

# *Tuolumne County Transportation Council*

## *September 27, 2006 Meeting Minutes*

The September 27, 2006 meeting of the Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) was called to order at 5:02 p.m. by Chairman Cooper Kessel in the County Board of Supervisors Chambers. Also in attendance were: Councilmembers Ron Stearn; Mark Thornton, Dick Pland and Hank Russell; Executive Director Peter Rei, Deputy Director Darin Grossi; Transportation Coordinator Diane Bynum, Transportation Planners Erin Gold and Tyler Summersett and Department Support Technician Denise Bergamaschi. Jane Perez attended representing the Department of Transportation, District 10.

- 1. Oral Communication (15 minutes) to allow the public to speak on any item not on the printed agenda. No action may be taken by the Council.**

*No one addressed the Council during this portion of the meeting,*

### **Consent Calendar:**

Items on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and enacted on by one motion. Any item may be removed for discussion and made part of the regular agenda at the request of a member of Council. The public will be given the opportunity to address any item on the Consent Calendar prior to action taken on any item.

- 2. Approval of the August 23, 2006 Meeting Minutes**
- 3. Approval and Execution of a \$79,910 Contract with Stantec Consulting, Incorporated to prepare the Environmental Impact Report for the Regional Transportation Plan Update.**
- 4. Adopt Resolutions Allocating 2006/07 Local Transportation Funds.**

Councilmember Thornton requested that Item 4 be pulled from the Agenda for further consideration. He also motioned to approve Items 2 and 3 as presented.

Councilmember Stearn questioned the dollar amount listed in Item 3.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that an Environmental Impact Report is required for most projects and that if it is already in progress, it helps accelerate the review process.

Chairman Kessel asked for Council's vote on Items 2 and 3. Councilmember Russell seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

At this time, Council discussed Item 4 as presented. Councilmember Thornton asked Deputy Director Grossi for an estimate of the percentage of the population that use transit compared to the percentage that drive their own vehicles.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that at this time he did not have an exact number but that the overall goal for public transit is 2%.

Councilmember Thornton acknowledged that he would like more funding put into the County's road system as opposed to transit.

Councilmember Thornton motioned to approve Item 4 as presented.

Councilmember Stearn seconded the motion. Motion approved 5-0.

### **Regular Agenda:**

#### **5. Approval of the Columbia Circulation Masterplan Request for Proposals.**

Deputy Director Grossi presented this item using several maps posted for this Item. He stated that he is hoping to hire a good consultant and is requesting approval from Council.

Councilmember Pland informed Deputy Director Grossi that he spoke to Dave Gould, the former Park Superintendent, regarding contributions and that he was very committed to taking part in this effort. He highly recommended that staff follow up with the new Superintendent.

Deputy Director Grossi informed Council that the preliminary budget for this project is \$40,000. A Memorandum of Understanding would be prepared between participating agencies to ensure each party understands their role in the project.

Councilmember Pland motioned for Council to approve the request for proposals.

Councilmember Stearn seconded the motion. Motion Approved 5-0.

Councilmember Thornton requested that some grammatical changes be made to the document before it is posted. He also expressed concern that the hired consultant understands the intermodal connection of the airport and how to integrate it as part of the plan. He stated that this is a critical part of the Circulation Plan.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that he would change the language as requested by Councilmember Thornton.

Chairman Kessel called for a vote to direct staff to circulate the plan as presented, with requested changes and comments. All voted in favor. 5-0 Motion approved.

*At this time, Deputy Director Gross asked Council that Item 10 of the Agenda be presented.*

**10. Reports:**

**Foothill Commuter Services now live:**

Deputy Director Grossi informed Council that the Foothill Commuter Service Project is a partnership effort between Tuolumne, Amador and Calaveras Counties to promote commuter services. He also informed the TCTC that they provided funding for this project through the Overall Work Program. He then introduced Renee Chatman from Amador County who put together the presentation for tonight.

Ms. Chatman approached the podium and thanked Council for moving her presentation up on the agenda and for supporting the Foothill Commuter Services Project. She stated that the web-site is now live and that a lot of people have registered to rideshare.

Ms. Chatman provided a summary on the progress of the project and an overview of the website.

**6. Approve the List of Regionally Significant Projects and Adopt Population Estimates for the Air Quality Model Analysis and State Implementation Plan Development.**

Deputy Director Grossi explained that Tuolumne County was designated as a non attainment area for air quality standards pursuant to the Clean Air Act. As a result, Tuolumne County is in a position of not receiving any additional Federal transportation funds until we develop a plan to achieve conformity with EPA Standards. He explained that the method for doing so would be to utilize the traffic model with a defined list of projects that will potentially receive transportation dollars in the future - including expected population growth. The traffic model will need to be run with various road network changes and the model will produce an estimate of the vehicle miles traveled. That information is put into a model run by Caltrans which contains information about the counties motor vehicle fleet from DMV and the types of emission typical in Tuolumne County. That model produces an emissions budget: the amount of emissions that this county will produce; that budget and information then goes to the Air District to write a plan to show that we will be consistent with EPA Standards for Air Quality. He also stated that there are the issues of transport from the valley and from the Bay Area. We have to show that our actions do not make conditions worse. He also explained that this is a new process and that the final deadline with the State is June of 2007. Until this information is submitted, any projects which are federally funded, are being postponed.

Councilmember Thornton inquired about Stint/Jacksonville Road and stated that it desperately needs to be finished. He stated that in 1980 the Board took action not to use funds to finish the project. He also mentioned that 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Jamestown should be widened to a 4-lane and that J59 should be taken over by the State.

Deputy Director Grossi said that he would add these items to the project list and see what can be done.

Discussion ensued regarding J59 as well as other projects that Council would like to see pursued.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that this is the kind of feedback he was looking for from the Council.

Councilmember Thornton motioned to approve the requested action for this item. Councilmember Pland seconded the motion. Motion approved 5-0.

**7. Presentation of the East Sonora Bypass Stage III Alternate Analysis Traffic Study.**

Carlos Yamzon with Caltrans, District 10, approached the podium and stated that the main objective of the traffic study was to analyze the benefits of improvements to the Bypass which included capacity improvement on the existing bypass and the new alignment. This was done based on data collected by Caltrans. Mr. Yamzon presented additional information regarding the Bypass, as well as outlying roads, concerning alignment and the various alternatives.

Chairman Kessel expressed his concern regarding this to Deputy Director Grossi as to why this is being re-analyzed when it was just done a year ago? He stated that perhaps because there is some information available that was not available last year.

Jane Perez stated that this is being done because the funding situation is different now as opposed to a year ago.

Discussion ensued regarding alternatives to the bypass, various funding options and right of way issues.

- *Councilmember Pland left at 5:57 p.m.*

Councilmember Thornton moved on accepting the report as presented. Councilmember Russell seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0.

**8. Consideration of Adopting Resolution No. 345-06 to Program \$641,000 to the East Sonora Bypass Stage I Project for Construction Claims Settlement and Environmental Mitigation.**

Councilmember Thornton stated that since no recommendation was made to the TCTC for this item it should be continued until further information is obtained from Caltrans.

Deputy Director Grossi emphasized that Caltrans *does* want to work cooperatively with the TCTC. He also stated that a lot depends on the Transportation Council's desires. If it is a full accounting of the project that is being sought, it is not readily available.

Chairman Kessel asked Executive Director Rei what his opinion is regarding the issue of reviewing the accounting.

Executive Director Rei stated that if only the claims are being referred to, which is the \$641,000 in question, we are fine. However, if you're inquiring about how much money was spent for the various phases of the project – then an exact figure is not available.

Chairman Kessel declared that there should be a way to work with Caltrans to monitor project costs.

Jane Perez stated that because of the coding used in their accounting department, it would be very difficult and time consuming to provide an itemized report for this project. She stated that she would mention this to Kome Ajise.

Discussion ensued amongst Councilmembers regarding the summarization of the costs for the Bypass.

Tony Singh with Caltrans informed Council that he could provide reports on a quarterly basis.

Councilmember Thornton said that he would like not only financial accountability but legal accountability as well. He stressed that no more money should be spent investigating the past and that we should settle this tonight. He also suggested that we re-agendize for another night a generic discussion on ideas how Caltrans can provide better cost tracking to the County on how they are spending our tax dollars.

Councilmember Thornton moved to authorize the settlement. Councilmember Stearn seconded the motion. Motion approved 4-0.

**9. Presentation of the Excess Right of Way Sales Work Plan/Caltrans Right of Way Plan.**

Deputy Director Grossi informed Council that the information that he has been requesting from Caltrans concerning the Excess Right of Way parcels has not been received as of

yet. Mike Rodrigues, who is the Project Manager on the project, was not in attendance tonight due to illness.

Jane Perez with District 10 apologized for Mr. Rodrigues not being able to attend tonight's meeting but also informed Council that on October 4<sup>th</sup> there is going to be a meeting regarding the clearance of 17 of the parcels to prepare them for selling.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that the County and other public agencies would like an early review of the parcels and he also informed Ms. Perez that as public agencies, we have to obtain funding from the respective Boards in order to purchase any of these parcels.

*There was no motion brought forth for this item.*

## **10. Reports:**

- **Staff Reports:**

- ***Sierra Railroad/Tuolumne Road Crossing Improvements***

Deputy Director Grossi informed Council the he has sent letters to Sierra Railroad concerning the Tuolumne Road Crossing to help address cost issues. He also stated that work is occurring and the hopefully he will have something to bring back to the Council in November.

Councilmember Thornton stated that he has wrote letters to the Railroad in June of this year and to date, still has not gotten a response.

**Executive Director Reports:** Executive Director Rei informed Council regarding meetings attended and his actions on the J59 project. He discussed two safety projects on 108 and that he has not received a definitive answer from Caltrans as far as a date and cost. He also mentioned Prop 42 and that a ban will enforced against borrowing any funds from this account. He also stated that there are two agenda items on next month's CTC for Tuolumne County; one being that there are emergency funds available for Hwy 120 in the amount of 2.5 million dollars and that that there is another 71k in PPM Funds which are used for funding evaporation for project planning and monitoring and programming.

**Caltrans Reports:** Jane Perez, with District 10, stated that Caltrans and Tuolumne County Reps should meet soon regarding several of the bond issues that Executive Director Rei mentioned. She also provided an update on the Status of 120. She also informed Council that Caltrans is working on an additional monitoring system and are planning on making improvements on the intersection of 120/132. Adding additional pavement to that intersection as well, if county permits and if so, would need to obtain an encroachment permit.

**Council Reports** - There were no Council Reports at this time.

There being no further items to be discussed, the meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Bergamaschi  
Department Support Technician

**Southern Mountain County Air Quality Conformity Meeting**

**September 22, 2006**

**Location: Tuolumne County Public Works Department  
Albert N. Francisco Building  
Third Floor – ANF Conference Room 1  
48 West Yaney Street, Sonora, CA 95370  
Time: 2:00 pm – 3:30 pm**

**Tentative Attendees: Tuolumne County Transportation Division  
Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District  
Mariposa County  
Caltrans, District 10, Planning  
Federal Highways Administration (FHWA)  
California Air Resources Board (CARB)**

**Introductions: 2:00 pm**

**Purpose: 2:15 pm**

Our purpose is to identify the steps required to meet CARB's deadline for us to submit vehicle activity data and emission results. So far, we understand that the 2013 Attainment Year is our highest priority; and, toward that end, we need to identify non-exempt transportation projects that will need to be included in the modeled network. We also need to develop a 2013 land use dataset for the model run.

**Draft Tuolumne County Population Estimates and Methodology for Air Quality Analysis: 2:50 pm**

Review and comment on the Tuolumne County Draft Population Estimates and Methodology for Air Quality Model runs. If the working paper is acceptable to the group, direct Tuolumne County staff to continue the air quality model runs incorporating land uses and roadway networks as presented.

**Conclusions: 3:20 pm**

**Adjourned: 3:30 pm**

Southern Mountain Counties Non Attainment Area Interagency  
Consultation Meeting  
September 22, 2006  
2:00 – 3:30 pm

AIR QUALITY MEETING  
*Via Conference Call*

September 22, 2006 Meeting Minutes

Those attending in person were: Bill Sandman, Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control; Darin Grossi, Tuolumne Deputy Director of Transportation Services; Erin Gold, Tuolumne County Transportation Planner; Tyler Summerset, Tuolumne County Transportation Planner; Gwendolyn Foster, Associate Civil Engineer for Mariposa County; John Gedney, Kathleen McClafin and Maria Rodriguez representing Caltrans District 10.

Those in attendance via phone were: Leland Tarnay from Yosemite National Park; Dennis Wade and Carol McLaughlin with the California Air Resources Board; Penny Gray and Mike Brady both with Caltrans Headquarters; and Jean Mazur with the Federal Highways Administration.

The meeting was brought to order at 2:10 p.m. and began with introductions on both ends.

John Gedney asked Dennis Wade for further clarification regarding the steps required to meet CARB's deadline for agencies to submit vehicle activity data and emissions results.

Dennis Wade briefed the group on several model outputs that the EMFAC model needs to complete emissions analysis which included Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) speed bin classifications by five mile an hour increments, and vehicle population statistics derived from the California Department of Motor Vehicle database.

John Gedney stated that the Fresno Council of Governments (COG) compiled a spreadsheet detailing vehicle population statistics that is available on their website. John confirmed with Dennis Wade that agencies are not bound by CARB's VMT speed bin numbers, but that if we wanted to provide our own we have to produce methodology documentation.

Dennis Wade stated that the way the modeling was looking as of now, that we would reach attainment by the year 2013. Dennis further stated that the interim years of 2008

and 2011 could be interpolated, but that we need distinct land use, network files and model runs for each threshold year.

Darin Grossi addressed the group and asked if the background information provided for this meeting that detailed the locally adopted population estimates for Tuolumne County, and the modeling air quality threshold years of 2002, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2025 were sufficient.

Dennis Wade responded that the methodology for the air quality modeling and modeling years was acceptable. He encouraged agencies to use locally adopted assumptions if they were not using Department of Finance population projections.

John Gedney explained to the group his understanding of how the project specific conformity modeling analysis was tied to the emissions budgets for the SIP. For the project specific conformity analysis, the modeling needed to encompass a less than base year (in this case 2002), a future build and a future no build model run for each project.

Dennis Wade stated that that was correct, and that before the State Implementation Plan (SIP) was adopted, agencies had a choice of which modeling tests to perform with no SIP in place. After the SIP is adopted, we are required to conform to the emissions budget established for each area.

Kathleen McClafflin stated that Park and Ride facilities must be included in agency project lists and must be determined to be exempt or significant projects for conformity determinations.

John Gedney then asked the group to approve the methodology and interim years 2002, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2025 for the air quality modeling presented by Tuolumne County so that they may continue to produce their own modeling for submission to CARB for the SIP development.

It was unanimously approved by the group that the presented population estimates, methodology and modeling years would suffice for the needed inputs for the EMFAC model and SIP development by CARB.

John Gedney further asked the group to review and comment on the submitted list of Tuolumne County projects for inclusion in the air quality modeling networks.

Dennis Wade responded that the Tuolumne County project list needed to be revamped to include the air quality model years that each project would be included in.

Erin Gold responded that she would update the list and submit it to CARB and the group for approval.

John Gedney further inquired if the group would approve the Tuolumne County project list as to the determination of whether each project appropriately was determined to be exempt from conformity analysis or regional significance.

It was unanimously approved by the group, with the exception of the updated model years, that the Tuolumne County project list was adequate in determining conformity exemption or regional significance for each project listed.

Dennis Wade questioned if Mariposa County or Yosemite National Park had any projects that need to be brought in front of the group for regional significance conformity determinations.

Gwendolyn Foster of Mariposa County replied that Mariposa County is generally a non growth county, that they did not have a model or any projects at this time to include. Gwendolyn further iterated that Mariposa County would be content with the given default VMT and emission figures provided by CARB.

Leland Tarnay responded that Yosemite National Park did not have any projects at this time either.

John Gedney stated that if any projects did come up in the future for either of these agencies, that they would need to have conformity determination consensus with this group.

Maria Rodriguez inquired if any tribal agency within the Southern Mountain Counties area had any projects to include.

Erin Gold responded that she would check with the tribal contact and see if they had any projects to bring forward for conformity determination.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

## ***Definitions from the Transportation Conformity Rule***

### ***Definition of regionally significant project***

#### **From 40 CFR 93.101**

*Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than an exempt project) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region; major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves) and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel.*

If a project is not exempt from conformity requirements, and is on a State Highway, it will practically always be regionally significant; State Highways are normally considered to be “principal arterials.” Functional classification information, and regional modeling networks, need to be consulted to see how many other facilities may fall into the “regionally significant” category.

### ***Definition of Exempt projects***

#### **From 40 CFR 93.126 Exempt Projects**

*Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 2 of this section are exempt from the requirement to determine conformity. Such projects may proceed toward implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed in Table 2 of this section is not exempt if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see §93.105(c)(1)(iii)), the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason. States and MPOs must ensure that exempt projects do not interfere with TCM implementation. Table 2 (next page)*

**From 40 CFR 93.127 Projects exempt from regional emissions analyses.**

*Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 3 of this section are exempt from regional emissions analysis requirements. The local effects of these projects with respect to CO or PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required prior to making a project-level conformity determination. These projects may then proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed in Table 3 of this section is not exempt from regional emissions analysis if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see §93.105(c)(1)(iii)), the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potential regional impacts for any reason. Table 3 follows.*

**From 40 CFR 93.128 Traffic signal synchronization projects.**

*Traffic signal synchronization projects may be approved, funded, and implemented without satisfying the requirements of this subpart. However, all subsequent regional emissions analyses required by §§93.118 and 93.119 for transportation plans, TIPs, or projects not from a conforming plan and TIP must include such regionally significant traffic signal synchronization projects.*

***Table 2 & 3 from the Transportation Conformity Rule, Examples of Exempt Projects***

*Table 2—Exempt Projects*

-----  
***Safety***

*Railroad/highway crossing.*

*Hazard elimination program.*

*Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.*

*Shoulder improvements.*

*Increasing sight distance.*

*Safety improvement program.*

*Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.*

*Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.*  
*Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.*  
*Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.*  
*Pavement marking demonstration.*  
*Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125).*  
*Fencing.*  
*Skid treatments.*  
*Safety roadside rest areas.*  
*Adding medians.*  
*Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.*  
*Lighting improvements.*  
*Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).*  
*Emergency truck pullovers.*

### ***Mass Transit***

*Operating assistance to transit agencies.*  
*Purchase of support vehicles.*  
*Rehabilitation of transit vehicles \I\.*  
*Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities.*  
*Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.).*  
*Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems.*  
*Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks.*  
*Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures).*  
*Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way.*  
*Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet \I\.*  
*Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.*

### ***Air Quality***

*Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion activities at current levels.*  
*Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.*

***Other***

*Specific activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as:*

*Planning and technical studies.*

*Grants for training and research programs.*

*Planning activities conducted pursuant to titles 23 and 49*

*U.S.C.*

*Federal-aid systems revisions.*

*Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.*

*Noise attenuation.*

*Emergency or hardship advance land acquisitions (23 CFR 710.503).*

*Acquisition of scenic easements.*

*Plantings, landscaping, etc.*

*Sign removal.*

*Directional and informational signs.*

*Transportation enhancement activities (except rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities).*

*Repair of damage caused by natural disasters, civil unrest, or terrorist acts, except projects involving substantial functional, locational or capacity changes.*

-----  
*Note: <sup>1</sup> In PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment or maintenance areas, such projects are exempt only if they are in compliance with control measures in the applicable implementation plan.*

*Table 3—Projects Exempt From Regional Emissions Analyses*

-----  
*Intersection channelization projects.*

*Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections.*

*Interchange reconfiguration projects.*

*Changes in vertical and horizontal alignment.*

*Truck size and weight inspection stations.*

*Bus terminals and transfer points.*

## **September 2006 Tuolumne County Air Quality Update**

### **Introduction:**

Tuolumne County is part of the Southern Mountain Counties Region air basin with Mariposa County and Yosemite National Park. While each designated air basin is its own entity, each agency within it is given individual emission budget establishments for air quality as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for the SIP development process and establishing emission budgets for each air district. The SIP document will demonstrate that Tuolumne County will attain transportation conformity in compliance with State and Federal regulations governing air quality such as the Clean Air Act (CAA). Transportation conformity is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval are only given to those transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. It makes certain that future planned programmed transportation projects will not worsen air quality or interfere with the "purpose" of the SIP, which is to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Meeting the NAAQS often requires demonstration of emissions reductions from mobile sources. The SIP for the Southern Mountain Counties air basin is due to federal agencies by June 2007.

### **Interagency Consultation and Staff Roles:**

Staff has been engaged in interagency consultation with local, State and Federal agencies for transportation conformity determination that include:

- The Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District (TCAPCD)
- Caltrans District 10 Air Quality officials
- The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- The California Air Resources Board (CARB)
- The California Department of Transportation (DOT)

Participating in these meetings allows all agencies involved to offer input into the development and implementation of the SIP, travel demand modeling planning assumptions, air quality modeling, mobile source emissions modeling, proposed group actions and project level transportation conformity analysis. On September 6, 2006, staff met with TCAPCD, Caltrans and CARB to discuss modeling and planning assumptions required as inputs for the SIP emission budget establishments. Staff has assumed responsibility for maintaining the Tuolumne County traffic model and socioeconomic data inputs needed to demonstrate transportation conformity. We have provided our own model data to Caltrans and CARB for the SIP development with the belief that it will ensure a more cohesive and comprehensive representation of future transportation impacts on emission levels in Tuolumne County. The procedures staff is taking to create the model data are as follows:

- Submit documentation indicating which future fiscally constrained transportation projects that are regionally significant and subject to conformity analysis.
- Agreement through interagency consultation on the future threshold years the model data should encompass.
- Documentation of the base and future year population estimates using the most recent locally adopted assumptions for model land use analysis interpolated to the threshold years.
- Relate population estimates to land use assumptions within the model scenarios.
- Program the regionally significant projects into the model road networks for analysis.
- Run model scenarios for threshold years with updated land uses and road networks.
- Extract Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) estimates and Speed Bin Classifications from model runs for submittal to State and CARB models for emission budget determinations.

**Progress:**

**Threshold Years and Regional Significance Determination**

In order to comply with SIP guidelines and modeling needs, staff was directed to create model threshold years for 2008, 2011 and 2013. Through the interagency consultation process staff was able to determine which future financially constrained transportation projects are subject to conformity analysis by being deemed regionally significant for emissions modeling and which threshold year the projects will be added into the modeling networks. Tables 1, 2 and 3 represent the future projects that are either exempt from conformity or are regionally significant and must be included in the air quality modeling analysis for future years.

**Population Projections for the Threshold Model Years**

After the threshold years and the regionally significant projects were determined, the next step in the modeling process was to identify the target population number for each of the future year model scenarios. As you may recall, on July 24, 2002, the Tuolumne County Transportation Council (TCTC) adopted localized population projections for Tuolumne County for the original circulation model development for 2015 and 2025 that were consistent with 2002 Department of Finance (DOF) population estimates. The reason for adopting our own population forecasts resulted from inconsistencies and a wide fluxuation of population estimates from DOF that did not give an accurate range for staff to factor in housing and commercial land uses that were realistic with historical growth in the County. Staff has utilized the locally adopted population projections and interpolated the air quality threshold years target population figures from those. Table 4 outlines the already adopted population projects and the corresponding threshold year(s) population estimates for the air quality model analysis.

**Table 4**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Change from Preceding Record Year</b>	
		<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>% Average Annual Growth</b>
1930	9,271	N/A	
1940	10,887	1,616	1.7
1950	12,584	1,697	2
1960	14,404	1,820	0.2
1970	22,169	7,765	5.3
1980	33,928	11,759	5.3
1990	48,456	14,528	4.3
1993	52,700	4,244	2.9
2002	55,755	3,055	0.6
2005	57,639	1,884	0.3
2006	58,231	592	0.1
2008	61,489	3,255	0.6
2011	66,325	4,839	0.8
2013	69,564	3,239	0.5
2015	72,800	3,236	0.5
2025	81,629	8,829	1.2

### **Methodology for population projections for interim air quality threshold years:**

DOF population figures for the most current years:

- 2005 Tuolumne County Population: 57,639
- 2006 Tuolumne County Population: 58,231

2015 Locally adopted population figures (-) minus the DOF 2006 population figure:

- $72,800 - 58,231 = 14,569$

Divide the difference in population figure by the number of years between forecasts:

- $14,569 / 9$  (years between figures) = 1,619 growth in population per year

Take the growth per year and multiply (x) by the number of years to factor up from the existing DOF figure:

- $1,619 \times 2$  years (2008 – 2006) = 3,238 population growth from 2006 to 2008.

Add growth figure to the existing 2006 DOF number:

- $58,231 + 3,238 = 61,469$  Total Population Target for 2008

The same method was applied to reach the target populations estimates for 2011 of 66,325 and 2013 of 69,564.

### **Next Steps:**

The next steps for the air quality analysis will be to determine the target housing estimates for each of the interim years required in the SIP. The land uses will be adjusted accordingly throughout the County to reflect the interpolated growth for each of the threshold years. The regionally significant transportation projects will be added into the road networks for the appropriate threshold year that they have been identified for. Staff will run the model scenarios, and extract VMT and Speed Bin Classification that are needed by Caltrans and CARB to complete their air quality model analysis for emission budget determination. Staff expects to be completed with this work by the end of September 2006.

Tuolumne County Projects anticipated to be built by 2008 - Table 1					
Community	Location	Project Type	Description	Regionally Significant or Exempt	Threshold Construction Date
Columbia	Intersection of <b>Parrotts Ferry Rd. and SR-49</b>	Signalization	Install a traffic signal when warranted.	Exempt	2008
Jamestown	Intersection of <b>SR-49/108 and Rawhide Road</b>	Signalization	Install traffic signals.	-	Completed
Jamestown	<b>SR-49/108</b> from near Woods Creek Bridge to Main Street	Continuous LTL	Construct a continuous left turn lane.	Exempt	2008
Sonora	<b>Mono Way</b> from Greenley Rd. to SR-108 Bypass	Widening	Widen to 5 lanes.	Regionally Significant	2008
Sonora	Intersection of <b>Greenley Rd., Sanguinetti Rd., and Old Wards Ferry Rd.</b>	Realignment & Signalization	Realign Old Wards Ferry Rd. with Greenley Rd. at Sanguinetti Rd. to replace the two closely spaced "T" intersections with a new 4-leg signalized intersection.	Regionally Significant	2008
Tuolumne	<b>Tuolumne Road</b> Bypass	Bypass on new alignment	Construct a roadway on a new alignment bypassing Tuolumne connecting Tuolumne Road and Tuolumne Road North	-	Completed
Yosemite Junction	Intersection of <b>SR-120/108 and O'Byrnes Ferry Road</b>	Signalization	Install a traffic signal.	Exempt	2008
East Sonora	Phoenix Lake Road at Sullivans Creek	Bridge Replacement	Replace two lane bridge on Phoenix Lake Road	Exempt	2008
Groveland	Evergreen Road at South Fork Tuolumne River	Bridge Deck Replacement	Replace bridge deck surface by chipping out top layer and replace existing surface with new concrete.	Exempt	2008
County	Tuolumne County	Purchase Hybrid Vehicle	Purchase new Hybrid vehicle for Transportation Division Use	Exempt	2008
Soulsbyville/ Tuolumne	Intersection of <b>Standard Road and Tuolumne Road</b>	Signalization	Install traffic signal	Exempt	2008

Tuolumne County Projects anticipated to be built by 2011 - Table 2					
East Sonora	Tuolumne Road from Mono Way to Standard Road	Passing Lanes & Widening, LTL	Construct passing lanes and turn outs, a continuous left turn lane & widen to 64 feet.	Exempt	2011
East Sonora	SR-108 from Standard Road to Draper Mine Road	Continuous LTL	Construct a continuous left turn lane.	Exempt	2011
Jamestown	SR-49/108 from Rawhide Road to Fifth Avenue	Signalization, Widening, Realignment, & Bridge Replacement	Replace one lane bridge on Rawhide Rd. Realign Rawhide Road, Jamestown Rd, & Main Street. Widen SR-108 to five lanes from Rawhide Road to 5th Avenue. Signalize SR-49/108 / Rawhide Road and SR-49/108 / 5th Avenue.	Regionally Significant	2011
East Sonora	Draper Mine Road at Curtis Creek	Bridge Replacement	Replace bridge on Draper Mine Road	Exempt	2011
Sonora	Tuolumne Road	Railroad Crossing Improvements	Improve RR Crossings	Exempt	2011
Sonora	Various Locations	Bus stops, shelters and pull outs	Construct various bus stops, shelters and pull outs throughout the County	Exempt	2011
Jamestown	Unknown	Park-N-Ride Facility	Construct a Park-N-Ride Lot	Regionally Significant	2011
Sonora	Intersection of SR-108 and South Washington Street	Intersection Improvements	Construct one additional lane on N/B approach and two additional lanes on S/B approach.	Regionally Significant	2011
East Sonora	SR-108 from Standard Rd/Peaceful Oak Rd. to Via Este.	East Sonora Bypass II	East Sonora Bypass, Phase II. Construct new two-lane arterial expressway bypassing existing SR-108.	Regionally Significant	2011
Unknown	Unknown	Transit Facility	Construct a vehicle maintenance, storage and dispatch transit center	Exempt	2011

Tuolumne County Projects anticipated to be built by 2013 - Table 3					
Community	Location	Project Type	Description	Regionally Significant or Exempt	Threshold Construction Date
Columbia	Parrotts Ferry Rd. from SR-49 to Sawmill Flat Rd. & from Sawmill Flat Rd. to Calaveras County Line	Widen and Upgrade	Widen to 4 lanes from SR-49 to Sawmill Flat Rd. Upgrade to major collector standards north of Sawmill Flat Rd. to Calaveras County line.	Regionally Significant	2013
Sonora	Greenley Road/Mono Way intersection.	Intersection Improvement	Improve intersection by adding through lanes.	Regionally Significant	2013
Soulsbyville/ Tuolumne	Tuolumne Road from Standard Road to Soulsbyville Road	Passing Lanes	Construct westbound and eastbound passing lanes	Regionally Significant	2013
Soulsbyville/ Tuolumne	Tuolumne Road from Soulsbyville Road to Woodham Carne Road	Widen	Widen to 4 lanes.	Regionally Significant	2013
Yosemite Junction	Junction of SR-120 and SR-108.	Signalization	Install a traffic signal or other intersection improvement.	Regionally Significant	2013
Tuolumne County Projects anticipated to be built by 2025 - Table 4					
East Sonora	Cabezut Road extension to Phoenix Lake Rd.	Roadway extension	Extend Cabezut Rd. to intersect Phoenix Lake Rd.	Regionally Significant	2025
East Sonora	Mono Way from Hess Ave. to Standard Rd.	Widening	Widen to 5 lanes	Regionally Significant	2025
East Sonora	North/South Connector from SR-108 East of Sonora to SR-49 north of Sonora	New Roadway / Roadway extension	Build a new major collector roadway on an undefined alignment. Possibly an extension of Greenley Road north to SR-49.	Regionally Significant	2025
East Sonora	Intersection of Cabezut Road and Phoenix Lake Road	Signalization	Install a traffic signal when warranted	Exempt	2025
East Sonora	Peaceful Oak Road Extension	Roadway extension	Extend Peaceful Oak Road from current terminus north to Phoenix Lake Road.	Regionally Significant	2025
East Sonora	SR-108 from Via Este to North Sunshine Drive	East Sonora Bypass III	East Sonora Bypass, Phase III. Construct new two-lane arterial expressway bypassing existing SR-108.	Regionally Significant	2025
Lake Don Pedro	Intersection of J-59 and Bonds Flat Road	Signalization	Install a traffic signal when warranted	Regionally Significant	2025
Phoenix Lake	Longeway Road from Soulsbyville Road to Hunts Road	Widening	Widen to 48 feet and add continuous left turn lane	Exempt	2025
Sonora	Greenley Road from Cabezut Rd. to Lyons Street	Widening	Widen Greenley Road by 6 feet on each side and provide 4 through lanes.	Regionally Significant	2025
Sonora	Intersection of Greenley Road and Lyons Bald Mountain Rd.	Signalization	Install traffic signal when warranted.	Exempt	2025
Sonora	SR-49 from proposed Greenley Road extension to Parrotts Ferry Rd	Widening	Widen to four lanes.	Regionally Significant	2025
Soulsbyville/ Tuolumne	Intersection of Woodham Carne Road and Tuolumne Road.	Realignment & Signalization	Realign intersection and install traffic signal	Exempt	2025
Jamestown	Bell Mooney Road at Woods Creek Bridge Crossing	Roadway alternative	Construct an alternative travel way from the current Woods Creek crossing along Bell Mooney Road from SR-49/108 to Seco Street.	Regionally Significant	2025
Soulsbyville/ Tuolumne	Cherokee Road from Tuolumne Road to Tuolumne Road North	Curve Corrections	Perform needed curve corrections	Exempt	2025

Tuolumne County Projects outside of the twenty year horizon - Table 5					
Community	Location	Project Type	Description	Regionally Significant or Exempt	Threshold Construction Date
Columbia	<b>Parrotts Ferry Road</b> from Airport Road to Pioneer Park	Bypass on new alignment	Construct bypass of Columbia on a new alignment, diverting traffic off Parrotts Ferry Road.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Groveland	<b>Ferretti Road</b> from SR-120 to Pine Mountain Lake Road	Capacity	Capacity improvements	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Groveland	<b>Ferretti Road</b> from Pine Mountain Lake Road to Clements Road	Widening	Widen to 40 feet.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Jamestown	<b>SR-49/108</b> from Chicken Ranch Road to Main Street	Widening	Widen to 5 lanes.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Jamestown	<b>SR-49/108</b> from 5th Avenue to SR-49 Junction south of Sonora	Widening	Widen to 5 lanes.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Jamestown	<b>Shell Road</b> extension to O'Byrnes Ferry Road	Roadway Extension	Extend Shell Road from current terminus to O'Byrnes Ferry Road.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Jamestown/ Montezuma Jct	<b>SR-49/108</b> from Junct. SR-49 & SR-108 to Chicken Ranch Road	Widening	Widen to 4-lane expressway.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Jamestown/ Sonora	<b>SR-49 from High School Road west of Jamestown to Rawhide Road north of Sonora</b>	New highway alignment	New 2 or 4 lane expressway on a new alignment bypassing Jamestown and Sonora to the west.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Keystone	<b>SR-120/108</b> from existing 4-lane expressway to Jun. SR-120 (Yosemite Junction)	Widening	Widen to a 4-lane expressway.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Montezuma Jct to Yosemite Junction	<b>SR-108 from SR-120 to SR-49</b>	Widening	Widen to 4-lane expressway.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Mi-Wuk Village/ Long Barn	<b>SR-108</b> from 4-lane expressway near Twain Harte to Long Barn Road	New highway alignment	New 2 or 4 lane expressway on a new alignment.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Sonora	<b>Leland Drive</b> from Racetrack Road to SR-49	Roadway Extension	Extend Roadway to connect with Ponderosa Drive	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Sonora	<b>Racetrack Road</b> from Jamestown Road to Leland Drive	Widen & Realignment	Widen to 36 feet and realign with Jamestown Road	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Soulsbyville/Tuolumne	<b>Standard Road</b> from Tuolumne Rd. to Mono Way	Roadway upgrade	Rebuild road to Major Collector standards, including realignment.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Twain Harte	<b>Twain Harte Drive</b> from Tiffeni Drive to SR-108	Widen	Widen the roadway and improve shoulders. Construct left turn pockets at SR-108 and install SR-108 signage.	Regionally Significant	Unknown
Twain Harte	<b>Twain Harte Drive</b> at Joaquin Gully Road	Turn pocket	Construct left turn pocket.	Exempt	Unknown
Twain Harte	<b>Manzanita Drive</b> from Joaquin Gully Road to Tiffeni Drive	Roadway extension	Extend Manzanita Drive to connect with Tiffeni Drive.	Unknown	Unknown

**Erin Gold**

---

**From:** Erin Gold  
**Sent:** Monday, September 18, 2006 11:44 AM  
**To:** Ed Wyllie (edwyllie@sonoraca.com); 'citymanager@sonora.com'; Gary Caseri; Bill Sandman; 'mbradshaw@fs.fed.us'; 'John Gedney'; Kathleen McClafin (Kathleen\_McClafin@dot.ca.gov); 'planner@mlode.com'; 'dean\_decker@ca.blm.gov'  
**Cc:** 'dhertfelder@mariposacounty.org'; 'Joe\_Meyer@nps.com'; 'leland\_tarnay@nps.com'  
**Subject:** Request for Future Transportation project data for State Implementation Plan (SIP) air quality modeling.

**Attachments:** Memo Request for SIP projects.doc; Transportation Conformity Rule, Examples of Exempt Projects.doc; Draft 2006 Regionally Significant Projects.xls

To all Interested Parties within the Southern Mountain Counties Air Basin,

The purpose of this email is to solicit input from other agencies within Tuolumne County that have future transportation projects to include within the air quality model analysis. It is of the highest importance to include all future transportation projects within the County during this stage of SIP development and model analysis in determining emission budgets. If future projects are not included within the model analysis, then it will be difficult to include them at a later date and to demonstrate air quality conformity for possible State and Federal funding in the future. I have attached the definitions of what qualifies a transportation project as being regionally significant for air quality conformity or exempt, and the most recent list of Tuolumne County projects and their perspective construction dates. Please review the material, and forward me any regionally significant project that your agency would like to include in the air quality analysis for the model scenarios and which model threshold year they will be constructed in.

Thank you for your valuable input throughout this process and identification of potential projects that need to be included in our regionally significant list and model runs. Potential projects will be considered at the next Tuolumne County Transportation Council meeting, September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2006. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at: (209) 533-5601.

Thank you,

Erin Gold



Memo Request for  
SIP projects....



Transportation  
Conformity Rule...



Draft 2006  
Regionally Signific...

**Erin D. Gold**

*Transportation Planner  
Tuolumne County Public Works  
Transportation Division  
2 South Green Street  
Sonora, Ca 95370  
Phone: (209) 533-5601  
Fax: (209) 533-5698*



## County of Tuolumne Department of Public Works

PETER REI, R.C.E., P.L.S.  
Director of Public Works

A.N. Francisco Building  
48 West Yaney Avenue  
Mailing: 2 South Green Street  
Sonora, California 95370

Engineering and Road Operations Divisions  
(209) 533-5601  
Transportation Division  
(209) 533-5603  
County Surveyor Division  
(209) 533-5626  
Environmental Management  
(209) 533-5588  
Fax (209) 533-5698

### Memorandum

**Date:** September 18, 2006

**To:** Interested Agencies within the Southern Mountain Counties Air Basin

**From:** Erin Gold, Tuolumne County Transportation Planner *EG/JS*

**Subject:** Request for Future Transportation project data for State Implementation Plan (SIP) air quality modeling.

As you may know, Tuolumne County is part of the Southern Mountain Counties Region air basin with Mariposa County and Yosemite National Park. While each designated air basin is its own entity, each agency within it is given individual emission budget establishments for air quality as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP document will demonstrate that Tuolumne County will attain transportation conformity in compliance with State and Federal regulations governing air quality such as the Clean Air Act (CAA). Transportation conformity is a way to ensure that Federal funding and approval are only given to those transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. It makes certain that future planned programmed transportation projects will not worsen air quality or interfere with the "purpose" of the SIP, which is to meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Meeting the NAAQS often requires demonstration of emissions reductions from mobile sources.

On September 6, 2006, Tuolumne County staff met with Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District, Caltrans and the California Air Resources Board to discuss modeling and planning assumptions required as inputs for the SIP emission budget establishments. The Tuolumne County Transportation division has assumed the responsibility for maintaining the Tuolumne County traffic model and socioeconomic data inputs needed to demonstrate transportation conformity. In order to be compliant with SIP guidelines, model threshold years for 2008, 2011 and 2013 are being utilized for air quality analysis. Additionally, a list of future financially constrained transportation projects was created to determine which of those are regionally significant and subject to air quality conformity and in which year the projects are expected to be constructed. Model scenarios will be conducted for each threshold year and future transportation projects will be included in the road networks to demonstrate that Tuolumne County will produce a reduction in emission readings pursuant to air quality conformity standards.

The purpose of this memo is to solicit input from other agencies within Tuolumne County that have future transportation projects to include within the air quality model analysis. It is of the highest importance to include all future transportation projects within the County during this stage of SIP development and model analysis in determining emission budgets. If future projects are not included within the model analysis, then it will be difficult to include them at a later date and to demonstrate air quality conformity for possible State and Federal funding in the future. I have attached the definitions of what qualifies a transportation project as being regionally significant for air quality conformity or exempt, and the most recent list of Tuolumne County projects and their perspective construction dates. Please review the material, and forward me any regionally significant project that your agency would like to include in the air quality analysis for the model scenarios and which model threshold year they will be constructed in.

Thank you for your valuable input throughout this process and identification of potential projects that need to be included in our regionally significant list and model runs. Potential projects will be considered at the next Tuolumne County Transportation Council meeting, September 27<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

Attached:     *Draft 2006 Regionally Significant Project Listing  
Transportation Conformity Rule, Definitions of Regionally Significant  
projects and Examples of Exempt Projects*

Cc:            Mariposa County  
                Yosemite National Park

8-Hr Federal Ozone Nonattainment and  
Transportation Conformity Issues  
Meeting Agenda

Date/Time: Thursday, May 11, 2006 / 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Call In Number: 1-517-652-7790 {Participant code 312401}

Meeting Participants: Tuolumne County Public Works Department  
Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District  
Yosemite National Park  
Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District  
Mariposa County Public Works Department  
California Department of Transportation  
California Air Resources Board  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Sierra National Forest  
Stanislaus National Forest  
YARTS & Other Transit providers

1. Introductions
2. Go through compiled lists of Transportation Projects that fall in the category of potentially being “Regionally Significant” - This includes projects being done by the counties, National Park, transit agencies, and the national forests – Lists need to be submitted to me by Friday May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006 COB. A definition is being attached to help with this. Fax: 209.948.7164.
3. Decide which projects should go through the conformity process as “regionally significant” and which are decided through consultation to not be regionally significant.
4. Discuss a timeline for addressing any regionally significant project (if any in the next year or two) – including establishing a timeline for developing the regional emissions analysis, the development of the conformity analysis document, the public notice & how to conduct the public information process. What are consequences of non-participation?
5. Status of the SIP
  - A) Responsibilities of the Districts and ARB. What are consequences of non-participation?
  - B) Milestones and Deadlines – What actions needs to be taken by each Air District?  
By ARB?

6. Status of the Interagency Consultation Procedures
  - A) Status of the Draft MOA
  - B) EPA Guidance - MOA, Rule or both. Are Interagency Consultation Procedures Required Prior to SIP Submittal?
  - C) Milestones and Deadlines – What action needs to be taken?
7. Review meeting findings & action items
8. Next meeting date?

8-hr Federal Ozone Nonattainment Interagency Consultation  
Meeting  
Southern Mountain Counties Air Basin 10:00 – 12:00 pm

AIR QUALITY MEETING  
*Via Conference Call*

APRIL 4, 2007 MEETING MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Deputy Director Grossi. Those attending in person were: Bill Sandman, Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control; Darin Grossi, Deputy Director of Transportation Services; Peter Rei, Executive Director of Public Works; Erin Gold, Transportation Planner; Steven Martinez, Transportation Planner; Denise Bergamaschi, Department Support Technician and John Gedney and Glen Villa both representing Caltrans District 10.

Those in attendance via phone were: Leland Tarnay with the National Park Service; Dennis Wade and Carol McClaughlin with the Air Resources Board; Dave Conway with Mariposa County; and Penny Gray and Mike Brady both with Caltrans Headquarters.

The following items were discussed at the meeting, in no specific order:

- 1) Guidance on Court decisions;
- 2) Discussion on SIP development;
- 3) Distribution of Air Quality Plans;
- 4) Results of EMFAC emissions model;
- 5) CMAQ Project Programming/Funding; and
- 6) Any other items that anyone felt needed to be discussed.

The meeting was brought to order at 10:12 a.m. and began with introductions on both ends.

Deputy Director Grossi went over the list of items that were presented on the agenda. He stated that it has been a while since all parties had met together and that they should touch bases to get an overall update.

He then requested that Mike Brady of Caltrans give an update on the SIP development and also, if he and Dennis could give an overview on the emissions budget development which, he stated, has been put on hold until the Fall.

Dennis Wade stated that while he is not directly involved with the SIP he does have an interest in it. He mentioned that it is fairly critical that projects be submitted by June. He also pointed out that the SIP is project driven not “program” driven.

John Gedney with Caltrans asked if anyone representing the EPA was on the line in attendance for the meeting. He then mentioned that the EPA attempted to write some guidance which, turned out to be “non” guidance and that they were vague as far as rural areas are concerned.

Dennis Wade then asked John if any new data was received on behalf of Tuolumne or Mariposa Counties as far as vehicle activity was concerned. John replied that the latest was the vehicle activity data that Erin Gold presented to him last fall and that there has been no update since then.

John said that given that information, they should be able to turn around and budget fairly quickly.

Deputy Director Grossi asked for a status of his latest effort. It was his understanding that the data goes into an impact model and produces an emissions report. He has not seen or heard anything relating to that.

Dennis said that the budget development is part of the plan and that the numbers he reviewed from John along with the follow up activity for Mariposa will be used to develop the budget.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that he had concerns about the work that was done in the fall being plugged into the process. He also stated that as long as the vehicle activity data is being used in budget development he is content with that.

Mike Brady then mentioned that he would like to see a budget before the end of the fiscal year.

John Gedney stated that it would be part of the draft plan.

Carol McLaughlin with the ARB, stated that it would depend on the funding. She also said that they just got the 2012 modeling and is making sure that the all of the arrows point at the Big “D”.

Deputy Director Grossi said that 2013 is the date he was looking at in the fall.

Carol McLaughlin stated that she adjusted inventory based on some regulations that could have been adopted and worked them in that inventory in the fall. She also stated that that was the basis for the 2012 modeling that just came out and that a copy was sent to Bill Sandman.

Deputy Director Grossi inquired about a “firm date” and asked for what year the emission budgets are developed for. He also added that if budgets are developed for a 10 year, or whatever amount required, then with a 2012 game date; when would an RFP be acquired?

The group posed the question if an earlier attainment date applies, and you don't have an RFP date – if you have attainment in 5 years; being 2009 - would you then have budget for 2008?

Dennis Wade stated that a “hammer will not drop” on June 16<sup>th</sup> because we are considered to be an isolated rural area as far as conformance concerns. There are no federal required plans or programs for our area. We do, however, have to show conformity for projects when needed.

Mike Brady stated that we should proceed in the same process as Calaveras County. This would be to collect a list of all of our projects so that they can all be analyzed at once.

Deputy Director Grossi explained that that is what Erin Gold did last fall. He also stated that Erin Gold has developed the model to include all submitted projects.

Penny with Caltrans stated that there are several bridge projects to be considered due to capacity increasing reasons.

Deputy Director Grossi mentioned that the Rawhide Bridge project is one that he would like to see completed. He is anticipating changing the 1-lane bridge to a 2-lane and adding a center turn lane.

Mike Brady discussed the consultation process.

Deputy Director Grossi said that this is the prelude to organizing an interagency consultation process once it is determined what projects we are going to do tests on. He also inquired about including all of the projects together.

Mike Brady gave the Sonora Bypass Project as an example and stated that if we were doing that project for conformity that we would need to know what all of the regionally significant projects are going to be for the next 20 years. We would need to include all of the analysis, this way if any funding comes along in the next few years – it's already in there; as long as it doesn't change significantly from the way it was first analyzed.

Deputy Director Grossi asked if the East Sonora Bypass Stage II and the Rawhide Bridge Project could be cleared under the same conformity level tests.

John Gedney replied that they would be independent projects but the regional analysis would be the same and separate reports would be issued for each of them.

Deputy Director Grossi also stated that he submitted modeling data with all projects that were included on the list documented last fall under the assumption of getting a determination on all the projects on the overall process and as individual projects.

Mike Brady informed Mr. Grossi that if he plans on doing that, that some sort of modeling would be necessary for the basis of the projects.

John Gedney stated that Deputy Director Grossi is taking the first necessary step: Consistency modeling thru a variety of applications. He also informed Deputy Director Grossi that in the fall he should set the emission budget for the SIP and that he will want to use that same model for the SIP as for vehicle activity and for build/no build.

Mr. Gedney noted that the following items are essential for setting up a project list:

- 1) Consistency;
- 2) Make sure documents in order
- 3) Start an interagency consultation formal process to get everyone in the loop.

He said that a meeting with Agnes Jenkins from District 6 needs to be set up to do tests and that he would keep us informed on the methodology they are going to use.

Deputy Director Grossi asked if Yosemite is following a similar process in getting their clearances.

Leland Tarnay stated that he hasn't been closely involved in new projects.

John Gedney asked if they have CMAQ funds available at this time. He also stated that they might want to think about getting obligated. He informed Mr. Tarnay that Yosemite achieved a non attainment status and that they are eligible for CMAQ money that was given to them in 2005/06 and that they would be getting an allocation every year which can be spent on transit related projects.

Penny Gray with Caltrans, stated that she will be setting up a workshop to discuss CMAQ issues on May 15, 2007 and suggested the Mr. Tarnay attend because he will learn a lot about obligated CMAQ money. She also informed Mr. Tarnay that Yosemite has not been programmed in the STIP and that the funds are inaccessible until someone programs them.

John Gedney also informed Mr. Tarnay that he needs to submit a list of projects that are non exempt for conformity that need to be included in the tests.

Mr. Tarnay stated that he was under the impression that the list was sent out to the appropriate person.

Deputy Director Grossi stated that he had not seen a list issued by Yosemite. He also said that a list of every projects that he knew would be building in the next 20 year time frame was circulated and that the projects was listed whether it was exempt or not.

Mr. Tarnay said that he would make sure that that gets taken care of.

Mr. Gedney informed Mr. Tarnay that this needs to be submitted to the inter agency group for a formal determination to see if it is exempt or not and to indicate whether it is Mariposa or Tuolumne County.

Dennis Wade stated that he will set up a future meeting with the southern mountain counties air basin.

John Gedney said that he will try to get that going in the next couple of month.

Mr. Gedney also stated that we should be looking at the ACTC process for CMAQ projects because they have a good template for following; They ask member agencies to nominate projects, a selection committee evaluates and prioritizes them and then a transportation commission formally adopts a priority list. This way, the funding year CMAQ monies can be identified and attached to the appropriate project and submitted to the FTIP.

*Mike Brady signed off at 10:35.*

Dennis Wade informed everyone that the Air District is putting together rules that need to be adopted by June 15, 2007 that deal with major sources such as the cutback asphalt rule, the gas rule, etc.

Carol stated that she just finished the 2012 modeling and that she needs to go through and analyze.

John Gedney stated to Penny Wade that it could be 2009 for Tuolumne and Mariposa for attainment.

Penny stated that there are some indications there, but she is not sure and she doesn't want everyone excited about it and have to say no.

Executive Director Rei asked about the significance of the 2009 attainment date.

Carol McClaughin explained the process and significance to Mr. Rei. She informed him that if in sub part 1 you don't have to do an RFP –it is still in effect in other areas until the court says otherwise. Prelim results by modeling show that we could attain by then.

John Gedney stated that he is waiting for the modeling results to determine whether the attainment will be by 2009 and for the court decision to be resolved.

Penny Wade said that the EPA requested a hearing on that ruling. She also informed everyone to go thru the process as your project is going to go through because there will only be additional requests – not fewer. She does not know when the court will make a decision on a re-hearing. She also said that in order to be re-designated you need 3 years of clean data. Meaning, three years of readings that show that the fourth high was lower than the standard.

Dave Conway with Mariposa asked if the 2009 model demonstrates conformity, does it take into account other transportation issues?

Carol McLaughlin replied, Yes – implicitly; it takes into account all of the emissions in the whole region. She stated that San Joaquin is likely to bump up because their main problem with one of the stationary monitors.

Bill Sandman asked Carol how the monitors are doing in San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties.

Dennis Wade stated that they are showing good reductions in the northern and central part of the basin and that it is the southern part that seems to be the problem.

Carol McLaughlin said that she has all of the information on an e-mail that she can forward to Bill Sandman.

Deputy Director Grossi asked if there were any other issues that anyone would like to discuss at this time.

Penny Wade added that she will set up another conference call regarding CMAQ issues in the near future. She also informed everyone that there will be an inter agency meeting in late May.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Southern Mountain Counties Non-Attainment Area  
Interagency Steering Committee Meeting  
Meeting Agenda  
Tuolumne County Public Works Department  
A.N. Francisco Building, Third Floor Conference Room  
48 West Yaney Street, Sonora, CA 95370

Date: 06/27/2007 Time: 10:00 am – 12:00 pm

Call In Number: 1 (888) 252-9167

Meeting Invitees: Tuolumne County Public Works Department  
Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District  
City of Sonora  
Yosemite National Park  
Stanislaus National Forest Service  
Mariposa County Public Works Department  
Mariposa County Air Pollution Control District  
California Department of Transportation (District 10 &  
Headquarters)  
California Air Resources Board  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Federal Highway Administration  
Bureau of Land Management

1. Introductions
2. Review of Minutes from previous meetings
3. Review Interagency Consultation Procedures
4. Review and Approve Regionally Significant or Exempt Projects from all agencies
5. Requirements for FSTIP project conformity to ensure funding
6. Review and Approve Conformity Methodology for Non-Exempt Regionally Significant Projects
7. CMAQ Projects and Funding Updates
8. Status of SIP
9. Review meeting findings and action items