



# 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.