyzed in the EIR. If the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)). The environmentally superior alternative is that alternative with the least adverse environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

As discussed in Chapter 5.0 of the Draft EIR and summarized in Table 5.0-2 of the Draft EIR, the Financially Constrained Alternative (the proposed project) has the lowest overall impact (score of 15) and is deemed the environmentally superior alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the other alternatives. The Transit Enhancement Alternative ranks second with a score of 19, and the Financially Unconstrained Alternative ranks third with a score of 21, the Road Emphasis Alternative ranks fourth with a score of 23, and the No Project Alternative ranks fifth with a score of 25.

VIII. STATEMENTS OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO THE EL DORADO 2020-2040 RTP FINDINGS

As described in detail in Section III of these Findings, the following significant and unavoidable impacts could occur with implementation of the project:

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

- Impact 3.2.1: Conversion of farmlands, including prime farmland, unique farmland, and farmland of statewide importance, to non-agricultural uses, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.
- Impact 3.5-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- Impact 3.7-2: Substantially interfere with achievement of the VMT reductions set forth in CARB's 2017 Scoping Plan.
- Impact 4.2: Cumulative Impact on Agricultural and Forest Land and Uses.
- Impact 4.5: Increased Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions May Contribute to Climate Change.
- Impact 4.7: Cumulative Impact on the Transportation Network.

The adverse effects listed above, and described in detail in Section III, are substantive issues of concern to EDCTC. However, EDCTC has developed a Regional Transportation Plan that emphasizes reductions in traffic congestion while improving human mobility, safety enhancements, community connectivity, socioeconomic growth that supports a sustainable broad-based economy, preservation and enhancement of community character and the environment, and ensures the implementation of a feasible funding plan, to preserve and enhance the existing countywide transportation system.

Based on the entire record and the EIR, the economic and social benefits of the project throughout El Dorado County outweigh and override any significant unavoidable environmental effects that would result from future project implementation as more fully described in Section III Findings and Recommendations Regarding Significant and Unavoidable Impacts. EDCTC Board has determined that any environmental detriment caused by the proposed project has been minimized to the extent feasible through the Mitigation Measures identified herein, and, where mitigation is not feasible, has been outweighed and counterbalanced by the significant transportation, environmental, and health and safety benefits throughout the region.

CEQA FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

This page left intentionally blank.

NOTICED PUBLIC HEARING
Allotted Time: 2:00 PM

STAFF REPORT

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: JERRY BARTON, SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
**SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN
2020-2040**

REQUESTED ACTION

Hold a Public Hearing to consider the Adoption of Resolution 20/21.19 (Attachment A) approving the Final El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2020-2040.

BACKGROUND

State law requires each Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) not less than every five years in non-urban regions. RTPs are developed by RTPAs in cooperation with Caltrans and other stakeholders. The purpose of the RTP is to establish regional goals, identify present and future needs, deficiencies, and constraints, analyze potential solutions, estimate available funding, and propose investments.

Every RTPA is required by law to conduct long range planning to ensure that the region's vision and goals are clearly identified and to ensure effective decision making relative to implementation of the stated vision and goals. California statute relating to the development of the RTP is primarily contained in Government Code Section 65080. The RTP is an important policy document that is based on the unique needs and characteristics of a region. The RTP helps shape the region's economy, environment, and community character. The RTP must also help to achieve the state goals for transportation, environmental quality, economic growth, and social equity (California Government Code Section 65041.1).

The RTP was prepared in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission in January 2017. While the guidelines include both state and federal requirements, RTPAs have the flexibility to be creative in selecting transportation planning options that best fit their regional needs.

Transportation projects and programs must be listed in the RTP as well as the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), and the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to allow cities, counties, and transit operators to be eligible for federal funds for capital improvements. Furthermore, any capacity-increasing capital projects are required to meet air quality conformity standards as outlined by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency and implemented by SACOG.

To qualify for funding in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), projects included in a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) or the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), must be consistent with adopted RTPs. In compliance with Government Code Section 65080(c), the California Transportation Commission will only consider STIP funding for projects consistent with an RTP adopted within five years (in rural regions) of STIP adoption.

DISCUSSION

The RTP Guidelines (GC Section 65080) state the RTP shall include a Policy Element, an Action Element, and a Financial Element. These three elements are addressed in the RTP 2020-2040 as follows:

- Chapters 1 through 5 comprise the **Policy Element** of the RTP which develops the process for implementing the short-term and long-term transportation strategies. Chapter 1 – Introduction, Chapter 2 – Organizational Setting, and Chapter 3 – Physical Setting, includes the data on the background, relationships, and projections that provide the basis on which the RTP is developed. Chapter 4 – Regional Transportation Issues, summarizes the issues facing transportation planning including: congestion, commute patterns, interregional tourism and recreation travel, inter-jurisdictional coordination, air quality, growth, emergency evacuation and planning, new technologies in transportation, sustainability, funding, maintenance and rehabilitation, safety, and multi-modal transportation. Chapter 5 identifies the mobility goals, objectives, strategies, and performance measures of the region.
- Chapters 6 through 12 comprise the **Action Element**. The Action Element identifies the multi-modal projects that implement the RTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the policy element. Projects are included for both the short-term (2020-2030), long-term (2030-2040), and Post 2040 (fiscally unconstrained) horizons. Transportation related issues and modes are addressed in the action element, including Integrated Land Use, Air Quality and Transportation Planning, Sustainability, Highways, Streets and Interregional Roadways, Transit, Aviation, Active Transportation, and Transportation Systems Management.
- Chapter 13 is the **Financial Element**, which summarizes the cost of implementing the projects in the RTP within a 20-year financially constrained environment. All anticipated transportation funding revenues are compared with the anticipated costs of the transportation projects identified in the action element. If shortfalls are identified, strategies such as a local transportation sales tax, public/private partnerships, peak-hour congestion pricing, bond measures, and a road user charge, are discussed to potentially fund the otherwise unfunded projects.

Under the terms of our Memorandum of Understanding with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), the RTP 2020-2040 will provide the necessary elements to update the El Dorado County component of the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) utilized an RTP Advisory Committee (RTP AC) as a focal point of the public involvement process based on the past success. The RTP AC was involved throughout the development of the RTP; and met three times during its development. EDCTC staff also took advantage of opportunities to present the background, purpose, and status of the RTP and conduct polling at non-RTP AC meetings. These meetings provided the opportunity to engage residents outside of the more structured RTP AC meeting format. EDCTC also conducted outreach to the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians (Shingle Springs Rancheria) early in the RTP 2020-2040 development process by including the tribe in all RTP AC outreach materials sent out by EDCTC. EDCTC and the Environmental Consulting team also met with Kara Perry, Site Protection Manager from the Shingle Springs Rancheria on August 26, 2020.

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic in 2020, EDCTC was faced with the necessity of pivoting to a virtual public outreach process. An enhanced slideshow presentation video was developed and made available online to provide an overview of the RTP and its contents. Each element of the RTP provided the public with 45 or more days to review the content, ask questions, and provide comments.

All of the public outreach efforts associated with the development of the RTP 2020-2040 are summarized in the Public Involvement Plan included in Appendix A of the RTP.

The following changes were made to the Draft RTP 2020-2040 as a result of comments received during the public review period:

Comments from Caltrans:

- *Added Unconstrained Project List (Post 2040) as Appendix E*
- *Included description of Class IV Bicycle Facilities in Chapter 9*
- *Indicated which projects proposed in the action element are considered “Regionally Significant”*

Comments from South Shore Transportation Management Association:

- *Added US 50 Rest Stop/Fueling Station to Unconstrained (Post 2040) Project List*

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

EDCTC has prepared a program EIR to analyze the environmental impacts of implementing the RTP. The purpose of the program EIR is to enable EDCTC to examine the overall effects of the RTP. The Draft EIR discusses potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural and tribal resources, greenhouse gas emissions, climate change and energy, land use and population, transportation and circulation, and wildfire. The EDCTC RTP 2020-2040 Draft EIR 45-day public review closed on Monday, October 19, 2020.

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

Attachments: A) EDCTC Resolution 20/21.19
B) Final El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan 2020-2040
(provided on CD, online, and at the EDCTC office)



2828 Easy Street, Suite 1, Placerville, CA 95667 www.edctc.org 530.642.5260

Councilmembers Representing City of Placerville: Patty Borelli, Kara Taylor, Dennis Thomas

Supervisors Representing El Dorado County: Shiva Frentzen, John Hidahl, Lori Parlin, Brian Veerkamp

RESOLUTION NO. 20/21.19

RESOLUTION OF THE EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ADOPTING THE EL DORADO COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2020-2040

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Government Code, Title 7.95, Section 67950, the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) was created as a local planning agency to provide regional transportation planning for the area of El Dorado County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 29532.1(g) identifies EDCTC as the designated regional transportation planning agency for El Dorado County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and is responsible for the planning, allocating and/or programming of funds; and

WHEREAS, the EDCTC is required by state law to adopt and submit a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission and the State Department of Transportation every five years (Government Code, Section 65080[c]); and

WHEREAS, the RTP is designed to be a blueprint for the systematic development of a balanced, comprehensive, multi-modal transportation system, including but not limited to: highways, streets and interregional roadways, public transit, aviation, freight/goods movement, active transportation (bikeways and pedestrian facilities), transportation systems management, and intelligent transportation systems. In addition, the RTP is action oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term (up to 10 year) and long-term (10-20 year) periods; and

WHEREAS, all elements of the Draft El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040 including the Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element were distributed and made available for comments during a 45-day review period; and

WHEREAS, a noticed public hearing was held on November 5, 2020 to receive comments on the Draft El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040; and

WHEREAS, the EDCTC, by Resolution No. 20/21.19 has certified the Environmental Impact Report on the RTP (SCH #2020019055) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), has adopted findings of fact, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) supporting adoption of the El Dorado County RTP 2020-2040; and

WHEREAS, all of the comments provided have been considered and addressed in the Final El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan 2020-2040.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the EDCTC hereby adopts the El Dorado County Regional Transportation Plan 2020-2040; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the EDCTC hereby authorizes staff to: a) submit said document to the California Transportation Commission, to the State Department of Transportation, to any person or agency requesting a copy, and to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) as the El Dorado portion of the SACOG 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan; and b) implement the RTP pursuant to the identified goals, objectives, and policies included in the RTP.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission governing body at the regular meeting held on November 5, 2020 by the following vote:

Vote Pending

Attest:

Shiva Frentzen, Chairperson

Dana Keffer, Secretary to the Commission

BUSINESS ITEM**STAFF REPORT**

DATE: NOVEMBER 5, 2020
TO: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FROM: DAN BOLSTER, SENIOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNER
SUBJECT: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT: EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY ZERO EMISSION BUS FLEET CONVERSION PLAN

REQUESTED ACTION

Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a professional services agreement between the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. (Stantec), to develop the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan for a not-to-exceed amount of \$195,000.

BACKGROUND

On October 16, 2019, EDCTC submitted an application to Caltrans for a Fiscal Year 2020/2021 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account – Sustainable Communities – Technical grant to fund the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan. On June 18, 2020 Caltrans notified EDCTC that the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan had been selected for funding in Fiscal Year 2020/2021 with an award of \$180,000. EDCTC committed \$25,000 in Local Transportation Funds and El Dorado County Transit Authority committed \$20,000 in State Transit Assistance funds for a combined total of \$45,000 in matching funds.

DISCUSSION

EDCTC staff distributed the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan on September 3, 2020. Notice of the RFP was distributed via email to 20 consultants, a consultant distribution center, was published in the Mountain Democrat, and was available online via Facebook and the EDCTC website. Staff received three proposals by the October 7, 2020 deadline. The proposals were received from Lion Electric, Nelson\Nygaard, and Stantec and were evaluated according to the criteria specified in the RFP by EDCTC staff and staff from El Dorado County Transit Authority.

The evaluation criteria included:

- Understanding the purpose and requirements of the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan;
- Familiarity with the project area and the type of issues and problems associated with the project;
- Experience in transportation planning and the issues and functional area(s) to be analyzed;
- Familiarity with state and federal procedures;
- Ability to meet the project's goals and objectives;
- Approach to be followed and the tasks to be performed, including detailed steps, resources required, and proposed project schedule;
- Qualifications, specific experience, and technical competence of the personnel to be assigned to this contract.

Based upon review of the proposals, interviews that were held on October 15, 2020 via Zoom, and Stantec's demonstrated expertise in delivering Zero Emission Bus Rollout Plans for small and large transit agencies in California, the U.S., and Canada, staff recommends Stantec for this contract. Key factors considered by the review panel in making this recommendation are as follows:

- The firm has extensive experience leading similar Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plans.
- The firm has a very strong understanding of the overall transit issues, project area land use and development, regulatory environment, and community issues in the project area.
- The firm is providing a highly-qualified project team.
- The firm provided a scope of work that detailed the steps and approach for completion of tasks necessary to deliver a comprehensive Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan.
- Strong public outreach services will be provided by AIM Consulting.

Tony Zavanelli of Stantec will serve as the Principal in Charge for the El Dorado County Transit Authority Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan. Mr. Zavanelli has 30-years of engineering and project management experience and has a keen interest in developing a Zero Emission Bus Fleet Conversion Plan that will identify the successful path forward for El Dorado County Transit Authority's transition to a 100% Zero Emission Bus Fleet.

Approved for Agenda:

Woodrow Deloria, Executive Director

Note: A copy of the RFP and the three proposals received are available for review at the EDCTC office.