

ROAD EVALUATION REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

PURPOSE: The *Road Evaluation Report* is intended as a way for an applicant to document the condition of the access road(s) serving the subject property for cannabis projects that require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Special Permit (SP), or Zoning Clearance Certificate (ZCC). This report is not intended to be used for any other type of Planning & Building Department permit application. This will enable Public Works staff to determine if the existing roadway network [excluding on-site driveway(s)] is suitable to accommodate the proposed use on the subject property.

In rural areas, a category 4 road is usually adequate for most uses. If the road is paved and has a centerline stripe it is considered by the Department to be a category 4 road. In urban and suburban areas, the road may also need to accommodate other road users (pedestrians, bicycles, equestrians, etc.). When roads meet or exceed this standard, the roadways can typically accommodate increased traffic. This evaluation is accomplished by the applicant completing Part A of the *Road Evaluation Report*.

When the roadways do not meet a category 4 standard, there is a question that road may not be able to accommodate traffic from the proposed use. The goal is to evaluate roads that do not meet road category 4 standards in order to determine if the roads can accommodate increased traffic. This evaluation is accomplished by the applicants engineer completing Part B of the *Road Evaluation Report*.

In lieu of constructing road improvements to meet a category 4 road standard, the Department may approve a *Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan*. A neighborhood traffic management plan may include (but is not limited) the following elements: restricting the times that project traffic will use the road to off-peak hours; combining trips to reduce the volume of project traffic; carpooling to reduce the volume of project traffic; the use of signs and CB radios to coordinate traffic using the road(s); etc. The Department's criteria for approving a *Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan* is based upon site specific conditions; sound engineering judgment; the proposed ADT and DHV of the roads; the need to accommodate other road users (pedestrians, bicycles, equestrians, and other cannabis projects using the road, etc.); and the frequency and quantity of traffic associated with the proposed use. The applicant's Civil Engineer can address this in Part B of the *Road Evaluation Report*.

There may be other cannabis projects that use the same access road(s) as your project. Part B of the *Road Evaluation Report* needs to address the cumulative impacts from your project and all other cannabis projects that will also use the same road(s). There may be benefits of applicants collectively working together with one engineer to complete the *Road Evaluation Reports* for all of the projects.

(continued on next page)

REFERENCES:

- Humboldt County Road Design Manual, Chapter 7, Design Standards for Roadway Categories.
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT ≤400).*
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AKA "Green Book")
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation

INSTRUCTIONS: The *Road Evaluation Report* consists of two parts. The first part (Part A) <u>may</u> be completed by the applicant. If the second part (Part B) is needed, it <u>must</u> be completed by a Civil Engineer licensed by the State of California. The .pdf version of this document provides fields that can be filled in.

A separate *Road Evaluation Report* is required for each road. Save Time: before completing these forms consult with the Land Use Division at 707.445.7205 to make sure you are evaluating all of the necessary roads for your project; that other cannabis projects in the vicinity have been included; and to make sure that you understand what is needed.

Special instructions to the applicant's Civil Engineer in completing Part B:

- Engineer will need to contact the Department for a list of other cannabis projects that may be using all or some of the same roads in the roadway network.
- Engineer will need to determine which of these projects utilize the roads within the same roadway network by personally reviewing the cannabis project applications at the Planning & Building Department. Many of the cannabis project applications are incomplete; therefore the engineer may need to directly contact other applicants to determine how these other cannabis projects will utilize the roads in question.
- Engineer may propose a master plan in which any required roadway improvements are incrementally divided among several cannabis projects. However, the master plan must be designed so that improvements to the road(s) will be adequate when constructed incrementally.

// END //

HUMBOLDT COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS ROAD EVALUATION REPORT

PART A: P	art A may be completed by the applicant			
Applicant Nar	me:Antonio Petrusevski- Mayers Flat Farms, LLC	APN:	211-372-006	
Planning & E	Building Department Case/File No.: PLN-12	2651-CUP		
Road Name:	Private road	(comple	ete a separate form	ı for each road)
From Road (Cross street): Avenue of the Giants			
To Road (Cro	oss street): Dyerville Loop Road			
Length of roa	ad segment: 1 Mile	miles	Date Inspected:	1/5/2021
Road is main	tained by: County X Other Road Asso	ociation / A	Adjacent Land Own	ners
Check one of	(State, Forest Service, Na f the following:	ational Park	, State Park, BLM	, Private, Tribal, etc
Box 1	The entire road segment is developed to Categ checked, then the road is adequate for the prop	•	,	,
Box 2 X	The entire road segment is developed to the ec then the road is adequate for the proposed use	-		
	An equivalent road category 4 standard is definition width, but has pinch points which narrow the one-lane bridges, trees, large rock outcroppin visibility where a driver can see oncoming veh oncoming vehicle to stop and wait in a 20 foot pass.	road. Pinc. gs, culverts picles throu	h points include, b , etc. Pinch points gh the pinch point	ut are not limited to s must provide which allows the
Box 3	The entire road segment is not developed to the equivalent of road category 4 or better. The roa may or may not be able to accommodate the proposed use and further evaluation is necessary.			

The statements in **PAPT** A are true and correct and have been made by me after personally inspecting and

Part B is to be completed by a Civil Engineer licensed by the State of California.

The statements in PART A are true and correct and have been made by me after personally inspecting and measuring the road. A map showing the location and limits of the road being evaluated in PART A is attached.

Antonio Petrusevski

Signature

01/17/2021 Date

Antonio Petrusevski Name Printed

Important: Read the instructions before using this form. If you have questions, please call the Dept. of Public Works Land Use Division at 707.445.7205.

PART B: Only complete Part B if Box 3 is checked in Part A. Part B is to be completed by a Civil Engineer licensed by the State of California. Complete a separate form for each road.

Road I	Name:	Date Inspected: APN:
From Road:		(Post Mile) Planning & Building
To Road:		(Post Wile) Department Case/File No.: (Post Mile)
1.	Num	is the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of the road (including other known cannabis projects)? ber of other known cannabis projects included in ADT calculations: act the Planning & Building Department for information on other nearby projects.)
	ADT	: Date(s) measured:
	Meth	od used to measure ADT: Counters Estimated using ITE Trip Generation Book
	Is the	ADT of the road less than 400? Yes No
	1	f YES , then the road is considered very low volume and shall comply with the design standards outlined in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) <i>Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT</i> \leq 400). Complete sections 2 and 3 below.
	1	f NO , then the road shall be reviewed per the applicable policies for the design of local roads and streets presented in AASHTO <i>A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets</i> , commonly known as the "Green Book". Complete section 3 below.
2.		ify site specific safety problems with the road that include, but are not limited to: (Refer to Chapter 3 in HTO <i>Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT</i> \leq 400) for guidance.)
	A.	Pattern of curve related crashes.
		Check one: No. Yes, see attached sheet for Post Mile (PM) locations.
	B.	Physical evidence of curve problems such as skid marks, scarred trees, or scarred utility poles
		Check one: No. Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.
	C.	Substantial edge rutting or encroachment.
		Check one: No. Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.
	D.	History of complaints from residents or law enforcement.
		Check one: No. Yes (check if written documentation is attached)
	E.	Measured or known speed substantially higher than the design speed of the road (20+ MPH higher)
		Check one: No. Yes.
	F.	Need for turn-outs.
		Check one: No. Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.
3.	Conc	lusions/Recommendations per AASHTO. Check one:
	canna	The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known abis projects identified above.
		The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known abis projects identified above, if the recommendations on the attached report are done. (check if a porhood Traffic Management Plan is also required and is attached.)
	addre	The roadway cannot accommodate increased traffic from the proposed use. It is not possible to ess increased traffic.
-		ng the location and limits of the road being evaluated in PART B is
		e statements in PART B are true and correct and have been made by
me afte	er pers	onally evaluating the road. (SEAL)

Signature of Civil Engineer

Date

Important: Read the instructions before using this form. If you have questions, please call the Dept. of Public Works Land Use Division at 707.445.7205.



Road Evaluation Report for Private Road Located in

Fruitland, California

Prepared for:

Mayers Flat Farms, LLC

APN: 211-372-006

Prepared by:

ETA Humboldt

Contact Name: Vanessa Valare

Telephone: 707.923.1180/760.613.6520

Email: etahumboldt@gmail.com

Introduction:

The subject of this road evaluation is for Private Road located in Fruitland, CA. The evaluation of this access road leading to 211-372-006 was conducted by ETA Humboldt on January 5th, 2021. This road evaluation was undertaken to determine if the road network used to access the project site is at Humboldt County Road Category 4 standard or equivalent.

Background:

The site is located approximately 7 miles up Dyerville Loop Rd and private driveways located off of Dyerville loop Road as seen on the Road Evaluation Map, West of the south fork of the Eel River near Miranda. French Rd is gravel and dirt and is shared with neighbors and a locked gate. There are three culverts along the private road as well as rolling dips. the private drive is a permanent use access road shared by Six landowners and 7 parcels.

To access the site Via 101-From South Hwy 101 (Eureka), Take Exit Myers flat. Take a left onto Avenue of the Giants, from there take a left heading towards Dyerville loop road. From Dyerville loop travel for approximately 6-7 miles till you reach 40.272207°, -123.779959°. There is a locked gate and the one mile of private drive continues from here.

Findings:

The ADT for the private road is less than 30 vehicles per day. The width of the private road ranged from 14ft- 20ft. Multiple locations were observed and referenced on the site map to have adequate room for vehicles to pull over and or pass with good visibility. There are approximately 17 locations mapped and references as Road Sites that were approximately 20ft in width and or provided a location to pull a vehicle over. Travel way width along the private portion of the private road varies from 14-28 ft wide with 1 ft -2 ft shoulder and adequate turnouts. See Site Map for specified locations.

Drainage control on the private road was found to be functioning adequately with well defined and appropriately spaced rolling dips, push-outs, ditches and ditch relief culverts.

Assessment of culverts and/or stream crossings was not part of our access road evaluation.

No improvements are being recommended for the private road to function as a road category 4, provided that the road is adequately maintained. No significant sediment discharge sites were observed on this access road.

Conclusion:

The private road leading of Dyerville Loop Road to the applicant's property, Apn- 211-372-006 and is equivalent to Road Category 4 due to an adequate distribution of turnouts and low ADT.

Mile 0.0 (Private Road) Paved enough space for vehicles to pass each other.



Mile 0.2 (Private Road: Approximate road width is 18ft at this location. Good visibility.



Mile 0.2 (Private Road): Turnout at this location. Good visibility.



Mile .4 (Private Road): Good visibility and enough room for vehicles to pass.



Mile .5 (French Road): Good visibility. Approximate road width 16ft.



Mile .6: (Private Road)



Mile .7 (Private Road): Good Visibility and adequately dispersed pull outs.



Mile .8 (Private Road) : Before property entrance road is 18ft wide at this point with good visibility and room for cars to pull out.

