



# CAT Plan Meeting Summary

District 1 TAG Meeting Minutes (all meetings held via Webex or Zoom)

**Del Norte: Tuesday, June 23 (2:00 – 3:00 p.m.)**

**Humboldt: Wednesday June 24, 2020 (1:00 – 2:30 p.m.)**

**Mendocino: Thursday June 25, 2020 (2:30 – 3:30 p.m.)**

**Lake: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 (10:30 – 11:30 a.m.)**

## 1. Welcome & Introductions:

<b>In Attendance</b>	
<p><b>Del Norte</b>            Rosanna Bower, County of Del Norte            Dave Gustafson, Resident/Member of cycling community            Tamera Leighton, DNLTC            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Humboldt</b>            Colin Fiske, CRTP            Marcella May, HCOAG            Hank Seemann, County of Humboldt            Emily Sinkhorn, RCAA            Christie Smith, HCOAG            Jesse Willor, City of Eureka            Patricia-Anne WinterSun, Humboldt Bay Bicycle Commuters' Association            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Brad Mettam, Caltrans District 1            Jesse Robertson, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>
<p><b>Lake</b>            Clarissa Kincy, Lake Links            Dana Lewis, People Services            Phil McGuire, Lake Links            John Speka, Lake APC            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Destiny Preston, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Mendocino</b>            Nephele Barrett, MCOG            Sonja Burgal, Walk &amp; Bike Mendocino            Wade Gray, Resident/Member of cycling community            Mo Mulheren, Ukiah City Council Member            Tina Tyler-O'Shea, Mendocino HHS            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Destiny Preston, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>

## **2. Public Engagement Plan (PEP) & Stakeholder List:**

Alexis went over attachments to invite/email. Requested TAG members please review and provide feedback on the Public Engagement Plan and Stakeholder List.

Alexis explained the Public Engagement Plan is a document that describes how we will get public input and incorporate them into CAT Plan outcomes. Requesting extra attention/feedback on the section regarding interviewing community-based organizations and how we will document conversations. Need to reach groups who have been underrepresented in past planning efforts, with a special emphasis on disadvantaged groups. Looking to build relationships while not putting an extra burden on leaders of these groups. Welcome any comments on entirety of document.

Alexis explained the stakeholder list is intended to be a companion with the Public Engagement Plan. This is our first look at groups to contact to reach Public Engagement Plan goals. Asked if there are any groups that need to be added, or groups who may be especially interested. Also asked if there are groups who TAG members have worked with before and if they are willing to make an introduction.

### **Del Norte**

TAG concerned about length of PEP document. Talked about the balance between providing clarity and transparency without overwhelming audience with too much information/losing public interest.

Add True North to stakeholder list. Review to make sure all tribes are included. TAG noted they will provide changes/additions.

### **Humboldt**

TAG members noted they like that table numbers were included from the census so they can be easily cross-referenced from the PEP. Also like the process graphic in Appendix B.

TAG members discussed how much back-and-forth is involved in the public participation process and highlighted the need for interactive communication. Discussed the use of Facebook as a method of two-way outreach and public comment, and they asked if it has been useful in past. Alexis explained that Caltrans District 1 Facebook page has lots of followers and she will check with the Caltrans Public Information Officer. Mentioned she is not sure if it has been used in this way before, but it has been used as a tool to share information. Alexis welcomed additional comments at any time.

TAG members discussed Appendix A and that there are additional plans that can be added. Caltrans staff will add planning grant plans and welcomed input on other plans to add.

TAG discussed concerns regarding the mapping survey not being used for prioritizing needs and the need for the public to be involved in prioritizing needs. TAG likes that the PEP discusses that Caltrans will provide feedback on how this input has been used during the process.

### **Lake**

Phil is retiring so Clarissa will take over review of these documents.

### **Mendocino**

A few tribal groups on the list were not recognized by the TAG and will be reviewed in more detail individually along with remainder of spreadsheet.

### **3. “Main Street” Areas and Intercommunity Connector:**

The CAT Plans use three land use context types to inform selection of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Alexis explained the three categories: urban, “main street” (when a highway or expressway goes through a town with lots of destinations and bike/pedestrian traffic) and rural. Some rural Caltrans districts are proposing an additional land use context type between “main street” and rural; Alexis called it “intercommunity connect” for the sake of conversation. The reason an additional category was proposed is that there is sometimes a need for some enhanced infrastructure—but less than main street treatments—on the edges of towns or between rural communities. The TAG agreed there should be a category between the rural and “main street” categories, where shoulders are not enough.

The TAG went through each county via Google Earth to identify “main street” areas and intercommunity connector areas. Kari noted each post mile in a spreadsheet as the TAG determined the begin/end of these areas. Alexis will look at existing documents for limits that need to be cross-referenced. Will also contact tribes to discuss areas of interest and need.

#### **Del Norte**

The TAG identified main street areas and recommended outreach to Tribes in their respective communities.

#### **Humboldt**

The TAG identified main street and connector areas, and recommended outreach to Tribes in their respective communities.

#### **Lake**

The TAG identified main street, connector, and alternate parallel route areas.

#### **Mendocino**

The TAG identified main street and connector areas, recommended checking existing plans for community limits, and recommended outreach to the Round Valley Tribe for Covelo community limits.

### **4. “Disadvantaged Community” definition:**

Alexis explained that each TAG will discuss and come to a consensus for the definition of “disadvantaged community” in their respective counties, and ultimately, these definitions will be combined to define “disadvantaged community” for District 1 as a whole. She went over definitions of disadvantage that have been used in the past and explained that the purpose of defining “disadvantaged community” is for use in the prioritization phase of plan development. “Equity” will be one factor in prioritization; the other three factors are safety, mobility, and preservation. Weights will be assigned to each factor in the prioritization phase. The definition needs to be something for which we can access geographic and quantitative data. Three sources of existing definitions were discussed (see below) and the TAG was asked to share if they know of others.

The TAG could recommend adopting one or a combination of the below measures of disadvantage or propose something not discussed below. Without a standard statewide definition, this is an opportunity to understand what “disadvantaged community” means in District 1.

District staff will be recommending one district-wide definition for the plan and will send this recommendation out to all the TAG groups for approval. Alexis invited everyone to share their thoughts and questions and asked if anyone could use additional information in order to make a recommendation. July 15 is proposed as a deadline for input, but this can be adjusted out if needed.

Here are the three sources of existing information described by Alexis:

- A. Toward an Active California - This is the statewide plan providing direction for preparing the District Active Transportation Plan. Though equity is a key goal in the plan, disadvantaged communities are identified only as including "low-income" and "communities of color." These terms are not defined and no thresholds are set. Implementation strategies in the plan also suggest the use of CalEnviroScreen.
- B. Active Transportation Program (ATP) - This is the primary source for dedicated funding for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in the state, and it is a highly-competitive grant program. Projects applying for funding receive points for serving disadvantaged communities. There are five ways an area can be identified as a disadvantaged community for scoring in the ATP.
  - i. Low-income: Defined as less than 80% of the statewide median household income (MHI) at the census tract or block group level. There are four income "severity" groupings used in ATP scoring (75%-80% of MHI, 70%-<75% of MHI, 65%-<70% of MHI, and <65%).
  - ii. CalEnviroScreen: An online mapping tool developed by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of the California Environmental Protection Agency. It identifies California communities by census tract that are disproportionately burdened by, and vulnerable to, multiple sources of pollution. For the ATP, disadvantage is defined as being above the 25% most disadvantaged tracts statewide. No census tracts in District 1 meets this criterion.
  - iii. National School Lunch Program: In the ATP, projects serving public schools--Safe Routes to School projects--can qualify as serving disadvantaged communities if 75% of more students at the qualifying school are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. When considering its use for the District Active Transportation Plan definition of disadvantage, one limitation is immediately evident: these data are based on enrollment boundary information which the District does not currently have and which may be difficult to obtain.
  - iv. Healthy Places Index: The Healthy Places Index is an online mapping tool developed by the Public Health Alliance of Southern California. It calculates health scores based on social determinants of health for a variety of geographies including census tracts. The ATP awards points for census tracts with healthy places percentile below 25.
  - v. Tribal lands: Projects within Federally-recognized tribal lands qualify as serving disadvantaged communities in the ATP.
- C. SB 127
  - a. Though vetoed, SB 127 proposed that priority "be given to communities that are most vulnerable to the inequities in the state's transportation system," which may be useful to consider.

- i. Low-income: Two definitions on low-income were proposed under SB 127. One matches the ATP – census tracts at less than 80% of the statewide MHI. The other uses the Department of Housing and Community Development's income limits, which are set for each county at the census tract level.
- ii. Low percentage of private vehicle access. This information is available at the block group and census tract level. SB 127 did not define "low percentage."
- iii. High percentage of persons who are disabled. This information is available at the census tract level. SB 127 did not define "high percentage."

### **Del Norte**

TAG noted a large number of people with disabilities and the importance of including this population in definition of "disadvantaged community." Income is a difficult measure because many households in the county are low income. Also discussed limitations of using geographical areas to designate disadvantaged communities because most measures (including disability or income) don't seem to be concentrated in particular locations in the county, or the existing data do not reflect actual conditions. Discussed concern/benefits of separating out areas not to be included in disadvantaged designation since much of the County can be considered disadvantaged and every location needs improvements. Alexis emphasized the purpose of the designation will be to assist in prioritization; if disadvantage is consistent throughout the county it will have little effect on prioritization.

TAG expressed a preference to see resources divided by region based on some other measure because every region has its own unique needs. Lane miles vs. population would result in very different outcomes and resource allocation. It is difficult to estimate use of proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but "if you build it, they will come."

TAG agreed they would like to hear how other counties define disadvantage and will weigh in more then.

### **Humboldt**

TAG members noted that less than \$50k annual income may be high for our area and translate into the majority of Humboldt County being categorized as disadvantaged/dilute prioritization, and that another source referenced less than \$36k during a CTC meeting. TAG members want to make sure local area income is specifically considered in developing our definition. Alexis asked the context regarding the \$36k income level, and Marcella said she could email Alexis with more information for review as part of "disadvantaged community" feedback. TAG members supported using SB 127 measures and also including tribal lands and communities of color. TAG members supported using data at smallest-available geographies for providing benefit to disadvantaged communities. The TAG said maps would help inform decisions about which measures to use and suggested reviewing the Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations Report.

### **Lake**

TAG discussed the importance of the transit system and that the CAT Plan will need to integrate it with active transportation and the needs of the disadvantaged and disabled populations. Specifically, it was highlighted that accessibility of bus stops in relation to pedestrian access is an issue. While all pedestrian improvements constructed by Caltrans will be ADA accessible, it is important to consider the context and how these elements connect. TAG also discussed the Lake County inventory previously completed

listing bus stops in the entire County and where ADA improvements are needed. Lake Transit Authority needs funding and will move forward to get grants, but this list may be very helpful for us in developing the CAT Plan. Alexis will review the inventory/list and stated this will be helpful. Clarified that the CAT Plan will provide a “tool box” to be used in future projects to identify needs as opposed to identifying specific projects, and the topic of interfacing with bus stops can be addressed in the “tool box” section.

TAG suggested using overlay map of bus routes on our “main streets”/intercommunity connect map, including bus stops and shelters.

The TAG ran out of time to discuss the definition of disadvantage in Lake County and District 1 as a whole, so Alexis will follow up via email to begin the conversation and come to a consensus.

### **Mendocino**

The TAG ran out of time to discuss in detail, so Alexis will follow up via email regarding coming to a consensus as to how to define disadvantage in Mendocino County and District 1 as a whole. Alexis offered to schedule another meeting to cover this subject or to send an email with an outline of different ways disadvantage has been defined in the past to get the conversation going. The TAG decided an email will be a good first step and will provide feedback that way.

## **5. Wrap up/Action Items:**

### **All**

- Now that we have consultant on board, Alexis updated timeline to reflect changes and will send out updated timeline in July.

### **Del Norte**

- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Stakeholder List by July 3.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Public Engagement Plan by July 3.

### **Humboldt**

- This TAG meeting was included as part of an existing Complete Streets Ad Hoc Committee meeting already on the calendar. TAG members discussed whether this group is advisory, or if it would be best to split the TAG meeting off as a separate meeting to be advertised. TAG members will research and provide feedback before next meeting. Next meeting scheduled for August 26.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Public Engagement Plan by July 3.
- TAG members will provide feedback regarding “disadvantaged community” by July 10.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Stakeholder List by July 10.

### **Lake**

- Alexis will email “disadvantaged community” definition information by July 8.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Public Engagement Plan by July 15.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Stakeholder List by July 15.
- TAG members will provide feedback regarding “disadvantaged community” email from Alexis by July 15.

**Mendocino**

- Alexis will email “disadvantaged community” definition information by July 6.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Public Engagement Plan by July 9.
- TAG members will review and provide feedback on the Stakeholder List by July 9.
- TAG members will provide feedback regarding “disadvantaged community” email from Alexis by July 15.

**Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be held in approximately two months.



# CAT Plan Meeting Summary

District 1 TAG Meeting Minutes (all meetings held via Webex or Zoom)

**Del Norte: Tuesday, August 25 (4:00 – 5:00 p.m.)**

**Humboldt: Wednesday August 26, 2020 (1:00 – 2:30 p.m.)**

**Lake: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 (1:30 – 2:30 a.m.)**

**Mendocino: Thursday September 3, 2020 (2:30 – 3:30 p.m.)**

## 1. Welcome & Introductions:

<b>In Attendance</b>	
<p><b>Del Norte</b>            Rosanna Bower, County of Del Norte            Dave Gustafson, Resident/Member of cycling community            Tamera Leighton, DNLTC            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Humboldt</b>            Kevin Carter, City of Fortuna            Colin Fiske, CRTP            Hank Seemann, County of Humboldt            Emily Sinkhorn, RCAA            Oona Smith, HCAOG            Jesse Willor, City of Eureka            Patricia-Anne WinterSun, Humboldt Bay Bicycle Commuters' Association            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Destiny Preston, Caltrans District 1            Jesse Robertson, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>
<p><b>Lake</b>            Clarissa Kincy, Lake Links            Dana Lewis, People Services            John Speka, Lake APC            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1            Saskia Rymer-Burnett, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Mendocino</b>            Nephele Barrett, MCOG            Sonja Burgal, Walk &amp; Bike Mendocino            Wade Gray, Resident/Member of cycling community            Mo Mulheren, Ukiah City Council Member            Tom Murphy, Gualala Municipal Advisory Council/Walk Bike Gualala            Tina Tyler-O'Shea, Mendocino HHS            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Destiny Preston, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>



## 2. 2020 SHOPP Complete Streets Reservation

Note: This agenda item is not part of the Active Transportation Plan, but we thought this would be a good group to update on a related active transportation effort.

- The Department has secured a \$100 Million Complete Streets (CS) Reservation in the 2020 SHOPP. This reservation has been set aside to be used for transformative Complete Streets Strategies to be incorporated in Programmed 2020 SHOPP Projects or new standalone CS projects. While a portion of the reservation has been earmarked for an existing 22 projects, there is an application process for the remainder of the reservation, which will be a competitive process based on a set of key criteria.
- The project proposal template was sent to meeting invitees. It asks for similar information as the Active Transportation Program application:
  - Disadvantaged communities—the project is in a DAC and/or provides benefits to a DAC
  - Need—expressed as increasing connectivity, closing gaps, connecting to destinations
  - Safety—are there collisions or safety concerns expressed by the public? Does the project include countermeasures to address these safety issues?
  - Planning—is the project supported by local/regional partners? Has the public participating in planning efforts?
- Using the list of project ideas generated at the beginning of this effort in November 2019 and adding new ones through an internal brainstorm in July, staff developed an initial ranking of projects, which was sent to the TAG.
- Caltrans is proposing to submit four applications for this funding—one in each county. We will apply for the highest-ranking feasible projects, unless the TAG can provide support that another project will be more competitive. If a partner agency wants to pursue applying for (an) additional project(s) and can complete the application with minimal input from Caltrans, they are welcome to do so. Looking for feedback on top ranking projects on the spreadsheet for each county; must have well-defined scope and element of public participation/support. Please provide feedback on projects to be added to spreadsheet or feedback on scoring of existing projects.
- One thing this scoring exercise has highlighted is the need to do more planning in and with disadvantaged communities.
- Timeline:
  - DN and HUM project selection due 8/30.
  - MEN and LAK project selection due 9/6.
  - Draft applications due from CT to partners 9/14.
  - Partner comments due to CT 9/21.
  - Completed applications due to CT HQ 9/25.

### Del Norte

Requested time to review spreadsheet. Need to review some projects; Washington Boulevard connection projects are a high priority.

### Humboldt

Discussed compressed timeline. Alexis confirmed Caltrans District 1 also noted the compressed timeline and relayed concerns to Caltrans Headquarters. Discussed projects that may be competitive and ready in

time. TAG wondered if this reservation process will happen again in the future. Alexis explained this is a one-time reservation and District 1 will be working within targets in the future. This is a transition that lead to additional funding. CAT Plan will inform future projects. Requested time to review spreadsheet.

### **Lake**

Discussed project list and decided to apply for Lucerne project.

### **Mendocino**

Covelo project was selected prior to the meeting.

## **3. Partner Survey**

As part of our CAT Plan project, Alexis gave a demonstration of the Partner Survey <https://clowder.tierraplan.com/caltrans/1>. Partner Survey instructions were sent to the TAG in the meeting invite. The purpose of the partner survey is to capture needs that have been identified in plans but for which we don't have GIS data. TAG members may also add locations they know of in their professional experience as a need but are reminded to please try not to add items that are personal preference or opinion (those can go on public survey). Please test out, let us know if you have any issues, or if the instructions don't make sense. Aiming for test points to be deleted September 7. Hoping to align this with release of the draft existing conditions report. We'll be sending to non-TAG partners as well.

Please indicate the plan that references the need or identify if it was a need received through public comment. Please remember to enter your information in the email address field. You can add as many locations (map "pins") as you would like. When you log out, you won't be able to see the prior locations you entered, so keep this in mind in organizing how you choose to enter the "pins". Please share the link with your organization/ coworkers. An email announcement will be going to TAG members and local agencies who are not part of the TAG.

Please note that Internet Explorer may not work well for this web app; we have been using Google Chrome with no problems. Contact us with any questions.

### **Del Norte**

No comments.

### **Humboldt**

TAG wondered if data from Street Story will still be used. Alexis explained there is no need to re-enter data from Street Story; Caltrans will export this data into GIS and combine with Street Story. TAG requested we include this information in meeting notes and future email once survey is officially launched. Survey will be online for a minimum of two months.

TAG asked if CAT Plan will include remedy for each need; Alexis explained it will not, but rather a contextual tool kit will be included.

TAG requested notification when Existing Conditions Report is available on CAT Plan site for partners.

TAG requested more information on the evaluation process for the data Caltrans obtains from the online surveys.

TAG requested an update on CAT Plan schedule for rest of calendar year; Alexis reviewed milestones.

**Lake**

No comments.

**Mendocino**

No comments.

**4. Public Survey**

Alexis gave a demonstration of the Public Survey <https://survey.catplan.org/>. Working with PIO to do a press release, email request, and flier that can be shared widely. TAG members are also encouraged to also test out the public survey. Goal for rollout is mid-September (will be sent out soon). Please let Alexis know if any mapping errors are noticed.

Email contacts for survey announcement will be those on stakeholder list, and everyone will be encouraged to share with other members of the public. Demographic questions will help us confirm we are hitting all demographic groups.

Please note that Internet Explorer may not work well for this web app; we have been using Google Chrome with no problems. Contact us with any questions.

**Del Norte**

No comments.

**Humboldt**

No comments.

**Lake**

No comments.

**Mendocino**

No comments.

**5. Wrap up/Action Items:**

**Del Norte**

- TAG members will review the project spreadsheet and provide feedback.
- Survey links will be sent out directly after the meeting; TAG members will test out partner and public surveys and provide feedback.
- A group of 300 bicyclists are coming to Del Norte County in 2023. Tamera will send additional information to Alexis via email so that Alexis/Suresh can research who can help facilitate and brainstorm which organizations to contact.

**Humboldt**

- TAG members will review the project spreadsheet and provide feedback.

- Survey links will be sent out directly after the meeting; TAG members will test out partner and public surveys and provide feedback.

#### **Lake**

- TAG members will review the project spreadsheet and provide feedback.
- Survey links will be sent out directly after the meeting; TAG members will test out partner and public surveys and provide feedback.

#### **Mendocino**

- TAG members will review the project spreadsheet and provide feedback.
- Survey links will be sent out directly after the meeting; TAG members will test out partner and public surveys and provide feedback.
- TAG members requested information on what Caltrans is doing on a global scale for complete streets.

#### **Next Meeting:**

- The next meeting will be held in approximately two months.
- Caltrans will log in a few minutes early to test out Brandi and Rosanna mute/unmute functions. There were technical issues with this meeting for their audio, so want to make sure it doesn't happen again next meeting.
- Humboldt County will hold next meeting on Wednesday, November 4 at 1 p.m. Caltrans to provide updated timeline and draft needs list (draft needs list if available, or right after).
- Alexis will provide a presentation on what Caltrans is doing statewide for complete streets.



# HCAOG Complete Streets Ad Hoc Advisory Committee

**District 1 Meeting Minutes (all meetings held via Webex or Zoom)  
Wednesday, November 18 (1:30 – 3:00 p.m.)**

**Note: The HCAOG Complete Streets Ad Hoc Advisory Committee also fills the role of the Humboldt TAG, and this meeting was at the request of the Committee. Other counties' TAG sections did not meet this month.**

## **1. Welcome & Introductions**

Colin Fiske, CRTP  
Hank Seemann, County of Humboldt  
Emily Sinkhorn, RCAA  
Oona Smith, HCAOG  
Jesse Willor, City of Eureka  
Patricia-Anne WinterSun, Humboldt Bay Bicycle Commuters Association  
Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1  
Destiny Preston, Caltrans District 1  
Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1

## **2. Review Action Minutes, August 26, 2020**

Approved.

## **3. Caltrans CAT Updated Timeline and Draft Needs List**

Alexis shared that the D1 Active Transportation Plan schedule is now online at <https://www.catplan.org/district-1>.

Hank recommended developing performance measures for the Plan.

Colin mentioned the HCAOG RTP update is currently in process and it would be worth reviewing if there may be synergy between the two efforts.

Emily recommended sharing draft SHOPP lists and an update if a project gets modified.

## **4. Update and Discussion on Public Survey Outreach**

Alexis let everyone know the November Outreach Report is now posted on the CAT Plan website, covering roughly September through October. The Caltrans team has reviewed the numbers from September, including the number of total responses and respondent demographic breakdown by county as a percentage of targets. Targets come

from census data on composition of that population as detailed in the Public Engagement Plan. Please note that in the Toward an Active California document, the term “disadvantaged” is used. Caltrans is now moving towards the term “under-served” for future documents and communications.

Alexis noted little participating in the partner survey. She emphasized that the partner survey is critical and asked if the group had any ideas to increase partner participation. The survey deadline has been extended to December 31. While it will be open until the end of the contract for at least another year, the December deadline is the cutoff for needs to be included in the Plan.

Emily asked about the effects of COVID on outreach efforts. Alexis said Caltrans would otherwise have attended events and community meetings, so outreach is more difficult without in-person interaction. In addition, people have other things on their minds this year, so getting their attention is not easy. We have contacted the groups on the public engagement contacts list multiple times via phone and email to encourage survey participation, with an emphasis on reaching under-served groups. It is also difficult because so many people can't be reached at the office when they are working from home. Contact info has often changed due to COVID or new staff members. The team will continue to try to get the word out as much as possible.

## **5. Review Action Items and Schedule Next Meeting**

- All
  - TAG members will participate in Partner Survey by December 31.
- Oona
  - Share data sources with Alexis (draft RTP targets).
- Alexis
  - Distribute Methodology Memo, Prioritization Memo, and menu of performance measures.
  - Distribute responses to ECR comments once final is received from consultant (by December 31).
  - Work with Oona, Christie, and Hank on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Destiny
  - Update “Project Needs List” to “Needs List” on website CAT Plan website.

**Next meeting: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 (1:30pm to 3pm)**



# CAT Plan Meeting Summary

2021 District 1 TAG Meeting Minutes (all meetings held via Webex or Zoom)

Del Norte: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 (3:00 – 4:00 p.m.)  
 Humboldt: Wednesday January 20, 2021 (1:30 – 3:00 p.m.)  
 Lake: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 (10:00 – 11:00 a.m.)  
 Mendocino: Thursday, January 21, 2021 (2:30 – 3:30 p.m.)

**1. Welcome & Introductions:**

<b>In Attendance</b>	
<p><b>Del Norte</b>            Rosanna Bower, County of Del Norte            Amber Leavitt, CA Coastal Commission            Tamera Leighton, DNLTC            Linda Locklin, CA Coastal Commission            Brandi Natt, Yurok Tribe            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Suresh Ratnam, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Humboldt</b>            Colin Fiske, CRTP            Hank Seemann, County of Humboldt            Emily Sinkhorn, RCAA            Oona Smith, HCAOG            Jesse Willor, City of Eureka            Patricia-Anne WinterSun, Humboldt Bay Bicycle Commuters' Association            Jessi Downing, Caltrans Headquarters            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>
<p><b>Lake</b>            Dana Lewis, People Services            John Speka, Lake APC            Terre Logsdon, Scotts Valley Tribal TANF            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Saskia Rymer-Burnett, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1</p>	<p><b>Mendocino</b>            Sonja Bural, Walk &amp; Bike Mendocino            Wade Gray, Resident/Member of cycling community            Tom Murphy, Gualala Municipal Advisory Council/Walk Bike Gualala            Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1            Kari Shelley, Caltrans District 1            Tatiana Ahlstrand, Caltrans District 1</p>

**2. Public Engagement Summary**





# **Caltrans**<sup>®</sup>

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

The public and partner surveys closed on December 31, 2020. Alexis showed the results on the mapping (Clowder) tool; there were 454 unique survey takers and 1,439 pins (locations). Pins are well-distributed throughout the District.

The Outreach Report has been posted on the CAT Plan web page and provides outreach statistics and demographic information for those who took the survey. Please see the report for more information: <https://www.catplan.org/files/managed/Document/980/Outreach%20Report%20January%202021.pdf>.

The public and partner surveys will remain open at least an additional year until all districts have completed their CAT Plans. There was not much partner survey participation. Alexis suggested that RTPA and their consultants provide GIS data to ensure partner-identified needs are included in the plan. Kari is entering local plan data into the partner survey to supplement the lack of data. The Caltrans team can still use incoming survey responses from the public and TAG members/partners, and the team plans on going out for in-person outreach as soon as it is safe to do so. In addition, we will be reaching out to the community again to confirm all needs and how to meet those needs during project development.

### **Del Norte**

TAG members advised staff are unavailable to complete the partner survey and no GIS data are available. Alexis understands other agencies may have the same resource issues. The TAG pointed out this is another example of a rural disadvantage. Tamera will bring this to the RTPA meeting next week. At suggestion of TAG, Kari will add all counties' ATP Plan high-priority projects as needs in the partner survey.

### **Humboldt**

TAG requested the Caltrans team send partner survey link with instructions again. Humboldt a bit better at reaching targets that other counties, perhaps due to existing advocacy groups and some pre-pandemic promotion of Street Story.

### **Lake**

TAG recommended Caltrans team look at Lake AT Plan appendix to review demographic data and public feedback.

### **Mendocino**

Suggested reaching out to bicycle groups more during project development.

## **3. Data driven needs**

Alexis shared a presentation and slides that Toole (consultant) gave District 1.







Caltrans Regional and Systems Planners will review the location-based needs data this week. Public and TAG members can still add needs through the public and partner surveys.

#### **Humboldt**

TAG asked if distance to nearest crossing is adjusted for land use context, or if it is consistent throughout. NAACTO recommends a crossing every 200 feet (or no longer than a 3-minute walk) to discourage crossing in undesignated areas. Should this be adjusted for main streets? Alexis will ask the consultant.

#### **4. Prioritization/Performance Measures**

There is a meeting scheduled this week to learn more; all TAG members are invited and should have received an invite. Alexis explained her current understanding of the prioritization/performance measures but let everyone know some aspects will be changing. The data methodology will be revised and provided to the Caltrans team in February; the old one is attached to the meeting invite. Updates will be shared with the TAG once they are received.

Measures of prioritization tie into four main goal areas in Toward and Active California Plan: mobility, safety, equity and preservation. Each goal includes both headquarters-required measures and optional measures. The list of optional measures can be used in any combination/number deemed by the TAG to be reflective of the unique needs of District 1, including measures not listed. A few measures listed as required are subjective or not applicable to District 1, and Alexis will ask if they can be removed/replaced. For example, **adjacency to major** transit station is subjective and Alexis is seeking a specific definition from the consultant. Another item listed as required is Cal Enviro Screen, but this measure is not applicable in rural districts with good air quality. Better to use reduced price school lunches and median household income or other measures as decided on by TAG.

Alexis showed the TAG an Excel document with the measures listed and let everyone know the spreadsheet will be used to weigh each prioritization measure. Weights are to be determined by the TAG. Minimum weights are assigned, but there is lots of room for the TAG to make decisions. Calculations will be performed on ~~each of the points or lines~~ highway segments to identify near/mid/long term priorities. Alexis clarified that another way to think of this is that ~~needs~~ highway segments which meet more performance objectives will rank higher in this exercise, but this doesn't mean the needs outside these areas are not priorities in a particular goal area. There is always room for something long-term priority to get done earlier based on funding. Regarding public input, survey points are not votes; Alexis will ask the consultant what the calculation is of input on demand.

Alexis asked the TAG to provide feedback on optional measures and weighting. The TAG recommended the following:





# **Caltrans**<sup>®</sup>

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

- **Mobility**

- **Latent demand** – Humboldt and Mendocino recommend adding e-bike potential. Mendocino recommended a distance of 8 miles.
- **Existing walk and bike trips** – Humboldt and Mendocino feel this measure doesn't capture potential because people don't walk/bike in areas they feel unsafe.
- **Public stakeholder on demand** – HQ recommends removal. Discussed that public input may be helpful in underreported areas. Alexis will provide an analysis on comparison of Street Story with SWITRS. In areas with low population and low traffic volumes, collisions are relatively low and therefore harder to identify areas of concerns such as near misses.
- **Locally determined short-trip demand** – Humboldt and Mendocino like this measure because it is more indicative of demand than existing trips. Humboldt discussed land use context areas (main streets and intercommunity connectors) might be areas of demand. Mendocino discussed latent demand might be sufficient.
- **Existing walk/bike trips (relative)** - Humboldt recommends adding this measure. Alexis explained StreetLight is big data software and points are captured by GPS (auto or cell). Data is not as robust for walking and biking as automobile but can give relative volumes.
- **Destinations** – All TAGs agree destinations important; can use proximity to schools, transit/social services/healthcare connectivity for under-served population. Will ask consultant how to add.

- **Safety**

- **Schools** – Lake recommends adding distance from schools as a performance measure.
- **Weighted crash density** – Del Norte and Mendocino expressed concern with this measure due to lack of density in rural areas. Bike/ped collision rates are unavailable because we don't have bike/ped volume data. Alexis will ask consultant if this measure can be normalized by population or by number of relative trips. TAG and Caltrans need to decide if normalizing is desirable. Please note Caltrans has a separately funded Safety Program to address safety priorities.

- **Equity**

- **Access between transit and social services** - Del Norte recommends adding this measure. Alexis will check for available data. There are many persons experiencing homelessness along Highway 101. Alexis will contact HHS to see if they have a list of common destinations. Suresh mentioned Joe at Redwood Transit Auth should be part of the conversation. Will look at ridership information in ATP Plan and send Joe an email.
- **CalEnviroScreen** – This was proposed as a required measure but due to lack of TAG support from all counties, consultant agreed to remove.





# **Caltrans**<sup>®</sup>

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

- **Health Outcomes** – Lake recommends adding this measure.
- **Non-White communities** – Mendocino supports this measure.
- **Seniors** – Del Norte, Lake, and Mendocino recommends adding this measure.
- **Youth** – Mendocino recommends adding this measure.
- **Disabled** – Mendocino recommends adding this measure.

### 5. Next steps

Caltrans team will compile notes from all TAG meetings and add measures to the spreadsheet. Will send out to TAG for review and feedback and discussion of assigning weights to measures. Schedule is posted on CAT Plan website. On February 8 consultants will begin prioritization. Feel free to contact Alexis with additional thoughts. TAG will also review in March to determine if it turned out as expected. Another meeting will be held in March/April to pull all four TAGs together to share more information on what Caltrans is doing regarding Complete Streets on a statewide level and how funding works. This is especially exciting now that Complete Streets finally has funding targets. Our vision is to engage TAGs more in future as projects are built.

