

APPENDICES

- A. Participation and Outreach Information and Documentation
- B. Caltrans SHOPP and Bridge Projects
- C. Unsurfaced County Maintained Roads and Water Quality
- D. Active Transportation Project Maps
- E. Active Transportation Plan Required Plan Elements
- F. 2019 Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & Engineered Feasibility Study (Excerpt) – Priority Projects
- G. Census Tract Information (2015-2019 American Community Survey)
- H. Regional Transportation Plan Maps & Land Use Maps
- I. 2019 Noyo Harbor Community Sustainability Study (Excerpt) – Priorities Recommendations & Implementation
- J. Constrained and Unconstrained Project Lists
- K. Environmental Document & Related Material
- L. Accident Data

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION

Virtual Public Outreach Process for the 2022 RTP Update

Date	Participant/Audience	Activity
10/5/2020	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
10/21/2020	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
11/16/2020	MCOG/SSTAC/Public	Draft RTP discussion at SSTAC meeting
12/14/2020	MCOG/Tribes	Sent letters to all 10 tribes informing of RTP update, offering consultation & requesting info.
1/20/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
1/25/2021	MCOG/Public	Posted RTP project webpage on MCOG website
1/26/2021	MCOG/Caltrans/Tribes	Draft RTP presentation at Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Meeting
2/1/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
2/17/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
3/4/2021	MCOG/Tribes	Sent follow up emails to all 10 tribes
3/17/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
3/30/2021	MCOG/Public	Posted Social Pinpoint survey & tools on MCOG website
March-June 2021	MCOG/Public/Local Agencies/News Media/Tribes/SSTAC/Caltrans	Notified media, public, stakeholders, agencies, tribes of virtual engagement and input options – press release, website, email, social media, partner agency websites, MTA transit vehicles
3/30/2021	MCOG/MTA/Public	Announced RTP update at MTA meeting
4/5/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
4/7/2021	MCOG/Public	Posted video on RTP update on MCOG website & County YouTube channel & notified subscribers
4/21/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
5/3/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
5/19/2021	MCOG/Hopland MAC/Public	Draft RTP discussion at Hopland MAC meeting
5/19/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
6/1/2021	MCOG/WMAC/Public	Draft RTP presentation at Westport MAC Meeting
6/2/2021	MCOG/RVAMAC/Public	Draft RTP presentation at Round Valley Area MAC Meeting
6/7/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
6/9/2021	MCOG/RVMAC/Public	Draft RTP presentation at Redwood Vly MAC meeting
6/18/2021	MCOG/MCCAAC/Public	Draft RTP presentation at Mendo. Co. Climate Action Advisory Committee Meeting
6/23/2021	MCOG/LAMAC/Public	Draft RTP presentation at Laytonville Area MAC Meeting
8/16/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
9/15/2021	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
10/4/2021	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
10/15-10/19/21	MCOG/Public/Local Agencies/News Media/Tribes/SSTAC/Caltrans	Notified media & stakeholders of Draft RTP posted on MCOG website for review
10/20/21	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
11/1/21	MCOG/Public	Draft RTP discussion at MCOG meeting
11/17/21	MCOG/Local Agencies/Public	Draft RTP discussion at TAC meeting
12/6/21	MCOG/Public	Public Hearing to adopt Negative Declaration & Final Plan at MCOG meeting

AGENDA EXCERPT**REGULAR CALENDAR**

5. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation of August 19, 2020: Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2020/21 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)
6. Adoption of Resolution No. M2020-___ * Approving the FY 2020/21 Project List for the California State of Good Repair Program

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.

7. Approval of August 17, 2020 Minutes

RATIFY ACTION

8. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

9. Reports – Information - *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. North Coast Railroad Authority
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Dow & Associates Offices Relocated to 525 S. Main St., Suite B, Ukiah – *verbal report*
 - ii. Financial Update – Budget Revenues
 - iii. Active Transportation Program (ATP) Application September 15, 2020 – Gualala Project
 - iv. Miscellaneous
 - v. Next Meeting Date – Monday, November 2, 2020
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. Davey-Bates Consulting Offices Relocated to 525 S. Main St., Suite G, Ukiah – *verbal report*
 - ii. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update – *verbal report*
 - iii. Miscellaneous
 - g. MCOG Directors
 - h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

ADJOURNMENT

10. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial de acuerdo con el Americans with Disabilities Act, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (libre de cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859 al menos cinco días antes de la reunión.



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street ~ Ukiah ~ California ~ 95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, October 21, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)
Meeting ID: 940 1729 4181 Passcode: 340278

NOTICE: During the declared local, state and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments’ Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 8/19/20 Minutes (*Action*)
- 5. Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update (*Discussion*)
6. Development of Local Road Safety Plans (*Discussion*)
7. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Early Action Planning Grants (REAP)
 - b. Active Transportation Program Cycle 5 Application Submitted – Gualala Streetscape Project
 - c. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Update
 - d. FY 2021/22 Overall Work Program – Application Cycle (10/15/20 – 12/1/20)
 - e. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Cycle 10 – Due Date Extended to 11/2/20



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

AGENDA

Monday, November 16, 2020
10:00 a.m. to approx. 12:00 p.m.

Teleconference - Remote Zoom Meeting

Participants must register in advance for this webinar at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85040046911?pwd=TDIralpFukV2ZHNjalkwTWI1QTJ5dz09>

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)
Meeting ID: 850 4004 6911 Passcode: 755013

1. Call to Order & Introductions
2. Public Expression – *No Action*
3. Minutes of May 26, 2020 – *No Action*
Due to the length of time between meetings, members have already been provided opportunity to provide comments and corrections, and the minutes have been finalized. They are provided here for information.
- 4. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update – *verbal report*
5. Presentation: Draft Mendocino County Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan – *Discussion and comments on the draft plan*
6. Annual Review of SSTAC Membership
7. 2020/21 Unmet Transit Needs Workshop and Recommendation – *Compile a list of Unmet Transit Needs and identify other transportation needs and potential solutions*
8. Miscellaneous / Information / Announcements
9. Adjournment

PUBLIC EXPRESSION

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.

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.

POSTED 11.9.2020



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Mr. James Russ, President
Round Valley Indian Tribes
77826 Covelo Road
Covelo, CA 95428

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear President Russ,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Ms. Mary J. Norris, Chairperson
Cahto Tribe of the Laytonville Rancheria
P. O. Box 1239
Laytonville, CA 95454

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairperson Norris,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard

Deputy Planner

/le

Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Mr. Michael Hunter, Chairman
Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians
P. O. Box 39
Redwood Valley, CA 95470

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairman Hunter,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Ms. Merlene Sanchez, Chairperson
Guidiville Rancheria
P. O. Box 339
Talmage, CA 95481

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairperson Sanchez,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Mr. Sonny J. Elliott, Chairman
Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
3000 Shanel Road
Hopland, CA 95449

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairman Elliott,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Jaime Cobarrubia, Chairman
Manchester Band of Pomo Indians
P. O. Box 623
Point Arena, CA 95468

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairman Cobarrubia,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Ms. Leona Williams, Chairperson
Pinoleville Pomo Nation
500 B Pinoleville Road
Ukiah, CA 95482

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairperson Williams,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Mr. Salvador Rosales, Chairman
Potter Valley Tribe
2251 South State Street
Ukiah, CA 95482

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairman Rosales,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Ms. Debra Ramirez, Chairperson
Redwood Valley Rancheria
3250 Road I
Redwood Valley, CA 95470

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairperson Ramirez,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,
Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard
Deputy Planner

/le
Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

December 14, 2020

Melanie Rafanan, Chairperson
Sherwood Valley Band of Pomo Indians
190 Sherwood Hill Drive
Willits, CA 95490

RE: Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Dear Chairperson Rafanan,

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is in the initial stages of updating Mendocino County's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This updated plan (which includes the Active Transportation Plan) will identify needs and projects for the next 20 years in all modes of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, streets and roads, highway, and transit.

The RTP includes a section to address Tribal transportation needs. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Tribal Transportation Element from the last update which was done in 2017. We ask that you please review the document, paying attention to the section specific to your tribe.

Specific tribal information regarding existing transportation facilities, transportation needs, population, housing, etc. is based on information found in plans and documents and input received from the tribes during the last update. In many cases, the information may be outdated and no longer accurate. Please provide us with updated information on your tribe's transportation needs, as well as any future plans that may increase transportation demands.

We would be happy to receive any additional information you would like to provide regarding transportation in Mendocino County and how it impacts the Tribal community. We are also interested in receiving any recent transportation plans that have been prepared for the Tribe.

We are planning to make a presentation at the next Caltrans Quarterly Tribal Transportation meeting, and this would be a good opportunity for the tribes to learn more about the RTP update. We would also be happy to provide direct consultation to your Tribal Council, if desired. Other opportunities to inform us of transportation concerns include our monthly Technical Advisory Committee meetings and a transportation survey that may be accessed here: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Mendocino20>

December 14, 2020

Page 2

We will be scheduling virtual public workshops in early 2021 as part of this outreach effort, and those dates will be provided once the workshops are scheduled.

We look forward to receiving any information you can provide. Information may be emailed to me at lellard@dbcteam.net or submitted to MCOG at 525 S. Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah CA 95482.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Loretta Ellard

Loretta J. Ellard

Deputy Planner

/le

Encls: Tribal Transportation Element



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, January 20, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)

Meeting ID: 943 0515 4205 Passcode: 736309

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 10/21/20 Minutes (*Action*)
5. Draft FY 2021/22 Overall Work Program – Funding Requests (*Discussion*)
6. Request from City of Point Arena for Unallocated LTF 2% Bike & Pedestrian Funds and RSTP Partnership Program Funds (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
- 7. 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan Update (*Discussion*)
8. Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
9. Caltrans Active Transportation (CAT) Plan (*Information*)
10. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Update
 - b. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update
 - c. Regional Early Action Planning Grants (REAP) – Update



Contact Us

Search...

Go!

[Home](#) [News & Notices](#) [Meetings](#) [Communities](#) [Regional Plans](#) [Resources](#) [About MCOG](#)

THIS ITEM APPEARS ON
HOMEPAGE

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

Please take the online survey and access interactive tools:

<https://mcoq.mysocialpinpoint.com/mcog-2022-rtp>

April 7, 2021 - A brief informational video is now available for viewing:
[MCOG Presentation on Regional and Active Transportation Plans - YouTube](#)

March 30, 2021 - MCOG is updating the Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and would like to hear from members of the community about transportation needs, deficiencies, and mobility barriers/challenges. Public outreach will be virtual during this initial needs assessment, due to the ongoing pandemic.

📎 [Press Release-MCOG Is Updating Regional Transportation Plan 2021-03-30.pdf](#)

📎 [MCOG 2022 RTP Update flyer 2021-03-30.pdf](#)

January 25, 2021 - One of MCOG's duties is to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Mendocino County every four years. The purpose of the RTP is to identify all types and modes of transportation improvements needed to keep people and goods moving efficiently and safely over the next 20 years. The Active Transportation Plan (ATP) for non-motorized modes is a part of this document.

We are now beginning the 2022 update process, and invite community members and stakeholders to become involved in this update. Your participation is vital to help us identify emerging needs and transportation issues in the region.

The project timeline extends throughout 2021, with the updated RTP/ATP due to be adopted by MCOG by February 5, 2022. With ongoing public health concerns related to COVID 19, public outreach will be conducted virtually with various opportunities for involvement.

More information and ways to participate will be posted here. To receive updates, click "Join our mailing list" in the main pages of this website.

Contact: Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner at lellard@dbcteam.net or 707-234-3434

[View the current 2017 RTP through the link below.](#)



**2022 Mendocino Regional Transportation Plan
Survey**

1. In what zip code do you live?

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95410 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95415 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95417 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95418 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95420 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95427 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95428 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95429 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95432 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95437 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95445 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95449 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95454 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95456 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95459 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95460 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95463 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95466 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95468 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95469 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95470 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95481 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95482 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95488 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95490 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 95494 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95585 | <input type="checkbox"/> 95587 | <input type="checkbox"/> Out of County | |

2. What is your main form of transportation on a typical WEEKDAY? Choose one.

- Auto/Motorcycle – drive alone
- Auto – travel with at least one other person
- Walk
- Bicycle
- Transit
- Assisted Mobility (wheelchair, electric scooter, etc.)
- Other

3. In an average week, what modes of transportation do you use? Please select all that apply and list the corresponding percentage.

- Personal Vehicle _____%
- Car Pool or Ride Share _____%
- Transportation Network Company (e.g., Uber, Lyft) _____%
- Walk _____%
- Bicycle _____%
- Transit _____%

4. If you have school-age children or college students in your household, what forms of transportation do they use to and from school? Mark all that apply.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Auto | <input type="checkbox"/> Walk | <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle |
| <input type="checkbox"/> School Bus | <input type="checkbox"/> Transit (non-school) | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable |

5. To what locations do you travel, and how often each week? Select only those types of reasons that apply to you.

	1 time Per week	2 times per week	3 times per week	4-5 times per week	6-7 times per week
Work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shopping/errands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medical appointments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Senior/Community Center	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. What is the one-way distance you commute between your home and work or school?

- Less than 1 mile
 1-5 miles
 5-10 miles
 10-20 miles
 20-40 miles
 Over 40
 Not applicable

7. How often do you travel out of the county and for what reasons? Select only those types of reasons that apply to you.

	1 trip per MONTH	2-3 trips per MONTH	4-5 trips per MONTH	1 trip per WEEK	2-3 trips per WEEK	4-5 trips per WEEK	6-7 trips per WEEK
Work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shopping/errands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreational	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Does anyone in your household own an electric vehicle?

- Yes
 No

If you answered “no”, what are the primary reasons for not choosing an electric vehicle now or for your next vehicle purchase?

- Availability of charging stations
 Distances or terrain of regular travel
 Cost of vehicle
 Time needed to charge a vehicle
 Not interested in electric vehicles
 Other

9. The following is a list of issues people are sometimes concerned about. Please indicate your degree of concern about each item.

	Very serious problem	Somewhat serious problem	Not a serious problem	No opinion
Lack of parking in commercial areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not enough bike paths and lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Condition of major highways in Mendocino County	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pavement condition of local streets and roads (i.e., potholes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Too much traffic on local streets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unsafe streets, roads and highways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The need for new streets, roads and highways	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not enough local bus service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. The following is a list of common reasons people do not use walking or bicycling as a mode of transportation. Please indicate if these items are barriers to you or your household members using these active modes of transportation.

	Significant Barrier	Somewhat of a barrier	Not a barrier
Lack of sidewalks or bike lanes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Time constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic danger	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Crime danger	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel distances are too far	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other barriers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
No barriers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Please describe any other issues or concerns you feel should be included with regards to future transportation planning in region.

12. Please tell us a little about yourself. Check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work full-time | <input type="checkbox"/> Work part-time | <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal Employment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time student | <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time student | <input type="checkbox"/> Retired |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Unemployed | <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to answer |

13. Ethnicity

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic or Latino | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Hispanic or Latino | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to answer |
|---|---|---|

14. Race

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian/Alaskan Native | <input type="checkbox"/> Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> White |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to answer | |

15. Please select your age category.

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 15 years or under | <input type="checkbox"/> 16-25 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 26-40 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41-60 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 61-80 years | <input type="checkbox"/> 81 and over |

16. What language is primarily spoken in your household? _____

Please return survey to:
Mendocino Council of Governments

525 S. Main St., Suite G
Ukiah, CA 95482

For more information on MCOG or the Regional Transportation Plan, visit our website:

www.mendocinocog.org

If you had \$100 for transportation, how would you spend it among the following types of projects? Dollars may be split between as many choices as you like or concentrated on just a few.

- Increase frequency/extend hours of existing transit service \$ _____
- Provide transit service to remote areas of the county \$ _____
- Maintaining/paving existing streets and roads & filling potholes \$ _____
- Street, road and highway projects to reduce congestion (e.g., roundabouts, turn lanes, widening) \$ _____
- Building new roads or road connectors (e.g. Brooktrails Second Access, Orchard Avenue Extension, Windy Hollow Bridge) \$ _____
- Improving safety and operations on local roads and highways (e.g., signals, traffic calming measures) \$ _____
- Improving/expanding bicycle routes and paths \$ _____
- Improving/increasing sidewalks and pedestrian walkways \$ _____
- Streetscape and landscape projects to improve aesthetics for travelers and beautify communities \$ _____
- Increasing non-automobile out of county travel options (e.g., interregional bus, train, air) \$ _____
- Improving airport facilities \$ _____
- Improving harbor facilities \$ _____


6. Sometimes money must be spent for specific types of projects. If you had \$50 that must be spent for active transportation projects, how would you spend it? Dollars may be split between as many choices as you like.

- Sidewalk infill in populated areas \$ _____
- Bike lane infill in populated areas \$ _____
- Safe Routes to Schools projects (sidewalks, bike lanes, paths in school areas) \$ _____
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities in commercial areas \$ _____
- Widening sidewalks, bulb-outs, pedestrian refuge islands \$ _____
- New bike or multi-use paths (e.g., Rail Trail, Noyo Harbor Access) \$ _____
- ADA compliant ramps at corners where none currently exist \$ _____
- Bicycle Parking \$ _____
- Recreational trails \$ _____
- Bicycle improvements on State Highways (e.g., SR 1, SR 253, SR 162) \$ _____



MENDOCINO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS TRIBAL QUARTERLY

January 26, 2021 - Tuesday
11am-12noon
WebEx



Agenda Details

- 1. Round Table Introductions**
- 2. Mendocino County of Governments - Nephele Barrett**
 - a. Regional Transportation Planning Agency review
- 3. Project Status Review - Whitney Petrey**
 - a. Caltrans will handout updated Project Status Sheet and Map
- 4. Tribal Updates/Questions**
 - a. Cahto Tribes
 - b. Coyote Valley Tribe
 - c. Guidiville Rancheria
 - d. Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
 - e. Manchester Band of Pomo Indians
 - f. Pinoleville Sovereign Nation
 - g. Potter Valley Tribe
 - h. Redwood Valley Rancheria
 - i. Round Valley Indian Tribes
 - j. Sherwood Band of Pomo Indians
- 5. Action Items**



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. Recognition of Retiring Board Member – Michael Carter
7. Annual Appointments to Standing Committees
 - a. Executive Committee
 - b. Transit Productivity Committee
 - c. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG)
8. Appointment to Ad Hoc Committee – Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail – *verbal report*
9. Adoption of 2021 Board Calendar
10. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation of January 20, 2021:
Approval of City of Point Arena's Request for Unallocated Two Percent Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Bicycle & Pedestrian Program Funds and Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) Partnership Program Funds - *Mill Street Reconstruction, Sidewalk, Drainage and Asphalt Replacement Project*
11. Discussion of Gualala Downtown Streetscape Enhancement Project – *No Action*

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.

12. Approval of December 3, 2020 Minutes

RATIFY ACTION

13. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

14. Reports – Information – *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. North Coast Railroad Authority
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Financial Update – Budget Revenues
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - iii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, March 1, 2021
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. Completion of Ukiah Traffic Analysis for Schools and Surrounding Areas – *verbal report*
 - ii. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Action Transportation Plan Update
 - iii. 2020 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update
 - iv. Local Road Safety Plans for Mendocino County Local Agencies
 - v. Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) – Housing Grant – *verbal report*
 - vi. Miscellaneous



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, February 17, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)
Meeting ID: 981 0539 8703# Passcode: 192806

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 1/20/21 Minutes (*Action*)
5. Draft FY 2021/22 Overall Work Program (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
- 6. Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update (*Discussion*)
7. Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
8. COVID 19 – Federal Stimulus Funds (*Discussion*)
9. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Lake & Mendocino Travel Demand Modeling – Caltrans Technical Advisory Group
 - b. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Update
 - c. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 17, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)


Meeting ID: 989 5821 5063# Passcode: 698321

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments [to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.](mailto:info@mendocinocog.org)
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 2/17/21 Minutes (*Action*)
5. 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – Proposed Amendment
(*Review/Recommendation*)
6. Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
7. Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act of 2021 (H.R. 133) Funding
(*Discussion*)
8. FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program- Proposed Fourth Amendment (*Review/ Recommendation*)
Report to be sent under separate Cover
9. Staff Reports (*Information*)



- a. Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update

From:
Sent:
To:

Wednesday, March 31, 2021 10:03 AM

Cc:

Email addresses REDACTED

Subject: RTP - Press Release & Flyer Distribution
Attachments: RTP Flyer.pdf; RTP Press Release - MCOG is Updating Regional Transportation Plan 2021-03-30.pdf

TO: Interested Parties

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is updating the **Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP)** and would like to hear from members of the community about transportation needs, deficiencies, and mobility barriers.

Please see the attached press release and flyer, and visit the RTP page on MCOG's website at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/regional-transportation-plan-rtp-active-transportation-plan-2022-update> to take our transportation survey and use the interactive tools to provide input on transportation issues in Mendocino County.

We would greatly appreciate it if you would help us spread the word about our transportation survey by forwarding this email to appropriate individuals in your agency or on your email contact list. In addition, if your agency has a website or social media page, we would appreciate it if you would post the attached press release or flyer, if possible.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me with any questions at 707-234-3434.

Loretta J. Ellard, Deputy Planner
Mendocino Council of Governments (Planning Services)
525 S. Main St., Suite G *(new address)*
Ukiah, CA 95482
707-234-3434 phone; 707-671-7764 fax
lellard@dbcteam.net
www.mendocinocog.org



Mendocino



Council of Governments

LET'S TALK **TRANSPORTATION**

Add photo here

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is updating the region's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP), and...

WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

- **WHAT TRANSPORTATION NEEDS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED?**
- **WHAT BARRIERS TO TRANSPORTATION DO YOU SEE?**
 - **WHAT MOBILITY CHALLENGES DO YOU SEE?**

Here are ways YOU can be involved in MCOG's Process:

- View the Virtual Presentation - Take our Online Survey -
- Visit our Interactive Website -



Use the QR code or click the link below:

<https://bit.ly/3bSij6u>

Questions or comments?

Contact MCOG Staff at lellard@dbcteam.net or 707-234-3434

Your Input Matters!

- e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. April 15, 2021 – Mendocino Express Corridor – *virtual ribbon cutting ceremony California EV Charging Corridors Celebration (chargepoint.com)*
 - ii. California Transportation Foundation (CTF) Forum, March 16, 2021
 - iii. Miscellaneous
 - iv. Next Meeting Date – Monday, May 3, 2021 – Virtual Transportation Tour of Ukiah Area, Coordinated Plan Adoption, and Budget Workshop
- f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Action Transportation Plan Update – Outreach through Social Pinpoint: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org)
 - ii. Miscellaneous
- g. MCOG Directors
- h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates – Regional Leadership Forum, March 22-23

ADJOURNMENT

17. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial de acuerdo con el Americans with Disabilities Act, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (libre de cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859 al menos cinco días antes de la reunión.

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 agendaized, 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 3.30.2021

Next Resolution Number: M2021-01



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 21, 2021 at 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)

Meeting ID: 946 2626 8993 Passcode: 902835

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 3/17/21 Minutes (*Action*)
5. Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding (*Discussion/Recommendation*)
6. Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act of 2021 (CRRSA) (H.R. 133) - Federal Stimulus Funds (*Discussion/Recommendation*) – *To be distributed under separate cover*
7. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update
<https://www.mendocinocog.org/regional-transportation-plan-rtp-active-transportation-plan-2022-update>
 - b. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Update
 - c. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update
 - d. MCOG May 3, 2021 Meeting - Virtual Tour of Ukiah Area Projects

- ii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, June 7, 2021 – Adoption of Budget and Transportation Planning Program
- f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Action Transportation Plan Update – Outreach through Social Pinpoint: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org)
 - ii. Miscellaneous
- g. MCOG Directors
- h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

ADJOURNMENT

15. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial de acuerdo con el Americans with Disabilities Act, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (libre de cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859 al menos cinco días antes de la reunión.

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 4.27.2021

* Next Resolution Number: M2021-01



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 19, 2021 - 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)
Meeting ID: 976 3662 7752 Passcode: 654906

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 4/21/21 Minutes (*Action*)
5. Final FY 2021/22 Overall Work Program (*Review/Recommendation*)
6. Caltrans Presentation – Project Development Update/Opportunities to Provide Input into the Caltrans Project Nomination Process (*Information*)
7. Upcoming Grant Opportunities (*Discussion*)
8. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update
<https://www.mendocinocog.org/regional-transportation-plan-rtp-active-transportation-plan-2022-update>
 - b. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update
<https://www.mendocinosaferoads.com>

Bill Knapp
Vice-Chair

Vacancy
Alternate

Gary Quinton
Secretary

Robert Scott
Chair

Thad Van Bueren
Director

Sally Grigg
Director



Westport Municipal Advisory Council

P. O. Box 307, Westport, CA 95488
www.westportmac.org

MEETING NOTICE

Date June 1st, 2021

Meeting WMAC Board

by Zoom at 7pm

For details contact WMAC95488@gmail.com

Agenda,

1) Roll Call:

2) Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes: Approval of the draft minutes of:
April 6th, 2021.

The DRAFT minutes of the May 10th, 2021.

3) New Business – Guest Presentation by MCOG

a) Transportation Issues in Mendocino County Presentation by the Mendocino Council of Governments, including Local Road Safety Plans.

3) Old business - (discussion and possible action)

a) Referral of Request for Past WMAC Minutes by Former Cannabis Growers to Mendocino County Attorney's Office.

4) Announcements / Correspondence - (Discussion only).

5) Set preliminary agenda for next Meeting.

6) Adjournment.

Following Completion of Open Meeting There Be an Executive Closed Session.

MEETING OF THE ROUND VALLEY AREA MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL (RVAMAC)

Wednesday, June 2nd, 2021 at 6:00 PM

Library Commons 23925 Howard Street, Covelo, CA

Mailing Address: PO Box 372, Covelo, CA 95428

www.MAC.RoundValley.org

To join Zoom meeting:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81233910849> Meeting ID: 812 3391 0849 Call In: +1 669 900 6833

For those who are not able to attend by phone or video, you may make public comment at the Library Commons. **Masks and social distancing will be required.**

Agenda

1. Call to Order & Roll call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of March 3rd, April 7th, & May 5th Meeting Minutes.
4. Public Comment & Announcements on non-agenda items.
5. Tribal Council Update & Public Comment.
6. Report from Supervisor John Haschak & Public Comment.
7. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) joins us to share important info on the Active & Regional Transportation Plans (RTP), and update on the Highway 162 Bike & Pedestrian Trail, and emergency evacuation route planning. Please take the time to complete the survey to provide input on the RTP. The link to the survey can be found at: <https://www.mendocinocog.org/regional-transportation-plan-rtp-active-transportation-plan-2022-update>
8. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Wildfire Preparation, with CalFire employees Chief George Gonzalez & Andy Whitlock.
9. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Development of downtown town water emergency fire hydrant system.
10. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Traffic Safety & Assembly Bill 43 – Proposing update to California Vehicle Code, relating to traffic safety. https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB43
11. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Water Resources, Well Monitoring, Drought Emergency, & Climate change impacts. RCAC Well Monitoring Program: <https://www.rcac.org/environmental/individual-well-program/>
12. Discussion, Public Comment, & Possible Action: Cannabis Ordinance, Code Enforcement.
13. Next Meeting: July 7th, 2021. Send agenda items to admin@mac.roundvalley.org.
14. Adjournment

- b. Mendocino Transit Authority
- c. North Coast Railroad Authority
- d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
- e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Miscellaneous
 - ii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, August 16, 2021
- f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Action Transportation Plan Update – Outreach through Social Pinpoint: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org)
 - ii. Local Road Safety Plans Update: Report Your Area of Concern at Mendocino Safe Roads – verbal report
 - iii. Miscellaneous
- g. MCOG Directors
- h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

ADJOURNMENT

15. Adjourn

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial de acuerdo con el Americans with Disabilities Act, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (libre de cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859 al menos cinco días antes de la reunión.

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 5.28.2021

Next Resolution Number: M2021-09



**Redwood Valley Municipal Advisory Council
Regular Meeting
June 09, 2021 05:00 PM
8650 East Rd - P.O Box 243 Redwood Valley 95470
<http://www.redwoodvalleymac.com/>**

Chair Dolly Riley • Vice-Chair Jini Reynolds • Treasurer Katrina Frey • Member Chris Boyd • Member Sattie Clark • Alternate Member Marybeth Kelly • Member Patricia Ris-Yarbrough • Member Adam Gaska

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact at dollypriley@gmail.com. Notification prior to the meeting will enable the Redwood Valley Municipal Advisory Council to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.

1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes of 5-12-21.

Discussion Possible Action Comment

2. Public Comments

Discussion Comment

The Council welcomes participation in the Council meetings. Comments shall be limited so that everyone may be heard. This item is limited to matters under the jurisdiction of the Council which are not on the posted agenda and items which have not already been considered by the Council. The Council limits comments on matters not on the agenda to 3 minutes per person. No action will be taken.

3. Report from County and Agencies on Current Events

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Guest Speaker: Loretta Ellard, of MCOG, to discuss transportation issues and the Regional Transportation Plan.
PG&E Settlement funds updates. Can MAC support Redwood Valley's obtaining assistance/joining with Russian River Flood Control District?
Redwood Valley water issue updates.
Fire Preparedness updates. Gizmo brief update on chain-spark-fire prevention.
Adopt-A-Road update.

4. Cannabis Policy Ad Hoc Subcommittee: Patricia, Sattie

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Community Member Martha Barra may work with Subcommittee. Discuss current cannabis rules, issues, problems, and possible solutions for Redwood Valley.

5. Development Review Ad Hoc Subcommittee: Marybeth, Jini, Patricia

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Community Member Gizmo Henderson may work with Subcommittee. Discuss building permits and activities.

6. CAP: Interim Community Action Plan and Design Review: Chris, Sattie

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Community Members Alex De Grasse and Sheilah Rogers may work with Subcommittee. MAC approved the Plan 7-15-20.

7. Officers and Members Reports and Announcements

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Discuss next step to eventually finalize MAC by-laws (subcommittee? review County's MAC bylaws?)
Discussion on inviting guest speakers - Sattie.
Note: Possible in-person meeting in July, depending on County regs. Reserve Grange space?

8. Adjournment. Next meeting 7-14-21.

Discussion Possible Action Comment

Mendocino County Climate Action Advisory Committee
Friday June 18, 3:00 - 5:00
Via ZOOM
Meeting Agenda

Here is your Zoom Meeting Invite:

Topic: Mendocino County Climate Action Advisory Committee

Time: Jun 18, 2021 03:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://mendocinocounty.zoom.us/j/85683019254>

Meeting ID: 856 8301 9254

One tap mobile

+16699009128,,85683019254# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 856 8301 9254

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Review of Agenda
3. Review and Approval of Minutes from May of 2021
4. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items
5. MCOG Community Outreach regarding the Regional Transportation Plan.
<https://www.mendocinocoq.org/2017-regional-transportation-plan-adopted>
6. Discuss Drought Policy and MCCAAC Policy Goals with Regard to Adaptation to Drought.
7. Discuss the proposed \$2 mil allocation of PG&E/COVID recovery funds to climate related projects.
8. Discuss letter of Comment to California Resources Agency re Gavin's 30 by 30 executive order.
9. Discuss Progress on First Priorities Doc and RTP recommendation.
10. Identify a Meeting Date for July
11. Adjournment

LAYTONVILLE AREA MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, June 23, 2021 — 6:30 p.m.

SPECIAL NOTICE REGARDING THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT

Pursuant to State Executive Order N-29-20 issued by Governor Gavin Newsom on March 12, 2020, it is the State's intent to control the spread of the COVID-19 Coronavirus and reduce and minimize the risk of infection. This Order enables local government agencies to hold meetings telephonically or electronically and calls for the cancellation of all large or crowded public gatherings.

The local government agency must still provide one physical publicly accessible location where the public may observe the meeting and make public comments, but the members of the governing body and staff do not have to be physically present at the public location, or even be in the jurisdiction. Additionally, the local government agency does not have to identify the teleconference locations of the participating board, does not have to make such locations accessible to the public, and does not have to post agendas at teleconference locations. The other provisions of the Brown Act remain in effect, particularly the rule that agendas must be posted in advance of the meetings. This limited suspension of the Brown Act will remain in effect during the period in which state or local public officials impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing, including but not limited to limitations on public events.

THIS MEETING WILL BE BY TELECONFERENCE USING ZOOM

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83038222559?pwd=aklwchF1Q3lvWFd3QTAYdFlwSjMyUT09>

Meeting ID: 830 3822 2559

Passcode: 512645

Dial in: +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

PUBLIC EXPRESSION: (PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

- Members of the public are welcome to address the Council on items not listed on the agenda and within the jurisdiction of the LAMAC. The Council is prohibited by law from taking action on matters not on the agenda, but may ask questions to clarify the speaker's comment and/or briefly answer questions. The Council may limit testimony on matters not on the agenda to a certain amount of minutes per person.
- Individuals wishing to address the Council under Public Expression are welcome to do so throughout the meeting.

Note: Agenda items generally occur sequentially, however, when circumstances warrant, the order of items may be changed at the discretion of the Chairman.

A. OPEN SESSION AND ROLL CALL (6:30 p.m.)

B. MINUTES

May 26, 2021 Regular Meeting

C. CONSENT CALENDAR

(The Consent Calendar is considered routine and non-controversial and will be acted upon by the Council at one time without discussion. Any Council member may request that any item be removed from the Consent Calendar for individual consideration.)

- Financial Report

D. ACTION ITEMS—NO ACTION ITEMS

1. Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) Presentation On Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan (RTP/ATP) - 2022 update.

4. 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

Attachments posted at [Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments \(mendocinocog.org\)](http://Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org))

5. Presentation: California Active Transportation (CAT) Plan – *Caltrans District 1 – No Action*
6. Transit Productivity Committee Recommendations of April 26, 2021 and July 21, 2021:
 - a. Actions to Develop Solutions for Identified Unmet Transit Needs
 - b. Approval of Resolution #M2021- ___ * Adopting Revised Formula for Allocating Local Transportation Funds to Senior Centers' Specialized Services
7. Approval of Resolution #M2021- ___ * Adopting Second Amendment to 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
8. Discussion/Direction: 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate

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.

9. Approval of June 3, 2021 Minutes
10. Approval of Transit Productivity Committee Minutes of July 21, 2021
11. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2021/22 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)

RATIFY ACTION

12. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

13. Reports – Information – *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. North Coast Railroad Authority
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Innovative Concepts Proposals Submitted - Biden Administration's American Jobs Plan
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - iii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, October 4, 2021
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Action Transportation Plan Update
 - ii. Local Road Safety Plans Update: Report Your Area of Concern at [Mendocino Safe Roads](#)
 - iii. Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Award
 - iv. Miscellaneous
 - g. MCOG Directors
 - h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, Sept. 15, 2021 - 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)

Meeting ID: 865 2471 4009 Passcode: 461332

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 5/19/21 Minutes (*Action*)
- 5. Draft Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update (*Discussion*)
6. 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (*Discussion*)
7. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grants – Update
 - b. Clean CA Grant Program
 - c. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update
<https://www.mendocinosaferoads.com>
 - d. Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant Award – “Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County”

PUBLIC EXPRESSION – *Please refer to notice at top of this Agenda.*

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

Attachments posted at [Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments \(mendocinocog.org\)](http://Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org))

6. Adoption of Resolution No. M2021-___ * Approving the FY 2021/22 Project List for the California State of Good Repair Program – *Mendocino Transit Authority – Purchase of Three Battery-Electric Busses with Associated Charging Infrastructure*
7. Authorization to Approve Setting Just Compensation and Commencement of First Written Offers and Negotiations for Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail Project

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.

8. Approval of August 16, 2021 Minutes

RATIFY ACTION

9. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

10. Reports – Information – *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. North Coast Railroad Authority
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Financial Update – Transportation Development Act (TDA) Revenues for FY 2020/21
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - iii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, November 1, 2021
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan Update
 - ii. Local Road Safety Plans Update – *verbal report*
 - iii. Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants – Applications due Oct. 27, 2021 – *verbal report*
 - iv. 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Project Submittals – *verbal report*
 - v. Miscellaneous
 - g. MCOG Directors
 - h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

ADJOURNMENT

11. Adjourn



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
October 19, 2021

To: Mendocino County News Media

Contact: Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner, 707-234-3434

Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Plan & Active Transportation Plan Available for Public Review

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) has updated the Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and the draft plan is now available for public review and comment. The draft plan may be viewed on MCOG's website at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/draft-2022-regional-transportation-plan>.

The RTP is a long-range planning document covering a 20-year time span, which includes short- and long-range transportation projects across all modes of transportation, including motorized, non-motorized, and public transit. It promotes a safe and efficient transportation system, and establishes regional goals that support mobility, economic, and health aims of the region. The RTP includes the Active Transportation Plan for the region. The 2022 RTP and ATP are scheduled to be adopted by MCOG on December 6, 2021.

Comments on the draft plan may be submitted on the Social Pinpoint page at <https://mcog.mysocialpinpoint.com/mcog-2022-rtp>, by email to lellard@dbcteam.net, or sent to 525 South Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah, CA 95482, for receipt by MCOG no later than December 5, 2021. Comments may also be presented at the public hearing. For more information visit MCOG's website at www.mendocinocog.org, call the MCOG office at 707-234-3434, or email lellard@dbcteam.net.

* * * * *

From:

Sent:

Tuesday, October 19, 2021 4:57 PM

To:

Email addresses REDACTED

Cc:

Subject:

Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Plan & Active Transportation Plan - Available for Public Review

TO: Interested Parties

RE: Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Plan & Active Transportation Plan - Available for Public Review

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) has updated the Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and the draft plan is now available for public review and comment. The draft plan may be viewed on MCOG's website at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/draft-2022-regional-transportation-plan>.

The RTP is a long-range planning document covering a 20-year time span, which includes short- and long-range transportation projects across all modes of transportation, including motorized, non-motorized, and public transit. It promotes a safe and efficient transportation system, and establishes regional goals that support mobility, economic, and health aims of the region. The RTP includes the Active Transportation Plan for the region. The 2022 RTP and ATP are scheduled to be adopted by MCOG on December 6, 2021.

Comments on the draft plan may be submitted on the Social Pinpoint page at <https://mcog.mysocialpinpoint.com/mcog-2022-rtp>, by email to lellard@dbcteam.net, or sent to 525 South Main Street, Suite G, Ukiah, CA 95482, for receipt by MCOG no later than December 5, 2021. Comments may also be presented at the public hearing. For more information visit MCOG's website at www.mendocinocog.org, call the MCOG office at 707-234-3434, or email lellard@dbcteam.net.

Charlene Parker for
Loretta J. Ellard, Deputy Planner
Mendocino Council of Governments (Planning Services)
525 S. Main St., Suite G (**new address**)
Ukiah, CA 95482
707-234-3434 phone; 707-671-7764 fax



**MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, October 20, 2021 - 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)

Meeting ID: 835 5234 7629 Passcode: 501432

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments [to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.](mailto:info@mendocinocog.org)
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Approval of 9/15/21 Minutes (*Action*) – *will be sent under separate cover*
- 5. Draft Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan – 2022 Update (*Discussion*)
6. 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (*Review/Recommendation*)
7. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grants – Update and Technical Assistance Review
 - b. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Update
<https://www.mendocinosaferoads.com>
 - c. FY 2022-23 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Cycle – Application Deadline 10/27/21
 - d. Clean CA Grant Program – Application Deadline February, 2022 (TBD)

4. Adoption of Resolution No. M2021-14 Making Continued Findings Pursuant to Assembly Bill 361 to Conduct Public Meetings Remotely for MCOG's Legislative and Advisory Bodies During the COVID-19 State of Emergency
5. Approval of October 4, 2021 Minutes

PUBLIC EXPRESSION – *Please refer to notice at top of this Agenda.*

6. 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

Attachments posted at [Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments \(mendocinocog.org\)](http://Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments (mendocinocog.org))

7. Review/Discussion: Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
- 8. Presentation and Discussion: Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) & Active Transportation Plan (ATP)
9. Discussion/Direction: Exploration of Options for Regional Energy Network and Climate Protection Agency

RATIFY ACTION

10. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

REPORTS

11. Reports – Information – *No Action*
 - a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
 - b. Mendocino Transit Authority
 - c. North Coast Railroad Authority
 - d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
 - e. MCOG Administration Staff
 - i. Position Open – Administrative Assistant – *verbal report*
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - iii. Next Meeting Date – Monday, December 6, 2021
 - f. MCOG Planning Staff
 - i. Position Open – Administrative Assistant – *verbal report*
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - g. MCOG Directors
 - h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

CLOSED SESSION

Any public reports of action taken in closed session will be made in accordance with Govt. Code sections 54957.1.

12. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL—EXISTING LITIGATION
(Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9)
Dewey-White v. Mendocino Council of Governments
Mendocino Superior Court Case No. SCUJ-CVPT 18-70179



**MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

AGENDA EXCERPT

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

Wednesday, November 17, 2021 - 10:00 a.m.

Videoconference/Teleconference

Zoom videoconference link provided to TAC members and by request.

Please submit access request to info@mendocinocog.org or call MCOG at (707) 463-1859.

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)

Meeting ID: 898 5114 8163 Passcode: 692629

NOTICE: During the declared local, state, and national emergency, all meetings of the Technical Advisory Committee will be conducted by teleconference (audio and/or video) and not available for in-person public participation, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20. To minimize the risk of exposure to COVID-19, the public may participate in lieu of personal attendance in several ways. Since opportunities during the meeting are limited, we encourage submitting comments in advance.

- In advance of the meeting: email comments to info@mendocinocog.org to be read aloud into the public record.
- During the meeting: make oral comments on the conference call by phone or video when public comment is invited by the Chair.

The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

1. Call to Order/Introductions
2. Public Expression
3. Input from Native American Tribal Governments' Representatives (*Information*)
4. Presentation from Blue Zones on Health & Transportation (*Information*)
5. Approval of Minutes (*Action*)
 - a. 9/15/21 TAC Meeting
 - b. 10/20/21 TAC Meeting
- 6. Draft 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan (*Review/Recommendation*)
7. 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) (*Review/Recommendation*)
8. Local Road Safety Plans (LRSP) – Invoices (*Discussion*)
9. Staff Reports (*Information*)
 - a. Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grants – Update
 - b. Clean CA Grant Program – Application Deadline February, 2022 (TBD)

1874	610	2:33	141
Total Visits	Unique Users	Avg Time (min)	Unique Stakeholders

126	113	45
Comments	Survey Responses	Budget Responses

Data as of 11/30/21

APPENDIX B

CALTRANS SHOPP AND BRIDGE PROJECTS

State Highway Operations and Protection Plan (SHOPP) & Bridge Projects – Caltrans District 1

SHOPP projects by definition are short-range program improvements. These projects are from funding identified expressly for safety, operations, maintenance, or rehabilitation needs on the state highway system. The SHOPP includes four years of programming and is adopted simultaneously with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) every two years. Although MCOG is allowed input in development of the SHOPP, the State has sole discretionary authority over the use of SHOPP funds; therefore listing of these projects in the RTP does not constitute approval by MCOG.

SHOPP and bridge projects identified for Mendocino County in the 2021 SHOPP are listed in the following tables:

**Caltrans District 1
SHOPP Project List**

SHOPP ID	Route	Begin Postmile	End Postmile	Activity	Description Project	Status Project	Cost (\$K)
18136	1	R65.13	65.49	Safety Improvements	Near Cleone, from 0.1-mile north of Mill Creek Drive to 0.3-mile north of Ward Avenue. Widen shoulders.	In Design	\$5,286
17257	1	6.50	9.50	Safety Improvements	Near Gualala, from 0.4 mile north of Havens Neck Drive to 0.5 mile south of Iverson Road. Widen shoulders and install edgeline rumble strips and guardrail.	In Design	\$940
20282	20	R38.3	44.10	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 20 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 11.4 lane miles of pavement, and 1 TMS element(s).	Conceptual	\$12,328
22718	101	R9.5	10.80	Safety Improvements	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 101 with primary work on Safety Improvements.	In Planning	\$14,400
18674	101	R33.73	R43.20	Pavement	Near Willits, from 1.1 miles north of West Road to 0.6 mile south of Haehl Creek Bridge. Rehabilitate pavement, replace concrete median barrier, rehabilitate	In Design	\$52,888

					drainage systems, and upgrade guardrail, signs, lighting, and Transportation Management System (TMS) elements.		
20250	101	T91.32	T106.8	Pavement	Near Leggett, Piercy and Cooks Valley, from north Route 1 to Humboldt County line. Rehabilitate pavement by grinding and placing rubberized asphalt, upgrade guardrails, repair Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, and upgrade curb ramps to ADA standards	In Planning	\$36,543
21336	101	63.90	R104.5	Drainage	Near Laytonville, Leggett, and Piercy, from 0.8 mile south of Old Sherwood Road to 0.7 mile north of Piercy Separation (Route 271). Replace and rehabilitate culverts.	In Design	\$6,883
20274	1	14.75	33.91	Pavement	In and near Point Arena, from 0.2 mile south of Iverson Ave to Philo Greenwood Road. Rehabilitate pavement by grinding and placing asphalt, upgrade guardrails, repair Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, and upgrade curb ramps to ADA standards.	In Planning	\$30,819
19291	1	33.70	R51.0	Pavement	Near the Mendocino community, from south of Philo Greenwood Road to north of Little Lake Road. Rehabilitate pavement, upgrade guardrail, and replace rumble strips.	In Design	\$31,573
22126	1	33.73	58.80	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 1 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 47 lane miles of pavement.	Conceptual	\$14,642
16451	1	41.77	42.33	Safety Improvements	Near Albion, from 1.5 miles north of Route 128 to 0.1 mile south of Navarro Ridge Road. Widen for standard shoulders, improve	In Design	\$5,594

					roadway cross slope, and install rumble strips and guardrail.		
16448	1	42.30	42.50	Major Damage - Protective Betterments	Near Albion, at Navarro Ridge Road. Improve drainage, repair erosion, widen shoulders, and repair roadway.	In Design	\$2,527
13454	1	59.80	62.10	Mobility - ADA	In Fort Bragg, from Route 20 to Pudding Creek Bridge. Construct Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant curb ramps and sidewalk, add high visibility signing and striping at crosswalks, construct retaining walls, and upgrade drainage.	In Design	\$9,598
18673	162	R0	25.70	Pavement	Near Dos Rios, from Route 101 to 2.6 miles west of Grist Creek Bridge. Rehabilitate roadway, upgrade guardrail and signs, apply High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST), replace Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, and enhance highway worker safety.	In Design	\$45,056
17457	1	71.26	71.36	Safety Improvements	Near Fort Bragg, from 0.03 mile south to 0.07 mile north of Abalobadiah Creek. Curve improvement and shoulder widening.	In Design	\$5,195
21686	1	78.90	87.85	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 1 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 16.9 lane miles of pavement.	Conceptual	\$16,378
19290	1	87.90	105.58	Pavement	Near Leggett, from north of Rockport Street to Route 101 (PM 87.85/105.580). Rehabilitate pavement and upgrade guardrail and Transportation Management System (TMS) elements.	In Design	\$25,502
20852	101	1.40	1.70	Major Damage - Permanent Restoration	Near Hopland, from 0.7 mile to 1.0 mile north of Geysers Road. Stabilize slope by constructing a soldier pile retaining wall	In Design	\$11,649

					and reinforce embankment.		
18672	101	9.90	11.20	Mobility - ADA	Near Hopland, from La Franchi Road to north of First Street. Upgrade facilities to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, rehabilitate pavement, and upgrade signs, guardrail, and Transportation Management System (TMS) elements. (Long Lead Project)	In Design	\$15,905
21994	20	17.28	28.70	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 20 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 22.7 lane miles of pavement.	Conceptual	\$11,068
19035	20	19.10	19.60	Safety Improvements	Near Willits, from 0.9 mile west to 0.4 mile west of James Creek Bridge. Improve curve, install center and edge-line rumble strips, upgrade guardrail, and widen shoulders.	In Design	\$5,669
21921	253	1.70	2.50	Major Damage - Permanent Restoration	Near Booneville, from 1.7 miles east to 2.5 miles east of Route 128. Construct retaining wall, reconstruct roadway, improve drainage, place Rock Slope Protection (RSP), and construct debris wall to stabilize storm damaged slope.	In Design	\$30,297
20270	1	0.00	105.50	Drainage	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 1 with primary work on Drainage. Project will address 194 drainage system(s).	Conceptual	\$85,615
22000	101	30.80	R33.8	Safety Improvements	Near Ukiah, from Route 20 to 0.1 mile south of Uva Drive/North State Street. Construct median barrier.	In Design	\$9,057
22253	101	41.20	R42.8	Safety Improvements	Near Willits, from north of Black Bart Road to north of Waterplant/Grider Road. Construct concrete median barrier and	In Planning	\$16,910

					retaining wall, upgrade guardrail, and make intersection improvements.		
19408	101	41.17	41.17	Mobility - WIM Scales & CVEFs	Near Willits, at the Ridgewood Grade Weigh Station. Install new Weigh-In-Motion (WIM) facility, restore existing weigh station concrete scale pad and rehabilitate asphalt pavement ramps, lanes and parking, upgrade and extend guardrail, upgrade lighting and Roadside Weather Information System (RWIS).	In Design	\$4,210
18675	101	48.96	55.06	Pavement	Near Willits, from 0.6 mile north of Upp Creek Bridge to 2.6 miles north of Ryan Creek Road. Rehabilitate pavement and upgrade guardrail and signs.	In Design	\$14,163
22659	101	50.70	52.20	Safety Improvements	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 101 with primary work on Safety Improvements. Project will address 6 drainage system(s).	In Planning	\$20,410
11314	101	58.90	82.50	Roadside	Near Laytonville, at Moss Cove Safety Roadside Rest Area (SRRRA); also at Irvine Lodge SRRRA (PM 61.8) and Empire Camp SRRRA (PM 82.5). Upgrade potable and wastewater systems.	In Construction	\$15,384
20245	101	81.40	T91.32	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 101 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 41.5 lane miles of pavement.	Conceptual	\$29,543
20289	128	17.90	30.66	Pavement	Near Boonville, from Mill Creek Bridge to Robinson Creek Bridge. Rehabilitate pavement, upgrade Transportation Management System (TMS) elements, guardrails, and sign panels, upgrade facilities to ADA standards, and	In Planning	\$24,630

					construct complete street elements.		
21995	128	30.66	50.90	Pavement	The scope of this planned project is under development in Mendocino County on Route 128 with primary work on Pavement. Project will address 40.3 lane miles of pavement.	Conceptual	\$31,915
11178	162	11.50	11.80	Major Damage - Permanent Restoration	Near Dos Rios, from 1.4 to 1.7 miles east of Rodeo Creek Bridge. Construct soldier pile walls, shear pile wall, drainage galleries, and correct roadway profile.	In Construction	\$49,935
22733	162	29.18	30.67	Sustainability	Near Covelo, from Howard Street to Hurt Road/Road 337D. Construct Class I multi-purpose paved trail along Route 162 as a complete streets element. Financial Contribution Only (FCO) to the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) for construction implementation.	In Design	\$2,011
20847	271	19.60	20.00	Major Damage - Permanent Restoration	Near Piercy, from 0.1 mile to 0.5 mile north of Route 101. Repair slope by constructing a retaining wall, reconstruct roadway and shoulders.	In Design	\$8,431
22124	128	0.00	50.50	Drainage	Near Philo and Boonville, from Route 1 to 0.4 mile west of Sonoma County line, at various locations. Rehabilitate drainage systems and remediate fish passage barriers.	In Planning	\$34,474
21052	20	20.00	20.30	Safety Improvements	Near Willits, from James Creek Bridge to 0.3 mile east of James Creek Bridge. Improve curve and roadway cross slope, widen shoulders, and install rumble strips.	In Design	\$4,094
19289	101	21.00	28.60	Pavement	In and near Ukiah, from north of Robinson Creek Bridge to Pomo Road Undercrossing. Rehabilitate roadway, upgrade guardrail, lighting, and Transportation	In Design	\$48,570

					Management System (TMS) elements, and apply High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST).		
19285	101	55.00	64.90	Pavement	Near Willits, from 0.5 mile south of Shimmins Ridge Road to north of Old Sherwood Road. Rehabilitate roadway and upgrade guardrail and Transportation Management System (TMS) elements.	In Design	\$31,522
20620	101	27.40	27.40	Facilities	Near Ukiah, at the Ukiah Maintenance Station (MS); also on Route 128 near Boonville, at the Boonville MS (PM R28.2). Repair or replacing existing maintenance station buildings, install new bulk fuel tank at Ukiah MS, and upgrade storage bin unit at Boonville MS.	In Planning	\$7,003

The following bridge projects located on State routes will be implemented by Caltrans.

**Caltrans District 1 Bridge Projects
SHOPP Project List**

SHOPP ID	Route	Begin Postmile	End Postmile	Activity	Description Project	Project Status	Cost (\$K)
13636	101	R106.2	T106.8	Bridge	Near Piercy, at South Fork Eel River Bridge No. 10-0218 (PM R106.57); also in Humboldt County (PM T0.0/T0.1). Seismic bridge retrofit, bridge rail upgrade, restripe for wider shoulders and bicycle access, and upgrade deck drainage.	In Design	\$7,203
13550	1	31.40	31.40	Bridge	Near Fort Bragg, at Elk Creek Bridge No. 10-0120. Replace bridge.	In Design	\$18,599
22536	1	42.40	43.30	Bridge	Near Albion, from 2.2 miles north of Route 128 Junction to 0.2 mile north of Salmon Creek Bridge No. 10-0134. Lead abatement for bridge replacement project EA 40140.	In Design	\$20,026
9132	1	42.40	43.30	Bridge	Near Albion, from 2.2 miles north of Route 128 Junction to 0.2 mile north of Salmon Creek Bridge No. 10-0134. Bridge replacement. (Long Lead Project)	In Design	\$61,592
9133	1	43.30	44.20	Bridge	Near Albion, from 3.0 miles north of Route 128 Junction to 0.2 mile north of Albion River Bridge No. 10-0136. Bridge replacement.	In Design	\$93,908
22342	1	51.87	51.87	Bridge	Near the Mendocino community, at Jack Peters Creek Bridge No. 10-0150 (PM 51.87). Bridge rail upgrade and widening.	In Design	\$20,255
17110	1	59.70	59.70	Bridge	Near Fort Bragg, at Hare Creek Bridge No. 10-0175. Upgrade bridge rails and widen to make standard. (G13 Contingency)	In Design	\$24,382
9139	1	62.12	62.12	Bridge	In Fort Bragg at Pudding Creek Bridge No. 10-0158 (PM 62.12). Bridge rail upgrade and widening.	In Design	\$17,816
19166	162	8.20	8.20	Bridge	Near Longvale, from 8.2 miles to 8.3 miles east of Route 101 at Eel River Bridge No. 10-0236. Bridge seismic retrofit.	In Design	\$14,739
13544	20	33.30	34.40	Bridge	Near Ukiah, from North Calpella Overcrossing to 0.5 mile east of County Road 144 at Russian River Bridge and Overhead No. 10-0182 and Redwood Valley Undercrossing No. 10-0183. Replace two bridges with a single bridge on a new alignment.	In Construction	\$47,579

21146	271	17.70	18.00	Bridge	Near Piercy, from 0.7 mile north of Route 271/101 Separation Bridge No. 10-0217 to 0.4 mile south of Sidehill Viaduct No. 10-0100. Mitigation planting and monitoring for EA 0A840.	In Construction	\$377
23234	20	33.30	33.40	Bridge	Near Ukiah, from North Calpella Overcrossing to 0.5 mile east of County Road 144 at Russian River Bridge and Overhead No. 10-0182 and Redwood Valley Undercrossing No. 10-0183. Mitigation project for onsite revegetation and monitoring for project EA 0E090	In Design	\$1,227

APPENDIX C

UNSURFACED COUNTY MAINTAINED ROADS AND WATER QUALITY

Unsurfaced County Maintained Roads and Water Quality

Overview

All dirt road surfaces produce sediment that migrates to streams and surfacing would improve this condition. However, recent analyses by MCDOT show that only about 15% of the County's road system is in close proximity to aquatic resource (blue line) streams. Limited resources necessitate that the Department prioritize efforts to first address sediment reduction in the more sensitive 15% portion of the road network. In general, MCDOT follows Five County Maintenance Manual practices which aim towards reducing sediment production from *all* County Maintained Roads. There is no way to eliminate sediment production from a dirt road. Surfacing dirt roads would greatly reduce sediment but even paved road systems produce some sediment from bank erosion. Sediment production from roads can never be 100% eliminated.

Applicable Clean Water Act (CWA) Programs

Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

The State Water Resources Control Board 303(d) List identifies water quality impairments on a watershed basis. In Mendocino County almost every watershed is listed as water quality impaired, due to sediment production. Most of these watersheds have a TMDL Implementation Plan that has not yet been amended into the Basin Plan. Once in the Basin Plan, an Action Plan will be developed by the regulators. After it's completed and approved, the Action Plan will identify which parties are affected and what they need to do to address applicable water quality impairments.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

At present the County is required to comply with the NPDES Phase II Program within urbanized areas around Ukiah and Fort Bragg. The program's intent is to address common urban-type pollutants. The County finished Year 5 of the five-year permit in June 2010, with a new permit being developed by the State Water Board. It's possible that the NPDES Program could be implemented on a broader basis, with substantial impacts on management of the County Maintained Road System.


Other Data

The County Department of Transportation has a database that identifies road-related sediment delivery mechanisms. Various analyses based on the data project the major level of sediment production and delivery associated with unsurfaced portions of the County's road network.


APPENDIX D


ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROJECT MAPS

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN LAYTONVILLE AREA



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMUNITY OF HOPLAND





 Map Developed By:
 A. Pedrotti
 525 S. Main Street, Suite G
 Ukiah, CA 95482

Short Range Priority Improvements


REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMUNITY OF GUALALA















REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COVELO AREA




REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CITY OF POINT ARENA



Legend

-  Schools
-  Business District
-  Existing Services
-  Other Attractors
-  Parks
-  MTA Transit Stops
-  Multi-Use Facility
-  Pedestrian Facilities
-  Existing Bicycle Facilities
-  State Highways
-  Local Roads
-  Rail Roads
-  City of Point Arena


REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CITY OF FORT BRAGG




Pudding Creek Trestle

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN




















COMMUNITY OF WILLITS



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN CITY OF UKIAH




Legend


-  Schools
-  Hospital
-  Business District
-  Government Buildings
-  Existing Services
-  Needed Parking
-  Other Attractors
-  Parks
-  Shopping
-  MTA Transit Stops
-  Intersection Improvements
-  Bicycle Facilities
-  Multi-Use Facility
-  Pedestrian Facilities
-  Existing Bike/Multi-Use Facilities
-  State Highways
-  Local Roads
-  Rail Roads
-  City of Ukiah

Map Developed By:
A. Pedrotti
525 S. Main Street, Suite G
Ukiah, CA 95482











Short Range Priority Improvements



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN COMMUNITY OF BOONVILLE



Legend

-  Schools
-  Business District
-  Government Buildings
-  Existing Services
-  Shopping
-  MTA Transit Stops
-  Bicycle Facilities
-  Pedestrian Facilities
-  State Highways
-  Local Roads

APPENDIX E

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN REQUIRED PLAN ELEMENTS

Required Plan Elements

The Active Transportation Plan Guidelines state that a city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan (bicycle, pedestrian, safe-routes-to-school, or comprehensive). An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

Requirement	Page
A. Mode Share: The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.	See Mode Share pg. 72; Usage & Parking pg. 84
B. Description of Land Use/Destinations: A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, major transit hubs, and other destinations. Major transit hubs must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.	See land use & zoning maps in Append. D & H
C. Pedestrian Facilities: A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities, including those at major transit hubs and those that serve public and private schools.	See Ped. Facilities pgs.71-73; Priority Improvements pgs. 81-88; & maps in Append. D
D. Bicycle Facilities: A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities including those at major transit hubs and those that serve public and private schools.	See Existing Facilities pgs. 68-71; Priority Improvements pgs. 81-88; & maps in Append. D
E. Bicycle Parking: A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities. Include a description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments. Also include a map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, bicycle parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.	See Support Facilities pgs.71-72; Usage & Parking pg. 84; & maps in Append. D

<p>F. Wayfinding: A description of existing and proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.</p>	<p>See Support Facilities & Signage pgs. 71-72</p>
<p>G. Non-Infrastructure: A description of existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation programs conducted in the area included within the plan. Include efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>See discussion of E's pgs. 78-80</p>
<p>H. Collision Analysis: The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.</p>	<p>See Accident History pg. 78 & Appendix L Accident Data</p>
<p>I. Equity Analysis: Identify census tracts that are considered disadvantaged or low-income and identify bicycle and pedestrian needs of those disadvantaged or low-income residents.</p>	<p>See Equity pgs. 80-81 & Appendix G</p>
<p>J. Community Engagement: A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.</p>	<p>See Public Participation pg. 65 & Needs Assessment pgs. 72-75</p>
<p>K. Coordination: A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, housing or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan, and local or regional housing plans or process improvements that are adopted or in development.</p>	<p>See Public Participation pg. 65, Needs Assessment pgs. 72-75; Existing Planning docs pgs. 75-78; Land Use pg. 12; Objectives & Policies LAE 4, pg. 22.</p>
<p>L. Prioritization: A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.</p>	<p>See Priority Improvements pgs. 81-91 & Plan Implementation pg. 92</p>
<p>M. Funding: A description of future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated cost, revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.</p>	<p>See Priority Improvements pgs. 81-91; Active Transportation Funding pgs. 142-144 & Appendix J.</p>

<p>N. Implementation: A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.</p>	<p>See Plan Implementation pg. 92</p>
<p>O. Maintenance: A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, ADA level surfaces, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.</p>	<p>See Objective & Policies AT 5, pg. 68</p>
<p>P. Resolution: A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.</p>	<p>Resolutions adopted by local agencies will be added to appendix, when adopted</p>

APPENDIX F

2019 PEDESTRIAN FACILITY NEEDS INVENTORY & ENGINEERED FEASIBILITY STUDY (EXCERPT) – PRIORITY PROJECTS

Mendocino County

Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & Engineered Feasibility Study



Local
Government
Commission

June 4, 2019

South Coast Priority Projects

City of Point Arena

Table 1: Tier 1


PA-1	Northern Point Arena Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project - State Highway
PA-3	Southern Point Arena Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project - State Highway

Table 2: Tier 2

PA-4	Southern Point Arena Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project - City Streets
PA-2	Northern Point Arena Sidewalk and Crossing Improvement Project

Table 3: Tier 3

PA-5	Pathway Connections to Port Road and Main Street
PA-6	Point Arena - Arena Cove Access



Map 1: Point Arena Priority Projects

Unincorporated South Coast Communities

Table 4: Tier 1

G-2	Gualala North Downtown Sidewalk and Crossing Improvements Project - State Highway
E-1	Central Elk Pedestrian Improvements - State Highway

Table 5: Tier 2

M-1	Central Manchester Highway 1 Sidewalk Connection - State Highway
G-3	Gualala Northern Sidewalk and Crossing Improvements Project - State Highway



North Coast/Inland Priority Projects

City of Fort Bragg and Adjacent Areas

Table 6: Tier 1


FB-2	Elm Street Pedestrian Improvements
FB-6	South Main Street (State Highway 1) Corridor Pedestrian Enhancement - Maple Street to Cypress Street - State Highway
FB-10	South Main Street (State Highway 1) Corridor Pedestrian Enhancement - Ocean View Drive to Highway 20 - State Highway
FB-3	Maple Street Pedestrian Improvements

Table 7: Tier 2

FB-4	Redwood Avenue Coastal Linkage
FB-1	Northern Highway 1 Crossings - State Highway
FB-9	South Main Street (State Highway 1) Corridor Pedestrian Enhancement - Noyo Bridge to Ocean View Drive - State Highway
FB-17	North of Fort Bragg Pedestrian Connections (Unincorporated)

Table 8: Tier 3

FB-7	North Harbor Drive Pedestrian Path
FB-5	Cedar Street Sidewalk Improvements
FB-8	South Noyo Harbor Trail



City of Ukiah and Adjacent Areas

Table 9: Tier 1


U-7	Leslie Street Pedestrian Facility Improvements
U-12	Ukiah Rail with Trail South Segment
U-23	Talmage Road Sidewalk or Path Improvements - State Highway (Unincorporated)
U-9	South Ukiah School Access Improvements
U-5	Clara Avenue Neighborhood Pedestrian Improvements
U-8	South Main Street Pedestrian Enhancement

Table 10: Tier 2

U-1	Despina Drive Crossing Improvements
U-10	South State Street Pedestrian Crossing Enhancement
U-2	Pedestrian Improvements Near Frank Zeek Elementary School
U-13	Airport Park Boulevard Pedestrian Enhancement
U-6	East Clay Street Sidewalk Gap Closure
U-22	Talmage Rd Interchange Sidewalk Improvements - State Highway (Unincorporated)

Table 11: Tier 3

U-11	Betty and Lorraine Street Improvements
U-4	Pomolita Middle School Access Improvements
U-21	Jefferson Lane Pedestrian Gap Closure (Unincorporated)
U-3	Cypress Ave Pedestrian Facility Improvements
U-20	Millview Road and Kuki Lane Sidewalk Gap Closure



Map 4: Ukiah Priority Projects

City of Willits and Adjacent Areas

Table 12: Tier 1


W-8	Walnut Street and South Main Street/Highway 20 Intersection Crossing Enhancement - State Highway
W-13	Manor Way and Main Street/Highway 20 Intersection Improvements - Part State Highway
W-16	Enhanced Lighting on South Main Street/Redwood Highway
W-1	East Van Lane and Schmidbauer Lane Pedestrian Alley and Enhanced Crosswalk
W-7	Blosser Lane Pedestrian Improvements - State Highway

Table 13: Tier 2

W-10	Baechtel Road and Shell Lane Sidewalk Improvements
W-9	Pedestrian Improvements near Baechtel Grove Middle School
W-6	Blosser Lane Pedestrian Improvements - City Streets
W-3	North Willits Rail Trail and Casteel Lane Connection
W-22	Della Avenue Sidewalk Improvements
W-14	South Main Street/Highway 20 to Sandy Lane Sidewalk Improvements - Part State Highway

Table 14: Tier 3

W-2	Brookside Elementary School Pedestrian Improvements
W-11	East Hill Road Sidewalk Improvements
W-12	Elm Lane pedestrian Improvements
W-4	Coast Street Pedestrian Improvements
W-15	Enhanced Lighting on East Commercial Street
W-5	Franklin Avenue Pedestrian Improvements



Map 5: Willits Priority Projects

Unincorporated North Coast/Inland Areas

Table 15: Tier 1


LTV-2	Laytonville Highway 101 Pedestrian Improvements
CO-2	Southern Highway 162 Pedestrian Improvements
LTV-3	Laytonville Elementary School Pedestrian Improvements
HOP-1	Hopland Highway 101 Complete Street Improvements

Table 16: Tier 2

BV-1	Downtown Boonville Crossing Improvements
LTV-1	Laytonville High School Pedestrian Improvements
CO-1	Howard Street and Foothill Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements
HOP-2	Highway 101 and Highway 175 Crossing Improvements

Table 17: Tier 3

CO-3	Highway 162 Crossing Improvements
CAL-1	Downtown Calpella Pedestrian Improvements
RW-2	Redwood Valley Pedestrian Improvements
WP1	North Westport Area Shoulder Path



Map 6: Unincorporated North Coast/ Inland Areas Priority Projects

APPENDIX G

CENSUS TRACT INFORMATION (2015-2019 AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY)

Census Tract Information


Geographic Area Name	Median Household Income (5-year estimate)	% of State
Census Tract 101	\$38,345	50.97%
Census Tract 102	\$38,274	50.87%
Census Tract 103	\$49,522	65.82%
Census Tract 104	\$49,853	66.26%
Census Tract 105	\$44,298	58.88%
Census Tract 106	\$52,386	69.63%
Census Tract 107	\$41,628	55.33%
Census Tract 108.01	\$63,281	84.11%
Census Tract 108.02	\$59,348	78.88%
Census Tract 109	\$57,344	76.22%
Census Tract 110.01	\$50,357	66.93%
Census Tract 110.02	\$63,236	84.05%
Census Tract 111.02	\$57,558	76.50%
Census Tract 112	\$44,896	59.67%
Census Tract 113	\$46,234	61.45%
Census Tract 114	\$78,438	104.26%
Census Tract 115	\$49,135	65.31%
Census Tract 116	\$34,487	45.84%
Census Tract 117	\$70,536	93.75%
Census Tract 118	\$58,900	78.29%
California	\$75,235	

*Source: American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2015-2019) Table B19013

APPENDIX H

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN MAPS &
LAND USE MAPS**

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE



**LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**


REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE



UKIAH VALLEY AREA LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE



LOCAL PUBLIC ROADS MAP

- LOCAL PUBLIC ROADS
- STATE HIGHWAYS
- RIVERS
- CITY BOUNDARIES
- MENDOCINO COUNTY BOUNDARY


0 0.3 0.6 1.2 Miles

MAP DEVELOPED BY:
A. PEDROTTI
MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
525 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE G
UKIAH, CA 95482


REDWOOD VALLEY AND POTTER VALLEY AREA LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




MAP DEVELOPED BY:
A. PEDROTTI
MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
525 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE G
UKIAH, CA 95482

WILLITS AND BROOKTRAILS AREA LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




MAP DEVELOPED BY:
A. PEDROTTI
MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
525 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE G
UKIAH, CA 95482


POINT ARENA COASTAL AREA
LOCAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA




REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2022 UPDATE




City of Ukiah Land Use




City of Willits Land Use




City of Point Arena Land Use




County of Mendocino
Land Use




County of Mendocino Land Use



Simpson Lane Existing Bikeway




County of Mendocino
Land Use



Redwood Valley Area

County of Mendocino
Land Use



North Ukiah Area

APPENDIX I

2019 NOYO HARBOR COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY STUDY (EXCERPT) – PRIORITIES, RECOMMENDATIONS & IMPLEMENTATION

NOYO HARBOR

COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLAN



JUNE 2019

7. PRIORITIES, RECOMMENDATIONS & IMPLEMENTATION

The Community Sustainability Plan recommendations are based on surveys, interviews and stakeholder input from the fishing industry, local business owners, and the broader community. This input identified needs related to infrastructure, facility and service needs; regulatory issues which affect fishery landings; and access concerns. Noyo Harbor District Commissioners used the stakeholder input as a foundation for prioritizing recommendations to improve fishing industry conditions and working waterfront operations for Noyo Harbor.



View of Noyo Harbor from Upper N. Harbor Drive

Community Sustainability Plan recommendations are intended to help make District operations more sustainable, to support the local commercial fishing industry, to reduce climate change vulnerability, and to foster resilience to environmental, economic and regulatory changes. The recommendations collectively serve as a Harbor District and Fishing Community sustainability and investment strategy, with local resources leveraged by outside grant funding and related support.

It is important to note that some of the recommendations in this report are already being implemented, and thus the report reaffirms the importance of continued support and investment. Other recommendations require additional technical or financial analysis before specific actions can be taken. In some instances, important co-benefits (which may take the form of increased District revenues, higher waterfront property values, increased visitor spending, and improved environmental conditions) should be taken into account.

7.1 PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

A list of 30 different Harbor-related projects and activities with benefits to the fishing community and the working waterfront was compiled based on surveys, interviews and stakeholder meetings in the initial phases of the planning process. At the third stakeholder meeting, participants were each given \$15,000 in fictitious “Harbor Dollars” to “spend” on these activities (see Stakeholder Open House Guide in Appendix A). The meeting room was lined with displays explaining each harbor issue and participants could “spend” their Harbor Dollars by dropping them into individual containers at each display station. For a week following the open house, stakeholders had access to the displays and containers for Harbor Dollar spending at Salmon Troller’s Hall. In all, participating stakeholders spent more than \$774,000 (Harbor Dollars). The following list presents the top 12 items receiving the most Harbor Dollars, along with the corresponding amount spent on each item. These 12 items represent more than 81% of the total Harbor Dollars spent:



Participants at the Stakeholder Open House

Harbor Dollars	Improvement or facility
\$138,000	1. Fuel dock
\$119,000	2. Upgraded flake ice/cold storage
\$75,000	3. Harbor entrance and channel dredging
\$51,000	4. Improved north harbor vehicle access
\$40,000	5. Mooring basin reconfiguration/reconstruction
\$39,000	6. Fish cleaning station
\$32,000	7. Local Coastal Program (LCP) Update
\$29,000	8. More fish-buyers, receivers, processors
\$28,000	9. Shoreside gear storage and repair sites
\$28,000	10. Improved hoist and loading/off-loading facilities
\$25,000	11. District encourages boatyard/marine services and supplies
\$24,000	12. Improved sidewalks, trails and bicycle lanes

Each of these priority items is discussed in more detail below.

7.2 TOP 12 PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. INSTALL A FUEL DOCK

The need for a fuel dock received the highest number of Harbor Dollars and survey respondents also strongly indicated the need for this facility. Noyo Harbor does not have a fuel dock available for vessel operators. Fuel represents one of the largest fishing operating costs. The lack of a fuel dock is a key factor inhibiting commercial operators and pleasure boaters from using Noyo Harbor. It was reported in interviews that commercial fishermen as well as pleasure and recreational craft travelling along the north coast often bypass Noyo Harbor due to the lack of a fuel dock. Without a fuel dock, fishing vessels in Noyo Harbor have limited refueling opportunities.

To act on this recommendation, the District should continue its efforts to secure grant funds for a fuel dock as part of the mooring basin improvements. A mooring basin location would allow convenient water and dockside equipment access and would allow for easy access by District staff. If the District seeks to lease the facility to an operator, discounted rent may be necessary for the facility to be commercially viable. A regional fuel cooperative could be considered to reduce fuel costs based on a commitment for higher volume purchases.

TABLE 7.1 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —INSTALLATION OF A FUEL DOCK

Environmental	Social	Economic
Use of approved fuel storage and fueling facilities reduce potential environmental risks of a fuel spill.	Helps to support local fishermen by providing more convenient access to fuel and may increase usage of the harbor by transient vessels.	Improved access to fuel dock is likely to bring additional revenue into waterfront community. Convenient and competitively priced fuel will provide an economic benefit to vessel operators using Noyo Harbor.

2. PROVIDE UPGRADED FLAKE ICE AND COLD STORAGE FACILITIES

The need for a reliable and accessible and affordable source of flake ice and a cold storage facility received the second highest amount of Harbor Dollars and was identified as a key priority in interviews and surveys. Flake ice and cold storage are critically important for both commercial and recreational fishermen. Currently, the availability of cold storage in Noyo Harbor is considered inadequate by many stakeholders. Very few commercial fishermen making local landings are able to seamlessly process their catches due to lack of sufficient readily available refrigerated or freezer storage. Cold storage and freezer facilities can help fishermen store bait and baited gear and to hold fish until market conditions improve. Access to cold storage could facilitate Noyo's smaller commercial fleet to establish new and competitive niche local and regional markets in which buyers such as restaurants and

households can reliably purchase small quantities of fish on a regular and dependable schedule.

Commercial fishing operations in Noyo Harbor have also been challenged by inadequate access to flake ice. The one currently operational ice house has dealt with aging equipment and, according to the owners, when mechanical failures necessitate equipment replacement or repair, financial resources are limited to maintain operations (personal communication, Stacy Bradley, January 2019).



Former Ice House, Noyo Harbor

The District should encourage the existing private ice house operator to work with local economic development entities to determine whether low-cost financing is available for further equipment upgrades. The District should explore cost-sharing opportunities to assist the existing ice facility given that it is a high priority but low profit operation and it is a critically important facility to support the fishing industry. This could include potential co-location of ice and fuel dispensing. The District could also explore partnership with local non-profit organizations interested in sustaining the local Noyo Harbor fishing community, to add additional capacity to a collaborative venture and may have access to funding sources that neither the public sector nor private entities may have.

TABLE 7.2 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —UPGRADED FLAKE ICE AND COLD STORAGE FACILITIES

Environmental	Social	Economic
More efficient ice-making and refrigeration systems reduce energy consumption and water use. Boats can ice up locally vs. steam to other ports for ice, which reduces the carbon footprint of diesel engine emissions.	Greater seafood sales and distribution supplies. Secure bait and baited gear. Improved culture and sense of belonging when minimum services are restored or provided that support fishing business.	Fishermen can hold product longer to take advantage of higher market prices. Faster trip turn-around when baited gear potentially co-located with offload site. Flash freeze & quick offload to controlled cold storage results in higher quality and higher value product. Expand market opportunities for vertical integration and higher profits.

3. ENSURE TIMELY HARBOR ENTRANCE AND CHANNEL DREDGING

Regularly scheduled dredging of the harbor channel and upper channel received the third highest amount of Harbor Dollars. Routine dredging of the harbor entrance and channel is critically important in order to maintain navigational access to Noyo Harbor for larger vessels. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performs dredging to keep the Noyo Harbor entrance and main channel open for fishing, recreational and Coast Guard vessels. The Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for maintaining at least 10’ mean lower low water at the

entrance and harbor channel. The channel is typically dredged on a biannual basis. It was last dredged in 2016, with 10,000 cubic yards of dredge spoils removed although dredging of the harbor entrance was not completed due to severe ocean conditions during the dredging operation. A key driving force behind dredging is to accommodate the commercial fishing fleet that operates out of Noyo Harbor. Channel maintenance dredging funding is a shared Harbor District and the Army Corps of Engineers responsibility. Funding for dredging the mooring basin, however, is exclusively the District's financial responsibility. The mooring basin was last dredged in 2015, removing 24,000 cubic yards of accumulated sediment.

Inadequate funding for dredging operations, combined with the limited capacity of the upland dredge spoils storage site, has resulted in repeated delays in the dredging schedule. The District is also responsible for furnishing an upland disposal site for all dredging operations in the harbor. A key challenge is to find a suitable disposal location rather than storing dredged materials indefinitely on the District's temporary storage site just north of the harbor entry.

The District should support the Corps of Engineers' efforts to develop a long-term Dredge Materials Management Plan and encourage legislative representatives to prioritize ongoing funding for Noyo Harbor maintenance dredging operations. In addition, the District should plan for periodic dredging of the mooring basin (which is solely the District's responsibility) in conjunction with the other dredging operations.

TABLE 7.3 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —TIMELY HARBOR ENTRANCE AND CHANNEL DREDGING

Environmental	Social	Economic
Maintenance of a navigable harbor entry and channel provides for safe passage of vessels, lessening the likelihood of groundings and related environmental hazards. Disposal of spoils in innovative ways that promote environment stewardship.	Regular maintenance dredging provides safer navigation for all mariners. Increases likelihood of recreational and pleasure boaters entering the harbor. Existing larger commercial vessels will continue to use Noyo for their port of call, thereby helping to retain a local fishing community.	More vessel access, increased landings and revenue. Higher demand for services could trigger private investment.

4. IMPROVE NORTH HARBOR VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING

Significant Harbor Dollars were spent on improving vehicle access for the north harbor area. North Harbor Drive, a City-maintained street, is the sole street accessing the north side of Noyo Harbor. Vehicle access is constrained by a singular entrance and exit point and the narrow, two-lane roadway. North Harbor Drive presents precarious conditions for drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians due to its narrow width and lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

The fact that there is only one road in and out of Noyo Harbor is a concern from a safety point of view. Any number of natural or man-made disasters could render North Harbor Drive unusable, thereby preventing emergency vehicle access to and safe evacuation of the harbor area. Survey respondents and stakeholders also expressed concerns about inadequate parking for employees and visitors, and inadequate space for commercial truck deliveries on North Harbor Drive in the harbor area.



Commercial Fishing Transportation Parking, North Harbor Drive

The District should seek Mendocino County and City of Fort Bragg assistance in establishing a secondary emergency access route to/from the north harbor along the alignment of the existing private access road that extends from North Noyo Point Road to the dredge spoils site. The District should also work with these two entities to identify improvements to the segment of North Harbor Drive in the lower harbor to better accommodate on-street parking, including designated handicapped spaces and loading zones. Improved shoulders and drainage would have the added benefit of protecting the edges of the roadway and providing for safer pedestrian access.

TABLE 7.4 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —IMPROVED NORTH HARBOR VEHICLE ACCESS AND PARKING

Environmental	Social	Economic
Improved vehicle access reduces pick-up and delivery time for trucks and reduced vehicle emissions. Improved storm drainage facilities may enhance quality of stormwater discharge to Noyo River.	Establishment of a secondary emergency access will enhance public safety and emergency response capabilities for residents, workers and visitors in Noyo Harbor.	Convenient parking for employees and access for delivery vehicles results in economic efficiencies.

5. COMPLETE MOORING BASIN RECONFIGURATION/RECONSTRUCTION

Stakeholders indicated that mooring basin reconfiguration and reconstruction is a top priority. The mooring basin reconfiguration/reconstruction garnered the fifth largest amount of Harbor Dollars.

The planning process for mooring basin improvements is in process, and a Strategic Planning & Harbor Marina Redevelopment Plan identifies phasing and costs for replacement of all existing docks (with the exceptions of the partially salvageable “B” dock and the recently reconstructed “C” Dock). The preliminary plans involve demolition of the existing docks F, G, H and K and subsequent rebuilding of F, G, and H Docks, reconfigured with American Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant gangways. Reconfiguration would yield fewer berths and


would allow larger vessels to dock. The new marina facilities would include 225 double loaded slips, 6 end tie slips, 5 side tie slips and a fuel dock. The project includes repairs to the existing harbor wave wall, installation of new restrooms and laundry facilities and installation of a new fuel dock with vessel pump-out facilities, and hazmat disposal facilities. The total estimated cost is approximately \$9.3 million, which could be funded by a combination of low-interest loan and grant funding.

TABLE 7.5 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —COMPLETE MOORING BASIN RECONFIGURATION / RECONSTRUCTION

Environmental	Social	Economic
The Marina Redevelopment project would be required to comply with all environmental regulations to protect sensitive habitat and species.	The improved facilities would better accommodate the fishing fleet and support the return of fish buyers/processors, and may incentivize additional investment in the Harbor.	The new facility would accommodate more larger vessels and may result in higher moorage revenues for the District and create an economic boom from the commercial and sport fishing industry and sounding business.

6. INSTALL A FISH CLEANING STATION

Sport fishermen do not have access to a privately owned or publicly managed fish cleaning station on either the north or south side of Noyo Harbor. The CPFV, or charter vessels operating out of Noyo Harbor that draw and generate substantial tourism dollars to the area would benefit greatly from a station where their daily catches can be cleaned. A fish cleaning facility is a common amenity offered in harbors such as Noyo with active charter and recreational fishing operations.



Existing North Side Fish Cleaning Station

TABLE 7.6 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —INSTALL FISH CLEANING STATION

Environmental	Social	Economic
Fish cleaning stations help avoid illicit fish waste product disposal in the river, and may deter landings in excess of bag limits	A fish cleaning station on the south side of the harbor would benefit recreational fishermen and CPFV operators and make their experience in the harbor more memorable. Social interaction often occurs on and around marine infrastructure and services. A fish cleaning station also provides a location for educational materials.	A fish cleaning station is an amenity that supports recreational fishing which, in turn, contributes to a healthy economy in the Harbor and the wider community.

7. UPDATE THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (LCP)

Updating of the Mendocino County Local Coastal Program (LCP) to address current conditions in Noyo Harbor received the seventh highest amount of Harbor Dollars. Most of Noyo Harbor is under the jurisdiction of Mendocino County is within the Fishing Village (FV) zoning district as defined by the Mendocino County Local Coastal Program (LCP). Under the FV classification, principally permitted uses include fishing and boating uses, such as mooring, launching, storage, servicing, supply, construction and repair. While the FV district is primarily intended to protect and preserve Noyo Harbor for businesses and activities that are dependent upon the waterfront location, the FV district provides some leeway for visitor-serving facilities by designating conditional uses such as shops, bars and restaurants.

The interest behind an LCP update is to make it easier for businesses to locate, expand, or remain in the harbor and to lessen the restrictions on allowable uses imposed by the Fishing Village land use designation. Currently, only businesses that are deemed coastal dependent (fishing and boating uses; boat mooring, launching, storage, servicing, supply, construction and repair) are considered principally permitted uses. Uses that involve services that support tourism such as hotels, bars and restaurants can be developed as a conditional use and are subject to numerous restrictions.

To promote economic resilience and vitality, the District should encourage Mendocino County to amend the very restrictive zoning regulations in the LCP to streamline permitting processes in the FV district and to establish non-conforming use regulations that are more specifically tailored to the unique circumstances facing businesses in Noyo Harbor. A County-initiated LCP amendment is the most straight-forward approach. Alternatively, the District could initiate an LCP amendment and submit it to the County for approval and processing through the California Coastal Commission's certification process.

TABLE 7.7 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —UPDATE THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

Environmental	Social	Economic
The Local Coastal Program includes many policies to ensure that new development is protective of coastal resources.	Amending the LCP to make it easier for businesses to thrive in Noyo Harbor would benefit all working waterfront stakeholders.	Revised regulations to streamline permit processing and support coastal-dependent and visitor-serving businesses would help to support and sustain businesses in the harbor.

8. ENCOURAGE MORE FISH-BUYERS, RECEIVERS, PROCESSORS

While the Harbor District has no direct control over the number of fish buyers operating in Noyo Harbor, the encouragement of more fish buyers by the Noyo Harbor District ranked eighth highest in expenditure of Harbor Dollars. Declines in landings of groundfish species, salmon, and red sea urchin are, in part, linked to reduced numbers of receiver/processors who serve as the market for fish brought to port by commercial fishermen.

The District could have a role by designating certain sites where mobile and seasonal fish buyers could locate. While this recommendation is primarily to attract commercial buyers, it could result in more local and visitor attraction to on vessel sales, where warranted by Harbor regulations. This could include seasonal signage at access locations, such as a 'Catch For Sale' Boards at prominent locations in the Harbor directing buyers to certain docks and vessels.



TABLE 7.8 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —ENCOURAGE MORE FISH BUYERS, RECEIVERS, PROCESSORS

Environmental	Social	Economic
Aggregated sales to specialty and seasonal buyers could reduce travel and associated fuel costs. Direct purchases from fishermen shortens the chain of custody, reduces the risk of seafood fraud, and may reduce reliance on seafood imports from areas with lower environmental standards. Reduced carbon footprint from vessels steaming to more distant ports to sell product.	Direct vendor to consumer sales increases social interactions with commercial fishermen. Buying directly from fishermen ties into the “foodie” movement that is driving demand for a traceable product, Noyo could be a distinguished port for its role in seafood traceability. Increased landings go to support surrounding infrastructure & services needed for a working waterfront.	Increased local sales, especially direct to consumers and direct to restaurants, provide an opportunity for the commercial fleet to vertically integrate and increase revenues with a premium ex-vessel price. More markets mean more jobs. Opportunity for job sharing of employees between buyers/processors.

9. ESTABLISH SHORESIDE GEAR STORAGE AND REPAIR SITES

The ninth largest expenditure of Harbor Dollars was for the provision of more shoreside gear storage and repair sites. The availability of gear storage and repair sites is a particular concern for commercial fishermen, and there is potential benefit for CPFV operators and sport fishermen as well. It was repeatedly noted that the lack of such facilities in Noyo Harbor complicates commercial fishing operations.

The Harbor District should work with the fishing industry to evaluate locations on District property in the south harbor where uses for temporary gear storage and gear repair have historically occurred, and assess the feasibility of dedicating space for such uses. District parking lots, which are underutilized for much of the year could fill the need, provide a valuable service, and potentially serve as an additional District revenue source during the winter months. The District may want to also evaluate whether some of its vacant parcels could be improved, if needed, for dry storage and gear repair. Ideally, a District-owned facility would be fenced with a secure gate. Service equipment including a mobile hoist and a forklift (along with a part-time operator) would be of great benefit.



Crab Pots

TABLE 7.9 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS —ESTABLISH SHORESIDE GEAR STORAGE AND REPAIR SITE

Environmental	Social	Economic
Greater access to shoreside facilities for vessel maintenance and gear repair can reduce potential for spills and leaks, thus protecting sensitive coastal habitat.	Convenient and secure dry storage and gear repair benefits commercial fisherman as well as other user groups: recreational and pleasure craft owners, etc. Improved relationships between District and user groups by working together to solve infrastructure needs.	Potential revenue stream for District and increased demand for associated services (hardware, mechanics, general supplies, services sought by visiting boat owners). Preventative and routine mending and repair of gear is necessary to reduce unwanted and unexpected costs.

10. IMPROVE HOIST AND LOADING/OFF-LOADING FACILITIES

The 10th largest expenditure of Harbor Dollars was for improved hoist and associated loading/off-loading facilities. The District's High Dock near the marina entrance has been inaccessible for over two years due to its deteriorated condition and length of time needed to obtain the required permits and proposals. The lack of a functional High Dock has presented a significant hardship to vessels needing to access a public hoist for loading and off-loading.

When operational, the High Dock is used to load and unload large and heavy equipment and fishing gear (such as nets, doors, pots/traps, polls, anchor, and life rafts) to and from commercial fishing vessels, and also for sport and transient vessels. Historically, the High Dock has served as a means for Noyo Harbor to distinguish itself as a robust and functional fishing port enabling numerous user groups to switch gear types easily and inexpensively.

Gear switching allows vessel operators to participate in multiple and often profitable fisheries throughout the year, creating year-round landings and port activities.

The Harbor District has completed the permitting process for repairs to the High Dock facility and expects to complete the project within the coming year. The High Dock also has been used in the past as an event destination, bringing in visitors and local community members to the harbor. Because the port is out of the way for many locals in Fort Bragg and beyond, it is often overlooked, creating a disconnect between residents and the District. Social events in Noyo Harbor serve an essential role in relationship building, education, and creating a deeper understanding of the commercial and recreational fishing industry in Fort Bragg - as well as creating a revenue source for the District.



High Dock

TABLE 7.10 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS—IMPROVE HOIST AND LOADING / OFF-LOADING FACILITIES


Environmental	Social	Economic
The High Dock project will use decking materials that are protective of water quality and avoids impacts to the river and associated environmental resources. The hoist allows for the safe transport of materials over the water.	Improved facilities to support the fishing industry create security and stability, incentivize further investments and reduce the risk of further consolidation and loss of the historical commercial fishing fleet	The improved High Dock will result in more efficient loading/off-loading operations for vessels and represents a renewed revenue stream for the District.

11. ENCOURAGE BOATYARD/MARINE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

The 11th largest expenditure of Harbor Dollars was for the District to find ways to encourage more boatyard/marine services and supplies. As recently as ten years ago, Noyo Harbor had three chandleries serving the commercial and recreational fleets. It now has none.

Marine services and supplies are typically private sector operations and the fact that none presently operate in Noyo Harbor is indicative of the shrinking of the local fishing fleet, and is linked to the broader systemic loss of basic port infrastructure and marine services needed to support a fishing community in Noyo Harbor. While the expansion of internet purchasing and express delivery services plays an important role, other market trends have also come into play affecting marine suppliers in Noyo Harbor. The feasibility of any commercial enterprise is dictated primarily by the market for its goods and/or services.

Notwithstanding the decline in ship chandlery services in Noyo Harbor, it should be noted that a diversified retailer in Fort Bragg has increased its inventory of commercial and recreational fishing supplies. The Englund Marine and Industrial Supply location in Eureka, California (135-mile drive from Noyo Harbor) has been cited as a primary destination for boatyard and marine supplies or services for fishermen in Noyo Harbor. This type of reliance on a distant chandlery and/or online purchasing creates additional costs and delays for the vessel operators awaiting equipment, parts or repairs and adds to their cost whether through deliveries or personal travel time and expense.



The District could include retail uses as principally permitted in the Fishing Village designation, as part of the Local Coastal Program Amendment in recommendation 7. Reduced permitting costs would be investment incentive and reduce development time.

TABLE 7.11 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS—ENCOURAGE BOATYARD / MARINE SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

Environmental	Social	Economic
More convenient access to necessary supplies and services can reduce the need for travel and associated vehicle emissions.	Additional ship chandlery could help keep more fishing-related expenditures in Noyo Harbor and provide a venue for interactions among various segments of the fishing and boating community.	Improved access to marine supply/services businesses would have a direct economic benefit to the commercial and recreational fleets. It would also support transient vessels and may help attract more activity to Noyo Harbor.

12. IMPROVE SIDEWALKS, TRAILS AND BICYCLE LANES

Stakeholders spent the 12th largest amount of Harbor Dollars on improving sidewalks, trails, and bicycle lanes. As noted elsewhere in this document, North Harbor Drive lacks an adequate shoulder, is narrow, has a sharp blind turn, lacks sidewalks, and so is widely considered

FIGURE 7.1 —ALIGNMENT OPTIONS FOR MULTI-USE TRAIL FROM NOYO HEADLANDS PARK TO NORTH HARBOR



unsafe for walkers and bikers travelling between Fort Bragg and Noyo Harbor. In addition, North Harbor Drive within the waterfront areas of the Harbor lacks sidewalks, curbs, gutters, shoulders, drainage facilities and parking controls. The edges of the roadway are rutted and potholed, further undermining its suitability for parking, walking or biking.

Unsafe conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists also exist along North Harbor Drive within the lower harbor area. The safety challenges facing pedestrians and bicyclists seeking to access the north side of Noyo Harbor diminishes the visitor experience.

The District should work to form relationships with key individuals in the City of Fort Bragg and Mendocino County to identify improvements to facilitate safe pedestrian and bicycle access into the north harbor area, possibly via an extension of Noyo Headlands Park's multi-use pathway. Pedestrian and bicycle access to the harbor could be established along the alignment of the old roadbed which extends from the park to the dredge spoils site.

TABLE 7.12 SUSTAINABILITY BENEFITS—IMPROVE SIDEWALKS, TRAILS AND BICYCLE LANES

Environmental	Social	Economic
Providing facilities for bicycles and pedestrians can reduce automobile traffic and associated vehicle emissions.	Walking and biking can be social activities that bring together people in the community. Also, it creates additional activities for families to spend time together for recreation and exercise	Providing multiple means of access and facilitating walking and biking can increase activity and result in higher sales at local businesses.

APPENDIX J

CONSTRAINED AND UNCONSTRAINED PROJECT LISTS

CONSTRAINED & UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS

The following tables contain a list of constrained projects expected to be completed in the short-term (0-10 years), and a list of unconstrained projects expected to be completed in the long-term (10-20 years).

CONSTRAINED PROJECTS

Project	Type	Cost. Est.
Point Arena		
Sidewalk Repair & Replacement Program	Ped	
Riverside Drive & Center Street Renovation	Reconstruction	\$275,000
Mill Street Reconstruction, Sidewalk, Drainage, and Asphalt Replacement	Reconstruction	\$1,520,000
Point Arena – Local Street Assessment and Shared Roadway Agreement	Local Street Assessment	\$53,750
Sidewalk repair, replacement, and new sidewalk program	Sidewalk Repair & Replacement	TBD
Fort Bragg		
Fort Bragg Sidewalk Infill (completion)	Bike/Ped	
So. Main St. Bike & Ped Improvements	Bike & Ped	\$1,485,000
Street Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation	\$1,923,000
Maple St. SD & Alley Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation	\$1,750,000
County		
Countywide – 2016-17 Storm Damage Repair, 5 sites	Storm Damage Repairs	\$1.9 million
Countywide – 2017 Fire Damage Restoration, 3 sites	Fire Damage Restoration	\$0.8 million
Countywide – 2019 Storm Damage Repairs, 7 sites	Storm Damage Repairs	\$4.7 million
Countywide – Annual Corrective Maintenance Preservation Program	Maintenance	\$5.5 million/yr.
Eureka Hill Road, MP 4.92 – Garcia River Bridge	Seismic Retrofit Bridge	\$3.2 million
North State Street, MP 1.06 – Ackerman Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$13.1 million
Lambert Lane, MP 0.07 – Robinson Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$3.9 million
Philo Greenwood Rd MP 17.33 – Navarro River Bridge	Rehabilitate Bridge	\$13.4 million
Hill Road, MP 2.05 – Mill Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$2.7 million
Wilderness Lodge Rd, MP 0.72 – Dutch Charlie Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$2.4 million
Briceland Road, MP 0.63 – Mattole River Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$2.2 million
Usal Road, MP 5.93 – Usal Creek Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$5.5 million
Reynolds Highway, MP 0.09 – Outlet Creek (Barney Schow) Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$4.9 million
East Side Potter Valley Road Reconstruction & Widening, Ph. 1	Road Widening and Reconstruction	\$4 million
Ukiah		
Downtown Streetscape Project, Phase II – State Street from Norton to Henry and Mill to Gobbi	Ped	
Gobbi @ S. Dora Intersection Improvements	Ped	
Great Redwood Trail (NWP Rail Trail), Ph. IV	Multi-use	
Orr Creek Trail Feasibility Study	Multi--use	
Dora Street – from Mill St. to Grove St.	Replace water & sewer mains	\$2,700,000
E. Clay Street – from Main St. to Railroad Crossing	Reconstruction	\$750,000
Orr Street Bridge at Orr Creek	Improve bridge	\$544,438
Low Gap Road & N. Bush Street	Roundabout	\$896,000
E. Gobbi Street & Main St.	Traffic Signal	\$818,000
Main Street – from Gobbi St. to Mill St.	Reconstruction	\$500,000
Clara Avenue – from State St. to Orchard Ave.	Reconstruction	\$2,000,000
Leslie Street – from Gobbi St. to Perkins St.	Rehabilitation	\$1,500,000

Gobbi St/Waugh Ln Traffic Signal	Install traffic signal at Gobbi St/Waugh Ln intersection	\$532,000
Willits		
Blosser Lane Improvements	Ped	
Various Pedestrian Improvements	Ped	
Coast Street Sidewalks	Ped/Bike (III)	
Locust Street Improvements	Ped/Bike (III)	
Railroad Avenue	Ped/Bike (III)	
Baechtel/ E. Hill Road	Rehabilitation, sidewalks	\$2,000,000
Railroad Avenue	Rehabilitation, sidewalks, drainage	\$2,000,000
Snider Park Vicinity	Rehabilitation, sidewalks, drainage	\$1,500,000
Blosser Lane	Rehabilitation, sidewalk, drainage	\$1,500,000
West Mendocino Ave.	Rehabilitation, sidewalks, drainage, utilities	\$2,000,000
Adjacent to Railroad Tracks Between E. Commercial St. & E. Hill Road(1.6 mi trail)	Class I bike & ped trail	\$6,172,000
State Highways		
Hopland US 101 ADA Project	Ped/Other	
Westport Bike lanes (project development)	Bike	
Laytonville Pedestrian Safety Improvements	Ped	
Blosser Lane/SR 20 Intersection Improvements	Ped	
Gualala Downtown Non-Motorized Transportation & Streetscape	Ped/Bike (II)	
SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail	Multi-use	

UNCONSTRAINED PROJECTS

Project	Type	Cost. Est.
Point Arena		
Lake Street Sidewalks	Ped	
Multi-use Trail from Cove (Harper's Cut-Off Trail) – between School St. and Port Road	Multi-use trail	\$127,420
Improve access to cove and pier	Roadway Access	
Roundabout at Hwy 1 and Lake Street	Roundabout	
Windy Hollow Road	Reconstruction	TBD
Fort Bragg		
Redwood Ave Coastal Trail Linkage – from Alder St. trailhead to Redwood Ave.	Multi-use trail	\$368,759
Noyo Harbor Access	Multi-use	
Development of parallel facility to SR 1	Roadway Construction	
Provide turnarounds or connect dead-end streets to improve circulation	Circulation Improvements	
Noyo Harbor Access – Old Mill Road – link to Coastal Trail	Multi-use trail	\$660,000
Noyo Harbor Emergency Access Route	Roadway Construction	
Noyo Harbor Multi-modal Improvements	Multi-modal improvements	
County		
Brush Street Walking & Biking Facilities	Bike/Ped/Multi-use	
Safe Routes to School Covelo	Ped	
Safe Routes to School Laytonville	Ped	
Anderson Valley Way Class III Bike route/Recreational Trail	Bike/Multi-use	
North State Street Intersection & Interchange Improvements, Ph. 1 - Two Roundabout at (1) KUKI Lane,	Roundabouts & Roadway Realignment	\$10.9 million

and (2) southbound 101 interchange, including realignment of Lover		
Brooktrails to Willits – Multi-Use Trail	Multi-use trail	Unknown
Rail Trail – Brush Street to Lake Mendocino Drive, along NWP rail line	Multi-use Trail	\$2,548,670
Windy Hollow Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge over Garcia River – Point Arena area	Bike & ped bridge	unknown
North State Street Intersection & Interchange Improvements, Ph. II – 2 roundabouts	Roundabouts	
East Side Potter Valley Road, Ph, II – MP 2.61 – MP 5.38	Reconstruction	
Orchard Avenue Extension – from Brush St, approx. 2.4 miles north	Roadway Extension	
Emergency Evacuation Routes – in various areas with “one way in, and one way out”	Evacuation Routes	
Brooktrails Second Access – provide alternative to only access road, Sherwood Road	Roadway Construction	\$22,000,000
SR 1/Garcia River/Windy Hollow Road Bridge Replacement	Bridge Replacement	\$35,000,000
Hearst Willits Road, MP 5.40 – Eel River Bridge	Replace Bridge	\$7.3 million
Ukiah		
E. Perkins Street – add storm drain, widen intersection, add East bound through lane	Intersection Improvements	\$2,277,000
Walking trail around Todd Grove Park	Walking path	\$400,000
Orr Creek Trail design & construction – along Orr Creek from Low Gap Park to Ukiah Sports Complex	Multi-use trail	TBD
Pomolita Middle School Level 3 Access Improvements – Cypress Ave., Spring St. & Hazel Ave.	ADA curb ramps & sidewalk gaps	\$650,000
Willits		
Blosser Lane/Hwy 20/Coast Street - Partner with Caltrans to enhance non-vehicular safety	Intersection Safety (Non-vehicular)	\$5,000,000 – \$6,000,000
Pedestrian crossing at Walnut & Main Street	Pedestrian crossing	Unknown
Willits Main Street Corridor Enhancement Plan projects - So. Main Street/Hwy 20	Sidewalk widening, bulb-outs, street plantings furniture, crosswalks, & refuge islands	Unknown
Brown’s Corner Roundabout/Signal – Baechtel Rd. and Main St/Hwy 20	Roundabout or signal	Unknown
East Valley Street Bridge Replacement	Bridge Replacement	
Railroad Avenue Extension – Extend south to Shell Lane or Baechtel Road	Roadway Extension	
East Hill Road	Ped	
Harrah’s Manor Pedestrian Improvements	Ped	
Shell Lane Improvements	Ped/Bike	
Coast Street	Rehabilitation, sidewalks, drainage, utilities	\$2,000,000
Sherwood Road	Rehabilitation, drainage	\$1,000,000
State Highways		
Route 1 Improvements – Pacific Coast Bike Route, various locations	Shoulder improvements	Unknown
Westport Bike lanes (construction) along 0.67 mile of SR 1, between PM 77.48 and 78.15.	Class II bike lanes	\$990,000
Roundabout/signal at SR 20 and Blosser Lane in Willits Area	Roundabout or signal	Unknown
US 101 – Ukiah Area Interchanges	Interchange Improvements	
US 101 (13.0/17.6) – North Hopland	Safety & Operational Improvements	
SR 1 (62.1/64.1) from Pudding Creek to 0.1 mile south of Odom Lane – Construct two-way left turn lane	Left Turn Lane	

Safe Routes to School Anderson Valley – Parallel to SR 128 with connection to school	Multi-use trail	Unknown
SR 20/So. Main Street, Willits -	Sidewalk widening, bulb-outs, street plantings & furniture, crosswalks, & refuge islands	
SR 222 Talmage Road – from City of Ukiah to Old River Road	Roadway & Non-Motorized Improvements	
Mackerricher State Park Haul Road Repair & Enhancement	Multi-use	

APPENDIX K

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT & RELATED MATERIAL

APPENDIX K

CEQA Document- Initial Study/Negative Declaration

- DATE:** October 28, 2021
- PROJECT TITLE:** 2022 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan
- LEAD AGENCY:** Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG)
525 South Main Street, Suite G
Ukiah, CA 95482
- CONTACT PERSON:** Nephele Barrett, MCOG Executive Director, 707-463-1859
James Sookne, Program Manager, MCOG, 707-234-3434
- PROJECT LOCATION:** The Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan covers the entire County-wide area, including the incorporated cities of Fort Bragg, Point Arena, Ukiah, and Willits.
- PROJECT SPONSOR:** Mendocino Council of Governments
525 South Main Street, Suite G
Ukiah, CA 95482
- PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan (RTP/ATP) is a transportation planning document prepared by the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG). 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/ATP 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. While it is intended to guide transportation decision making over a 20-year planning horizon, it does not necessarily require that projects recommended in the document become implemented. Such decisions are instead made by jurisdictional authorities with discretionary control over subject facilities such as Caltrans, local streets and roads departments, or regional tribal leaders, based on a variety of factors (e.g. budgetary constraints, local priorities, environmental considerations, etc.) specific to local or regional needs.
- 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 alleys, 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/ATP will be undertaken by individual agencies within the region (e.g. Caltrans, public works, tribal authorities, 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/ATP.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION: California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area were notified at the earliest stages of the RTP/ATP'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.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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).

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. 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.

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: This section assesses the potential environmental impacts which may result from the project. Questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and answers are provided based on analysis undertaken.

<u>I. AESTHETICS.</u> Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through d) No Impact- The Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan (RTP/ATP) 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/ATP involving improvements or maintenance of the system. Most of the projects included in the draft RTP/ATP are relatively minor roadway or bicycle/pedestrian improvement projects that would not adversely affect views once construction is complete. 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.

<u>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through e) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact- The RTP/ATP 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.

<u>III. AIR QUALITY.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through d) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact- Adoption of the RTP/ATP 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 Mendocino County Air Basin has been designated as an “attainment” area with respect to each of the (10) State and (6) national area criteria pollutants including ozone, suspended particulate matter (PM10), fine suspended particulate matter (PM2.5), carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, sulfates, lead, hydrogen sulfide 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 affect 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, traffic related congestion and vehicle miles traveled, and support increased utilization of zero emission vehicles, to the overall benefit of local and regional air quality.

<u>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through f) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact- The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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.

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through c) Less Than Significant Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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 Mendocino County region is pre-existing with many of the projects included in the RTP/ATP 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 potential impacts to historical, archaeological resources, or disturbance of human remains outside of formal cemeteries, at the time of design.

<u>VI. ENERGY.</u> Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact- The RTP/ATP 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/ATP will not result in specific energy related impacts, 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/ATP 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 potential impacts resulting from wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, at the time of design.

<u>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through f) Less Than Significant Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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 related to exposure to fault ruptures, ground shaking, slides, erosion or soils capability, or potential impacts to unique paleontological resources, sites, or unique geologic features, at the time of design.

<u>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

		Incorporated		
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact – Certain projects included within the RTP/ATP may involve roadway capacity increases, although, given the small and rural nature of the region, they are usually intended more for safety or multi-modal considerations and are unlikely to lead to additional automobile traffic. 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. The Goals, Objectives, Policies section of the RTP/ATP 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.

<u>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through g) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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.

<u>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u> 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 or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through e) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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, additional surface or polluted runoff, increases in pollutant discharges, or additions to potential flood hazards, at the time of design.

<u>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) No Impact - Adoption of the RTP/ATP would not conflict with existing general, area or specific plans or zoning ordinances within the region. The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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, tribal lands, 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.

<u>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.</u> 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) No Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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.

<u>XIII. NOISE.</u> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

a) through c) Less Than Significant Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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 (e.g. 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.

<u>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u> 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact – Adoption of the RTP/ATP will not result in population growth or housing displacement. Given the small populations (Countywide estimated to be 86,749 as of 2019) 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 current overall lack of development pressure in the area would not be affected by implementing projects found within the RTP/ATP. 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.

<u>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	------------------

a) 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) No Impact – Adoption of the RTP/ATP 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/ATP, 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.

<u>XVI. RECREATION.</u>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) and b) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact – The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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. 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.

<u>XVII. TRANSPORTATION.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) through d) **Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact** – Adoption of the RTP/ATP 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.

<u>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) Less Than Significant Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP will not result in specific impacts to tribal cultural 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/ATP 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 potential impacts to historical resources or resources potentially significant to one or more of the region’s Native American tribes, at the time of design.

<u>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a through e) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact – The RTP/ATP 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/ATP will not result in impacts to utilities and service systems, 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/ATP 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 potential impacts related to stormwater drainage, electric power lines, or natural gas or telecommunications infrastructure, at the time of design.

<u>XX. WILDFIRE.</u> If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a through d) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact – The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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 transportation projects that may that may exacerbate fire risk, or expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes, at the time of design.

<u>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) through c) Less than Significant Impact/No Impact - The RTP/ATP 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/ATP 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/ATP 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 and/or cumulative impacts involving biological, historical, archaeological or other resources, at the time of design.

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.

10/28/2021

Date

Signature



Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
 For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH #

Project Title: _____
 Lead Agency: _____ Contact Person: _____
 Mailing Address: _____ Phone: _____
 City: _____ Zip: _____ County: _____

Project Location: County: _____ City/Nearest Community: _____
 Cross Streets: _____ Zip Code: _____
 Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): _____° _____' _____" N / _____° _____' _____" W Total Acres: _____
 Assessor's Parcel No.: _____ Section: _____ Twp.: _____ Range: _____ Base: _____
 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: _____ Waterways: _____
 Airports: _____ Railways: _____ Schools: _____

Document Type:

CEQA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOP	<input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR	NEPA: <input type="checkbox"/> NOI	Other: <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document
<input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons	<input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR	<input type="checkbox"/> EA	<input type="checkbox"/> Final Document
<input type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec	(Prior SCH No.) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Mit Neg Dec	Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> FONSI	_____

Local Action Type:

<input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Rezone	<input type="checkbox"/> Annexation
<input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Prezone	<input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment
<input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element	<input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit
<input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Development Type:

<input type="checkbox"/> Residential: Units _____ Acres _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation: Type _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Mining: Mineral _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Power: Type _____ MW _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment: Type _____ MGD _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Educational: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste: Type _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Recreational: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____	

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetic/Visual	<input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation/Parks	<input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land	<input type="checkbox"/> Flood Plain/Flooding	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools/Universities	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Forest Land/Fire Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/> Septic Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Supply/Groundwater
<input type="checkbox"/> Archeological/Historical	<input type="checkbox"/> Geologic/Seismic	<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland/Riparian
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Minerals	<input type="checkbox"/> Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading	<input type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducement
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use
<input type="checkbox"/> Drainage/Absorption	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing Balance	<input type="checkbox"/> Toxic/Hazardous	<input type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic/Jobs	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic/Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with an "X".
If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

<input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation
<input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction
<input type="checkbox"/> California Emergency Management Agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol	<input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission
<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	<input type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> Central Valley Flood Protection Board	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board	<input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy
<input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission
<input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
<input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights
<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of
<input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of	
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission	

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date _____ Ending Date _____

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____	Applicant: _____
Address: _____	Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: _____
Contact: _____	Phone: _____
Phone: _____	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative: _____ Date: _____

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

November 1, 2021

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING AND AVAILABILITY
OF DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) will meet on Monday, December 6, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as possible, to conduct a public hearing on the following project and the Draft Negative Declaration:

Project Title: 2022 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan

Project Description: The Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan (RTP/ATP) is a transportation planning document prepared by MCOG which identifies regional transportation goals, policies and objectives for all modes of travel, including local streets and roads, State highways, public transit, bicycle, pedestrian, aviation, rail, and maritime. It assesses current transportation, identifies needs and problems, suggests actions to solve these problems and improve transportation, and considers funding options in relation to projects.

Project Location: All of Mendocino County, including the incorporated cities.

Environmental Determination: MCOG has prepared a Draft Negative Declaration for the above plan (no significant environmental impacts are anticipated)

Review Period: The public review period shall begin on November 6, 2021, and end on December 6, 2021.

The RTP/ATP and Draft Negative Declaration may be reviewed at the MCOG offices, 525 S. Main St, Ste. B, Ukiah, CA, or online at the following website:

<http://www.mendocinocog.org/>

Written comments on the RTP/ATP and/or the Draft Negative Declaration should be submitted to the Mendocino Council of Governments no later than December 5, 2021. Written comments should be submitted to the Mendocino Council of Governments at 525 S. Main Street, Ste. G, Ukiah, CA 95482, or by email to lellard@dcbteam.net. Comments may also be presented at the public hearing. Pursuant to AB 361, MCOG continues to conduct their meetings virtually. Virtual meeting information, and in-person locations if available, will be posted to MCOG's website under the "meetings" tab.

For additional information, please contact Loretta Ellard at MCOG, 707-234-3434.

NEPHELE BARRETT, Executive Director



MENDOCINO
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B
(707) 463-1859
Transportation Planning: Suite G
(707) 234-3434

November 1, 2021

RE: Notification of Consultation Opportunity for the Draft 2022 Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan

Dear Tribal Representative,

The Mendocino County Regional Transportation Plan and Active Transportation Plan (RTP/ATP) is the region's long-term planning document covering a 20-year time span intended to promote a safe and efficient transportation system for the movement of people and goods throughout the region. The purpose of the plan is to identify transportation needs and priority projects in all modes of transportation including streets, highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, aviation and transit. Updated every four years, the RTP/ATP covers present and future transportation needs, deficiencies and constraints, as well as providing estimates of available funding for future transportation projects in the region.

A draft of the 2022 RTP/ATP is now complete and available for review. It can be found online at the following address- <https://www.mendocinocog.org/draft-2022-regional-transportation-plan>.

Comments will be accepted between now and the anticipated date of adoption (December 6, 2021) at a public meeting before the Mendocino Council of Governments Board. Please address comments to Loretta Ellard, Senior Transportation Planner, via email (lellard@dbcteam.net), or by mail to our physical address: Mendocino Council of Governments, 525 South Main Street, Ste. B, Ukiah, CA 95482.

If your Tribe is interested in an individual consultation, please contact us in writing to schedule within the next 30 days, pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1 (b).

Respectfully,

James Sookne
Program Manager

APPENDIX L

ACCIDENT DATA

Ukiah

Total Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:
Fatal	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	0.85%
Severe Injury	3	4	7	4	3	5	9	6	5	7	53	11.23%
Other Visible Injury	8	13	11	17	14	15	23	17	16	8	142	30.08%
Complaint of Pain	25	36	24	20	31	35	30	28	23	21	273	57.84%
Total:	36	54	42	42	48	55	62	53	44	36	472	100.00%

Bicycle Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	5.41%	50.00%
Severe Injury	0	0	3	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	10	27.03%	18.87%
Other Visible Injury	1	0	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	14	37.84%	9.86%
Complaint of Pain	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	3	0	1	11	29.73%	4.03%
Total:	2	3	4	5	3	6	5	6	1	2	37	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	5.56%	5.56%	9.52%	11.90%	6.25%	10.91%	8.06%	11.32%	2.27%	5.56%	7.84%		

Pedestrian Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.15%	25.00%
Severe Injury	0	1	3	0	2	3	2	3	1	2	17	19.54%	32.08%
Other Visible Injury	4	4	2	5	5	2	4	6	3	1	36	41.38%	25.35%
Complaint of Pain	5	3	1	3	3	5	2	6	2	3	33	37.93%	12.09%
Total:	9	8	6	8	10	10	8	16	6	6	87	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	25.00%	14.81%	14.29%	19.05%	20.83%	18.18%	12.90%	30.19%	13.64%	16.67%	18.43%		

Willits

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Total Collisions</u>										Total:	%:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
Fatal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.45%
Severe Injury	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	15.94%
Other Visible Injury	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	13	18.84%
Complaint of Pain	4	5	6	4	11	7	1	1	4	1	44	63.77%
Total:	8	6	6	6	15	8	3	4	8	5	69	100.00%

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Bicycle Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Severe Injury	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.33%	9.09%
Other Visible Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	33.33%	7.69%
Complaint of Pain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	33.33%	2.27%
Total:	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.67%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	12.50%	0.00%	4.35%		

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Pedestrian Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.56%	100.00%
Severe Injury	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	16.67%	27.27%
Other Visible Injury	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	5	27.78%	38.46%
Complaint of Pain	1	2	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	9	50.00%	20.45%
Total:	4	2	0	1	6	2	1	0	2	0	18	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	50.00%	33.33%	0.00%	16.67%	40.00%	25.00%	33.33%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	26.09%		

Fort Bragg

Total Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:
Fatal	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1.63%
Severe Injury	3	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	5	2	16	8.70%
Other Visible Injury	6	6	4	3	3	3	7	4	7	9	52	28.26%
Complaint of Pain	9	12	11	19	13	8	7	8	15	11	113	61.41%
Total:	18	20	16	23	16	13	14	14	28	22	184	100.00%

Bicycle Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Severe Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Other Visible Injury	1	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	41.18%	13.46%
Complaint of Pain	0	0	1	3	1	1	1	0	1	2	10	58.82%	8.85%
Total:	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	17	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	5.56%	10.00%	18.75%	13.04%	12.50%	7.69%	7.14%	7.14%	3.57%	9.09%	9.24%		

Pedestrian Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	8.11%	100.00%
Severe Injury	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	13.51%	31.25%
Other Visible Injury	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	12	32.43%	23.08%
Complaint of Pain	1	0	1	4	3	2	2	1	3	0	17	45.95%	15.04%
Total:	3	4	1	6	4	5	4	3	5	2	37	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	16.67%	20.00%	6.25%	26.09%	25.00%	38.46%	28.57%	21.43%	17.86%	9.09%	20.11%		

Point Arena

Total Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Severe Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	50.00%
Other Visible Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Complaint of Pain	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50.00%
Total:	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	100.00%

Bicycle Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Severe Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Other Visible Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Complaint of Pain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
% of Total Collisions:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%		

Pedestrian Collisions

<u>Collision Severity</u>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Severe Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Other Visible Injury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Complaint of Pain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
% of Total Collisions:	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%		

Unincorporated County (excluding State highways)

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Total Collisions</u>										Total:	%:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
Fatal	5	3	6	1	2	4	5	5	5	5	41	3.63%
Severe Injury	17	19	21	18	23	23	24	27	28	23	223	19.72%
Other Visible Injury	59	57	46	45	56	49	55	45	44	26	482	42.62%
Complaint of Pain	37	57	38	33	50	46	36	26	22	40	385	34.04%
Total:	118	136	111	97	131	122	120	103	99	94	1131	100.00%

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Bicycle Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.50%	2.44%
Severe Injury	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	13	32.50%	5.83%
Other Visible Injury	3	4	3	1	2	0	4	1	0	1	19	47.50%	3.94%
Complaint of Pain	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	17.50%	1.82%
Total:	5	10	5	2	5	1	7	2	2	1	40	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	4.24%	7.35%	4.50%	2.06%	3.82%	0.82%	5.83%	1.94%	2.02%	1.06%	3.54%		

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Pedestrian Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	11.11%	9.76%
Severe Injury	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	2	5	1	15	41.67%	6.73%
Other Visible Injury	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	16.67%	1.24%
Complaint of Pain	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	2	1	11	30.56%	2.86%
Total:	3	0	5	4	3	4	5	2	7	3	36	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	2.54%	0.00%	4.50%	4.12%	2.29%	3.28%	4.17%	1.94%	7.07%	3.19%	3.18%		

Unincorporated County (State highways only)

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Total Collisions</u>										Total:	%:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
Fatal	11	14	9	14	7	20	22	23	15	16	151	6.22%
Severe Injury	37	40	33	27	49	49	66	56	49	55	461	19.00%
Other Visible Injury	101	87	88	95	105	102	102	114	86	76	956	39.41%
Complaint of Pain	82	99	85	77	106	127	102	59	67	54	858	35.37%
Total:	231	240	215	213	267	298	292	252	217	201	2426	100.00%

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Bicycle Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2.50%	0.66%
Severe Injury	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	13	32.50%	2.82%
Other Visible Injury	3	4	3	1	2	0	4	1	0	1	19	47.50%	1.99%
Complaint of Pain	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	17.50%	0.82%
Total:	5	10	5	2	5	1	7	2	2	1	40	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	2.16%	4.17%	2.33%	0.94%	1.87%	0.34%	2.40%	0.79%	0.92%	0.50%	1.65%		

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Pedestrian Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	11.11%	2.65%
Severe Injury	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	2	5	1	15	41.67%	3.25%
Other Visible Injury	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	16.67%	0.63%
Complaint of Pain	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	0	2	1	11	30.56%	1.28%
Total:	3	0	5	4	3	4	5	2	7	3	36	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	1.30%	0.00%	2.33%	1.88%	1.12%	1.34%	1.71%	0.79%	3.23%	1.49%	1.48%		

County-Wide

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Total Collisions</u>										Total:	%:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
Fatal	17	19	15	16	9	24	27	31	21	21	200	4.67%
Severe Injury	61	65	62	51	78	79	99	91	89	90	765	17.86%
Other Visible Injury	176	163	149	161	179	170	189	183	155	120	1645	38.40%
Complaint of Pain	157	209	165	153	211	223	176	122	131	127	1674	39.08%
Total:	411	456	391	381	477	496	491	427	396	358	4284	100.00%

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Bicycle Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	2.92%	2.00%
Severe Injury	4	4	5	4	6	4	6	2	2	0	37	27.01%	4.84%
Other Visible Injury	8	10	9	3	6	3	11	6	1	3	60	43.80%	3.65%
Complaint of Pain	1	10	3	5	4	2	3	3	2	3	36	26.28%	2.15%
Total:	13	25	17	12	16	9	20	12	7	6	137	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	3.16%	5.48%	4.35%	3.15%	3.35%	1.81%	4.07%	2.81%	1.77%	1.68%	3.20%		

<u>Collision Severity</u>	<u>Pedestrian Collisions</u>										Total:	%:	% of Total Collisions:
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020			
Fatal	3	1	2	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	13	6.07%	6.50%
Severe Injury	2	2	9	3	3	9	4	7	12	4	55	25.70%	7.19%
Other Visible Injury	8	6	4	8	7	4	11	7	5	5	65	30.37%	3.95%
Complaint of Pain	9	5	2	12	14	12	6	7	9	5	81	37.85%	4.84%
Total:	22	14	17	23	26	25	23	23	27	14	214	100.00%	
% of Total Collisions:	5.35%	3.07%	4.35%	6.04%	5.45%	5.04%	4.68%	5.39%	6.82%	3.91%	5.00%		