

# APPENDIX A

## VISIONING AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

Visualization exercises were conducted at three community workshops and a focus group as part of the Regional Trails Master Plan community outreach program. Exercise participants were asked to provide an active transportation system vision that focused on: 1) the areas of the community connected by active transportation facilities, 2) the types of facilities that comprise the active transportation system and 3) the active transportation system or trail users. Below is all of the visualization comments received from community members.

Regional Trails Master Plan comments received via email follow the visualization comments.

### EUREKA TRAIL VISIONING

- Formalize the trail connecting Highland to Golf Course Road (example of many trails in community)
- We are hopeful that there will be an opportunity for Caltrans to input on bicycle/pedestrian trails on 255 though Manila from Arcata to bridge before this plan is completed
- Trails from Highway 255 community plan not shown
- No connection to College of the Redwoods to Fortuna to Humboldt Hill from Eureka (There is a railroad here!)
- Multiple-use to include hoof, foot, bike, skates, boards, strollers – the more use the safer the areas – “safety in numbers” concept
- Bike lanes on all major through streets in 7 cities and county towns
- Coastal trail linking Humboldt County north to south
- Multi-use trails regional, accessible to various users – equitable, old, young, rich, poor, rural, urban ...
- Class I trail connecting Blue Lake, McKinleyville, Arcata and Eureka
- Eureka: foot and bike paths developed and with greenbelts and gulches all thru town
- Class I trails will outnumber by far Class II and Class III trails as society moves away from car dependence

- Lanes for bicyclists on H and I Streets, access for Worthington School to Myrtle off Harris – for Myrtle Avenue to North side of Redwood Acres, more signage and space for bicyclists Walnut, Ridgewood and Elk River Road
- Go rails to trails North to South
- Multi-use dedicated trail connecting all cities along Highway 101
- Class I on NCRA right-of-way around Humboldt Bay from Town of Samoa to College of the Redwoods
- Multi-use trail connecting Manila and Arcata, using the small existing road between Humboldt Bay and Route 255, constructing part of it on the berm surrounding the bay
- Multi-use trail to the west of 255 between Peninsula Road and Lupin Avenue to the north
- A huge network of heretofore non-existent footpath like spider webs fostering walkable communities
- What were roads have been turned into, in many cases, Class I trail
- Main trail from Southern Humboldt to Orick – off roads as much as possible – multi-use (paved) – feeder trails linking communities to main trails to other communities
- Connect Trinidad to McKinleyville to Arcata to Blue Lake to Eureka with a Class I and Class II (only if necessary)
- Connective: city to city to business district, transit stops, recreational points of interest
- Arcata – Fortuna Bay Trail (College of the Redwoods at least) – footpath Myrtle West, North of County Office of Education
- Definitely a trail (bicycle and pedestrian) connecting Eureka to Arcata via 255. Another multi-use trail to jetty. 255 trail to connect west Humboldt Coastal Nature Center. Bike trails (Class III) along Arcata bottoms. Good bike trail thru Eureka along Waterfront Drive through Old Town. Safer bike path along 101 to Del Norte. Good signage of pedestrian/bicycle routes.
- Trails connecting cities especially Arcata to Eureka and linking gulches and greenways
- Well established neighborhood to community center trail networks that are consistent, guaranteed access routes for every type of user to safely navigate our community
- Clearly marked, connective trails, separate from vehicular traffic, across and between communities
- Trail connections from communities to transit stops (i.e., King Salmon to Highway 101)

- 101 corridor trail banked Eureka to Arcata trail
- More neighborhood connections
- Multi-use trail connecting coastal cities in Humboldt
- Link community gulches and greenways
- Community funded – long-term vision
- Pedestrian bicycle paths all around Humboldt Bay including Samoa Bridge. The Humboldt Bay Trail connects north to Redwood National Park and South to Humboldt Redwoods State Park. All along the route there are shops, lodging, restraints and multiple stops for bicycle carrying busses. Tourists from all over come to experience this trail.
- Commute routes with well marked bicycle and pedestrian lane that connect to more “nature” trails
- Class I trail between Arcata and Eureka with center strip for both way traffic and no horses
- Multi-use trail from Rio Dell to Trinidad – not on road but separate – parallel – more street trails through Eureka
- Greenways and gulches preserved with safe public access
- Link Headwaters Forest and Redwood National Park and State Parks and campgrounds
- Multi-use trail connecting Eureka waterfront with Henderson Center
- A safe equitable, complete multi-use trail system that links where we live, work and play with the world beyond
- Commute oriented Arcata to Eureka corridor
- Cooperation between jurisdictions for local connections and with other public lands (USFS, BLM, etc) to link local regional to recreational
- A multi-use trail network connecting communities. Would look similar to American River Bike Trail – Sacramento, CA
- Minimized elevation change – more direct network Eureka
- Interpretive areas (child friendly)
- Exercise stations
- Recreational trail – Elk River picnic facility, artist designed gates, signs, etc

- Picnic tables and benches
- Indicators and signage showing “best routes” using permanent existing infrastructure
- Safer streets, slower traffic, more trees, less one-way streets
- Scenic and off street where possible. Multi-user, or complete street design
- Safety from car accidents
- Safe, convenient, fun trails that allow people to get where they want to go for daily tasks, get exercise, and interact with each other and with the environment
- Trails that are beautiful and provide incentive to walk
- Adjacent to other recreations including boat docks, stables, tennis courts, schools as well as commerce. Also include watering for bottles and pets
- Trails with trees and shrubs separating trail from highway
- Night lighting
- Nature view areas in scenic areas
- Trails that are truly accessible to people with a variety of disabilities – not just accessible for non-ambulatory
- Eel River Bikeway
- Multi-use with bicycles, pedestrians and horses being ridden and driven – lots of small parks along multi-use trails with benches, hitching rails, and small cart vendors. Horses have been and should remain a part of our experience
- Don’t underestimate horse riders traveling from community to community along-side foot and bike traffic
- Web-based interactive map illustrating existing trails from regional to neighborhood scale
- Safe and healthy trail system, multi-use and well connected to scenic, business, commerce, recreation, educational destinations – well used and actually lowering emissions and obesity
- South to Humboldt Bay Wildlife Refuge and beyond , multi-use trail
- Trail that runs along the bayfront from Old Town to mouth of Elk River – then continues
- Include covered bike parking as an element of the trail system at reasonable intervals
- Inclusion of stormwater friendly surfaces – L.I.D!

- Bathrooms with changing tables
- Equestrian have been noted in other multi-use areas as keeping compaction of trails hard

## FORTUNA TRAIL VISIONING

- A top priority should be a bike trail (away from Highway 101) between Eureka and Arcata
- Propensity of multi-use trails adapted to locale for a range of users
- Connect communities and offer safe active transport routes within communities
- Multi-use unpaved trails connecting communities to Coastal Trail
- A multi-use trail system that compliments the Rail Road between Scotia and Humboldt Bay. Rail road to create an excursion trail around Humboldt Bay serving Arcata, Eureka, Fortuna, Rio Dell and Scotia
- Multi-use from Alton to Swains Flat
- Trail from Riverlodge north along the river to Fernbridge
- Sidewalk continued along Bluff Street in Ferndale to Rose Avenue
- To the extent possible bike trails should be physically separated from automobile traffic
- More trails separated from autos
- A pedestrian friendly trail from downtown to South Fortuna Boulevard
- Multi-use from Alton to the mouth of the Eel River
- Trail from Humboldt Hill to Elk River
- Multi-use trail crossing Table Bluff to Tompkins Hill possibly following rail road right of way except for tunnel
- Multi-use trails include pedestrians, bicycles, horses, and connect to city areas throughout Humboldt. The vision also includes “parking” areas for all non-motorized transportation including horses.
- Multi-use trail from McKinleyville to Scotia with branches into all communities along the route
- Trail along Eel River coast to Garberville
- Avenue of the Giants trail – Eureka to Arcata pathway

- Regional Orick to Piercy bike route
- Trail (multiuse) from Eureka to College of the Redwoods. Trail connects multi-use along Avenue of the Giants and to Humboldt Redwood State Parks on Honeydew Road to Albee and Cuneo creek
- If you are going to develop trails to connect communities, they should be multi-use (i.e., to include walk, bike, horse, with horses you wouldn't want them in town on streets, but pens to hold while shopping would be perfect reality). There are those who may spend \$2,000 on a bicycle, horse people spend up to several hundred a month – you only mentioned equestrian use once
- Rail to trail seems to me obvious; that alone would bring Humboldt County out of the dark ages
- Trail from Fortuna to Trinidad multi-use with horses where appropriate. Connectivity to Ferndale that does not involve riding across Fernbridge
- Railroad right of way from Alton to Carlotta (Class I)
- Levee along Eel River from Riverwalk area to Alton (Class I)
- Trail from Scotia to Eureka or further up; multi-use includes walkers, horseback riding ... more trails that are usable for horseback riders
- Maybe a summer bridge for bicycles across the Eel River. Access to Headwaters from Fortuna – multi-use
- More accessible trails within Eureka to outlying communities Freshwater, Elk River, Humboldt Hill, Cutten
- Multi-use from Rio Dell to Alton
- Railroad right of way from Arcata to at least Fortuna, possibly continuing thru the Eel River Canyon (Class I)
- I'd really like to see trails all around the Bay
- 36 Highway bike path with safe crossings at towns
- More equestrian trails – The Lost Coast trail continued north from King Range
- Multi-use Coastal Trail (unpaved) running all up and down the county
- Signs on roads clearly directing people to a nearby trail
- Old logging roads can be cleared and opened – example, along Highway 36
- Neighborhood parks integrated as part of destination by trail

- Within the cities, especially Eureka and Arcata, bike boulevards (like Palo Alto) would make biking more attractive
- All two lane roads without shoulders have bike/pedestrian lane off to the side separate from auto traffic
- Connects to public transit at “transit hubs” with safe covered bike parking
- Bike lanes in the neighborhoods, connected to schools
- Trailhead parking lots needed to be able to accommodate trucks with trailers
- Designated bike boulevards in cities (roads made more friendly for bikes, less auto oriented parallel to auto routes)
- More awareness of safe storage facilities for bikes along important commerce destinations along trails
- Trail side rest stops at vista points or mid way of longer distances
- Include non-paved multi-use trails along paved trails for horse traffic
- Width – (double as fire breaks wildlands) 4 equestrian access, destinations, loops and link ups, secure sites (i.e., corrals/tie ups in urban and suburban locations), coastal trails use beach only stretches where high tide hits bluffs need detours. Posted tide tables
- Rules for equine, biker, hiker safety (i.e., yield to certain types of users) – some non-paved trails
- Horse trails multi-use trails connecting towns – connecting communities
- Horses needed to have access to most trails
- Multi-use trails with room for equestrians – several equestrian only trails (no bicyclists at least) – patrol so homeless do not over run trails – a trail from Fortuna to Eureka
- Multi-use trails to include equestrians – this would be good for tourism – as it would bring people and dollars to our area – horse people buy trucks, gas and supplies
- Distinctive signs that are similar but which reflect individual communities as name plates/directional/points of interest, etc.
- We need more multi-use trails for horseback riding – open up Headwaters for use from Fortuna
- Equestrian access!!!! Would like a multi-use trail from Eureka and Fortuna, preferably away from the high with equine access – large parking for trailers! Recreational use trails!

## MCKINLEYVILLE TRAIL VISIONING

- Emphasis on bike Class II and Class III only inside communities – a sign along around is a waste of resources ( \$ )
- Informal footpaths need to be indentified and documented
- Fewer cars on the road
- No asphalt! Only use permeable pavement when needed
- Bike lanes on H and I Streets in Eureka
- Take over every other street in town (no cars)
- Bus systems need to connect at city points
- Complete network of trails of multi-use and multi-designed trails that go throughout and between all communities
- More bridges over rivers for people and bikes ... not having to risk getting run over
- Historical equestrian trails incorporated where possible
- Cooperative agreements and Green Diamond and Humboldt Redwood Company for recreation access to fish and swim locations and from coast to Redwood National Park and United States Forest Service lands
- Safety issues ...lighting, sanitation ... porta potty
- Trails should be safe and well maintained
- Sections of trails could be “adopted” to keep them litter free and to report maintenance needs
- Trails should be long enough – that is not continually interrupted. Trails should have different construction specifications, to among other things, conserve costs. Trails should allow various modes of movement – bike, run, walk, horse. A system of upkeep must be in place. Trails should have different surfaces – pavement, rock, dirt, grass. Trails should be placed so as to minimize negative impacts on surrounding property
- Less expensive design leads to more trails built
- Highway like system with amenities like: connectivity with communities via natural routes; sharing roads with cars minimally; small, attractive signage marking routes (uniform style/design); bathroom facilities with information kiosks and route maps
- Bay trail separated from Highway 101 on the old railroad

- Better separation between traffic and pedestrian/bikes
- Trails separated from motorized traffic (e.g., Corvallis)
- A walkable connection from the north end of the gravel Hammond Trail as it hugs the beach to the bottom or airport hill to connect with that existing trail from south end or Clam Beach connect to county owned Little River Drive with a connection on the north end of LRD to get you to Scenic Drive without having to share the 101 bridge with traffic
- Completion of a trail and bridge over Little River (from Granel to South Scenic Drive. [This is the BIGGEST transportation bottleneck in Humboldt County. You cross in your car or bike no pedestrians
- Trail connectivity Eureka to College of the Redwoods to Fortuna
- Annie and Mary to North Bank Road how? Widen North Bank Road
- Annie and Mary over Fieldbrook to Hammond Trail to Patricks Point
- Completed waterfront trail all the way to College of the Redwoods
- Trail connecting Fortuna to Rio Dell
- Mid-town trail completed through Mill Creek Falls (McKinleyville)
- Ride the Annie and Mary to Arcata thru Arcata to Humboldt Bay Trail
- Make North Bank Road one way traffic to develop a trail
- McKinleyville – Fieldbrook multi-use trail (Murray Road – Fieldbrook Road)
- Little River Bridge to the South end of Scenic Drive
- Mid Town trail completed through to Murray Road (McKinleyville)
- Community ownership of trail (i.e., landscaping, trash, design)
- Trails with lots of signage to well worn trails used by many in the community
- Consistently maintained, benches for resting, doggie poop bags, safe=no brush for encampments
- Takes into consideration local flora and fauna
- Where lighting is needed, solar powered
- Trails connected to picnic areas, recreation, public transportation
- Interpretive signage

- Signs that tell how far to next feature
- Kiosks that defines which trail appropriate for handicapped, runners, etc.
- Nicely designed signs indicating points of interest (i.e., information on native vegetation, coastal resources, animals, marine life)
- Definitely adopt-a-trail program needs to be implemented for maintenance
- Standard trail Identification system regional, inner city, neighborhood
- Class I bike trail with adequate shoulder for equestrians
- Off the highway Class I bike trail from Eureka to Avenue of the Giants
- Additional off road paved or unpaved trails linking communities to recreational features
- Extensive off road, single track, mountain bike
- Hiking trail that is continuous from north to south – same for bike trail
- Trails should provide coastal views and passage through old growth Redwood
- Recreation loops need to connect
- Promote cycling as a valid and lucrative alternative to commuting by auto
- Coastal Commission holding low environmental benefits higher than significant safety benefits for pedestrians
- Inconsistent terminology, colloquial terminology
- Unclear routes promoted to get funding poundage
- Safety of pedestrians and bicyclists not considered
- Conversion of cheap right-of-way result in unsafe intersections
- Transportation first, recreation second, sometimes useless pork projects
- Legal requirement to provide alternative pedestrian routes
- Commuting bicyclists not compatible with pedestrians because of speeds
- Multi-use trail parallel to / within Westhaven Drive right-of-way
- Multi-use trail to connect Westhaven on east side of freeway to Coastal Trail and beaches

- Multi-use trail extending coastal trail across Little River and up Scenic Drive, Stagecoach Road, Patricks Point Drive
- Multi-use pathways that can include equestrians
- Multi-use trails easy access for pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchairs, strollers
- Multi-use, commute, recreate, no cars
- Multi-use systems are a priority – the dream
- To keep our trails open where the equestrians ride now
- Converting existing railroad right-of-way to multi-use trails
- Use railroad right-of-way
- Pull up the tracks
- Railroad tracks or right-of-way converted to multi-us trails between Arcata and Fortuna
- Trail systems put on-line for tourists or those unfamiliar with routes
- Definitely turning old rail road tracks into trails (i.e., between Arcata and Eureka)
- Transportation trails that connect to trail systems to schools / neighborhoods / shops
- Bike / walk from Ocean Drive to central safely in McKinleyville
- Bike and hike entire county with hostels to stay at along the way
- Diversity is nice along any trail (i.e., a bridge or bench with view etc.)
- Bike friendly (no car parking)
- Bike and hiking path from Honeydew to Petrolia
- Priority on completion of several high profile / high quality / high use trails (e.g., Bay Trail Annie and Mary Trail)
- Clear trail route and contiguous flow in design
- Connect communities with walking, biking, and where possible include equestrian trails
- A multiuse trail (whenever possible) that connects town (coastal mostly with Blue Lake, Fieldbrook included) This trail should run at a minimum from Trinidad to Avenue of the Giants utilizing rail to trail (rail with trail along Humboldt Bay. Should utilize connections to bus stops, should have viewing benches at scenic spots and have good signage. Scenic beauty, recreation, and access to bus stop all important

- Biking/hiking trail should be established on old rail line between Arcata and Eureka
- To keep our trails open where we walk with our dogs now
- Connected North Bank / Central to Valley West not by 101
- More trails for equestrians in the future

## SOUTHERN HUMBOLDT TRAIL VISIONING

- Special attention to narrow and high car traffic areas
- Multipurpose trails are in use within rural watershed communities to allow for more than just biking/walking but also for utilitarian uses like horse-drawn carts or small electric vehicles
- Increased opportunities for off-road (unpaved) biking and hiking
- Developed trail system for mountain bikes in community park / state park
- Developed/improved trails serve to connect within rural communities, i.e., Salmon Creek has these for people to walk/ride a bike rather than use the main dirt road
- Improved river access for community
- Trails along South Fork of Eel River (multi-purpose)
- More developed trails within the community park
- Class I, II, III trails on residential roadway in Garberville, Redway, Phillipsville, and Miranda
- Developed and improved trail from lower Redway-Eel River to Upper Redway
- I also hope to see some routes connecting topographically adjacent communities that are not currently connected by roadways - Salmon Creek and Briceland for example
- A combination (as appropriate) of multi-purpose trails, developed and improved trails and Class I, II, III bikeways connecting Humboldt communities. I expect most of these would be along existing rights-of-way, i.e., county roads
- Highway Avenue of the Giants to Redway, widen Redway to Garberville, create Garberville to Southern Humboldt Community Park

- Multipurpose trail from Garberville to the Community Park including a riparian trail, along Kimtu Road (eventually from Kintu - Benbow)
- A developed trail from Garberville to the Community Park
- Class I bike path between Garberville and Community Park
- Redway/Garberville/Benbow are interconnected with safe non-motorized trails
- Class I between Garberville and Redway
- Multipurpose trail between Benbow and Garberville
- Many more Class I bike path are in place, such as around Garberville and connecting to Redway around Redway.
- Class II bike lanes are in use along Shelter Cove Road and the road down to Community Park
- Bikeway(s) connecting communities along the Avenue of the Giants (plus south to Benbow)
- Class III bikeway between Redway and Garberville
- Developed trails between Redway and Benbow
- Class III bike lane from Garberville to Redway
- Multipurpose trail between Southern Humboldt Community Park and Benbow
- Connectivity - continuous, widen existing road between Briceland and Redway, create new path between Garberville and Southern Humboldt Community Park and Kintu for pedestrian and bicycles
- Class I bikeway from Del Norte to Mendocino
- Connectivity between existing towns - Benbow, Garberville, Redway with mostly developed and improved trails

# WRITTEN COMMENTS

Dear HCAOG Staff:

As the Master Plan moves forward, which appears to be a complicated and political process, we wish to submit the following input with respect particularly to the protected dunes areas:

1. Accommodating everyone seems a difficult task.
2. There are many more walkers than equestrians, which should be taken into account when considering trail use allocation.
3. Walking on sandy trails that have been recently used by horses is like walking in cultivated soil. Trails for walkers and equestrians should be separate. Motorized vehicles should be prohibited in all dune areas.
4. Horse travel is more likely to damage trail areas than foot travel.
5. If beach access is a common equestrian destination, travel through protected dune areas appears unnecessary as the distance is short and other points of access are available, as shown on the Humboldt Bay Beaches and Dunes Map and Guide, which also shows many other areas for equestrian use.

Ours is a small planet with dwindling resources and an increasing population. Protection and preservation should be foremost.

Thank you.

Bob and Nancy Gardner  
Eureka

I am writing to urge that Manila and the Samoa Peninsula are included in the 2010 Regional Trails Master Plan.

We have been working with local and state agencies for years to mitigate the unsafe and unhealthy conditions that Highway 255 causes Peninsula pedestrians and cyclists since it has such a narrow shoulder.

Also we have many beautiful coastal trails on the Peninsula that are an asset to the community and Humboldt County.

To view some of our history and planning documents regarding trails you can visit <http://safepaths.wikispaces.com/>

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,  
Ian Davidson

Dear Tiffany,

We should have included that mountain bikes can be damaging and should be excluded from dunes trails.

Bob and Nancy

To All Trail Planners

I am writing to urge t  
Trails Master Plan.

We have been worl  
mitigate the unsafe  
Peninsula pedestria

Also we have many  
an asset to the com

To view some of o  
you can visit <http://>

Thank you for your  
Sincerely,  
Cathy Larripa - Mani

I am writing to urge the inclusion of Manila and the Samoa Peninsula in the 2010 Regional Trails Master Plan, as I am unable to attend this evening's meeting.

Manila community members have been working with local and state agencies for years to mitigate the unsafe and unhealthy conditions that Highway 255 causes Peninsula pedestrians and cyclists, due to its narrow shoulder and the 55 MPH speed limit.

It would be very helpful to residents and visitors on foot to be able to walk safely to various parts of this community without having to walk along this dangerous highway. A trail option would benefit the area greatly.

This trail deficit was something I discovered right away, when I moved to Manila 10 years ago. I could not walk the length of the ocean-side of the community without having to walk partially on the highway.

Plus, we already have many beautiful coastal trails within the dunes on the Peninsula that are an asset to the community and Humboldt County.

The group working on this project has put up some history and planning documents regarding trails at: <http://safepaths.wikispaces.com/>

Thank you for time and consideration of this community need.

Sincerely,  
Grace Kerr

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to urge that Manila and the Samoa Peninsula are included in the 2010 Regional Trails Master Plan.

We have been working with local and state agencies for years to mitigate the unsafe and unhealthy conditions that Highway 255 causes Peninsula pedestrians and cyclists since it has such a narrow shoulder.

Also we have many beautiful coastal trails on the Peninsula that are an asset to the community and Humboldt County.

To view some of our history and planning documents regarding trails you can visit <http://safepaths.wikispaces.com/>

Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,  
Joy Dellas  
manila resident

Tiffany,

The workshop was very informative, but what struck me odd was to find that the workshop included onroad cycling infrastructure in it's lineup, and being billed as a "trails" workshop only implies, to the unwary, that it is only for such input. One suggestion I might make is to add/change the name of the workshop to include onroad cycling infrastructure. Somehow, the word "trails" does not drum up thoughts of bike lanes and sharrows to the average cyclist, and I'm not surprised at the low percentage of participants voting for onroad cycling infrastructure at this workshop. I like the idea of having of any type cycling infrastructure being implemented, but I feel that there would have been a higher percentage of input towards onroad infrastructure if there was more indication of this nature in the workshop's billing/ notifications.

Thanks,  
Don Campbell

To whom it may concern: This letter is advocating a public works project between Eureka and Arcata and submit the following arguments in support there-of.

(1) The 7 mile stretch (hwy101) btwn Arcata/Eureka is designated a safety corridor and an alternate Bicycle-pedestrian route is a matter of public safety.

(2) any conversion into Bike-pedX would be 95% manual labor,removal of rails/ties/weedwacking,etc and would only leave the area prepared for future rail placement.

(3) the State of California has "forgiven" North Coast Rail authority 2 million dollars back tax with-in the last 2 years,while State unemployment claims reached record-levels 12.2% reported in Aug.09.

(4) Many of these former workers face benefit expiration in the comming months and I propose a homeless encampment to provide the afore-mentioned labor.

(5) The Obama administration has expressed an interest in PUBLIC WORKS [prgms.as](#) part of the current stimulas package.During the depression era the W.P.A.nd CCC produced projects that worked.

(6) Critics will allude to the South Jetty but this project will be monitored,perhaps instilling a sense of community in those who choose to participate.

(7) paid with grants it would allow the participants the oppertunity to save for "first and last,while an alternate transportation route will relieve Arcatas perceived housing shortage and provide recreational benefits for regular users.

(8) several existing non-profits in the area could contract to provide hot meals-laundry services etc.

Thanking you in advance for considering my option.

Randy Myers Arcata resident

I have been in contact with the Trails Trust of Humboldt Bay in the past.

I shared my ideas in the past regarding other trails, one such trail would incorporate the green belts that run from the bay side of town up into the neighborhoods along Harrison, Myrtle, and S Streets. These green belts (gulches) would provide the type of bike, pedestrian, and other alternative access modes that Trails Trust mentions exist in cities such as Redding, Eugene, and Astoria. Another huge selling point on these gulches is that with respect to all three (working from west to east- gulch from Eureka High to Myrtle, gulch from Harris that runs by St Joseph Hospital to Myrtle, and the gulch that runs from Harris from near Alora Lane to Myrtle) they only cross one or two roads maximum.

The Eureka High gulch starting at Buhne only crosses Del Norte and 14 Street until it reaches Myrtle and essentially the bay connection. The St Joseph Hospital gulch starting at Harris Street only crosses Buhne until it reaches Myrtle. The last gulch only crosses Lucas Street until it reaches Myrtle.

The use of these as trail corridors would link the bulk of the city to the waterfront, old town, and down town with crossing only a minimum of roads thereby providing good access, high level of safety, and reduce significantly the amount of bike traffic on the main roadways in the city. There are many more benefits and offsets to mention here, but safe to say this is a huge mitigation for carbon, gas savings, emissions in town, air quality, quality of life, safety, etc., etc.

A key part of this is to make sure that development is monitored and that buffer areas adjacent to the creeks are maintained for eventual use as trails. Houses and assorted structures should not be allowed to be built in wetlands and would fall under either the City (wetland permitting, Coastal Development Permit) if inside the City limits, or would fall to the County or the Army Corps of Engineers if outside the City limits. Either way there should not be any building allowed currently or into the future in these gulch/green belt areas. Thus preserving these areas for trails long term.

We do have the potential to become trail friendly like the Astorias, Reddings, etc. out there, in fact we have the ability to go beyond those cities. With the link to the new improved water front, Wharfinger Building events, Boardwalk, and the Bay activities (boating, kayaking, water trails, etc) and the festivities that occur in these areas (Arts Alive, Summer Concert Series, Blues by the Bay, on and on) we have the potential to go way beyond these other cities.

Please push for this to happen and make sure the City and County are following proper procedure and environmental regulations when it comes to development in these areas.

Sincerely,

Robert Vogt

5-7-10

Trail Plan  
Humboldt County Association of Governments  
427 F Street  
Eureka, CA

Attached are my comments on the HCAOG "Trail" Plan in Humboldt County.

In particular, note that Caltrans District 1 has a **de facto policy** of posting "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs instead of providing a safe pedestrian alternative route **between** communities as required by several State and Federal laws. Caltrans has changed Humboldt County into a series of small pedestrian ghettos enforced by the California Highway Patrol. **Los Angeles is much more pedestrian friendly.**

I note that my comments on Caltrans' "Pedestrians Prohibited" policy at the public meetings were not included, which is just like the last time PlanWest did the report about 6 years ago. This lack of consideration gives me the impression PlanWest doesn't want to say anything negative about any government entity.

I picked up the "CD" on 4-27-10, but it was really a DVD and could not be read by my computer. I live in Orick, an hour from Eureka, and I can't run into town every day. We come in once a week, so I had the DVD converted to a CD on 5-4-10. You wanted comments by 5-5-10, and it takes time to read the report. I imagine that I am one of the few people to read it all the way through.

Anyway, thank you for the opportunity to comment.



Charles Wilson  
President, Citizens' Review  
P.O. Box 127  
Orick, CA 95555-0127

**Comments on the proposed 2010 HCAOG Walking and Bicycling Plan (Plan):**

By Charles Wilson, P.O. Box 127, Orick, CA 95555-0127. 5-7-10.

Page 1. Use of the word "active" in "development of a regional active transportation system" is meaningless and apparently just another attempt to create a cute new buzz-word. Since government is so untrustworthy and so frequently tries to shift attention from what it is doing, this word may be an attempt to hide its purpose. The word "alternative" should be used instead because it places the correct emphasis on providing transportation without motor vehicles.

Page 1. Bicyclists already have the legal right to use all roads in Humboldt County including freeways. Walking is the primary means of transportation and many more pedestrians are killed than bicyclists. The "Plan" starts off, however, as a bikeway plan and proceeds to ignore pedestrians. The lame statement that "relatively little data exists for pedestrian facilities, therefore these important connections are not included in the effort" further confirms that the "Plan" is just another one of the many useless bikeway plans. Even the listing of these many plans on page 9 says: "The plans listed below summarize the **bicycle** planning efforts". On page 26 four types of bikeways are even used for the trail categories considered: "paths, lanes, routes, multipurpose trails".

Page 1, 3. Travel **between** communities is mouthed many times in the "Plan", but little effort is made to facilitate this travel. Page 1 uses "travel **between** mostly coast communities" and "travel **between** communities". Page 2 says "allow residents and visitors to move safely and efficiently within and **between** communities." Page 3 mentions "non-motorized connections within and **between** communities". Page 9 says Goal 1 is "connectivity within and **between** communities". Page 26, "trails **between** communities" and "the majority of the visualization comments pertained to developing trails that **connect** communities".

Page 3. The phrase "regionally significant trail and bikeway facilities" starts the establishment of the concept that "trail facilities" are separate from "bikeway facilities". The phrase "proposed trail and bicycle infrastructure" again implies that trails are separate from bikeways. Again, "local and regional trail and bicycle facility data". Page 7 repeats the theme, "Trails and bicycle facilities".

Page 6. The idea that "trail facilities would "complete the street"" follows that same faulty logic that the McKinleyville Community Plan followed when it designated useless and wasteful "trails" along urban streets instead of suggesting sidewalks.

Page 6. "ethnic minority populations" implies that that they are being discriminated against and that other populations are not as important. Ethnicity is a popular political card nowadays, but it has no relevance to trails.

Page 7, 8. "Walking or bicycling" is a logical combination of words, as is "pedestrian and bicyclist". Page 5, "Pedestrian and bicycle travel" is just as poor as saying "shoe and bicycle travel". Page 9. "bicycle, pedestrian, and motorist" would be more logical as "bicyclist, pedestrian, and motorist".

Page 7. The California Dept. of Finance does not "predict", it only projects past data. Its projections also said that there would be no increase in the working population and that the increase would all be in the over 65 year category. More planning of bikeways for able bodied college-age kids does not meet the needs of the aging population.

Page 7. Pedestrian fatalities are significantly greater than bicyclist fatalities, and these statistics should be compared with the more commonly stated motor vehicle fatalities.

Page 8. "For construction of the most recent segment of the Hammond Coastal Trail in 2007 nearly one half million dollars went to local purchases of materials, and a roughly equal amount to payroll for local firms and organizations." In other words, the short segment cost \$1 million. The Coastal Plan did not point out that the its projects totaled \$2 Billion. As page 86 points out, "money is the issue". Without building anything and without buying any right of way, there is an **existing public right of way** that would allow pedestrians to go from community to community, all the way from Crescent City to Eureka and to Mendocino County -- if Caltrans would allow it.

Page 11. TAC is an undefined abbreviation. TAC is finally defined in parentheses on page 98, 87 pages later.

Page 12. McKinleyville Parks and Recreation Plan (2008) is listed, but the "2008" date is the date shown on the cover sheet and is changed every time a new copy is printed and not a single word in the plan has been changed for over 15 years.

Page 18. Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan (1995). As I remember, sea salt spray was a very significant portion of PM10 in Humboldt County. If all the vehicles in the county were eliminated, the county would still be in PM10 non-compliance because of the salt. Use of the PM10 argument for trails is fakery. If the definition for PM10 were amended to exclude sea salt, however, then the PM10 argument for trails would be valid.

Page 20. Caltrans Deputy Directive LA-R1 (2008). Sacramento design policy is in direct conflict with the de facto Caltrans District 1 policy of not providing safe alternative routes for pedestrians, particularly where there is no other physical way. Instead, District 1 posts "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs in an attempt to limit its legal liability, pretending that it is keeping hitchhikers out.

Page 21. At least three pedestrian oriented regulations have been omitted. :1) California Streets and Highways Code Section 157, 2) ADA access requirements, and 3) U.S. Constitution requirement of compensation for confiscation of access and egress from private property.

Page 23. "Master plan". "Plan" should be capitalized because it is part of the title.

Page 34, 128. "'Yield to' signage should be installed to notify user right-of-ways". No indication is given on who yields. All bikes, not just mountain bikes, should yield to pedestrians. Pedestrians have no right of way longitudinally in a street, that is, on bike lanes and bike routes. If a bike path is considered a roadway, pedestrians would not have any right of way on it either. Humboldt County Public Works policy removes the limited pedestrian right of way at intersections when it paints the limit line even with the curb line.

Page 35. "cyclists" should be replaced by "bicyclists". There is enough confusion in terms already without using a term that includes motorcycles, scooters, electric bicycles, and motor-bikes.

Page 36. Wide, paved trails are primarily included to serve narrow-wheeled bicycles, not pedestrians. Bicyclists are the cause of most of the trail cost.

2

Page 36. "undeveloped public rights-of-way such as utility corridors" is **incorrect**. Utility corridors (easements), such as for sewers, water mains, overhead wires, etc., cannot legally be confiscated for use as bikeways. Quite often they are not usable anyway because of grades, wetlands, agricultural land, etc. Railroad right of ways likewise cannot be confiscated for bikeways if the easement is only for railroads.

Page 39. "historic reports" should perhaps be "historical reports". There is nothing historic about a report.

Page 48, 71. "The Hammond Bridge needs to be replaced." The cost for replacing the bridge is about \$6 million now, and it would take the entire County Public Works budget for one year. In contrast, after 11 years Caltrans District I finally conceded that pedestrians had a legal right to be able to cross the Mad River with the Highway 101 bridge reconstruction. After the Hammond Bridge collapses or is finally recognized as a hazardous lead paint structure, the Highway 101 pedestrian crossing will be the only physical and legal way to leave McKinleyville without swimming the river.

Page 50. All the plans I have seen for utilizing railroad right of ways create hazardous crossings at intersections. Bicyclists are notorious for ignoring signs and violating regulations, and not expecting them cross a street hazardously at midblock is unrealistic.

Page 71. "averaging nearly three percent per year" may be incorrect for the last 20 years.

Page 71. "to share recreation authority within McKinleyville" may be incorrect. If the County "shares" recreation authority, it hasn't done anything.

Page 73. The "proposed Class III (Bike Route)" on **Bald Hills Road should be deleted**. Bicyclists already have the legal right to use roads, and the proposed designation would provide no improvement in safety. In 25 years I haven't see a bicyclist on this road, so the usage would not justify the cost of polluting the scenery with bike route signs. Including this useless bikeway gives the impression that the selection criteria are not very realistic.

Page 73 and 84 says "There are four Rancherias (Bear River, Big Lagoon, Blue Lake, and Trinidad) and four reservations (Hoopa, Karuk, Yurok, and Table Bluff) in Humboldt County. Page 45, however, **inconsistently** says "The seven Native American Tribes in Humboldt County were contacted ...".

Page 75. The paved bike path down the Patrick Creek streambed should be **deleted**. It begins on Dow's Prairie Road where there is no bicyclist traffic, corrupts a streambed surrounded by agricultural land, goes down a steep, very narrow road with blind curves, and drops off at another dead location where they have to cross back to Central Avenue. It is a useless waste of taxpayer money and should be deleted.

Page 76. The proposed bike path on Clam Beach Road should be **deleted**. It starts at Dow's Prairie Road where there is no bicyclist traffic, parallels a country road with little traffic, then cuts down a steep slope with blind curves used by equestrians.

Page 76. The proposed bike path down the Strawberry Creek streambed should be **deleted**. It starts at Dow's Prairie Road where there is no bicyclist traffic, destroys a streambed, and is separated from Central Avenue by single lots.

Page 57 and 75. The **pedestrian** crossing of the reconstructed Mad River bridge is **not a bikeway**. Bicyclists already have 10 foot wide shoulders on the bridge for the Pacific Coast bike route.

Page 80. "The historic Arcata Hotel is **owned** and operated by the Big Lagoon Rancheria" is incorrect. The hotel was paid for by U.S. taxpayers and the U.S. Dept. of the Interior holds the title. **This kind of non-bikeway information should not be included in the bikeway report, and it should be deleted.**

Page 80. "The tribe was interested in building a casino on Rancheria lands. Rather than develop on the Rancheria's highly sensitive natural environment ...". **This kind of non-bikeway political propaganda should not be included in the bikeway report, and it should be deleted.** The Rancheria's attempt to develop a casino on sensitive natural land rather than building houses as was the declared intent for getting the funds is a flagrant mockery of the "preserve the land" Yurok noise. Building a casino instead of houses is inconsistent with the efforts of non-indian peoples to protect our land.

Page 84. "The Wiyot people have lived in the Humboldt bay region for thousands of years." This statement is **unsubstantiated and some evidence indicates otherwise**. Their language (along with the Yurok's) has a different origin from other nearby tribes, and they may have been a lost Shoshone war party from 800 miles away only a few hundred years ago. There may be an archaeological record of somebody being present, but there is no evidence that these are the same peoples as at present. There is also no evidence they were "continuous" by the same group, and they are not necessarily "their ancestors". **This kind of non-bikeway propaganda should not be included in the bikeway report, and it should be deleted.**

Page 87. "some of the more obvious, natural trail corridors are predominately in private ownership". A streambed is **not** an "obvious, natural trail corridor" like Humboldt Planning promotes.

Page 88. The meaning of "basis self defense" is not clear.

Nowhere in the report is mention made of the dangers of creating little used, isolated trails hidden from view of streets. Crime is not unknown on trails. The McKinleyville Community Plan used the cute buzzword "TrailSafe" to imply that something might be done, but it never gave any more information than the buzzword. Trails are less safe than dark alleys.

Page 89. "given the perception that a regional framework for trail development does not exist" is more than a perception.

Page 107, 108. In Table 5 the title for one column is "acronym", but there is only one pronounceable acronym out of the 29 abbreviations. Re-label the column correctly as "abbreviation".

Page 108, "Table 5, continued" should be shown for the unlabeled table.

Page 108. The "Local Funding sources" should have the abbreviation shown in parentheses after the name of the source. The sources should be in the same alphabetical sequence as in Tables 5 and 6, or Table 5 and 6 should be restructured to show the funding sources in the same sequence as they are discussed.

4

Page 128, 132. Terminology should be consistent and not colloquial rephrasing. "Class I bike paths" should be "Class I bikeways (bike paths)". Government reports need consistency and clarity, not literary variety.

Page 143. Trail signals cost money. I designed the first bikeway signal in California in 1973.

Page 143. Grade separated crossings cost millions and are usually bypassed, so fences are needed to force their use.

#### Other comments

There are separate specific laws for hitchhikers and a separate specific sign prohibiting hitchhiking on public roads. All hitchhikers may be pedestrians, but Caltrans District 1 has politically considered "all" pedestrians to be hitch hikers. The previous Caltrans District 1 Director, a bicyclist, promoted bicyclist continuity on State highways but not pedestrian continuity. At a 1993 HCAOG meeting, the Caltrans representative (District 1 Assistant Director) stated "We don't want hitchhikers on our highway." HCAOG, Caltrans, Humboldt County Planning, CoastWalk, and the California Coastal Trail reports have all ignored this problem. The prohibition is enforced by the California Highway Patrol by citing various Code sections, such as violating a posted sign, walking on a freeway, etc., and about 15 years ago the fine was \$84 per the Humboldt County Court, but it is probably a lot more now.

All ramps leading to the Klamath River Highway 101 bridge, as well as the bridge itself, are posted "Pedestrians Prohibited". Caltrans District 1 should **remove** the "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs from the Klamath River bridge, the bridge off-ramps, and the bridge on-ramps. Pedestrians should not be required to ride a bike or purchase a car in order to travel from their homes to adjacent communities. The cost for removal of the signs is miniscule.

Highway 101 between the Klamath River bridge and the Newton Drury off-ramp is an expressway, not a freeway. The Prairie Creek State Park bypass also is an expressway, not a freeway. Both segments of Highway 101 are posted "Pedestrians Prohibited". When Caltrans relinquished the Newton Drury Parkway to the National Park Service it did not retain a right of way for pedestrians. Both State and Federal parks have several times proposed charging "fees" to enter parks. State and Federal deficits will continue in trillions for decades, and there is no guarantee that future administrations will not start charging locally. Caltrans District 1 should **remove** the "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs from the Prairie Creek State Park Bypass unless Redwood and National State Parks agrees to **return** the public right of way easement for pedestrians thru the park. RNSP annually closes the Drury Parkway to vehicles in order to have bicycle races.

Orick is a short distance from Prairie Creek State Park. We had the "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs between the Prairie Creek State Park southbound on-ramp and Orick removed three separate times in order to legally walk between the two, and they have finally stayed removed.

The Big Lagoon sand spit is very difficult to walk on for five miles, and the creek sometimes blocks crossing. State Dept. of Fish and Game threatens to prohibit pedestrians at times when "endangered" species such as the plover are present. The few pedestrians should be allowed to use Highway 101 between Stone Lagoon and Patrick's Point Drive. Prior to a few years ago there was only a "Pedestrians Prohibited" sign on the southbound off-ramp, and we requested its removal. Caltrans must have listened to some extent because they then **installed a new** "Pedestrians Prohibited" sign on the northbound off-ramp as well. Caltrans District 1 should **remove** the "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs from the southbound off-ramp and the north-bound

on-ramp to Highway 101 at Patrick's Point Drive near Patrick's Point State Park. Between the Patrick's Point Drive grade separation and Moonstone, pedestrians can use Patrick's Point Drive and Scenic Drive. Neither street has much room for pedestrians, but at least it is a legal and physical route. Providing a wider shoulder on the ocean side would improve pedestrian safety as well as improve motor vehicle safety.

Caltrans District 1 widened the shoulders on the Little River Highway 101 bridge with a \$3 million project in order to **not restrict bicyclists** from using freeways in Humboldt County. No pedestrian crossing was provided because the Sierra Club did not like Caltrans' proposed design, so Caltrans installed "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs which prohibited walking between Trinidad and McKinleyville. The only legal and physical way to go between the two communities was to swim the river unaided or cross once a year when they put a rope across for the Clam Beach Run. Humboldt County Judge Miles' daughter drowned in the river a few years ago while trying to cross with her horse. When Caltrans planner Guy Luther was working on the proposed Highway 101 Coastal Scenic Corridor plan we managed to get the "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs at the southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramps at the Crannell interchange removed, however, the northbound on-ramp sign was reinstalled and we had to work to get it removed again. Over the years we talked to several other Caltrans people and managed to get the signs removed at Moonstone at the northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp. Few people walk nowadays, but at least there is now a legal and physical way to walk from Trinidad to McKinleyville.

Caltrans should construct a usable shoulder on southbound Highway 101 between PM 122.69 and Bald Hills Road. There is no shoulder and there is no safe stopping sight distance for both pedestrians and bicyclists. A rolled curb and shoulder would at least provide room for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as room for emergency motor vehicle parking (flares don't always work). The Coastal Trail is supposed to be continuous, but it is unsafe for pedestrian to walk on Highway 101 to Orick. **Three (3) motorists have died in the last 6 months on Highway 101 between Robinson Road (PM 122.69) and Bald Hills Road.** After several cars went into Prairie Creek about 23 years ago we got Caltrans to install Botts dots, but the dots are obscured just south of Bald Hills Road by the rise in the highway pavement. Twenty years ago after three river crashes and a death within 2 weeks (plus numerous other crashes) we got Caltrans to put up the plastic reflectorized lane marker-wands south of Bald Hills Road, but vehicles would knock them down and as well as the pavement delineator reflectors on the northeast corner of Bald Hills Road. After the 19 year old girl drowned in the creek in October 2008 and after several more near fatalities, we convinced Caltrans to put up a single arrow to alert motorists that there was a turn in the road. Other roads like at Big Lagoon got 5-10 arrows, but at least we got one. One week after the 19 year old girl died we saw 5 people standing along the road where she had gone over, and we thought they were investigating it. As it turned out, they were hunting for the car of another driver who had gone off the road and managed to escape from his car without drowning. He had a scuba diver looking in the creek, but they couldn't find the car, only a bunch of other old auto parts. The two other people who drowned in 2009 after going off the road were about 1/4 mile further north of Bald Hills Road but south of Robinson Road.

Caltrans should relocate the centerline of Highway 101 just north of Freshwater Lagoon to provide a shoulder on the northbound lane. Additional roadway pavement would be needed on the westerly, ocean side, but Caltrans has the right of way already. The Freshwater Lagoon spit has a fatality rate 20 times higher than the Eureka-Arcata corridor where Caltrans is proposing to spend \$30-60 million. All we got after pointing it out was a painted double yellow line. The Botts dots on the double yellow line are knocked off by all the motorists constantly crossing it, and the dots were finally replaced about two months ago, after ten years.

6

Caltrans should paint a pedestrian crossing on Highway 101 for RNSP's Trail X to alert motorists of the possibility of pedestrians. Stopping sight distance is very good on this straight section of highway.

A trail should be constructed from RNSP Berry Glen Trail W along the abandoned logging road to the southeast behind the recently closed mill and connect with the Bald Hills Road intersection leading to RNSP Redwood Creek trailhead and to Orick. This road appears to not be located on Green Diamond property if you use County Assessor maps, but the County maps are often inaccurate and several people have said the old road east of the mill is actually Green Diamond's.

Pedestrians already have the right of way at the Bald Hills Road intersection east of Green Diamond's south mill entrance, and motorists are more likely to be cautious near an intersection which has more signs and turning vehicles. Stopping sight distance is fairly good eastbound, but traffic coming down the hill may be going faster. A painted crosswalk should be installed to alert motorists of the possibility of pedestrians crossing to continue onto the southerly side of Bald Hills Road or to get to the Redwood Creek trailhead to the east. This Redwood Creek trail progresses inland upstream along Redwood Creek to the Tall Trees Grove. Ultimately it could connect to the Pacific Coast Trail.

The northerly Redwood Creek levee may be a useful for local equestrian use, but it leads only to the section of beach north of the levee. For purposes of a "Coastal Trail", this section goes nowhere. For much of the year Redwood Creek blocks passage to the south. The rocky promontory (Mussel Point) at the north end of the beach is too high to be bypassed. The RNSP Skunk Cabbage Creek Trail used to continue to the beach about a mile north of Mussel Point, but it was relocated about two miles to the north. RNSP gave up on trying to provide a trail south of Mussel Point because when Redwood Creek cut through the spit, hikers would trespass on private property to get to Hufford Road and then two miles inland to the Redwood Creek bridge. One report mentioned "cultural resources", but the "cultural" part was the trespassing across private property. A pedestrian bridge over the mouth of Redwood Creek would cost \$5-10 million and destroy much of what people come to RNSP for. It may also be prohibited by the legislation which created Redwood Park.

Humboldt County Public Works should install signs directing trail users from the intersection of the Redwood Creek trailhead road at Bald Hills Road along Bald Hills Road itself, over the Prairie Creek bridge, south on the southeasterly side of Highway 101 (there is adequate room outside of the pavement), and then onto the Redwood Creek levee continuing south into Orick. Users could leave the levee at the ramp just south of the Orick Community Service District office and signs could direct them to cross Highway 101 at the existing crosswalk. Orick could provide lodging, food, and supplies. There is even periodic bus service to Eureka. There is also periodic bus service from the McKinleyville Airport to Orick for visitors who are avoiding cars. Note that Caltrans has made it illegal to walk from McKinleyville to Orick by posting "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs at several places on Highway 101. Signs could then direct users over the Redwood Creek Bridge where in 1984 we previously got Caltrans to provide New Jersey-style concrete traffic barriers on each side to protect pedestrians and horses. Signs should direct users onto the south side Redwood Creek levee which leads to the RNSP Visitor Center.

Ultimately **construct** a short bridge over the south slough of Redwood Creek from the south-side levee across the south slough to the RNSP Visitor Center itself. With construction of proposed RNSP Gyron Bluff Trail R, **the Coastal Trail would then be continuously pedestrian accessible to the south end of RNSP.**

**Construct** a short bridge over the south slough of Redwood Creek from the south-side levee to the RNSP Visitor Center itself. Tourists at the Visitor Center could also cross a short distance to the island. With construction of the small bridge over the slough and the proposed Gyron Bluff Trail R, **the Coastal Trail would then be complete and continuously pedestrian accessible all the way to the southern end of RNSP.** This portion of the Coastal Trail is entirely within government owned land.

The legislation for the national park prohibits permanent bridges across Redwood Creek. The south slough of Redwood Creek is already crossed by the gated culvert through the south levee, so it apparently is not considered as "Redwood Creek". The legislation **expanding** Redwood National Park prohibits installation of permanent footbridges across Redwood Creek, but the slough was acquired prior to the expansion, so perhaps it wouldn't apply anyway. A bridge over the slough, therefore, could be a "permanent bridge", although any floods might damage it like they would damage the Visitor's Center ADA boardwalk or the Visitor Center itself. Until the south slough bridge is built, however, trail users could get off the levee (with private property owner permission) at the Shoreline Deli (food and supplies) and get to the Visitor Center by traveling a third of a mile on Highway 101.

Shoreline Deli's owner should be contacted to confirm his revocable permission to temporarily cross from the levee at Shoreline Deli to Highway 101 in order to get to the Orick Visitor Center by traveling a third of a mile on Highway 101. Many people have used this crossing in the past, and it is presumed that he has no objection.

Caltrans in the past proposed giving to Redwood National Park the existing public right-of-way on both side of SR 101 at Freshwater Lagoon in Humboldt County. This land was purchased with State gas tax monies paid by motorists. Shortly before making the give-away proposal, Rick Knapp, the District 1 Director, made a statement at another project that it was inconceivable that the State would give away properties that the State taxpayer gas tax monies had bought, so he was inconsistent but promoting a political agenda. Redwood National Park might prohibit various users or might charge fees for access to the State owned tidelands below mean high tide as well as for access to the State owned property in Freshwater Lagoon. Since this section of SR 101 has a fatality rate 483 times the State average, it is desirable to preserve adequate vehicular right-of-way so that safety could someday be improved. If the right-of-way proposed to be retained is used for widening the vehicular roadway, however, Caltrans might not provide parallel pedestrian access along both sides of Highway 101. Since Caltrans District 1 has a policy of posting "Pedestrians Prohibited" signs when it does not provide safe pedestrian access, there is a possibility that in addition to not being able to cross Redwood National Park land without paying access fees, there would be no way to leave the Orick community to the south along Highway 101.

RNSP's Trail 0 at the Redwood Creek Picnic Area should stay on the ocean side of Highway 101 using the existing dirt shoulder. After 40 years of commenting, the Highway 101 along Freshwater Lagoon Spit no longer looks like the Redwood National **Parking lot**, the grand entrance to RNSP. Immediately after the three year termination period when the last campers were gone, one of the local newspapers reported that business in Orick had increased significantly, which is in direct contrast to Chamber of Commerce statements.

Walking and crawling from the south end of Freshwater Lagoon Spit to Dry Lagoon before CDRP cut the Stone Lagoon section of their trail about 1993 was very time consuming. The cave at the south end of the spit can only be entered at very low tide. Between the cave and Stone Lagoon you can climb and slide over the rocks. At the south end of Freshwater Lagoon Spit

Caltrans hydro-mulched the westerly cut slope about 1995, 15 years ago, and it has worked fairly well, but the northerly section could be mulched again. **The RNSP proposal for the Gyon Bluff segment (RNSP Trail R) between the south end of Freshwater Lagoon Spit and Stone Lagoon is a good, useful trail.** RNSP Trail R might give RNSP an excuse to finally do needed mulching and trail building.

In priority, the Plan's purposes are apparently:

- 1) recreation
- then, 2) transportation

The priority of the purposes should be reversed. Many useless "recreational" trails can be created which will have little usage. Consider the bike lane at the Minor Theater in McKinleyville which starts at a tee intersection and ends at a cul de sac 300 feet to the south, going nowhere. Or consider the looped Nursery Way bike lane behind Miller Farms which goes nowhere, and the only use it has ever gotten is a one-time bicycle race promoted by a County Planning Commission member. Transportation trails are obviously also recreational trails for those who want to get somewhere.

The Plan proposes four types of hard-paved bikeways:

- 1) Class I bikeway (bike path)
- 2) Class II bikeway (bike lane)
- 3) Class III bikeway (bike route)
- 4) Multi-Use bikeway

No mention is made of sidewalks. Pedestrians are forced to use facilities where they have no legal right of way over bicyclists. No mention is made of posting "pedestrians have the right of way" signs. No physical engineering design consideration seems to ever be given to the bicycle speeds that are politically promoted by bicycle clubs. Bicycles kill pedestrians too. If a bicyclist kills or injures a pedestrian on a "trail" which has not been properly designed for the bicycle speeds promoted, then government is liable for significant damages.

The Plan's construction materials should be evaluated:

- 1) concrete (Portland cement concrete) (PCC)
- 2) asphalt (actually asphaltic concrete) (AC)
- 3) disintegrated granite (DG)
- 4) graded crushed rock
- 5) wood chips over dirt
- 6) un-modified bare dirt (natural surface)

All the Plan's construction materials are impervious except wood chips over dirt and un-modified dirt (natural surface). Impervious materials for a bikeway are just as impervious as materials used for a road used by vehicles. The area proposed to be made impervious should be calculated since it has a significant impact on the environment: land, streams, and ocean. The Plan proposes to pave the world. Where are the protests from the Arcata eco-types? Now it seems to be fashionable to pave with asphalt and disintegrated granite as long as you call it a bikeway. Bikeways require hard, impervious surfacing and are not "green". Pedestrians don't require the same hard, impervious surface; it is only the Maintenance Department that needs it.

Modes of alternative transportation should be recognized and evaluated:

"walking" by "pedestrians" on "feet" (or "foot").  
hiking is a form of walking, but only the term walking should be used in the Plan.  
bicycle ("bicycling" by "bicyclists" on "bicycles")  
narrow wheel touring bicycles which require hard, impervious surfaces.

mountain bikes which presumably don't need impervious surfaces, but are usually provided with it anyway.

tricycles (adult, bicycle-like). The elderly and handicapped should not be ignored.

tricycles (children's).

gin rick shaws.

horses ("riding" by "equestrians" on "horses")

skate boards.

skates ("skating" by "skaters" on "skates")

in-line skates.

wheel chairs.

scooters (motorized wheel chairs).

golf carts ("riding"). Elderly and handicapped can use these vehicles on roadways which have posted speeds of less than 25 mph.

Segway. Do motor vehicle laws prevail?

Electric bicycles. Governed by motor vehicle laws.

# APPENDIX B

## QUESTIONNAIRE TEMPLATE

To identify the regional capacity for trail planning and development, the following questionnaire was provided to public works and/or planning staff of the seven incorporated cities and the county. The information obtained from the questionnaire and interviews was used to characterize the opportunities and constraints surrounding active transportation system development in the Humboldt County Regional Trails Master Plan.

1. How is the City facilitating trail development? This could include City-wide trail planning efforts and/or looking for trail opportunities on a project by project basis.
2. What methods does the City use to acquire trail corridors? This could include dedication at time of development or City acquisition programs.
3. Does the City have trail preservation strategy/ies, in cases where there are important but informal local trails or where you otherwise do not have right-of-way?
4. What are the constraints that limit the City from pursuing local multi-use trail system and regional trail system connections? Or from City participation in regional trail system development?
5. What City department is primarily responsible for planning trails?
6. What City department is primarily responsible for constructing and maintaining trails?
7. What are the main sources of funding the City uses to construct trails?
8. Do you have a trail maintenance program? If so, how is maintenance funded?
9. What are the City's trail maintenance challenges and solutions?
10. Does your agency have any volunteer trail maintenance programs? If not, would you be interested in learning how other municipalities and organizations run these programs?

*This page is intentionally left blank.*

# APPENDIX C

## REFERENCES

AB No. 1358, Chapter 657, Legislative Counsel's Digest.

[http://www.calbike.org/pdfs/ab\\_1358\\_bill\\_20080930\\_chaptered.pdf](http://www.calbike.org/pdfs/ab_1358_bill_20080930_chaptered.pdf)

California (State) Coastal Conservancy. 2003. Annie & Mary Rail-Trail Feasibility Study. Prepared by Redwood Community Action Agency, Natural Resources Services Division (RCAA NRS).

California (State) Coastal Conservancy. 2005. Hammond Coastal Trail: South Implementation Strategy. Prepared by Redwood Community Action Agency.

California Department of Finance. 2009. E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2009, with 2000 Benchmark. URL:

[http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4\\_2001-07](http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-4_2001-07). Accessed on May 24, 2010.

California Department of Public Health. 2004. Prevalence of Obesity and Healthy Weight in California Counties, 2001. URL:

<http://www.cdph.ca.gov/pubsforms/Pubs/OHIRobesityweightCA2001.pdf>. Accessed on December 22, 2009.

California Transportation Plan 2035 Executive Summary, [www.californiatransportationplan.org](http://www.californiatransportationplan.org)

County of Humboldt. 2002. Building Communities Report.

County of Humboldt. 2002. Natural Resources and Hazards Report.

County of Humboldt, Department of Health & Human Services (HCDHHS). 2008. Humboldt County General Plan Update Health Impact Assessment. URL: [www.humpal.org/hia](http://www.humpal.org/hia). Accessed on December 14, 2009.

County of Humboldt, Department of Public Works. 2001. Hammond Coastal Trail Extension Analysis: From Trinidad to Fortuna. Prepared by RCAA NRS.

County of Humboldt, Department of Public Works. 2006. Humboldt County Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations Report. Prepared by Redwood Community Action Agency, Natural Resources Services Division.

County of Humboldt, Department of Public Works. 2009. Letz Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Path and Hammond Trail Enhancement Project Description.

Humboldt County Association of Governments (HCAOG). 2008. *Annie and Mary Trail, Next Steps*. Prepared by Alta Planning + Design.

HCAOG. 2008. *Hammond Trail Extension: Next Steps*. Prepared by Alta Planning + Design.

Maher, Joe. 2009. *Federal Funding for Conservation and Recreation: Trails Funding by the Department of Transportation. Resources for the Future*.

Nelson / Nygaard, *Tribal Transportation Needs Assessment Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria*, prepared on behalf of Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, February 2009.

North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA). 2008. Board of Directors Resolution No. 2008-11.

Planwest Partners, *2008 Humboldt County Regional Transportation Plan*, prepared for Humboldt County Association of Governments, 2008.

Rails-to-Trails Conservancy. 2007. *What is Railbanking?* URL: <http://www.railstotrails.org/ourWork/advocacy/policyAndFunding/railbanking.html>. Accessed on September 8, 2009.

Rails with Trails Conservancy. 2000. *Design, Management and Operation Characteristics along 61 Active Railroad Corridors*.

Red Plains Professionals Inc., *Draft Long Range Transportation Plan Hoopa Valley Reservation*, prepared for the Hoopa Valley Tribe, 2008.

Redwood Community Action Agency, Natural Resources Services. URL: <http://www.naturalresourcecesservices.org/HammondTrail.html> (December 19, 2009)

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2002. *Rails with Trails: Lessons Learned*. URL: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rectrails/guidance.htm>. Accessed December 18, 2009.

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHA), Office of Highway Policy Information. 2002. *Highway Statistics 2000*. URL: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ohim/hs00/ps1r.htm>. Accessed on December 14, 2009.

Wylde, Margaret. 2002. *Consumers' Survey on Smart Choices for Homebuyers*. Survey Sponsored by the National Association of Home Builders and National Association of Realtors.

[http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab\\_1351-1400/ab\\_1358\\_bill\\_20080930\\_chaptered.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/asm/ab_1351-1400/ab_1358_bill_20080930_chaptered.html) (December 20 2009)

<http://www.karuk.us/> (February 22, 2010)

<http://www.yuroktribe.org> (February 23, 2010)

[http://www.cgcc.ca.gov/Press/Big\\_Lagoon\\_Rancheria\\_Compact.pdf](http://www.cgcc.ca.gov/Press/Big_Lagoon_Rancheria_Compact.pdf) (March 1, 2010)

<http://www.wiyot.com/> (March 1, 2010)