MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
367 North State Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

PHILLIP J. DOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite 206
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite 204
(707) 234-3434

AGENDA

Monday, February 5, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers
Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

Additional Media
For live streaming and later viewing:
https://www.youtube.com/, search for Mendocino County Video, or
YouTube link at http://www.mendocinocog.org under Meetings

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

NOTE: ***All items are considered for action unless otherwise noted.***

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Election of Officers – Chair and Vice Chair
3. Convene as RTPA
4. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

PUBLIC EXPRESSION

5. Participation is welcome in Council meetings. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and not more than ten minutes per subject, so that everyone can be heard. "Public Expression" time is limited to matters under the Council's jurisdiction that may not have been considered by the Council previously and are not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Members of the public may comment also during specific agenda items when recognized by the Chair.

REGULAR CALENDAR

6. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendations of January 17, 2018
   a. **Public Hearing at 1:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as possible:** Consideration and Finding of Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact, followed by Adoption of Resolution No. M2018-___* Approving the 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan
   b. Award of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Two Percent Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Grants
   c. Approval of Request for Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Funds – City of Fort Bragg Electric Vehicle Charging Station, Not to Exceed $12,000
7. Consideration/Discussion of State Route 1 Traffic Issues in Elk
8. Annual Appointments to Standing Committees
   a. Executive Committee
   b. Transit Productivity Committee
   c. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG)
9. Adoption of 2018 Board Calendar

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items are considered for approval in accordance with Administrative Staff, Committee, and/or Directors' recommendations and will be enacted by a single motion. Items may be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration, upon request by a Director or citizen.

10. Approval of December 4, 2017 Minutes
11. Acceptance of 2016/17 MCOG Fiscal Audit
12. Appointments to Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)
13. Approval of Third Amendment to Fiscal Year 2017/18 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)

RATIFY ACTION

14. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee - Reconvene as RTPA - Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

15. Reports – Information - *No Action*
    a. Mendocino Transit Authority
    b. North Coast Railroad Authority
    c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
    d. MCOG Administration Staff – *verbal*
    e. MCOG Planning Staff – *verbal*
    f. MCOG Directors
    g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

ADJOURNMENT

16. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) REQUESTS

To request disability-related modifications or accommodations for accessible locations or meeting materials in alternative formats (as allowed under Section 12132 of the ADA) please contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, at least 72 hours before the meeting.

ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

The Brown Act, Section 54954.2, states that the Board may take action on off-agenda items when:

a) a majority vote determines that an "emergency situation" exists as defined in Section 54956.5, **or**
b) a two-thirds vote of the body, or a unanimous vote of those present, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and the need for action arose after the agenda was legally posted, **or**
c) the item was continued from a prior, legally posted meeting not more than five calendar days before this meeting.

CLOSED SESSION

If agendized, MCOG may adjourn to a closed session to consider litigation or personnel matters (i.e. contractor agreements). Discussion of litigation or pending litigation may be held in closed session by authority of Govt. Code Section 54956.9; discussion of personnel matters by authority of Govt. Code Section 54957.

POSTED 1/30/2018 * Next Resolution Number: M2018-01

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Annual Election of Officers

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO DATE: 1/26/2018

BACKGROUND:

According to MCOG's bylaws, a Chair and a Vice Chair are elected annually by the Board of Directors, typically on the first Monday in February, as the first meeting of the calendar year. The appropriate sections of the bylaws are attached for your reference.

Officers elected in 2017 were Dan Gjerde as Chair and Larry Stranske as Vice Chair.

This item is placed as the first business on the agenda, since officers are elected to serve the Council regardless of which body is convened -- RTPA, SAFE, or simply as the COG for other business such as housing or economic development.

Committee appointments are placed later on the agenda, as their business is mostly related to the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and should be made after convening the Policy Advisory Committee.

ACTION REQUIRED:

Follow last year's method or vote to use another method.
Procedure followed in 2017, consistent with Robert's Rules of Order[1]:

1. Hear any and all nominations for the office of Chair. A second is not required to nominate.
2. Discuss and answer questions. Nominees may state their qualifications for the office.
3. Close nominations.
4. Move, second and vote on each nominee until a motion carries.
5. Repeat for the office of Vice Chair.

ALTERNATIVES:

According to Robert's Rules, "If no method of nominating has been specified in the bylaws and if the assembly has adopted no rule on the subject, any member can make a motion prescribing the method." The bylaws do not specify and, to our knowledge, MCOG has adopted no rule.

The Council may adopt a rule, by motion and vote. Staff would advise that such a rule be written and ratified at a future meeting.

No alternative to the annual election is identified. According to the bylaws, "*The term of the Chair shall be for one (1) year, commencing on the first Monday in February when elected and ending on the following first Monday in February or at the next officers election.*"

RECOMMENDATION:

Allow staff to receive nominations and conduct votes, first for Chair and then for Vice Chair. After that, the new or re-elected Chair presides over the meeting.

Enc: Bylaws excerpt

[1] "A nomination is, in effect, a proposal to fill the blank in an assumed motion 'that _____ be elected' to the specified position. In choosing someone to fill an office or other elected position in a society or assembly, a more effective freedom of choice is maintained through the practice of nominating persons for the office, rather than moving that a given person be elected as in the older British procedure." - Robert's Rules of Order, 2000 edition

Excerpt of MCOG Bylaws Amended May 6, 2013

ARTICLE III - OFFICERS/STAFF/COMMITTEES

Section 1.1 Chair: The Chair of the Council shall be selected by a majority of its voting members. The term of the Chair shall be for one (1) year, commencing on the first Monday in February when elected and ending on the following first Monday in February or at the next officers election.

Section 1.2 Powers of Chair: The Chair, when present, shall preside at all meetings of the Council. The Chair shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide all questions of order subject to the action of a majority of the Council. The Chair shall be permitted to participate in debate without surrender of the chair. The Chair shall be permitted to vote, move, and second a motion. If the Chair is absent, then the Vice Chair shall preside. If both the Chair and Vice Chair are absent, a chair *pro tem* may be appointed for the purposes of the meeting.

Section 2. Vice Chair: The Vice Chair of the Council shall be selected by a majority of its voting members. The term of the Vice Chair shall be for one (1) year, commencing on the first Monday in February when elected and ending on the following first Monday in February or at the next officers election. The Vice Chair shall have all of the powers and act in the place of the Chair in his/her absence.

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Public Hearing – Adoption of 2017 Regional Transportation Plan and Negative Declaration

DATE PREPARED: 01/25/18
MEETING DATE: 02/05/18

SUBMITTED BY: Nephele Barrett, Program Manager

BACKGROUND:
Over the past year, MCOG staff has been working with local agencies and other stakeholders to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is the primary transportation planning document for the region. The RTP addresses all modes of transportation and includes goals and policies, an assessment of needs, identification of potential projects and discussion of relative funding. The RTP was last updated in 2010. An update was started in 2014, but then suspended when MCOG adopted a new RTP update schedule in order to correspond with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment.

The RTP has been developed with public, agency, and other stakeholder input. In the fall of 2016, a series of public workshops was conducted around the county to gather public input for both the RTP and ATP. Surveys have also been utilized as a way for members of the public to participate in the process. In addition to public input, MCOG has gathered information from local agencies, the Technical Advisory Committee and Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, utilized existing planning documents and sought input from Native American Tribes in the region. The input received from these sources has been used in development of the draft plan.

An administrative draft of the RTP was presented at the September TAC meeting, providing opportunity to comment prior to completion of this current draft. Comments received from local agencies have been incorporated into the plan. Tribal governments were also provided additional opportunity for input at that time. Subsequently, a complete first draft was provided to TAC members and the MCOG Board for review. The final draft was then prepared which incorporates any comments received, as appropriate.

A Draft Negative Declaration has been prepared for the RTP and distributed for review and comment through the State Clearinghouse, as well as posted on the MCOG website. The official 30 day public and agency review period for the document ends on February 2, 2018. To date, no comments have been received on the Draft Negative Declaration.

The TAC considered the Draft Negative Declaration and the RTP at their January 17, 2018, meeting and recommended approval of both documents. The TAC's recommendation included a minor modification to one Objective and one Policy under Climate Change & the Environment in the RTP. The Objective now reflects the need for MCOG policy was modified to reflect the need for MCOG to participate in both capital and regional planning efforts related to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Policy acknowledges that a balance of both public and private investment is needed in the electric vehicle charging network. The revisions can be found on pages 18 and 19.

At the time of this report, the only comments on the final draft of the RTP that have been received other than from MCOG staff have been draft comments that were discussed by the Brooktrails Township Community Service District at a recent meeting. The comments focus on two things—a second access to the Brooktrails area and a bicycle/pedestrian trail serving the area. MCOG acknowledges the need for a Brooktrails Second Access, as has been demonstrated by funding of past planning efforts. The project is discussed as an "Unfunded Need" in the plan, along with the need to extend Redemeyer Road for similar reasons. The draft comments from the Brooktrails CSD meeting express the desire to have the project

listed in the Action Plan of the document, as a short range project. While staff understands there is a recently rekindled desire on the part of the County to explore a potential project, we feel that it is still most appropriately included as an "Unfunded Need" in the RTP due to the magnitude of planning, funding and project development that would be required.

Regarding the desire for a walking/biking facility serving Brooktrails, "Brooktrails to Willits – Multi-Use Trail" is included as a project in the Active Transportation Element of the RTP, although a specific route is not identified. The need for safe walking and biking between the Brooktrails area and the City of Willits was a concern expressed by many during development of the RTP. The draft comments from the CSD meeting suggest a specific route be identified utilizing a long abandoned railroad grade, referred to as the "Willits Creek Trail." If an implementing agency chose to pursue the project, this route suggested by the CSD could be considered. However, staff believes that inadequate planning has been done to identify a route for this type of new facility at this time.

At this meeting, a public hearing will be held in order to receive comments on the Negative Declaration and Regional Transportation Plan. Prior to adopting the Plan, the MCOG Board must consider the Draft Negative Declaration and any comments received during the public review period. Upon finding that there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the Plan will have a significant effect on the environment, the Board may then approve the Negative Declaration. Once the Negative Declaration has been approved, the Board may take action on the Plan itself. Attached to this staff report is a proposed resolution to adopt the 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan.

ACTION REQUIRED:

1. Make finding that proper notice of meeting has been provided (UDJ 1/4, Willits News 1/3, ICO 1/1). A notice was also posted at the Mendocino County Clerk's office, the MCOG website, sent to local agencies and Tribal Governments, and circulated through the State Clearinghouse.)
2. Receive staff report.
3. Open public hearing.
4. Receive public comments.
5. Close public hearing.
6. Consideration of Negative Declaration – Upon finding that there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the Plan will have a significant effect on the environment, approve the Negative Declaration.
7. Action by Resolution on 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Adopt the RTP with changes.
2. Continue adoption of the RTP to a later meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: The Technical Advisory Committee and staff recommend the following:

1. Upon finding that there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the Plan will have a significant effect on the environment approve the Negative Declaration
2. By Resolution, adopt the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan.

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION NO. M2018-_____

ADOPTING THE 2017 MENDOCINO COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS,

- The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Mendocino County;

- State law required the preparation of Regional Transportation Plans by regional transportation planning agencies to address transportation issues and to assist local and state decision makers with shaping California's transportation infrastructure;

- In accordance with Government Code Section 65080, MCOG is required to regularly adopt a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);

- The last RTP for the Mendocino County region was adopted February 19, 2011;

- MCOG prepared, in accordance with the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines, a Draft 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan, which was distributed for review and comment;

- Throughout the RTP update process MCOG has made efforts to include and consult with Tribal governments, other governmental agencies, community organizations, the private sector, and members of the public, consistent with the adopted Public Participation Plan;

- MCOG's Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the RTP at their meeting of January 17, 2018, and recommended approval; and

- MCOG has found that there is no substantial evidence that adoption of the RTP will have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore, has adopted a Negative Declaration for the Plan, pursuant to CEQA; therefore, be it

RESOLVED THAT:

The Mendocino Council of Governments hereby adopts the 2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director _____, seconded by Director _____, and carried this 5th day of February, 2018, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAINING:
ABSENT:

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the resolution adopted, AND SO ORDERED.

_____ _____

ATTEST: Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director Chair

Mendocino Council of Governments
DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION

For review by interested agencies and the public in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, an analysis has been made of possible environmental impacts of the following project. Attached hereto is a copy of the Initial Study documenting reasons to support the above findings.

DATE:	December 19, 2017
PROJECT TITLE:	2017 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan Update
LEAD AGENCY:	Mendocino Council of Governments 367 North State Street, Suite 206 Ukiah, CA 95482
CONTACT PERSON:	Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director, 707-463-1859 Nephele Barrett, Program Manager, 707-234-3434
PROJECT LOCATION:	The Regional Transportation Plan would cover the entire County-wide area, including the incorporated cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg, Willits and Point Arena.
PROJECT SPONSOR:	Mendocino Council of Governments 367 North State Street, Suite 206 Ukiah, CA 95482

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a transportation planning document prepared by the Mendocino Council of Governments. The Plan provides an overview of both short- and long-term transportation goals, objectives and policies for the region, as well as a list of potential projects intended for implementation. The RTP considers all modes of transportation including automobile, trucking, bicycle, pedestrian, air, public transit, rail, maritime and any related facilities needed for an effective transportation system. The Plan also assesses current and long-range transportation issues, identifies needs and deficiencies, considers funding options and suggests actions to address these items, in an effort to improve the overall transportation system in the region.

SETTING: Mendocino County is located in Northern California, lying within the northern extension of California's coast mountain ranges, and is bordered by the Counties of Lake, Sonoma, Humboldt, Trinity, Tehama and Glenn and the Pacific Ocean to the west. These mountains are characterized by a series of southeast to northwest ridges that are separated occasionally by narrow valleys. The coastline is also rugged and rocky. Much of the land area is taken by forest lands, with the remainder used for agriculture, residential and other uses. Transportation routes tend to be located within valleys, and east-west travel is especially difficult, since parallel ridges must be traversed. The mountainous nature of the County tends to minimize ground transportation options throughout the region

OTHER NECESSARY APPROVALS: Projects listed in the RTP will be undertaken by individual agencies within the region (e.g. Caltrans, public works, transit agency, etc.) and may require approvals from responsible or trustee agencies (e.g. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Army Corps of Engineers, California Coastal Commission, etc.). No other approvals are required for adoption of the RTP.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION: California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area were notified at the earliest stages of the RTP's development, with offers for individual consultation between the Lead Agency and the tribes. No requests for consultation were received from tribal representatives notified of the Plan, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☒ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☒ Geology /Soils
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☒ Hydrology / Water Quality
☒ Land Use / Planning	☒ Mineral Resources	☒ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☒ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

"Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change, may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

12/26/17
DATE

Phillip J. Dow
SIGNATURE

INITIAL STUDY/EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

An explanation for all checklist responses is included, and all answers take into account the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site; cumulative as well as project-level; indirect as well as direct; and construction as well as operational impacts. References to information sources for potential impacts are cited where appropriate. The explanation of each issue identifies (a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. In the checklist the following definitions are used:

"**Potentially Significant Impact**" means there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant.

"**Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated**" means the incorporation of one or more mitigation measures can reduce the effect from potentially significant to a less than significant level.

"**Less Than Significant Impact"** means that the effect is less than significant and no mitigation is necessary to reduce the impact to a lesser level.

"**No Impact"** means that the effect does not apply to the Project, or clearly will not impact nor be impacted by the Project.

I. AESTHETICS. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through d) **No Impact-** The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Its adoption will not result in specific impacts to scenic resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Most of the projects included in the draft RTP are relatively minor roadway or bicycle/pedestrian improvement projects that would not adversely affect views once construction is completed. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of scenic as well as light and/or glare impacts at the time of design.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through e) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact-** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Its adoption will not result in specific impacts to agricultural or forestland resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. Projects involving grading, widening or expansion of streets, roads or highways may entail the acquisition of additional right-of-way, which could include marginal degrees of resource land conversion depending on the setting. In these cases, potentially adverse effects will be analyzed and appropriate mitigation measures will be recommended at the time of project development.

III. AIR QUALITY. **Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through e) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact-** Adoption of the RTP would not conflict with local air quality plans or create objectionable odors, nor are projects contained in the Plan, upon implementation, expected to have any substantial impacts on local air quality. The most recent State Area Designations (June 2017) indicate that Mendocino County is designated as a non-attainment area for suspended particulate matter (PM10) and unclassified for hydrogen sulfide. The Mendocino County Air Basin has been designated as an attainment area with respect to the remaining State and national ambient air quality standards, including those for ozone, fine suspended particulate matter (PM2.5), carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, sulfates, lead, and visibility reducing particles. Potentially adverse effects resulting from individual projects within the Plan will be analyzed and appropriate mitigation measures will be recommended at the time of design. Short term impacts that may result from local construction activities will not have a significant effect on overall air quality in the region. In addition, components of the Plan (e.g. Transit Element, Active Transportation Element, etc.) include goals and policies intended to reduce dependency on automobile travel, as well as congestion and vehicle miles traveled and support increased utilization of zero emission vehicles.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through f) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact-** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in specific impacts to biological resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts to sensitive or special status species, riparian habitat, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, native resident, migratory species, or other biological resources, at the time of design. In these cases, potentially adverse effects will be analyzed and

appropriate mitigation measures will be recommended at the time of project development. Likewise, consistency with all local policies, including the Coastal Act, Local Coastal Plan, or approved local, regional or State habitat conservation plans will be addressed during the design phase of the proposed projects.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through d) **Less Than Significant Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in specific impacts to cultural resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts to historical, archaeological and paleontological resources, as well as potential impacts to unique geologic features or disturbance of human remains outside of formal cemeteries, at the time of design.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through e) **Less Than Significant Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in specific impacts to geology and soils, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. No major new roadway projects are currently proposed for programming. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts related to exposure to fault ruptures, ground shaking, slides, erosion or soils capability, at the time of design.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) and b) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact –** Certain projects included within the RTP may involve roadway capacity increases, which could in turn lead to additional automobile traffic within the region. Implementation of these projects could therefore lead to local increases in the generation of greenhouse gases (GHGs). However, the majority of roadway improvements identified in the RTP are operational in nature, rather than capacity increasing, which would lead to a reduction in GHGs. Potentially adverse effects resulting from individual projects within the Plan will be analyzed and appropriate mitigation measures will be recommended at the time of design. In addition, many projects identified in this plan would facilitate a mode shift to active forms of transportation, also reducing GHGs. The Goals, Objectives, Policies section of the RTP includes policies intended to reduce GHGs by prioritizing transportation projects which lead to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Goals and policies also support and encourage expanding opportunities for utilizing transit, active transportation, and the use of zero emission vehicles.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through h) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in specific risks involving hazardous materials or situations, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts involving the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or other conditions which would expose people or structures to hazardous materials or situations, at the time of design.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for	☐	☐	☐	☒

which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters considering water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g. heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
l) Have a potentially significant impact on groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
m) Impact aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through m) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in impacts to water quality or hydrology, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. No major new roadway projects are currently proposed for programming. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, bicycle/pedestrian trails, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts involving existing drainage patterns, additional surface or polluted runoff, increases in pollutant discharges, potential inundation or aquatic, wetland or riparian habitat, at the time of design.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through c) **No Impact -** Adoption of the RTP would not conflict with existing general, area or specific plans or zoning ordinances within the region. The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level consistency evaluation at the time of design. As project implementation will be led by the individual jurisdictions in which they are located (i.e. cities, county, State right-of-way), local land use regulations will apply. As a result, consistency with all local policies or approved local, regional or State plans will be addressed during the design phase of the proposed projects.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) and b) **No Impact** - The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in impacts to available mineral resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts involving the availability of known mineral resources at the time of design.

XII. NOISE. **Would the project result in:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through f) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in exposures to excessive levels of noise, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. Short term impacts that may result from local construction activities will be held to noise standards of the local jurisdiction in which the project is located (i.e. cities or County). Longer term impacts such as traffic noise will need to be evaluated as part of the environmental review of the individual projects, with potential abatement measures recommended as needed.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) through c) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact –** Adoption of the RTP will not result in population growth or housing displacement. Given the small populations (Countywide estimated to be 87,628 as of July 2017) and relatively slow growth rates (approximately 0.5% annually) of the region, improvements to or expansion of the existing transportation system will not have a substantial impact on housing or population. Local land use decisions regarding housing development may include the need for improved access over time to facilitate better or more efficient circulation, although the overall lack of development pressure in the area would not be affected by implementing projects found within the RTP. Implementation of projects discussed in the Plan will involve a project level evaluation of impacts to housing and population growth at the time of design.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	☒
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Medical Services?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) **No Impact –** Adoption of the RTP would not affect the provision of government services or facilities. Implementing projects within the Plan would lead to improvements to or expansion of the existing transportation system, which would benefit many of the public services including those involving response times, access, connectivity and medical services. Short term impacts may lead to some minor congestion and alternative routing in certain cases, although not to a significant degree. Active transportation projects included within the RTP, upon implementation, will improve safety and access for pedestrians and bicyclists to schools, parks and other public spaces. Implementation of projects discussed in the Plan will involve a project level evaluation of impacts to public services at the time of design.

XV. RECREATION.	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) and b) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact –** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not lead to adverse impacts on parks or other recreational activities within the region. While implementation of certain projects may improve transportation modes to and from local and regional recreation areas, the potential increase in use will not result in the substantial deterioration of such facilities. Projects in the plan that could increase access to parks are primarily improvements to or extensions of existing networks, rather than entirely new facilities. Implementation of projects discussed in the Plan will involve a project level evaluation of impacts to parks and recreational activities at the time of design.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Generate substantial additional vehicular movement?	☐	☐	☒	☐

b) Effect existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially impact existing transportation systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Alter present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Increase traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through f) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact –** Adoption of the RTP will lead to overall improvements to the transportation system with individual projects having a positive effect on different aspects of the system including highways, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, public transit and others. Implementation of certain projects discussed in the Plan will involve increases in capacity, which could result in additional vehicular movement, although such increases are not expected to adversely affect either individual components of the transportation system, or the regional system as a whole. Many other projects found within the Plan are intended to improve safety for automobile, bicycle and pedestrian traffic upon implementation. An evaluation of specific impacts from yet-to-be-implemented projects will be required at the time of design.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. **Would the project:**	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a through g) **No Impact –** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in impacts to utilities and service systems, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects. In general, implementation of projects included in the plan would not have a substantial effect on public services. Construction activities may have temporary water needs for dust control and grading activities, however these would be short term and not pose a significant impact. The vast majority of the transportation system in the region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently

conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts involving existing drainage patterns and/or drainage facilities, at the time of design.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) through c) **Less than Significant Impact/No Impact -** The RTP is a program level document, which includes a general overview of both short- and long-range projects expected to be implemented over time. Adoption of the RTP will not result in cumulative impacts to biological or historical resources, although individual projects included within the Plan may include potentially adverse effects, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. The vast majority of the transportation system in the Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. There are no major new facilities identified for implementation within the plan. Other projects discussed within the Plan, such as grading, road widening and expanded right-of-way acquisition, new structures or new road projects are presently conceptual in nature and will involve a project level evaluation of impacts and/or cumulative impacts involving biological, historical, archaeological or other resources, at the time of design.

Agenda # 6b
Regular Calendar
MCOG Meeting
2/5/2018

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: FY 2017/18 Local Transportation Fund (LTF) 2% Bicycle & Pedestrian Applications – TAC Recommendation

DATE PREPARED: 1/26/18

SUBMITTED BY: Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director

MEETING DATE: 2/5/18

BACKGROUND:
There is an approximate fund balance of $137,000 in MCOG's LTF 2% Bicycle & Pedestrian Program *(from FY 2016/17& 2017/18, plus interest and released minor balances)* available for allocation.

MCOG staff recently solicited applications for these funds, with requests due from local agencies on December 1, 2017. A total of three applications were received. At their January 17, 2018 meeting, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and ranked the three applications as follows:

Applicant	Project	Funds Requested	TAC Ranking *(lower points are better)*
County Dept. of Transportation	**Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile Creek along Branscomb Road in Laytonville –** to construct a pedestrian multi-use bridge alongside existing vehicular bridge & replace existing narrow pedestrian bridge	$137,000	#1 11 points
City of Point Arena	**Port Road Rehab & Overlay –** to rehabilitate approx. 0.6 miles of Class II bikeway on each side of roadway	$ 89,832	#2 15 points
City of Willits	**Elm Lane Pedestrian Ramp Improvements** – to construct six ADA-compliant corner ramps to create accessible path to essential services at shopping center	$ 48,000	#3 16 points

The TAC unanimously recommended that if the #1 ranked project **(**Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile Creek) does not require all of the requested $137,000 *(once construction bids are known)* any remaining funding should be awarded to the #2 and #3 ranked projects, in order of ranking.

I attended the bid opening for the Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge project on January 25, 2018. Although an award has yet to be made (pending verification), the low bid is slightly below the Engineer's Estimate. At this point the project appears headed for construction. There will likely be some remaining funding that can be directed to the TAC's second priority project upon project completion this fall.

ACTION REQUIRED: Consider TAC recommendation to award LTF 2% Bicycle & Pedestrian funds.

ALTERNATIVES: (1) Accept TAC recommendation to award funding to the #1 ranked project *(Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile Creek),* with any remaining funds to be made available to the #2 *(Port Road Rehab & Overlay)* and # 3 *(Elm Lane Pedestrian Ramp Improvements**)*** ranked projects, in order of ranking *(recommended);* (2) Do not accept TAC recommendation, and instead award funding to lower ranked projects *(not recommended);* (3) Decline to award funds this cycle, and roll over fund balance to next cycle *(not recommended).*

RECOMMENDATION: Accept TAC recommendation to award $137,000 in LTF 2% Bike & Pedestrian funding to the #1 ranked project, *(Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile Creek)* with any remaining funds to be made available to the #2 *(Port Road Rehab & Overlay)* and # 3 *(Elm Lane Pedestrian Ramp Improvements**)*** ranked projects, in order of ranking *(recommended).*

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Request for Funding: Electric Vehicle Charging Station – Fort Bragg

DATE PREPARED: 01/26/18
MEETING DATE: 02/05/18

SUBMITTED BY: Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director

BACKGROUND:
Consistent with our role to assist in statewide efforts to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, MCOG developed the Mendocino County Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Regional Readiness Plan that was adopted by the Board on August 19, 2013. Since that time we have been working to support local and statewide efforts to install electric vehicle (EV) charging stations systematically throughout Mendocino County and connecting to the larger statewide network.

Last year we assisted Point Arena by providing funding to upgrade a charging station that was originally scheduled to be installed on State Park property. When the State Park location proved infeasible, funding was needed to upgrade the unit to include fee recovery hardware and software. The funding for this work required up to $17,500 and funding was approved from our Partnership Funding Program for this project.

In November Fort Bragg Public Works Director Tom Varga sought our assistance on this project. The Mendocino Land Trust has installed two EV charging stations in Fort Bragg. One installation has resulted in a problem since parking spaces adjacent to the chargers are not compliant with ADA standards. Approximately 600 square feet of pavement needs to be removed, graded, and replaced to correct the slope.

The initial cost estimated to bring this site into compliance ranges from $18,000 to $24,000. At this point a complete cost estimate is not available, but the need for a timely solution is clear. Consistent with the purpose of the Partnership Funding Program, there is also a need for financial participation from the City of Fort Bragg.

Hearing all of this at the Technical Advisory Committee, there was support for the project. After discussion, the recommendation to the Board was to commit up to $12,000 from MCOG's Partnership Funding Program to be matched from Fort Bragg sources to address ADA issues at the selected EV charging site in Fort Bragg.

ACTION REQUIRED: Provide matching funding from the Partnership Funding Program to correct ADA issues at the EV charging station in Fort Bragg.

ALTERNATIVES: (1) The Board may choose not to support this project. (2) The Board may also choose to support this project at a different funding level.

RECOMMENDATION: The Technical Advisory Committee recommended at their January 17, 2018 meeting that the Board approve up to $12,000 from the Partnership Funding Program to match Fort Bragg's costs to correct ADA related deficiencies at the new EV charging site in Fort Bragg. The Executive Director concurs with the TAC recommendation.

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Elk Transportation Issues

DATE PREPARED: 12/28/17
MEETING DATE: 02/05/17

SUBMITTED BY: Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director

BACKGROUND:
Last year at the February 2017 meeting I briefed the Board on issues that had been raised in the community of Elk. I agreed to report back in one year regarding these issues. My staff report of last year dated 01/27/17 is attached for your reference.

To summarize, the issues of concern that have been identified are:

1. Location of the northbound radar speed feedback sign is poorly placed.
2. Prevailing speeds through the community are too high
3. Insufficient off-street parking
4. Insufficient bicycle and pedestrian facilities

Regarding the issues identified above, I offer the following:

As reported last year, I had been working with Caltrans Safety Engineer Darron Hill regarding the placement of the existing radar feedback sign. We agreed that placement of the sign would be more effective to the north near the approach to metro Elk. We also agreed that an additional sign would be placed further north on the southbound approach to Elk so that the speed constraint effect of these signs is more compact, hopefully more effective, and where it is most needed. The additional sign has been ordered and I expect that these installations will occur soon.

In an effort to emphasize the 30 miles per hour limit through Elk, an additional speed limit sign was placed by Caltrans last spring. It was a great location for traffic purposes, but was placed at Li Foo Gulch and evidently obscured the view of the headlands and Wharf Rock. I was contacted regarding this and passed the information on to Mr. Hill. The sign was moved to an alternate location.

I have nothing to offer regarding off-street parking. Typically higher volume businesses offer off-street parking for their customers, but no such businesses exit there. There is a gravel parking lot on the west side but it is only for Greenwood State Park access. Most other small communities have perpendicular side streets which would provide a non-highway on-street alternative, but there are none in Elk. Furthermore, I found from research into this issue in Gualala that there are no funding sources available to MCOG which could be used to provide off-street parking.

Regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities, there is news to report. In the 2017/18 Regional Transportation Planning Work Program, we have funded an element, *Work Element 19 – Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory/Engineered Feasibility Study – South Coast.* The purpose of this effort is to conduct a study of the needs, priorities, and feasibility of improving identifiable deficiencies within the pedestrian network of Point Arena, and greater point Arena/South Coast area (south of Highway 128) in Mendocino County.

The product of this study will provide us with information that will be critical in applying for competitive grants to implement priority improvement projects. MCOG also was recently awarded a Caltrans Sustainable Communities Planning Grant to provide the same product throughout the remainder of the county. Both projects will be initiated this winter.

ACTION REQUIRED: None.

ALTERNATIVES: The Board may choose to provide direction to staff after discussion on issues presented by staff and the public.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff has no recommendations at this point.

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Elk Community Issues

DATE PREPARED: 01/27/17
MEETING DATE: 02/06/17

SUBMITTED BY: Phillip J. Dow, Executive Director

BACKGROUND:
In the past couple of years I have been coordinating with Caltrans Safety Engineer Darron Hill regarding traffic speed issues along Highway 1 in and around the community of Elk. One of the mitigations that was implemented involved the installation of a radar-feedback speed sign on the northbound approach to the community. There have been local concerns expressed that the device is ineffective due to its placement. In the meantime, working again with Mr. Hill, there are plans to re-evaluate the southerly location of the radar-feedback sign and to install another north of the community for southbound traffic.

Recently I was approached by former Supervisor Norman deVall about other traffic issues, notably about pedestrian and bicycle safety issues. Constrained to what is likely to be prescriptive right-of-way, there are no pedestrian facilities in Elk. Although in certain areas, the shoulders have been widened, the additional paving outside the edge lines are often used for parallel parking. Pedestrians use this area when vacant and share it when there are vehicles present. In other areas, particularly around the Elk Garage and north of town, there are pockets of informal 90 degree parking. In addition the Pacific Coast Bike Route extends through Elk sharing the limited right-of-way with motorists, pedestrians and parked vehicles.

Mr. deVall asked me the appropriate forum to address his concerns. I replied that it would be MCOG since the issues he identified all involved Highway 1 and not a County facility. I told Mr. deVall that I would place an item on the agenda so that he could address the Board about these concerns.

MCOG staff intends to continue to work with Caltrans on existing identified concerns as well as others that may be identified before the Board.

ACTION REQUIRED: Provide a forum to discuss traffic speed, pedestrian and general traffic safety issues in Elk.

ALTERNATIVES: None identified.

RECOMMENDATION: Receive staff report and input from Mr. deVall, and provide direction to staff as appropriate.

Photos provided by Norman de Vall 1/26/2018

Photos provided by Norman de Vall
1/26/2018

Agenda # 8
Regular Calendar
MCOG Meeting
2/5/2018

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Annual Committee Appointments

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO DATE: 1/26/2018

BACKGROUND:

Following are the procedures for appointment of Board members to MCOG's standing committees. I have attached the appropriate sections of the bylaws for your reference. (Seats on the other standing committees are not filled by MCOG Board members.)

- The Council may appoint an Executive Committee, consisting of the Chair, the Vice Chair, and one other member reflecting a city-county balance.
- The Chair shall appoint two members to the Transit Productivity Committee.
- The Council shall appoint two members to CALCOG, including at least one Executive Committee member. One serves as the delegate and the other as the alternate.

The most recent appointments are:

- Executive Committee - Chair **Gjerde**, Vice Chair **Stranske**, and Director **Scalmanini**
- Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) – Chair **Gjerde** and Director **Ranochak**
- CALCOG – Director **Scalmanini** (Delegate) and Chair **Gjerde** (Alternate Delegate)

ACTION REQUIRED:

a. Appointment by the Council of the Executive Committee. – *The next meeting will need to be scheduled for late February.*

b. Appointments by the Chair to the Transit Productivity Committee. – *Please note a meeting will need to be scheduled for mid-April to review MTA's annual claim and the unmet needs analysis. Transit performance issues are addressed annually, typically at the April TPC meeting, or later in the year if necessary.*

c. Appointment by the Council of two CALCOG Delegates. – *Typically CALCOG delegates have met in March/April for the annual Regional Leadership Forum, and again in the autumn for a joint meeting with statewide county and city associations. This year the Forum is scheduled for March 14-16 in Monterey. Also there may be business meetings with a call-in option.*

ALTERNATIVES:

- The Executive Committee is optional according to the bylaws.
- TPC membership is mandated by the bylaws, so there is no alternative without amendment.
- Annual CALCOG appointments are mandated also, so there is no alternative without amending the bylaws.

RECOMMENDATION:

Appoint members to the standing committees described above, following MCOG's bylaws.

Enc: Bylaws excerpts

Excerpts of MCOG Bylaws Amended May 6, 2013

ARTICLE III - OFFICERS/STAFF/COMMITTEES

Section 5. STANDING COMMITTEES

Section 5.2 Executive Committee: The Council may appoint an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair, the Vice Chair and one member from a city or the County. The Executive Committee may carry on the administrative and executive functions of the Council between regular meetings of the Council. The Executive Committee may also be used to oversee the personnel budget and policy issues and make recommendations to the full Council.

The Council shall attempt to appoint members to the Executive Committee that reflect a balance between City and County representation.

Section 5.4 Transit Productivity Committee (TPC): The TPC shall consist of five (5) voting members: two (2) members of the Council appointed by the Chair; two (2) members of the transit operator's Board of Directors; and one (1) senior centers representative to be selected by those senior centers under the Council's jurisdiction and then formally appointed by the Council. The TPC shall be staffed by the MCOG Executive Director or his/her authorized representative.

The purpose of the TPC will be to review transit performance and productivity issues in accordance with approved standards adopted by the Council, including review of quarterly reports of the transit operator. The TPC will review and make recommendations to the Council on the annual Transit Claim, and also provide input on the "unmet transit needs" process, including findings of the SSTAC. Meetings will be held at least once annually, or quarterly if warranted.

Section 6. ASSOCIATIONS

Section 6.1 California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG): The Council shall annually appoint two members of the Council, at least one of whom shall be an Executive Committee member, to the CALCOG organization for the purpose of voting on statewide issues. One member shall be the delegate, the other member, the alternate. The term of these appointments shall be for one year commencing on the first Monday in February when appointed and ending on the following first Monday in February or at the next year's committee appointments.

2018 MCOG BOARD MEETING CALENDAR

1st Monday at 1:30 pm, 9-10 months per year, at County Administration Center,
Board of Supervisors Chambers, Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah
Subject to Venue Availability and Unless Otherwise Noticed

As of 1/26/2018 - subject to change

Date	Planned Highlights and Recurring Actions	Notes
January	No meeting this month	
February 5	Election of Officers and Committee Appointments	
March 5	Executive Committee Recommendations: Draft 2018/19 Budget – No Action	
April 2	Regular Business	
May 7	Budget Workshop Including: Executive Committee Recommendations: Draft 2018/19 Budget Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) and SSTAC Recommendations: 2018/19 Unmet Transit Needs Reasonable-to-Meet Finding Funding of MTA's Annual Transit Claim	
June 4	Combined Recommendations of Staff & Committees: Adoption of 2018/19 Regional Transportation Planning Agency Budget TAC Recommendations: Adoption of 2018/19 Planning Overall Work Program	
July	No meeting this month	
August 20 Special Meeting	Regular Business	Change to third Monday
September TBD Special Meeting	On Location Tour/Mobile Workshop (Optional): ▪ Transportation Tour of Plans & Projects – To Be Determined ▪ Informal Lunch and Presentations/Discussion	All-day field trip and community meeting
October 1	Regular Business	
November 5	Regular Business	
December 3	Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Recommendations: 2019/20 Unmet Transit Needs - Public Hearing	

Related Meetings of Interest / Educational Options

February 21	19th Annual CTF Transportation Forum, Sacramento http://www.transportationfoundation.org/	CA's leading charitable transportation organization
March 14-16	CALCOG Delegates: 2018 Annual Regional Leadership Forum, Monterey http://www.calcog.org/	Assn. of regional agencies; networking & current issues
Oct. 28-30	29th Annual Focus on the Future Conference – Self Help Counties Coalition, Indian Wells, CA http://www.selfhelpcounties.org/focus/	20 local agencies with transportation sales taxes

January 29, 2018

To: MCOG Board of Directors
From: Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO
Subject: Consent Calendar of February 5, 2018

The following agenda items are recommended for approval/action.

10. Approval of December 4, 2017 Minutes – *attached*

11. Acceptance of 2016/17 MCOG Fiscal Audit **–** MCOG received a clean fiscal audit report. *– Staff report, Basic Financial Statements and Management Report attached*

12. Appointments to Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) **–** Four appointments are proposed. *– Staff report and Membership Roster attached*

13. Approval of Third Amendment to Fiscal Year 2017/18 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) **–** This is a routine amendment to (1) program the recently approved Caltrans Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning grant and required local match (adding new W.E. 21), and (2) move some RPA funds between existing work elements. This proposed amendment would increase the total work program from $1,488,176 to $1,690,626, an increase of $202,450 *($179,229 Caltrans grant, plus $23,221 match from Local Transportation Funds). – Staff report and funding tables attached*

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

MINUTES

Monday, December 4, 2017
County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers

ADDITIONAL MEDIA:
Find YouTube link at http://www.mendocinocog.org under Meetings
or search Mendocino County Video at www.youtube.com

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

1. Call to Order / Roll Call. The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. with Directors Steve Scalmanini, Larry Stranske, Richey Wasserman, Susan Ranochak, Georgeanne Croskey, and Rex Jackman (Caltrans/PAC, via audioconference); Chair Dan Gjerde presiding. Michael Cimolino was excused.
Staff present: Phil Dow, Executive Director; Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO; Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner; Nephele Barrett, Program Manager; James Sookne, Project Manager; and Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant.

2. Convene as RTPA

3. Recess as RTPA - Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee.

4. Public Expression. None.

5 - 8. Regular Calendar.

5. Public Hearing: Unmet Transit Needs for Fiscal Year 2018/19 – Including Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Recommendations of November 13, 2017. Finding of Proper Notice. Ms. Orth confirmed proofs of publication were received from three local publishing media: Ukiah Daily Journal, published on November 3, 2017, The Mendocino Beacon, published on November 9, 2017, and Independent Coast Observer, published on November 11, 2017. The notice was posted on MCOG's website and emailed directly to interested Transit Stakeholders. Recommendation of finding of proper notice, then to hold the public hearing.

Upon motion by Wasserman, second by Ranochak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote *(7 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranske, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes, 0 Abstained; 1 Absent):* IT IS ORDERED that this public hearing on Fiscal Year 2018/19 Unmet Transit Needs was properly noticed.

Public Hearing. Chair Gjerde opened the hearing at 1:33 p.m. Ms. Orth reported findings from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) workshop conducted on November 13, 2017. An outcome of the meeting was a list of five unmet needs that were identified in the workshop. Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) separately provided a list of 12 unmet needs from public input collected at their meetings. The Hearing was closed at 1:39. The hearing was reopened at 1:51 p.m. after Agenda Item #6 to receive additional testimony from a late arrival to the Public Hearing on Unmet Transit Needs. Pam Jansen of Ukiah Valley Association for Habilitation (UVAH) gave testimony on the needs of UVAH clients. UVAH serves approximately one hundred Adults with Developmental Disabilities in the community. They provide Day Services and Employment Services in the area. She requested that MTA Fixed Routes and Dial-a-Ride service start about half an hour earlier in the morning to provide adequate time for the participants in the program to get to their jobs. The hearing was closed at 1:53 p.m.

Board Action. **Upon motion** by Ranochak, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote [list votes]: IT IS ORDERED that that 1) MCOG receives as testimony all needs reported by the SSTAC, MTA, and the public hearing; 2) the testimony received includes "unmet transit needs" as qualified by MCOG's adopted definitions; and 3) all testimony is directed to Mendocino Transit Authority for analysis and for further review by the Transit Productivity Committee and Social Services Transportation Advisory Council.

6. Public Hearing: Approval of Resolution Adopting the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Finding of Proper Notice. Ms. Barrett confirmed proof of publication from Ukiah Daily Journal, published on November 24, 2017. Recommendation of finding of proper notice, then hold the public hearing.

Upon motion by Croskey, second by Wasserman, and carried unanimously by roll call vote *(7 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranske, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes, 0 Abstained; 1 Absent):* IT IS ORDERED that this public hearing on Approval of the 2018 RTIP was properly noticed.

Ms. Barrett referred to her written staff report. The Council was given the opportunity to review the Draft RTIP, included in the November MCOG meeting agenda packet. The Fund Estimate (FE) for the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) identified $3,000,000 for the Mendocino County region over the next five years. The improvement over the 2016 STIP, which required MCOG to deprogram projects, was primarily due to SB1 passing into law. The Technical Advisory Committee supported MCOG staff throughout development of the 2018 RTIP and recommended the projects and funding identified in the proposed RTIP and resolution. The RTIP includes an analysis of how the projects support the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan. It also establishes future funding commitments for some Ukiah projects that were cut from the 2016 STIP.

Public Hearing. Chair Gjerde opened the hearing at 1:49 p.m. With no one testifying, and no written testimony received from the public, the hearing was closed at 1:50 p.m.

Upon motion by Wasserman, second by Croskey and carried unanimously on roll call vote *(7 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranske, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes, 0 Abstained; 1 Absent):* IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is adopted, and staff is authorized to submit the adopted RTIP to Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission.

Resolution No. M2017-14
Adopting the 2018 Regional Transportation
Improvement Program
(Reso. #M2017-14 is incorporated herein by reference)

Planning, Programming & Monitoring	$ 298,000
New STIP Programming:	
North State Street Intersection/Interchange Improvement	
Environmental & Permits (E&P)	132,000
Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)	336,000
Fort Bragg S. Main Street Pedestrian Improvements	
E&P	45,000
PS&E	110,000
Construction (CON)	1,330,000
Gualala Downtown Streetscape – PS&E (APDE Funds)	575,000
Sherwood Road Geometric Upgrade – CON	100,000
Willits Bypass Relinquishment	
Right of Way (ROW)	15,000
CON	83,000
TOTAL	**$ 3,024,000**

Ms. Orth added that MCOG staff plans to submit a press release, as part of a statewide effort that highlights projects funded by SB1. She invited the Board to add comments to include in the press release. Director Croskey volunteered to meet with Ms. Orth to add comments.

7. Approval of Resolution Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Making Related Findings in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act Relating to the Covelo State Route 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail in the Town of Covelo, California; Approving the Project; and Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute and File the Notice of Determination on Behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments.

Mr. Sookne presented a final draft of the Covelo State Route 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail Initial Study / Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration. He introduced Micha Schwarz, Senior Scientist with GHD, the consultant leading the studies for the required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document. Dr. Schwarz explained the CEQA process and discussed the public environmental concerns that were received through public comments. He explained changes made in Appendix D to ensure public concerns were addressed. He explained the actions recommended for the Board in order to proceed with the project. Chair Gjerde invited public comments; no comments were received.

Upon motion by Croskey, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously by roll call vote. *(7 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranske, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes, 0 Abstained; 1 Absent):* IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is adopted.

Resolution N. M2017-15

Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Making Related Findings In Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act Relating To the Covelo State Route 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail In the Town Of Covelo, California; Approving the Project; and Authorizing the Executive Director To Execute and File The Notice Of Determination on Behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments
(Reso. #M2017-15 is incorporated herein by reference)

Director Gjerde asked about the next steps advancing towards construction after the approval by resolution. Mr. Sookne explained that directly after the meeting, the Notice of Determination will be filed with the County to start the necessary 30-day public comment period. He will then take the information to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in January, to approve allocating the money for design for Phases I and II. Then work will start on the design, permits and right of way. Construction is programed to go out to bid for construction in FY 2019-20.

8. Discussion/Direction: 2018 MCOG Board Calendar. Ms. Orth referred to the proposed draft calendar included in the board packet. The calendar was not scheduled to be adopted at this time. MCOG staff requests input and direction from the Board prior to submitting for approval at the next MCOG meeting. The February MCOG meeting will include any newly appointed Board members. The schedule includes two placeholders for On Location Tour/Mobile Workshops to be determined for spring and/or autumn. There are no scheduled meetings in January and July, due to conflicts with holidays. The August meeting was proposed for the third Monday of the month to bridge the gap between the June and October meetings. The schedule will be on the February meeting agenda for adoption. No action was taken.

9. Consent Calendar. Upon motion by Wasserman, second by Ranochak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote *(7 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranskey, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent)*: IT IS ORDERED that consent items are approved:

9. **Approval of November 6, 2017 Minutes** – *As amended, Agenda Item #11e1, MCOG Planning Staff: the Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant Cycle was reported due on January 21; the actual due date for proposals is February 23.*
10. **Adoption of Resolution Approving the Updated Title VI Program and Associated Limited English Proficiency Plan; Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute Said Policy on Behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments and Appoint a Title VI Coordinator.**

Resolution No. M2017-16
Approving the Updated Title VI Program and Associated Limited English Proficiency Plan; Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute Said Policy On Behalf of the Mendocino Council of Governments and Appoint a Title VI Coordinator
(Reso. #M2017-16 is incorporated herein by reference)

11. **Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee.** Upon motion by Director Croskey, second by Ranochak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote *(6 Ayes – Scalmanini, Stranskey, Wasserman, Ranochak, Croskey, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent)*: IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

12. Reports - Information

a. Mendocino Transit Authority. MTA General Manager Carla Meyer reported.
- They held their first Annual Board Retreat in late October. They hired an outside facilitator from Sacramento; all the board members and management attended. Ms. Meyer said they created an MTA strategic vision and identified three main goals to focus the direction for the future of MTA to create their five-year plan.
- They held their first All Staff Training Day on November 11. California law requires that bus operators receive eight hours of refresher training per year. Due to various schedules of the employees, it makes this requirement difficult to fulfill. They received required training and were given dedicated time to focus on the subject matter. The guest speakers' training materials included safety training functions, wheelchair securement, and new department policies and procedures.
- The RouteMatch installation is in progress; the computer hardware and software components for the buses will make communicating with customers and the dispatcher easier and more efficient.
- They recently hired a new dispatcher, which will allow for full coverage for the duration of operation.

b. North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA). Ms. Ellard reported on the November NCRA meeting in Ukiah. NCRA reported they are ahead of schedule on the Ukiah Depot Improvement Project. The bridge was completed and they are out of the creek bed. They are currently working on mitigation; the project deadline is June, 2018. NCRA staff has been working with Senator McGuire's office to develop legislation with intent to introduce to the State in 2018. If passed, the bill would provide annual NCRA funding and a one-time sum to assist in repayment of their debt. They have plans to conduct a public workshop to discuss issues surrounding the proposed legislative bill in January; Senator McGuire's staff will be invited to participate.

c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings. Executive Director Dow referred to his written staff report. He remarked that the multitude of meetings involving the implementation of SB1 programs has slowed down as components of the programs and guidelines have been adopted. Mr. Dow will attend the California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting the following Thursday in Riverside.

d. MCOG Administration Staff
   1. *Senate Bill 1 Implementation – Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017.* Mr. Dow referred to his written staff report. He said this week the CTC will adopt formulas for the Local Partnership Program shares. The formulas will be set for a couple of years then the CTC will revisit to discuss whether changes are necessary.
   2. *2017 Caltrans Excellence in Transportation Award for Willits Bypass Project – Plaque Presented to MCOG for Partnership Role.* Mr. Dow presented a plaque from Caltrans that commemorates MCOG's partnership with Caltrans. The mitigation project will take a few years to complete, now that construction has been completed.
   3. *Miscellaneous.* Mr. Dow announced the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was going to be on this agenda for adoption; however, Ms. Barrett found out it was not critical at this specific time and is taking the opportunity to add to it. This will also allow more time for review and comment prior to requesting the Board to adopt the RTP. The RTP will be on the next agenda for the Board to adopt.

e. MCOG Planning Staff.
   1. *Proposals Received for FY 2018/19 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP).* Ms. Ellard gave an update of local grant processes. The proposals for next year's Transportation Overall Work Program (OWP) were due on December 1. There were four applications received for next year's OWP:
      - City of Fort Bragg – Transportation Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning Project
      - County DOT – Combined Special Studies
      - MTA – Transit Designs Guidelines Manual
      - MCOG Administration – Zero Emissions Vehicle (ZEV) & Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan Update

      The applications will be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) over the next few months as the FY 2018-19 OWP is developed.
   2. *Proposals Received for MCOG's Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Two Percent Bicycle & Pedestrian Program.* Ms. Ellard reported applications were due on November 1. From the past two years of budget allocations, the total fund balance available is $137,000. Three applications were submitted:
      - City of Willits – Elm Lane Pedestrian Ramp Improvements
      - County DOT – Branscomb Road Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile
      - City of Point Arena – Port Road Rehab & Overlay

      The TAC will look at the applications in January and will bring their recommendations to the February MCOG Meeting.
   3. *Miscellaneous.* Today, Ms. Ellard learned that the application MCOG submitted to Caltrans for the Sustainable Communities Grant Program for the Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study was recommended by Caltrans staff for CTC approval. The application covers most of the County, with the exception of the South Coast. The South Coast project is currently covered by an OWP element. If Notice of Approval for this application comes, the project is expected to begin in February. Ms. Ellard will start the State RPA funded portion on the South Coast project, as outlined in

the OWP, soon. She would like to get approval from Caltrans to combine both projects on one Request for Proposal (RFP) and procurement process to use one consultant, as it would be more efficient.

The next Caltrans planning grant cycle applications are due February 23; local agencies have been notified and MCOG has offered assistance. The Active Transportation Plan Guidelines are being developed, and the next grant cycle begins in March.

f. MCOG Directors. None.

g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. None.

13. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Submitted: PHILLIP J. DOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant

Agenda # 11
Consent Calendar
MCOG Meeting
2/5/2018

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Acceptance of 2016/17 MCOG Fiscal Audit

SUBMITTED BY: Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO DATE: 1/26/2018

BACKGROUND:

The final audit report for the year ended June 30, 2017 has been completed by the independent CPA, R. J. Ricciardi, Inc., of San Rafael. Once again, MCOG has received a favorable and compliant audit. There were no current or prior-year observations for management concerning internal controls. All previous recommendations have been implemented.

Occasionally in past years, the Executive Committee has reviewed the audit report prior to acceptance by the full Council. This year, no issues arose in the audit report. Formerly, it was agreed that with no findings or recommendations by the auditor, the committee did not need to convene for that purpose.

MCOG has 15 separate funds in a trust account held in the County treasury. The audit report, i.e. the "Basic Financial Statements," classifies them in certain ways and, according to standards, is not allowed to state a combined fund balance. I have summarized totals here for your reference, only to show the extent of assets for which MCOG is responsible.

Governmental Funds or "Special Revenue Funds" for Programs	Net Position	$ 874,889
Trust and Agency Funds or "Fiduciary Fund Types"	Net Position	$4,846,054
	TOTAL	$5,720,943

As I mentioned in the Management's Discussion and Analysis, MCOG's net position typically has been in the range of approximately $1.5 million in Governmental funds and $3.5 million in Fiduciary funds, for about $5 million total in the cash accounts and capital assets. Recently there has been slightly less in the Governmental funds and significantly more in the Fiduciary funds. I should also note that "Expendable Trust" funds are now referred to as "Private Purpose Trust." Apparently this is a directive of the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

The financial statements (considered a trial balance) are produced by staff on an accrual basis and audited by the independent CPA. The funds are held in the County Treasury and controlled by the County Auditor. MCOG's data is verified by the County's records. For the past six years, this has proved to be an efficient system and is functioning well.

As approved by the Council, we have one more year of engagement with R. J. Ricciardi, Inc., as approved by the Council in June 2017. After that we intend to issue a Request for Proposals for another five years of fiscal audits.

ACTION REQUIRED:

Accept the audited Basic Financial Statements and Management Report. In any case, I must transmit the statements to the State Controller as required, as soon as practical within this fiscal year.

ALTERNATIVES: The Council may direct the Executive Committee to review and comment on the audit reports prior to acceptance by the full Council. Of course, I would be glad to answer any questions if the Council wishes to pull this item off the Consent Calendar.

RECOMMENDATION:

Accept the audited Basic Financial Statements and Management Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2017 as prepared by R. J. Ricciardi, Inc., Certified Public Accountants.

Enclosures: Audited Basic Financial Statements and Management Report

Agenda # 12
Consent Calendar
MCOG Meeting
2/5/2018

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Social Services Transportation Advisory Council Appointments
DATE PREPARED: 01/29/18
MEETING DATE: 02/05/18
SUBMITTED BY: Nephele Barrett, Program Manager

BACKGROUND: The Transportation Development Act (TDA) mandates that Regional Transportation Planning Agencies maintain a Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC).

Appointments are proposed for four seats. Three seats will expire this spring, two of which are currently filled by interim members. The existing or interim members are proposed for reappointment. The fourth appointment is to fill a seat which is currently vacant. In addition to these positions, there are two seats that remain vacant. Members have not been identified to fill these seats at this time. The seats that are currently nominated to be filled are listed below.

- "Local social service provider for seniors"
  - Appoint through April 2021
  Richard Baker, Willits Seniors, Inc. (currently serving as interim)

- "Local social service provider for seniors"
  - Appoint through April 2021
  Teresa Newton, Area Agency on Aging (currently serving as interim)

- "Local social service provider for seniors that provides transportation"
  - Reappoint through April 2021
  Charles Bush, Redwood Coast Seniors

- "Representative of local Consolidated Transportation Services Agency"
  - Appoint through April 2019
  Jacob King, Mendocino Transit Authority

Please refer to the attached chart of available seats and qualified nominations. Terms are for three-year, staggered terms. If volunteers become available for the vacant seats, additional appointments can be made by the MCOG Board at such time.

ACTION REQUIRED: Appoint four members to fill terms on the SSTAC.

ALTERNATIVES: The Board may submit additional names for consideration. Also, the Board may appoint more members than the nine prescribed by law.

RECOMMENDATION: Appoint Richard Baker, Teresa Newton, Charles Bush and Jacob King to the SSTAC.

Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)

Proposed Membership Roster

November 2017

Position	Name	Alternate	Agency	Term Expires
Local social service provider for seniors	~~Allyn Nonneman~~ (Richard Baker)	Priscilla Tarver	Willits Seniors, Inc.	April 2018
	~~Michelle (Micki) Dolby~~ (Teresa Newton)		Area Agency on Aging	April 2018
Local social service provider for seniors that provides transportation	Charles Bush	Steve Jordan	Redwood Coast Seniors	April 2018
Potential transit user at least 60 years of age	*Vacant*			April 2018
Potential "handicapped" transit user	*Vacant*			April 2019
Local social service provider for the handicapped that provides transportation	Marilyn DeFrange	Diana Clarke	Ukiah Senior Center	April 2019
Representative of local Consolidated Transportation Services Agency	~~*Vacant*~~ (Jacob King)			April 2019
Local social service provider for the handicapped	Sheila Keys		Redwood Coast Regional Center	April 2020
Local social service provider for persons of limited means	Arlene Peterson		Action Network	April 2020
	Doris Sloan		Consolidated Tribal Health	April 2020
Representative of local Consolidated Transportation Services Agency	Carla Meyer		Mendocino Transit Authority	April 2020

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Third Amendment to FY 2017/18 Overall Work Program - TAC Recommendation

DATE PREPARED: 1/22/18

SUBMITTED BY: Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner

MEETING DATE: 2/5/18

BACKGROUND:
The Final FY 2017/18 Overall Work Program *(totaling $1,239,550)* was adopted by MCOG on 6/5/17. It was first amended on 8/21/17 to adjust carryover amounts and make other miscellaneous changes; and amended again on 11/6/17 to program Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funds *(carryover and reserve),* resulting in a revised total of $1,488,176.

There is now a need for a third amendment to (1) program the recently approved Caltrans Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning grant and required local match (adding new W.E. 21), and (2) move some RPA funds between existing work elements to avoid potential carryover problems *(RPA carryover is limited to 25% of the annual amount).* Proposed revisions are as follows:

W.E. 10 (MCOG) Regional Transportation Plan 2017 Update, Ph. 2 – Carryover – A large of amount of carryover RPA funds was added to this work element in the second amendment, and staff has now determined that the RTP update effort will not require all of the programmed funds, so they need to be reprogrammed to ensure they are expended in a timely manner. A total of $32,000 in RPA funds is being transferred out of this work element into other work elements where most needed, as described below. Total budget is proposed to decrease from $72,707 to $40,707 *(a decrease of $32,000).*

W.E. 1 (MCOG) Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination – A total of $15,000 in RPA funds is being transferred into this work element from W.E. 10. This work element experiences a high level of activity and is routinely fully expended at the end of the fiscal year. Total budget is proposed to increase from $81,975 to $96,975 *(an increase of $15,000).*

W.E. 3 (MCOG) Community Transportation Planning & Coordination – A total of $10,000 in RPA funds is being transferred into this work element from W.E. 10. This will likely result in the under-claiming of the existing Local Transportation Funds (LTF) is this work element; however, LTF funds don't expire and may be carried over and reprogrammed as needed. Total budget is proposed to increase from $14,750 to $24,750 *(an increase of $10,000).*

W.E. 16 (MCOG) Multi-Modal Transportation Planning – A total of $7,000 in RPA funds is being transferred into this heavily used work element from W.E. 10. Total budget is proposed to increase from $20,000 to $27,000 *(an increase of $7,000).*

New Project – W.E 21 (MCOG) Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory/Engineered Feasibility Study – Inland/North Coast Area - A total of $202,450 ($179,229 Caltrans Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant, plus $23,221 local match from LTF carryover) is being programmed for this recently awarded grant project. The purpose of this new project is to conduct a Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory/Engineered Feasibility Study for the Inland/North Coast area of the county. *Note: This same type of project covering the Greater Point Arena/South Coast area is funded separately in W.E. 19. With Caltrans' concurrence, these two projects are being combined into one comprehensive regional project with two components, for efficiency (one procurement process, one consultant contract, etc.)*

In summary, this proposed amendment would increase the total work program from $1,488,176 to $1,690,626, an increase of $202,450 *($179,229 Caltrans grant, plus $23,221 LTF match).* Details are shown in **bold** and ~~strike-out~~ on the attached financial summary sheets. *Copies of the full amendment are available upon request.*

The TAC considered this proposed Third Amendment at their January 17, 2018 meeting, and unanimously recommended approval.

ACTION REQUIRED: Consider TAC's recommendation to approve Third Amendment to FY 2017/18 Overall Work Program.

ALTERNATIVES: (1) Accept TAC's Recommendation to approve Amendment *(Recommended);* (2) Do not approve Amendment; or (3) Revise Amendment.

RECOMMENDATION: Accept TAC's recommendation to approve the Third Amendment to FY 2017/18 Overall Work Program (OWP), and authorize Executive Director to sign appropriate certifications and revised OWP Agreement (as needed), and forward to Caltrans as required.

/le
Attachments: FY 2017/18 OWP - Summary of Funding Sources
FY 2017/18 OWP - Funding Allocation & Expenditure Summary
New W.E. 21 - Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & EFS – Inland/North Coast

NEW

WORK ELEMENT (21) **MCOG – MENDOCINO COUNTY PEDESTRIAN FACILITY NEEDS INVENTORY AND ENGINEERED FEASIBILITY STUDY (INLAND/NORTH COAST)**

PURPOSE:
This grant-funded project will explore the needs, priorities and feasibility of improving identified deficiencies within the pedestrian network of the cities of Ukiah, Willits, and Fort Bragg, as well as most of the unincorporated communities in the County.
(Note: This project will be combined with W.E. 19 which has the same Scope of Work for the City of Point Arena and unincorporated south coast area.)

PREVIOUS WORK: None.

TASKS:
Note: Staff time for Task 1 duties will not be charged to this grant-funded work element, as the procurement tasks performed under W.E. 19 encompassed this work as part of a combined countywide project, for efficiency. (Caltrans District 1 staff agreed to this approach.)

Task 1: Project Initiation: Kick-off Meeting; RFP Preparation; Committee Formation; Consultant Selection; Contract Preparation & Execution

Task 1.1: Hold a project kick-off meeting with MCOG staff and Caltrans staff to discuss grant procedures and project expectations including invoicing, quarterly reporting, and all other relevant project information. (MCOG)
Task 1.1: Prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) and Scope of Work and distribute to various qualified consulting firms to obtain competitive bids for this project. (MCOG)
Task 1.2: Form a Consultant Selection Committee (expected to be composed of representatives of MCOG, Caltrans, County of Mendocino, City of Ukiah, City of Willits, and City of Fort Bragg) to review proposals received and select a consultant to perform work. (MCOG)
Task 1.3: Prepare and execute a contract with the successful consultant. (MCOG)

Responsible Party: MCOG

Task	*Deliverable*
1.1	*Project Kick-off Meeting Agenda & Meeting Notes*
1.2	*Request for Proposals (RFP) (MCOG)*
1.3	*Agenda, Scoring Sheets, & Meeting Notes (MCOG)*
1.4	*Executed Consultant Contract (MCOG)*

Task 2: Coordination with Project Partners & Consultant

Task 2.1: Form a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) consisting of representatives from MCOG, County of Mendocino, City of Ukiah, City of Willits, City of Fort Bragg, Caltrans, and Tribal transportation to provide input and provide consultant oversight during the Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility & Engineered Feasibility Study. (MCOG)
Task 2.2: Conduct study kick-off meeting with TAG and consultant to refine the scope of work, clarify the scope of the project, and resolve remaining issues. Includes travel expense. (MCOG, TAG & Consultant)

Task 2.3: Meet, as needed, as TAG throughout the course of the study and prepare agendas and minutes for TAG meetings. (TAG & Consultant)

Responsible Party: MCOG & Consultant

Task	Deliverable
2.1	*Technical Advisory Group Members Roster (MCOG)*
2.2	*Study Kickoff Meeting Agenda and Meeting Notes, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
2.3	*TAG Meeting Agendas and Meeting Notes, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*

Task 3: Prepare Existing Conditions Report

Task 3.1: Gather and review existing data relevant to pedestrian infrastructure needs that may have been identified in prior planning studies, Regional Transportation Plan, development proposals, needs assessments, community plans, Safe Routes to Schools plans, or safety assessments. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 3.2: Identify gaps and deficiencies that exist in existing pedestrian facilities through consultation with TAG and through commercially available technology such as Google Earth. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 3.3: Prepare GIS based maps that depict previously identified pedestrian infrastructure needs as well as gaps in existing pedestrian facilities. Separate maps should be produced for the each city as well as unincorporated communities (Leggett, Laytonville, Covelo, Potter Valley, Calpella, Hopland, Talmage, Caspar, Mendocino, Albion, etc. (Consultant)

Task 3.4: Develop data tables for each community that identifies, at a minimum, the source of the identified deficiency (planning study, gap study, etc.), type of facility (paved asphalt path, sidewalk-no curb & gutter, sidewalk with curb & gutter), approximate width and length, and termini. (Consultant)

Task 3.5: Prepare Draft Existing Conditions Report that documents the process that was used to develop the report and contains the maps and tables identified herein. (Consultant)

Task 3.6: Receive TAG comments on the Draft Existing Conditions Report, and then prepare Final Existing Conditions Report. (Consultant)

Responsible Party: Consultant

Task	Deliverable
3.1	*List of source documents and previously identified needs, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
3.2	*List of identified pedestrian infrastructure gaps and deficiencies, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
3.3	*GIS-based maps, by community (Consultant)*
3.4	*Pedestrian infrastructure data tables, by community (Consultant)*

3.5	*Draft Existing Conditions Report (Consultant)*
3.6	*Final Existing Conditions Report (Consultant)*

Task 4: Public Participation, Community, and Tribal Outreach

Task 4.1: With input from the TAG, identify and develop a list of stakeholders for advertisement of public workshops. (Consultant)

Task 4.2: Advertise public workshops in the community, using a variety of outreach methods consistent with MCOG's Public Participation Plan. This may include social media and online surveys in addition to traditional outreach methods. Efforts will target Tribal governments, low-income households, and under-represented Hispanic communities in Mendocino County. (Consultant)

Task 4.3: Conduct up to four community workshops to solicit input on projects identified in the Existing Conditions Report as well as other pedestrian infrastructure and/or pedestrian crossing locations of local concern. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 4.4: Record public comments on Existing Conditions Report as well as new pedestrian issues identified through the public process. (Consultant)

Responsible Party: Consultant

Task	Deliverable
4.1	*Stakeholders Roster (Consultant)*
4.2	*Advertising Materials, News Releases, Surveys, etc. (Consultant)*
4.3	*Workshop Agendas and Meeting Notes, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
4.4	*Record of Public Comments on Existing Conditions Report; List of Issues/Projects identified in Public Process (Consultant)*

Task 5: Develop draft *Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study – South Coast.*

Task 5.1: Evaluate public comments, consider TAG input to evaluate projects and public comments identified in Task 4 for inclusion in the *Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory*. (Consultant)

Task 5.2: With TAG input, develop a methodology to prioritize pedestrian projects identified in the *Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory.* This methodology should consider, at a minimum, pedestrian safety, Safe Routes to School plans, community development plans, adjacent vehicular traffic, costs, and constructability. (Consultant)

Task 5.3: Prepare draft *Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory* that includes all projects identified in the Existing Conditions Inventory and those identified through the public participation process. Projects are to be prioritized and listed by community. (Consultant)

Task 5.4: Convene TAG to receive and review comments on the draft *Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory.* Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 5.5: Apply prioritization methodology and conduct field review of top priority candidate projects within in each jurisdiction to confirm pedestrian project type and materials, identify obstacles, verify dimensions, establish project termini, and determine constructability. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 5.6: Develop preliminary planning level cost estimates for priority pedestrian and/or pedestrian crossing projects within each local jurisdiction approximately as follows: (a) 10 within the City of Ukiah; (b) 10 within the City of Willits; (c) 10 within the City of Fort Bragg; (d) 20 in unincorporated areas within Mendocino County. The TAG may adjust the breakdown of distribution between entities, but total will not exceed 50. (Consultant)

Task 5.7: Based on TAG and consultant technical input, prepare draft *Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study.* (Consultant)

Responsible Party: Consultant

Task	Deliverable
5.1	*List of publically identified projects to be added to the Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory as a result of public input (Consultant)*
5.2	*Prioritization Methodology (Consultant)*
5.3	*Draft Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory (Consultant)*
5.4	*TAG Agenda & Meeting Notes; Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
5.5	*Priority Project Parameter Spreadsheet (Consultant)*
5.6.	*Preliminary Planning Level Cost Estimates Spreadsheet for Priority Projects; Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
5.7.	*Draft "Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study" (Consultant)*

Task 6: Final Study Preparation & Hearing

Task 6.1: Present draft final *Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study* to MCOG Technical Advisory Committee. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 6.2: Present draft final *Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study* to the Mendocino Council of Governments at a public hearing. Includes travel expenses. (Consultant)

Task 6.3: Make final changes as may be directed by the Mendocino Council of Governments, and then prepare the final *Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study* for acceptance. (Consultant)

Task 6.4: Prepare and distribute final electronic and hard copies. (Consultant)

Responsible Party: Consultant

Task	Deliverable
6.1	*Presentation Materials, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
6.2	*Presentation Materials, Travel Expenses (Consultant)*
6.3	*Final Mendocino County Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study (Consultant)*
6.4	*Electronic & Hard Copies of Final Study (Consultant)*

Task 7: Project Management/Administration

Task 7.1: MCOG will administer project, provide coordination, prepare quarterly reports, process invoices and act as the fiscal administrator for the project, and will establish and oversee contractual agreements with consultant, coordinate involved agencies, as well as coordinate with and participate in the Technical Advisory Group. (MCOG)

Responsible Party: MCOG

Task	Deliverable
7.1	*Coordination & Quarterly Reports (MCOG)*

PRODUCTS: *Listed under each task above.*

FUNDING AND AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsible Agency	Estimated Person Days	Budget	Funding Source	Fiscal Year
MCOG		$13,501 $1,749 $15,250	State Sustainable Comm. Grant Local LTF	2017/18 2016/17 *C/O*
Consultant		$165,728 $21,472 $187,200	State Sustainable Comm. Grant Local LTF	2017/18 2016/17 *C/O*
Total		**$202,450**	**$179,229 State Sust. Comm. Grant** **$23,221 Local LTF** **$76,258 Total**	

ESTIMATED SCHEDULE

Tasks	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	FY 18/19
1													
2							x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3									x	x	x		
4											x	x	x
5												x	x
6													x
7							x	x	x	x	x	x	x

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Staff Report

TITLE: Summary of Meetings **DATE PREPARED: 01/26/18**
MEETING DATE: 02/05/18

SUBMITTED BY: Phil Dow, Executive Director

BACKGROUND:
Since our last regular MCOG meeting packet, MCOG Administration and Planning staff (Planning staff in italics) has attended (or will have attended) the following statewide and local meetings on behalf of MCOG:

1. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
   Riverside 12/06/17
   (Dow)

2. California Transportation Commission
   Riverside 12/06/17 - 12/07/17
   (Dow)

3. Mendocino Transit Authority
   Ukiah 12/06/17
   (Ellard & Orth)

4. *Active Transportation Program (ATP) Non-Infrastructure Grant Coordination – NCO*
   Ukiah 12/07/17
   (Barrett & Ellard)

5. North State Street Interchange Coordination with Caltrans
   Teleconference 12/08/17
   (Barrett & Dow)

6. *Active Transportation Program (ATP) Non-Infrastructure Grant Coordination – HHSA & NCO*
   Teleconference 12/12/17
   (Barrett & Ellard)

7. Caltrans/RTPA Coordination
   Teleconference 12/12/17
   (Dow & Davey-Bates)

8. North Coast Railroad Authority
   Novato 12/13/17
   (Ellard)

9. Fiscal Audit
   Ukiah 12/21/17 – 12/22/17
   (Orth)

10. Dow/DBC Coordination Meeting
    Ukiah 12/19/17
    All

11. Dow/DBC Work Program Coordination Meeting
    Ukiah 01/03/18
    (Davey-Bates, Ellard & Dow)

12. Gualala Municipal Advisory Committee 01/04/18
    Gualala
    (Dow)

13. California Energy Commission Grant Workshop
    Webinar 01/10/18
    (Orth)

14. Tribal Transportation Summit
    Ukiah *01/16/18*
    (Dow, Orth, Sookne, Ellard, Speka, & Barrett)

15. Gualala Streetscape Environmental Phase Public Meeting
    Gualala 01/16/18
    (Dow)

16. *CalCOG Directors*
    Sacramento *01/16/18*
    (Davey-Bates)

17. Technical Advisory Committee
    Ukiah *01/17/18*
    (Dow, Orth, Davey-Bates, Ellard, & Barrett)

18. ChargePoint Monthly Coordination
    Teleconference 01/19/18
    (Orth)

19. Caltrans Mendocino Monthly Status Report
    Teleconference *01/22/18*
    (Barrett)

20. Brooktrails Board Meeting
    Brooktrails *01/23/18*
    (Dow)

21. Rural Counties Task Force
    Sacramento 01/26/17
    (Davey-Bates) and Ellard - teleconference

22. Caltrans Planning Grant Workshop
    Video-conference *01/30/18*
    (Ellard)

23. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
    Sacramento 01/31/18
    (Dow & Davey-Bates)

24. California Transportation Commission
    Sacramento 01/31/17 – 02/01/18
    (Dow & Davey-Bates)

25. *Mendocino Transit Authority*
    Ukiah *01/31/18*
    (Ellard)

26. Northern California STIP Hearing
    Sacramento 02/01/18
    (Barrett & Dow)

I will provide information to Board members regarding the outcome of any of these meetings as requested.

ACTION REQUIRED:
None.

ALTERNATIVES:
None identified.

RECOMMENDATION: None. This is for information only.