



Pacific Coast Bike Route/California Coastal Trail Engineered Feasibility Study

Final Report February 2013

PREPARED BY:

Alta Planning + Design

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:

GHD, Inc

RCAA

PREPARED FOR:

Caltrans District 1 and Mendocino Council of Governments



Pacific Coast Bike Route/California Coastal Trail Engineered Feasibility Study

Final Report

Prepared for:

Caltrans District 1

Mendocino Council of Governments

Prepared February, 2013

Alta Planning + Design

GHD, Inc

RCAA



This page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the community members and agency staff who provided input during public workshops and advisory group meetings throughout the planning process. Your participation and contributions are key to this and future efforts to develop Pacific Coast Bike Route and California Coastal Trail in Mendocino County.

Management Team

Phil Dow, Mendocino Council of Governments
Janet Orth, Mendocino Council of Governments
Cheryl Willis, Caltrans
Rex Jackman, Caltrans
Jesse Robertson, Caltrans

Technical Advisory Group

Bob Merrill, California Coastal Commission
Tamara Gedik, California Coastal Commission
Tammi Grove, California Coastal Commission
Lee Otter, California Coastal Commission
Lisa Ames, California Coastal Conservancy
Loren Rex, California State Parks
Louisa Morris, Mendocino Land Trust
Teresa Spade, City of Fort Bragg
Abbey Stockwell, Mendocino County Planning
Patti Black, Mendocino County DOT

Project Team

Alta
GHD
RCAA
VRPA

“The preparation of this report was programmed through the Mendocino Council of Governments’ FY 2011/12 and 2012/13 Transportation Planning Work Programs and funded with State Planning & Research funds (\$150,000). The project budget includes one contract with Alta Planning + Design at \$134,977, covering a team of consultants and subcontractors: Alta (\$50,090), GHD, Inc. (\$73,227) and Redwood Community Action Agency (\$11,660).”

This page intentionally left blank.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	iii
1. Introduction and Summary.....	1-1
1.1. Project Description.....	1-1
1.2. Objective.....	1-1
1.3. Study Process.....	1-2
1.4. Methodology.....	1-2
1.5. Report Organization.....	1-3
2. Identification and Evaluation of Potential Improvements.....	2-1
2.1. Guidance for Design Concepts.....	2-1
2.2. Caltrans Active Projects.....	2-3
2.3. Relevant Plans and Projects.....	2-11
2.4. Basic Improvement Concepts.....	2-16
2.5. Improvement Design Illustrations.....	2-17
2.6. Evaluation Criteria.....	2-25
2.7. Other Potential Improvements.....	2-27
2.8. Evaluating and Summarizing Potential Improvements.....	2-27
3. Recommendations.....	3-1
3.1. Segment Overview Maps and Summaries.....	3-1
3.2. Potential Improvement Segments.....	3-7
3.3. Next Steps.....	3-53
Appendices	
A. Relevant Documents and References.....	A-1
B. Study Data and Analysis Methodology.....	B-1
C. Cost Estimate Methodology.....	C-1
D. Technical Advisory Group and Public Participation Process.....	D-1
E. Typical Project Implementation Steps.....	E-1

Table of Figures

Figure 2-1. Caltrans Standards for Class II Bike Lanes on Rural Highways (Figure 301.2A)	2-2
Figure 2-2. Caltrans Active Projects.....	2-7
Figure 2-3. Downtown Gualala Active Project.....	2-8
Figure 2-4. Fort Bragg to Tenmile River Active Project	2-9
Figure 2-5. Recommended Refined Street Section, Downtown Gualala.....	2-12
Figure 2-6. Point Arena Proposed Trail and Access Route Improvements.....	2-13
Figure 2-7. Proposed State Route 1 Cross-Section through Fort Bragg, Oak Street to Maple Street.....	2-14
Figure 2-8. Typical Conditions and Improvement Cross-Sections.....	2-18
Figure 2-9. Potential Improvement Segment Summary Form.....	2-28
Figure 3-1. South Mendocino County Segment Overview Map	3-3
Figure 3-2. South Central Mendocino County Segment Overview Map.....	3-4
Figure 3-3. North Central Mendocino County Segment Overview Map	3-5
Figure 3-4. North Mendocino County Segment Overview Map	3-6
Figure 3-5. Sonoma County Line to Gualala Potential Improvement Segments	3-11
Figure 3-6. Gualala to Glennen Gulch Potential Improvement Segments	3-15
Figure 3-7. Anchor Bay Potential Improvement Segments	3-19
Figure 3-8. Hearn Gulch to Point Arena Potential Improvement Segments.....	3-23
Figure 3-9. Point Arena to Garcia River Potential Improvement Segments	3-27
Figure 3-10. Elk and Greenwood State Beach Potential Improvement Segments	3-31
Figure 3-11. Elk to Cuffey’s Cove Potential Improvement Segments	3-35
Figure 3-12. Navarro River to Little River Potential Improvement Segments.....	3-39
Figure 3-13. Mendocino to Fort Bragg Potential Improvement Segments	3-43
Figure 3-14. Abalobadiah Gulch to Chadbourne Gulch Potential Improvement Segments	3-47
Figure 3-15. Westport to Westport Union Landing Potential Improvement Segments	3-51

Table of Tables

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Improvement Segments.....	iv
Table 2-1. Scoring Levels	2-27
Table 2-2. Basis for Establishing Scores	2-27
Table 3-1. Potential Improvement Segments	3-7
Table A-1. Summary of Design Guidelines and Regulations.....	A-2
Table A-2. Key Standards for Trail, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	A-11
Table B-1. Non-Motorized Count Data	B-1
Table B-2. Field Data Classifications	B-3
Table B-3. Field Data Category Descriptions	B-4
Table C-1. Master Cost Item List	C-11

Executive Summary

The Pacific Coast Bike Route and California Coastal Trail Engineered Feasibility Study examines current conditions versus needed pedestrian and bicycle improvements for the Pacific Coast Bike Route (PCBR) in the right-of-way and along parallel routes to Route 1 in Mendocino County, as well as accommodation of the California Coastal Trail (CCT) where it is planned to share the Route 1 right-of-way, per prior studies and plans.

The results of this high-level planning study are based on a combination of data from Caltrans and other agencies and organizations; review of relevant plans, projects, and policies within the study area; field-gathered data of engineering and environmental conditions; and broad engagement with the public and stakeholders through two series of region-wide public workshops.

During the first workshop series, the project team introduced the study's process and methodology. On maps of the study area, participants identified gaps in pedestrian and bicycle facilities (See Appendix D for a summary of the workshop results). Participants scored a list of evaluation criteria based on improvement priorities. The public scored "Safety Concerns" and "High Bicycle and Pedestrian Use" as their first and second priorities, respectively.

Criterion	Basis for Higher Score
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Conditions	Higher traffic volumes; speed limits; hills; curves; public comment
Safety Concerns	Higher # of bike or pedestrian accidents
High Bicycle and Pedestrian Use	High use counts by Caltrans; public comments
Provides a Regional Connection	Community and development areas, parks, preserves and destinations mapped or visible in GIS data/Google Earth; public comments
Gap Closure Opportunities	Lack of shoulders; narrow bridges; no feasible alternative route; relatively small segments without bike and pedestrian facilities located between nearby built facilities or connections to destinations (note that "improved" goal differs depending on terrain)
California Coastal Trail (CCT) Intersect	Depends on extent of planned CCT in segment without an alternative route
Biological and Cultural Resources	Low biological data score per ¼ mile and no present cultural resources
Constructability/Cost	Low average constraint score per ¼ mi; low construction cost per mile; adjacent to currently planned project

The project team identified an initial set of Potential Improvement Segments by applying the weighted priorities established from the public's input to an analysis of shoulder conditions. The segments were further developed through a dialogue with the technical advisory group (TAG) about how the segments relate to the context of existing community plans, active projects, trails and open space plans. Consideration was also given to the geographic spread of identified segments. The TAG's input also helped refine logical beginning and end points of Potential Improvement Segments in relationship to physical conditions and knowledge of planned projects along the study corridor.

A set of symbols was developed to score the Potential Improvement Segments based on the evaluation criteria. These segments are identified in the maps and tables in Chapter 3 of the study. Each criterion was scored according to the symbols listed in the following table.

Symbol	Associated Scoring Level
	High - strong presence/score
	Moderate presence/score
	Low - Limited presence/score
	Not present

Planning-level cost estimates were developed for each segment based on existing conditions and the type of proposed pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Potential Improvement Segments' evaluation criteria scores, as well as planning-level estimated costs for implementation, are compiled in Table ES-1.

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Improvement Segments*

Segment Name	Existing Facilities	Safety	High Use	Regional Connection	Gap Closure	CCT	Bio and Cultural Resources	Constructability	Cost Estimate
Sonoma County Line to Gualala									\$14,100,000
Gualala to Glennen Gulch									\$8,100,000
Anchor Bay									\$20,900,000
Hearn Gulch to Point Arena									\$22,800,000
Point Arena to Garcia River									\$13,200,000
Greenwood State Beach/ Greenwood Bridge and Elk									\$14,300,000
Elk to Cuffey's Cove									\$2,200,000

Segment Name	Existing Facilities	Safety	High Use	Regional Connection	Gap Closure	CCT	Bio and Cultural Resources	Constructability	Cost Estimate
Navarro River to Little River	◐	◐	◐	●	●	●	○	◐	\$51,800,000
Mendocino to Fort Bragg	○	●	●	●	○	○	●	◐	\$11,700,000
Abalobadiah Gulch to Chadbourne Gulch	●	◐		◐	●	◐	◐	◐	\$35,500,000
Westport to Westport Union Landing	●		◐	●	◐	◐	◐	○	\$23,100,000

* Potential Improvement Segments are listed from south to north along the project's study area of State Route 1 in Mendocino County.

During the second workshop series, the project team presented the draft Potential Improvement Segments and asked for input on the following questions:

- Did we evaluate the draft Potential Improvement Segments correctly?
- What are the key sections of these segments that are most important for bicycle and pedestrian facility improvement?

The workshop participants provided feedback to these questions via a facilitated discussion and notes applied directly to the Potential Improvement Segments maps (See Appendix D for a summary of the workshop results). Although the participants' feedback did not result in conclusive priorities, it did provide useful input for further consideration of the Potential Improvement Segments by Caltrans during the project definition stage.

In summary, the PCBR and CCT Engineered Feasibility Study accomplished three major things:

- The collection of existing conditions base data in Geographic Information System (GIS) format.
- The identification of Potential Improvement Segments with their associated cost estimates.
- The gathering of public and stakeholder weighted priorities for pedestrian and bicycle improvements and their initial feedback on the Potential Improvement Segments.

This planning-level study is just the beginning of further planning and analysis of the Potential Improvement Segments. As a next step in the process, Caltrans will utilize the existing conditions GIS data, improvement cross section typologies, and initial planning-level cost estimates to advance the study of the Potential Improvement Segments. Caltrans will then seek to match developed design concepts with appropriate funding sources. Planning-level design concepts will sequentially follow the Caltrans projects that have

already been initiated. Caltrans will continue to engage the public and stakeholders on the development of the segments throughout the project development process.