

Lassen  
COUNTY LINE



# Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2023-2043

Prepared for the



Lassen County Transportation  
Commission



*Lassen County*  
*Regional Transportation Plan*  
*2023*

Lassen County Transportation Commission  
707 Nevada St. #4  
Susanville, CA 96130

*October 6, 2023*

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Lassen County 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides a coordinated, 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within the region. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), the Lassen County Local Transportation Commission (LCTC) is required by California law to adopt and submit an approved RTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) every four years. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) assists with plan preparation and reviews draft documents for compliance and consistency. The RTP must be consistent with other planning guidance in the region such as adopted general plans, airport plans, bicycle plans, and public transit plans.

### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

The LCTC solicited public comment from a wide variety of groups, including the public, resource management agencies administering public lands, transit operators, transportation advocacy groups, tribal governments, and all surrounding counties. Recent complementary transportation planning efforts provided valuable community input that was utilized for this RTP update. Public outreach was also conducted during the RTP process at the Susanville Farmers Market and a virtual workshop and online survey were available to the general public in early 2023 to gather input on potential projects identified in the RTP project tables. The Draft RTP was presented at an LCTC meeting that was open to the public and stakeholders and the public alike were invited to attend and comment on the Draft RTP.

### REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

Environmental documentation for an RTP is required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The LCTC has preliminarily determined that the Lassen County 2023 RTP will not result in significant impacts. Therefore, an Initial Study/Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and is being circulated with this Draft RTP.

### REGIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Lassen County is located on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada mountains in northeastern California approximately 90 miles northwest of Reno, Nevada, and approximately 200 miles northeast of Sacramento, California. Lassen County is bound by Modoc County to the north, Shasta County to the west, Plumas and Sierra Counties to the south, and Washoe County (State of Nevada) to the east. The County contains one incorporated city (Susanville) and one federally recognized tribal entity (Susanville Indian Rancheria).

### DEMOGRAPHICS AND ECONOMICS

The U.S. Census reported the population of Lassen County at 32,730 in 2020, including an inmate and institutionalized population of about 8,750. In 2020, Susanville had a population of about 16,730, half of the county's total population, including an institutionalized population of approximately 7,600.

The California Department of Finance (DOF) predicts that the total population for Lassen County will decrease significantly, by 19.3%, and the non-institutionalized population will decrease by 17.9% during the lifetime of this RTP. The percentage of individuals in the combined age range group of 50-74 years is forecast to decrease by 45.7% while the 75+ age group is set to increase by 89.2%. An aging population is indicative of a future need for increased transit services. The age group from 20 to 49 years old is anticipated to increase by 5.6% to 50% of the total population by 2045. This segment is those most likely to be transporting children to school and extracurricular activities, as well as commuting to and from work.

The median household income in Lassen County was estimated at \$56,971 in 2020, according to the 2020 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. On a countywide level, Lassen County's median household income is 73 percent of the statewide average. This classifies some census tracts as disadvantaged communities. Government agencies constitute major sources of employment in Lassen County, including the Army, prisons, and educational institutions.

## **CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

As required by the guidelines, this version of the RTP is consistent with other local and regional planning documents. Transportation capital improvement projects listed in these plans have been incorporated into the Action Element of the RTP. These documents include Lassen County General Plan Circulation Element (2000), City of Susanville General Plan (1990), Lassen County Transportation Development Plan (2021), Lassen County Active Transportation Plan (2022), 2020 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program, Lassen County Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (2018), Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (2021), and the City of Susanville Vehicular Wayfinding Sign Plan (2015).

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM**

The Lassen County regional roadway network is comprised of 1,706.45 miles of streets, roads, and highways. The mileage includes five State Routes (SR 36, SR 44, SR 70, SR 139, and SR 299) equaling 305.23 miles, City-maintained roads equaling 43.48 miles, and County-maintained roads, which comprises the bulk of the roadway system in the County at 1,065.35 miles.

Federal agencies maintain 641.1 miles of road in Lassen County. USDA Forest Service manages the Lassen National Forest and maintains approximately 228 miles of roadway in Lassen County. Other agency roadways in Lassen County are maintained by the U.S. Army, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the National and State Parks Services, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Most of the federal roadways in the County are not paved.

## **ROADWAYS AND BRIDGES**

Existing traffic volumes for the most recent 6 years (2014 – 2019) for which data is available on Lassen County state highways were obtained from Caltrans. Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on state highways within the Susanville area has generally decreased over the last ten years except for Ash Street-SR 139.

The highest truck traffic volumes (measured as Truck AADT) were found on US 395 while the largest increase in Truck AADT was found on SR 147 with an annual average increase of 131 percent.

When we look at Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (DVMT), estimates for countywide VMT for 2018-2020 show that VMTs are decreasing year after year.

As of the most recent California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment (2018), the average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for roadways in Lassen County is 60. The PCI in Lassen County is just within PCI scores deemed “at risk” (PCI between 50 and 60). Once pavement reaches this condition, it tends to deteriorate at a faster rate and should be addressed as quickly as possible.

Automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian accident data was reviewed from California Highway Patrol’s Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) and Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) databases for 2016-2019. There were a total of 1,561 injury crashes and roughly 2 percent of the total crashes of all types resulted in a fatality. During this same period, there were no bicycle accidents resulting in a fatality.

In Lassen County, roadways are the most used transportation facility. A significant investment in roadway maintenance and repair will be required over the next 20 years.

### **Transit Services**

The Lassen Transit Service Agency (LTSA) provides public transportation services in Lassen County through the operation of Lassen Rural Bus (LRB). LRB provides fixed route service along a Susanville City Route and several inter-community routes as well as providing a Dial-a-Ride service for those meeting particular criteria.

### **Non-Motorized Facilities**

Bicycle and pedestrian facility needs have been well documented in Lassen County. Lassen County adopted a Bikeway Master Plan in 2011 which included an overview of existing conditions, general needs, and recommendations for projects, and recently updated the County’s Active Transportation Plan in 2022. The RTP identifies numerous non-motorized facility needs.

### **Aviation Facilities**

Lassen County has five airports: Susanville Municipal Airport, Southard Field in Bieber, Ravendale, Herlong, and Spaulding. Only the Susanville Municipal Airport is on the Nation Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPAIS), meaning this is the only airport eligible for federal funding.

### **Goods Movement**

A combination of State Highways and County roads serve as the primary network for goods movement in Lassen County, with US 395 serving as a primary route for trucking through the County. Adequate maintenance and efficient operation of this roadway network is critical to the continued economic vitality of the County, as well as for the safety of the public. In Lassen County, the goods movement is focused on trucking.

## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION GOALS

The LCTC proposes the following general regional transportation goals:

- **Goal 1:** Develop and maintain a comprehensive, efficient, and safe transportation system to serve the needs of County residents and to stimulate the economic progress of the County.
- **Goal 2:** To provide adequate cost-effective public transit services, especially to accommodate the needs of the elderly and handicapped.
- **Goal 3:** Promote the continuous flow of goods in, out of, and through the County in a safe and economically efficient manner.
- **Goal 4a:** Provide an adequate number of safe, efficient airports and airfields.
- **Goal 4b:** Support the expansion of economical, efficient air services.
- **Goal 5:** Provide a safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian circulation system that takes advantage of the natural scenery and physical characteristics of Lassen County.
- **Goal 6a:** Minimize traffic congestion by increasing the efficiency of the existing transportation system through Transportation System Management (TSM) techniques.
- **Goal 6b:** Where feasible, reduce the demand for travel by Single Occupant Vehicles (SOVs) through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) techniques.
- **Goal 7:** Reduce GHG emissions from transportation-related activities within the Lassen County boundaries to support the state's efforts under AB-32 and to mitigate the impact of climate change.

As demonstrated in the RTP capital improvement project lists, Lassen County adheres to these goals. Additionally, these goals reflect existing conditions in the county.

## TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AND SECURITY/EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The policy element of this RTP includes safety goals and objectives that comply with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Transportation security/emergency preparedness addresses issues associated with large-scale evacuation due to a natural disaster such as wildfire or flood. Emergency preparedness involves many aspects including training/education, planning appropriate responses to possible emergencies, and most importantly communication and coordination. Transportation improvement projects that specifically address safety for all types of transportation modes are included in the project list tables.

## TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

As a method of developing responses to the transportation needs and issues discussed in the earlier portions of this document, this RTP includes a list of transportation system improvements for each mode of transportation applicable to Lassen County. This RTP lists both financially constrained and financially unconstrained improvements. Financially constrained projects are funded over the short- and long-term periods as demonstrated in the Financial Element. The unconstrained project list is considered a "wish list" of projects that would provide benefit to the region but are unlikely to receive funding over the next 20 years unless new funding sources become available.



Proposed transportation improvement projects are categorized by funded status, transportation mode, project type, and community location. The RTP improvement projects are consistent with those included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

## **TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PROGRAMS**

The Financial Element describes numerous federal, state, and local funding sources and programs that are available to the LCTC for transportation programs. Unfortunately, many of these funding sources are discretionary and allocated on a competitive basis and are therefore very difficult to predict. The primary state transportation funding source is fuel tax revenues which have been decreasing over time accounting for inflation and as vehicles have become more efficient. This RTP is based on a very conservative outlook on transportation funding over the next 20 years and includes a large financially unconstrained or “wish list” project list.

As part of the Financial Element, roadway, bridge, aviation, and transit revenues were forecasted over the next 20 years by using a variety of methods. The first five years of RTP projects are fiscally constrained. However, for the mid-term and long-term periods, there is a significant shortfall in recurring revenues. Additionally, this figure does not include long-term projects with unknown project costs. Specific implementation dates for projects will depend on the actual revenue available.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

**Chapter 1: Introduction ..... 1**  
Regional Transportation Process ..... 1  
Plan Purpose..... 1  
RTP Elements..... 2  
Consistency with 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines ..... 2  
Planning Legislation ..... 2  
New Planning Requirements..... 4  
Promoting Health..... 4  
RTP Planning Process ..... 4  
Coordination with Other Plans and Studies..... 5  
Transportation/Land Use Integration ..... 5  
Participation and Consultation Process ..... 6  
Social Equity and Environmental Considerations ..... 11

**Chapter 2: Existing Conditions ..... 13**  
Regional Description ..... 13  
Population Characteristics ..... 13  
Demographics ..... 17  
Commute and Travel Patterns ..... 21  
Public Health and Health Equity ..... 21  
Land Use ..... 23

**Chapter 3: Planning Documents ..... 25**  
Existing Planning Documents ..... 25

**Chapter 4: Modal Discussion ..... 29**  
Roadway Transportation Network..... 29  
Rail Facilities ..... 34  
Goods Movement ..... 36  
Transit Services ..... 37  
Non-Motorized Facilities..... 43  
Aviation ..... 46

**Chapter 5: Policy Element ..... 47**  
Goals, Policies, and Objectives..... 47

**Chapter 6: Action Element ..... 55**  
Plan Assumptions ..... 55  
Transportation Safety ..... 56  
Transportation Security/Emergency Preparedness ..... 57  
Environmental Mitigation ..... 57

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Lassen County Strategies to Reduce GHG Emissions .....             | 58        |
| Performance Measures.....  | 58        |
| Transportation Improvement Projects.....                           | 61        |
| Long-term and Financially Unconstrained Roadway Projects.....      | 65        |
| <b>Chapter 7: Financial Element .....</b>                          | <b>73</b> |
| Roadway Improvement Funding.....                                   | 73        |
| Discretionary Grants for Charging and Fueling Infrastructure ..... | 77        |
| Local Sources.....   | 85        |
| Transit Improvement Funding .....                                  | 85        |
| Aviation .....   | 87        |
| Projected Revenues .....   | 88        |

## **LIST OF TABLES**

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Participation Process During RTP Development.....                          | 7  |
| Table 2: Lassen County Disadvantaged Population.....                                | 12 |
| Table 3: Lassen County Population Trends.....                                       | 15 |
| Table 4: Existing and Future Age of Population.....                                 | 16 |
| Table 5: Lassen County Characteristics by Census Tract.....                         | 18 |
| Table 6: Housing Units in Lassen County .....                                       | 19 |
| Table 7: Median Household Income .....  | 19 |
| Table 8: Unemployment Rate .....  | 20 |
| Table 9: Major Employers in Lassen County.....                                      | 20 |
| Table 10: Lassen County Commuter Patterns .....                                     | 22 |
| Table 11: Lassen County - AADT Summary.....   | 33 |
| Table 12: Lassen County Daily Vehicle Miles Travelled (DVMT) .....                  | 33 |
| Table 13: Summary of Crashes by Severity in Lassen County .....                     | 34 |
| Table 14: Summary of Crashes by Crash Type Category in Lassen County.....           | 36 |
| Table 15: Lassen County Bicycle Accidents .....                                     | 36 |
| Table 16: Summary of Truck Traffic in Lassen County.....                            | 37 |
| Table 17: Summary of Recently Completed Projects .....                              | 62 |
| Table 18: State Highway Projects in Lassen County .....                             | 64 |
| Table 19: Lassen County Constrained Roadway Projects (Short-term, 10 Years).....    | 66 |
| Table 20a: City of Susanville Short-term Roadway Projects (0-10 Years) .....        | 67 |
| Table 20b: City of Susanville Short-term Roadway Projects (0-10 Years).....         | 68 |
| Table 21: Lassen County Unconstrained Projects 10+ Years .....                      | 69 |
| Table 22: Lassen County Bridge Projects.....  | 70 |
| Table 23: Lassen County Transit Services Agency - Capital Improvement Projects..... | 71 |
| Table 24: Lassen County Aviation Projects.....                                      | 72 |
| Table 25: RTP Forecast Revenue Summary .....  | 90 |
| Table 26: Lassen RTP Revenue/Expenditure Comparison.....                            | 91 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: Lassen County Site Map.....                                  | 14 |
| Figure 2: Lassen County Historical Population .....                    | 15 |
| Figure 3: Lassen County Future Population Trends.....                  | 16 |
| Figure 4: Lassen County Race/Ethnicity.....                            | 19 |
| Figure 5: Volcanic Scenic Byway .....                                  | 31 |
| Figure 6: Lassen County Vehicle Crashes 2016-2019 .....                | 35 |
| Figure 7: Susanville Route Map.....                                    | 39 |
| Figure 8: Lassen County Transit Routes.....                            | 40 |
| Figure 9: Lassen County Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities ..... | 44 |
| Figure 10: Susanville Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities .....   | 45 |
| Figure 11: Lassen County Road Classifications .....                    | 47 |

*Appendix A: LCTC Public Participation Plan and Policy*

*Appendix B: Agency and Stakeholder Involvement*

*Appendix C: Relevant Community Surveys*

*Appendix D: Active Transportation Improvement Projects*

*Appendix E: Virtual Workshop Survey Summary*

*This page intentionally left blank.*

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Lassen County. The LCTC is comprised of six commissioners, three members from the Lassen County Board of Supervisors, and three from the Susanville City Council. Lassen County is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of Caltrans District 2 with offices in Redding. The LCTC, along with Caltrans District 2, fulfills the transportation planning responsibilities for Lassen County. One of the main responsibilities of the LCTC is the preparation and approval of the Regional Transportation Plan.

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROCESS**

One of the major planning responsibilities of the LCTC is the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments in Lassen County involving local, state, and federal funding over the next twenty years. Transportation improvements in the RTP are identified as short-range/constrained (2023-2033) or long-range/unconstrained (2034-2044). The RTP must be updated every five (5) years to comply with Caltrans guidelines and be eligible for many sources of funding. The last RTP update was adopted in 2017.

The overall focus of the 2023 RTP is directed at developing a coordinated and balanced multi-modal regional transportation system that is financially constrained to the revenues anticipated over the life of the plan. The coordination focus brings the County, Caltrans, the City of Susanville, government resource agencies, commercial and agricultural interests, Susanville Indian Rancheria, and citizens into the planning process. The balance is achieved by considering investment and improvements for moving people and goods across all types of transportation including automobiles, public transit, bicycle, pedestrian, trucking, railroad, and aviation.

## **PLAN PURPOSE**

The RTP documents the policy direction, actions, and funding plan designed to maintain and improve the regional transportation system using the following methods:

- Provide an assessment of the current modes of transportation and examine the potential for new travel options within the region.
- Identify projected growth areas and future improvements for travel and goods movement.
- Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs and establish short-term and long-term goals to facilitate these actions.
- Provide information for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP), and the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).
- Identify and integrate public policy decisions made by local, regional, State, and Federal officials regarding transportation funding.
- Promote consistency between the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the RTP, and other plans developed by Cities, Counties, districts, Tribal Governments, and State and Federal agencies in response to Statewide and interregional transportation needs and issues.

- Employ performance measures that monitor the effectiveness of the transportation improvement projects in meeting the intended goals.
- Provide a forum for participation and cooperation and facilitate partnerships that reconcile transportation issues that transcend boundaries.
- Include Federal, State, and local agencies, Tribal Governments, the public, and elected officials in discussions and decision-making early in the transportation planning process.

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) prepared this 2023 RTP update based on these objectives consistent with the 2017 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines (RTP Guidelines), CTC, adopted on January 18, 2017.

## **RTP ELEMENTS**

The purpose of the RTP is to provide a vision for the region, supported by short- and long-range transportation goals. State and federal requirements prescribe that, for approval, RTPs must include the following elements:

- The Modal Discussion (Chapter 4) addresses the needs and future vision for each transportation mode separately. In Lassen County, this includes state highways, local streets and roads, public transit, active transportation facilities, railroads, goods movement, aviation facilities, and recreational trails.
- The Policy Element (Chapter 5) describes the transportation issues in the region, identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both a short- and long-range framework, and maintains internal consistency with the financial element fund estimates. Related goals, objectives, and policies are provided along with performance indicators and measures.
- The Action Element (Chapter 6) identifies projects that address the needs and issues of each transportation mode in accordance with the policy element.
- The Financial Element (Chapter 7) identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and funding strategies available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the action element. The intent is to define realistic funding constraints and opportunities.

## **CONSISTENCY WITH 2017 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) GUIDELINES**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) develops RTP Guidelines consistent with federal and state transportation planning requirements to guide RTPAs in developing their RTPs. For the first time, two separate guidelines were adopted in January 2017 to guide RTP development in Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs). Both documents incorporate new legislation and the associated goals, particularly related to reducing Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and improving air quality.

## **PLANNING LEGISLATION**

The Regional Transportation Plan must be consistent with the State's Transportation Plan and therefore much of the statewide legislation regarding regional planning focuses on the California Transportation Plan (CTP). To reach statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goals set by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and implementing legislation SB 375, the CTP considers the following areas for the movement of people and freight:



- Mobility and accessibility.
- Integration and connectivity.
- Efficient system management/operation.
- Existing system management and operation.
- Existing system preservation.
- Safety and security.
- Economic development.
- Environmental protection and quality of life.

Senate Bill 391 (SB 391, 2009) required the California Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan (CTP), the State's long-range transportation plan, by December 2015, to reduce GHG emissions and VMT. At the time of its original creation, the Plan stated that GHG emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below the 1990 levels by 2050 as described by AB 32 and Executive Order S-03-05.

In 2013, the connection between land use planning, transportation infrastructure investment, and greenhouse gases was strengthened by SB 743. SB 743 directed the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines to provide an alternative to the Level of Service (LOS) for evaluating transportation impacts. Particularly within areas served by transit, those alternative criteria must “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” (New Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1)). In January 2016, OPR released draft CEQA Guidelines and a Technical Advisory that changed the primary metric of transportation impacts from LOS to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Using the VMT metric promotes the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses. Per the California Air Resources Board Vision Model results, reductions in VMT growth are needed to achieve sufficient greenhouse gas emissions reduction for climate stabilization.

In 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-30-15 establishing a California GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Modeling undertaken by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) shows that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) will have to be kept to a 5.5 percent increase through 2030 to satisfy the executive order.

Executive Order B-32-15 issued by Governor Brown in July 2015, prioritizes California’s transition to a more efficient and less polluting freight transportation system. The California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP) and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan (CSFAP) direct State agencies to develop an integrated action plan by July 2016 that establishes clear targets to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase the competitiveness of California’s freight system.

The most recently completed 2050 CTP made efforts to acknowledge the unique challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. It goes on to demonstrate how major metropolitan areas, rural areas, and state agencies can coordinate planning efforts to achieve critical statewide goals that include safety, climate, equity, accessibility, quality of life/public health, economy, environment, and infrastructure. It is important to

align and implement the goals, policies, and strategies laid out in the CTP 2050 and CTPs completed previously.

## **NEW PLANNING REQUIREMENTS**

The latest RTP Guidelines (2017) incorporate the requirements of Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375. These bills encourage regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks through changes in transportation and land use. Although Lassen County is not located in an MPO and therefore not subject to the strict guidelines regulating GHG emission reductions, this planning document will promote measures to improve air quality and health goals in alignment with state and federal goals.

## **PROMOTING HEALTH**

The 2017 RTP guidelines have placed a new emphasis on promoting health for California residents through the promotion of transportation planning and policies that encourage physical activity and improve air quality. RTPs often incorporate many or all of the following health-promoting programs and planning strategies: safe routes to school programs; complete streets strategies; equity considerations; transportation safety; and policies to promote transit, bicycling, and walking. Air quality and safety are very important to public health; however, transportation can also encourage physical activity, such as walking and biking. Access to jobs, education, healthy food, recreation, worship, community activities, healthcare, and more also increase health benefits. As nations, states, and regions shift away from fossil fuel-dependent transportation modes, the benefits of reducing the effects of climate change will also help to reduce the public health risks from climate change effects such as extreme heat, storms, and drought.

## **RTP PLANNING PROCESS**

### **Inter-Agency Coordination and Planning Consistency**

The LCTC is served by the Lassen Transit Service Agency (LTSA), which provides public transportation within Lassen County. The six members of the LTSA are appointed by the LCTC and include representatives from the following entities:

- Three members from the Lassen County Board of Supervisors.
- Three members from the City of Susanville Council.

The LCTC is served by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) whose members are appointed by the LCTC and represent seniors, people with disabilities, and persons of limited means regarding transit matters.

## COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLANS AND STUDIES

During the development of the 2023 RTP update, existing plans, policy documents, and studies addressing transportation in Lassen County are reviewed under Chapter 5. These documents are listed below:

- Lassen County Transit Development Plan (2021)
- Coordinated Public Transit – Human Service Transportation Plan (2021)
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (2020)
- Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2017
- Lassen County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (2016)
- Active Transportation Program Applications (2015, 2022)
- City of Susanville Vehicular Wayfinding Sign Plan (2015)
- Ten-Year State Highway Operation and Protection Plan (2022)
- California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) (2022)
- US 395 Investment Strategy (2022)
- SR 36 Complete Streets and Mobility Plan (2021)
- Lassen County Housing Element (2014)
- City of Susanville General Plan
- Transportation Emergency Preparedness Initiative (2013)
- Lassen County Active Transportation Plan (2022)
- Susanville Indian Rancheria Long Range Transportation Plan (2007)
- Lassen County General Plan Circulation Element (2000)
- California Transportation Plan 2050
- Annual Unmet Transit Needs

## TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE INTEGRATION

This RTP is consistent with the City’s and the County’s General Plan Circulation Element, which supports the development and maintenance of an efficient, safe, and effective road system. The Circulation Element also supports an infrastructure plan that supports the purpose of the land use element. This needs to be consistent with demand and available resources, as well as the study of the orderly growth of Lassen County. The goals of the General Plan circulation element are consistent with the goals outlined in the Policy Element.

This RTP recognizes the importance of integrating land use planning and transportation planning to create a more efficient system. Future development should occur in areas that will be the easiest to develop without high public service costs, have the least negative environmental impact, and will not displace or endanger the region’s critical natural resources. This approach will result in lower costs for improvements and increased operational efficiency of the existing transportation system because it will be sized to reflect more compact growth near existing or planned services. Compact growth leads to healthier lifestyles, as access to bicycle and pedestrian facilities grows congruently. Additionally, aligning bicycle and pedestrian facilities with growth can help implement complete streets which increase livability and reduce traffic demand within the region by encouraging alternative modes. The complete street concept is supported and encouraged by this RTP and the California Transportation Plan 2050.

## **PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION PROCESS**

The planning of the regional transportation system is accomplished through the coordination of various governmental agencies, advisory committees, and public input. The organizational structure and composition of the LCTC and advisory groups involved in the development of the RTP are as follows:

- The LCTC, serving as the RTPA, includes three appointed representatives from the Lassen County Board of Supervisors and three appointed representatives from the Susanville City Council. The LCTC elects a Chairman and Vice Chairman, each of whom serves in this capacity for one year.
- The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) is a transit-specific advisory committee established by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). In Lassen County, the Council meets annually to discuss unmet transit needs, particularly those of the disadvantaged.
- Caltrans is responsible for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of the State Highway System and that portion of the Interstate Highway System within California. Enacted in 1972, Assembly Bill 69 laid out the basic framework for Caltrans. Headquartered in Sacramento, Caltrans has twelve district offices throughout the state. Lassen County is located in District 2, with offices in Redding. District 2 staff members serve as liaisons to the LCTC.

### **Public and Stakeholder Involvement**

A public involvement program is required for each RTP and is intended to provide a reasonable opportunity for citizens, private and public transit and freight operators, tribal governments, and other interested parties to participate early in the process. Public involvement was conducted in accordance with the 2017 RTP Guidelines and the LCTC Public Participation Plan and Policy, which is presented in Appendix A. The 2023 RTP update on public and stakeholder involvement included context-sensitive solutions. A summary of public and stakeholder outreach for the 2023 Lassen RTP update is summarized below.

Appendix B presents correspondence with agencies/stakeholders contacted as well as copies of flyers and advertising materials for public input. Table 1 below lists specific activities in the participation/consultation process of this RTP.

### **Native American Tribal Government Consultation and Coordination**

As part of the notification process, LCTC sent letters to the tribes identified in the Native American Heritage Commission Consultation list to notify them of the RTP process and availability of the Draft RTP and to invite them to discuss regional transportation needs in a one-on-one setting per AB 52. To date, none have responded. The Susanville Indian Rancheria covers approximately 1,350 acres throughout Lassen County and is regularly invited to LCTC TAC meetings. Multiple Susanville Indian Rancheria representatives have been contacted to provide input and distribute outreach materials.

### **Affected Regional Transportation Planning Agencies**

An important part of the RTP consultation process is to contact RTPAs in adjacent counties that may be affected by the Lassen RTP. Lassen County is bordered by Modoc County to the North, Plumas County to the South, Shasta and Sierra Counties to the West, and Washoe County, Nevada to the East. All five adjacent counties were contacted for input in this RTP update. Four have responded, as discussed below.

**Table 1: Participation Process During RTP Development**

| Participant  | Activity   | Date                    |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <b>Natural Resource Agencies</b><br>(BLM, USFS, CA Fish & Game, APCD)  | Contacted Requesting Input and Sent Survey                     | June - August 2022      |
| <b>Adjacent RTPAs</b><br>(Modoc CTC, Shasta RTA, Sierra CTC, Plumas CTC, Washoe RTC)   | Contacted Requesting Input                                     | June - August 2022      |
| <b>Public Outreach at Susanville Farmers Market</b>  | Shared information booth with LTSA, distributed link to survey | June 2023               |
| <b>Virtual Workshop and Survey Distribution</b><br>Transportation Advocacy Groups, Human Service Agencies, Medical Services, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Local Agency Staff | Link to Workshop and Survey Distributed                        | June 2023               |
| <b>Tribal Governments</b>  | Contacted Requesting Input and Sent Draft RTP                  | June 2022 and July 2023 |
| <b>Public Hearing</b><br>Draft RTP and Proposed Negative Declaration   | LCTC Meeting   | August 2023             |

***Modoc County Transportation Commission***

Modoc County and Lassen County are linked, most prominently, by US 395 and secondarily by SR 139. The Modoc County Transportation Commission (MCTC) expressed their interest in continuing to communicate with LCTC around inter-county roadways to enhance mobility in Modoc County. MCTC identified coordinated public transit service between the two counties as being successful, however also identified COVID-related impacts on Sage Stage, the public transit provider in Modoc County, as negatively impacting passengers. The reality that Modoc County’s population is projected to continue to decline, along with the uncertainty of funding, rising costs, and reduction in personal spending within Modoc County may impact transportation demands in Lassen County.

MCTC staff expressed their continued interest in the relocation of the Sage Hen Summit Roadside Rest Area by Caltrans which is located in Lassen County.

***Plumas County Transportation Commission***

Lassen County shares its southern border with Plumas County and is linked by both SR 70 and SR 36. The Plumas County Transportation Commission (PCTC) expressed their interest in continued coordination in providing public transit services to residents of the region and identified this as a high priority for the future. PCTC staff indicated that a housing shortage in Plumas County due to the loss of residences in recent wildfires may impact Lassen County as residents relocate to the County and that Plumas County’s economic investment in the recreation economy may impact Lassen as well. PCTC highlighted the following two projects as being of potential interest to LCTC during this RTP update: the construction of a

roundabout at SR 36 and County Road A13 and the Chester Complete Streets and Context Sensitive Streetscape Plan.

### ***Shasta Regional Transportation Agency***

Shasta County and Lassen County share two primary regional roadways, SR 299 and SR 99. The Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) expressed their interest in coordinating with Lassen County as well as Caltrans to maintain and improve transportation facilities that serve both counties. Furthermore, SRTA stressed the importance of working jointly towards the deployment of Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure along interregional corridors. SRTA representatives recommended that LCTC consider the following in updating the RTP:

- SRTA continues to work with transit agencies in the North State Super Region on the North State intercity Bus System, including coordination of ZEV infrastructure.
- SRTA is disappointed that Susanville Indian Rancheria no longer provides transit service to Red Bluff and Redding.
- Widespread opportunities for outdoor recreation in Shasta and Lassen Counties have the potential to impact transportation in the region.
- Population changes due to extreme climate events, availability of commercial air service, access to public transit, and the development of the Shasta County Jail may impact transportation in the region.
- SRTA is one of several partners working to create a vision for a North State east/west Alternative Fuels Corridor from Arcata to Reno, NV including SR 44, SR 36, and US 395.
- Caltrans District 2 is seeking funding to rehabilitate the Pit River Bridge over Shasta Lake. This project will impact Interstate 5 and the Union Pacific Railroad Valley Subdivision.
- The Lake Britton Bridge Project on SR 89 will impact both Shasta and Lassen County residents and may impact SR 299 traffic in Lassen County.

### ***Sierra County Transportation Commission***

Sierra County and Lassen County are linked directly by US 395 on the eastern side of the counties and indirectly by SR 70 which passes through Plumas County. The Sierra County Transportation Commission (SCTC) stressed the importance of maintaining these corridors as these routes are critical to goods movement, services, and travelers into both counties. Thus, the SCTC feels these corridors should be a priority for the LCTC and an area for potential coordination between the two counties for future projects.

### **Environmental Agency Consultation**

The 2017 RTP Guidelines identify that the RTP shall reflect consultation with resource and permit agencies to ensure early coordination with environmental resource protection and management plans. The following natural resource agencies/landholders were contacted for input. Relevant resource maps or plans were compared to this RTP. Copies of all correspondence can be found in Appendix B.

- California Fish and Wildlife
- Lassen County Air Pollution Control District
- Bureau of Land Management

- Lassen Land and Trails Trust
- Lassen National Forest
- Central Valley Regional Water Control Board

Findings and input from environmental agencies are summarized below.

### ***Lassen National Forest***

Lassen National Forest encompasses a total of 1.2 million acres of land managed by the US Forest Service. It lies within seven counties, of which Lassen County is one. The US Forest Service yard in Susanville is located near the intersection of Chestnut, Grand Avenue, and Paul Bunyan. Lassen National Forest representatives identified the following as high priorities for consideration in the Lassen County RTP:

- Improvement of the busy 5-way intersection in Susanville where the US Forest Service yard is located to increase the safety of drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.
- Consideration of a dedicated path along Paul Bunyan Road between the 5-way intersection in from of the yard and the Diamond Mountain Casino.
- E-bike access and safety.
- Improvement of pedestrian and bicycle access to Lassen College along SR 139 and Skyway Road.

### **Coordination with the California State Wildlife Action Plan**

Projects identified in the 2023 RTP will be evaluated at the project level through the CEQA and NEPA (if applicable) processes. However, the long-term goals identified in the Policy Element of this plan consider many of the stressors defined in the State Wildlife Action Plan (2015).

Lassen County straddles four separate conservation management ecoregions as managed by the California State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP): the Northwest Basin and Range, Southern Cascades, Modoc Plateau, and the Sierra Nevada. The SWAP identifies sensitive species, habitat stressors, and suggests conservation goals and actions for each of the ecoregions within the provinces. According to the SWAP, the major stressors within Lassen County conservation units are as follows:

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| • Annual and Perennial Non-Timber Crops | • Logging and Wood Harvesting   |
| • Climate Change                        | • Other Ecosystem Modifications |
| • Dams and Water Management/Use         | • Parasites/Pathogens/Diseases  |
| • Fire and Fire Suppression             | • Recreational Activities       |
| • Housing / Urban Areas                 | • Renewable Energy              |
| • Invasive Plants/Species               | • Roads and Railroads           |
| • Livestock, Farming, and Ranching      | • Utility and Service Lines     |

### **Public Transit Operators and Other Transportation Providers**

The Lassen Transit Service Agency is the primary public transit provider in Lassen County and provided input throughout the planning process. Through the SSTAC, LCTC made other transportation providers in Lassen County and neighboring Modoc County aware of the RTP update.

## **Community Input**

An important objective for this RTP update is to obtain input on the transportation planning process from a wide variety of Lassen residents. For this reason, a public outreach program was conducted starting early in the RTP process. Recent complementary transportation planning efforts provided valuable community input that was utilized for this RTP update, a summary of which is provided below. Public outreach was also conducted during the RTP process at the Susanville Farmers Market in 2023. Finally, a virtual workshop and online survey were available to the general public in early 2023 to gather input on potential projects identified in the RTP project tables.

### ***Active Transportation Plan Community Survey***

Extensive outreach was conducted for the development of the Lassen ATP in 2021 and was incorporated into the RTP planning process. As the ATP has a specific focus on transportation facilities that serve active modes of transportation, this community survey provided in-depth feedback on bicycle and pedestrian use and needs throughout the county. The ATP community survey was available online and was advertised through various local news outlets, stakeholders, and social media. A total of 247 survey responses were received. A summary of the ATP community survey results is provided below, and a complete analysis is included in Appendix C.

- Of survey respondents, 25 percent mentioned that they walk more than four times a week, 24 percent walk to a destination 1 to 3 times per week, and 19 percent walk 1 to 3 times per month.
- While 29 percent of respondents bike for non-recreational purposes with varying frequency, 61 percent of respondents bicycle for recreational purposes.
- The two most common reasons given as to why respondents do not bike or walk more often are poor road and bike lane conditions (49 percent of respondents) and poor sidewalk conditions (37 percent of respondents).
- Common requests for specific improvements included recreational trails and access to recreational trails in communities, sidewalks/separated paths along Main Street in Janesville, lighting and safer place for pedestrians on Paul Bunyan Road, maintenance of existing paths, and continuing the Skyline Extension Trail.

### ***State Route 36 Complete Street and Safe Mobility Report Community Survey***

Community input was solicited for the State Route 36 Complete Street and Safe Mobility Report in late 2020. This report is intended to create a vision for the revitalization and redevelopment of Main Street (SR 36) in downtown Susanville to create a safer corridor for multimodal transportation. The associated community survey effort was conducted online and was advertised through a project website and direct outreach to various stakeholder groups. This survey asked respondents about eight types of potential improvements to increase safety and mobility on Main Street. The weighted average of responses ranked improvements in the following order of importance from highest to lowest: Street Lighting, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, Sidewalk repair, Street Trees, Colored Concrete Banding, Wayfinding Signage, Gateway Feature, and Lane Re-allocation. A total of 383 survey responses were received. A complete analysis of the online survey is included in Appendix C.



## ***Virtual Workshop Survey***

During the RTP update process, lists of potential projects were compiled and presented to the public for review on the LCTC website along with a virtual workshop that provided an overview of the RTP planning process and what that means for transportation improvements in Lassen County. A corresponding survey was conducted online to collect input on potential transportation improvement projects. The survey, conducted through SurveyMonkey was available via the LCTC website. The survey and the virtual workshop were advertised by flyer as well. The virtual workshop survey collected 12 responses in total. Survey results are discussed in detail in Appendix E.

- Ten out of the 12 survey respondents are full-time residents of Lassen County.
- Nine out of the 12 respondents live in Susanville, with one living in Eagle Lakes Stones-Bengard and one living in Johnstonville.
- Presented with the opportunity to allocate \$100 among several types of transportation improvements, survey respondents indicated that they would spend the most money on maintaining and fixing existing streets and roads and the least on roadway improvements to improve fire safety. Similarly, Farmers Market attendees participating in a similar survey noted that they would spend the most on roadway maintenance, although pedestrian facilities were a close second.

## **SOCIAL EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Both state and federal laws require that regions plan for and implement transportation system improvements that will benefit all residents. Transportation improvements should not have a disproportionate adverse impact on low-income or other under-represented groups. Examples relevant to the RTP include access to transportation, displacement and gentrification, transportation affordability, and jobs/housing fit.

Median Household Income (MHI) for Lassen County was \$56,971 in 2020, according to the American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, or 73 percent of statewide MHI (Table 2). Many census tracts have an MHI that is less than 80 percent of the statewide MHI, a threshold widely used to designate a community disadvantaged due to low income. Approximately 60 percent of the Lassen County population is White, while 23 percent of the population is Hispanic, a figure that represents a 29 percent increase from 2015.

The Action Element of this RTP does not include new roadways or bypass projects that would displace underrepresented groups or decrease access to transportation. The Action Element includes capital improvement projects which will increase mobility for residents with no vehicle available to them such as maintaining a safe and reliable public transit fleet and expanding the bicycle and pedestrian facilities network. Public outreach for the RTP considered social equity factors. Direct links and notifications of the community survey were sent to leaders of social service programs, disabled advocacy organizations, and tribes.

**Table 2: Lassen County Disadvantaged Population**

| Census Tract              | Block Group | Area Description                        | Total Population <sup>1</sup> | Total Households | Median Household Income <sup>2</sup> | % of State-wide Median Income | Healthy Places                   |
|---------------------------|-------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                           |             |   |                               |                  |                                      |                               | Index <sup>3</sup><br>Percentile |
| 401                       | 1           | Bieber/Nubieber                         | 370                           | 154              | \$43,207                             | 72%                           | 20.0%                            |
| 401                       | 2           | Ash Creek Wildlife Area                 | 754                           | 404              | \$43,207                             | 72%                           | 20.0%                            |
| 401                       | 3           | Madeline/Termo                          | 266                           | 109              | \$43,207                             | 72%                           | 20.0%                            |
| 402                       | 1           | Spaulding                               | 732                           | 349              | \$46,884                             | 78%                           | 46.6%                            |
| 402                       | 2           | Westwood                                | 1,382                         | 701              | \$46,884                             | 78%                           | 46.6%                            |
| 402                       | 3           | Norville, Lasco, Coppervale             | 473                           | 237              | \$46,884                             | 78%                           | 46.6%                            |
| 403.02                    | 1           | Lake Leavitt                            | 1,185                         | 425              | \$69,728                             | 116%                          | 57.8%                            |
| 403.02                    | 2           | South of Gold Run                       | 1,454                         | 614              | \$69,728                             | 116%                          | 57.8%                            |
| 403.02                    | 3           | North of Gold Run                       | 1,407                         | 608              | \$69,728                             | 116%                          | 57.8%                            |
| 403.03                    | 1           | SR 139, outskirts Susanville            | 1,181                         | 505              | \$43,836                             | 73%                           | 28.1%                            |
| 403.03                    | 2           | E of Hall, N of Main                    | 497                           | 321              | \$43,836                             | 73%                           | 28.1%                            |
| 403.03                    | 3           | W of Hall, E of Grand, N of Main        | 552                           | 254              | \$43,836                             | 73%                           | 28.1%                            |
| 403.04                    | 1           | Susanville Downtown                     | 911                           | 355              | \$43,182                             | 72%                           | 8.6%                             |
| 403.04                    | 2           | Susanville - E. of Alexander, S of Main | 630                           | 299              | \$43,182                             | 72%                           | 8.6%                             |
| 403.05                    | 1           | Susanville Rch Prk to Eagle Lk          | 1,452                         | 593              | \$64,131                             | 107%                          | 66.8%                            |
| 403.05                    | 2           | E of Roop, N of Main                    | 750                           | 274              | \$64,131                             | 107%                          | 66.8%                            |
| 403.05                    | 3           | W of Roop, N of Hwy 36                  | 799                           | 368              | \$64,131                             | 107%                          | 66.8%                            |
| 404                       | 1           | Litchfield, Standish                    | 1,108                         | 480              | \$56,964                             | 95%                           | NA                               |
| 404                       | 2           | Correctional Facilities                 | 120                           | 0                | \$56,964                             | 95%                           | NA                               |
| 405                       | 1           | East of Hwy 395/Janesville              | 1,270                         | 494              | \$92,888                             | 154%                          | 61.6%                            |
| 405                       | 2           | South of Janesville                     | 483                           | 188              | \$92,888                             | 154%                          | 61.6%                            |
| 405                       | 3           | Janesville                              | 1,487                         | 647              | \$92,888                             | 154%                          | 61.6%                            |
| 406                       | 1           | Milford, Wendel, Honey Lake             | 608                           | 469              | \$55,184                             | 92%                           | 16.3%                            |
| 406                       | 2           | Herlong                                 | 1,380                         | 116              | \$55,184                             | 92%                           | 16.3%                            |
| 406                       | 3           | Doyle/S. County                         | 755                           | 316              | \$55,184                             | 92%                           | 16.3%                            |
| <b>TOTAL STUDY AREA</b>   |             |   | <b>22,006</b>                 | <b>9,280</b>     | <b>\$56,352</b>                      | <b>94%</b>                    | <b>46.4%</b>                     |
| <b>City of Susanville</b> |             |   | <b>15,064</b>                 | <b>3,001</b>     | <b>\$52,488</b>                      | <b>87%</b>                    | <b>12.5%</b>                     |

Note 1: Non-institutionalized population (does not include persons incarcerated and living in a skilled nursing facility).

Note 2: Census tracts (or cities with populations under 15,000) wherein median household incomes are less than 80% of the statewide mean (currently less than \$60,188) are considered low income and qualify as disadvantaged in terms of Active Transportation Plan Projects.

Note 3: California Healthy Place Index is a composite score; those lower than the 25th percentile qualify as disadvantaged communities.

Source: US Census American Community Survey 2019 Five Year Estimates

## **REGIONAL DESCRIPTION**

Lassen County, California is located on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada mountains in northeastern California approximately 90 miles northwest of Reno, Nevada, and approximately 200 miles northeast of Sacramento, California. Lassen County is bound by Modoc County to the north, Shasta County to the west, Plumas and Sierra Counties to the south, and Washoe County (State of Nevada) to the east (see Figure 1). The County contains one incorporated city (Susanville) and one federally recognized tribal entity (Susanville Indian Rancheria).

Lassen County is comprised of approximately 4,720 square miles and is characterized by varied geography with elevations ranging between 3,270 feet and 8,740 feet. Lassen’s geography consists of extensive forest and mountains to the west and desert hills to the east. The County contains two major rivers, the Susan River and the Pit River. The Susan River runs for approximately 67 miles beginning at the volcanic highlands and flows from the east along the Great Basin Divide to Honey Lake. The Pit River flows into northern Lassen County past Bieber, to emerge into the ranching region of Big Valley. The Pit River is a major river draining from the northeast into the State’s Central Valley. Lassen County is susceptible to severe weather and natural disasters, including wildfires, severe winter storms, flooding, strong winds, and landslides during major rain events.

## **POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**

### **Population Trends**


According to the U.S. Census and The California Department of Finance (DOF), the Lassen County population increased by 61.1, from 21,661 in 1980 to 34,895 in 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, the Lassen County population growth slowed considerably, increasing by only 3.2%. And most recently, from 2010 to 2020, the county’s population decreased by 6.2% to 32,730 (see Figure 2). This population includes the inmate population.

The U.S. Census reported the population of Lassen County at 32,730 in 2020, including an inmate and institutionalized population of about 8,750. In 2020, Susanville had a population of about 16,730, half of the county’s total population, including an institutionalized population of approximately 7,600. The total population figure for the County includes the inmates of four correctional facilities (High Desert State Prison, California Correctional Center (closing June 30, 2023), Lassen County Adult Detention Facility, Federal Correction Institution Herlong, and Lassen County Juvenile Detention). Population estimates for Lassen County and the City of Susanville excluding institutionalized populations are shown in Table 3.



**Figure 1**  
**Lassen County Site Map**





**Table 3: Lassen County Population Trends**


|   | 2010   | 2020   | 2025   | 2030   | 2035   | 2040   | 2045   |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>Total Lassen County</b>                  | 34,895 | 32,730 | 30,135 | 29,422 | 28,106 | 27,293 | 26,400 |
| <b>Lassen County Non-Institutionalized</b>  | 25,291 | 23,994 | 22,497 | 21,954 | 20,972 | 20,365 | 19,699 |
| <b>Susanville Non-Institutionalized</b>     | 9,547  | 9,130  | 8,560  | 8,354  | 7,980  | 7,749  | 7,496  |
| <b>Unincorporated Non-Institutionalized</b> | 15,744 | 14,864 | 13,937 | 13,600 | 12,992 | 12,616 | 12,203 |

*Source: U.S. 2010 and 2020 Decennial Census, The California Department of Finance*

As seen in Figure 3, The California Department of Finance (DOF) predicts that the total population for Lassen County will decrease significantly, by 19.3%, and the non-institutionalized population will decrease by 17.9% during the lifetime of this RTP.

### **Population Age Groups**

Table 4 shows the age trends over the lifetime of the RTP. The most notable changes in upcoming decades are a decrease of 45.7% in the combined age range group of 50-74 years and an increase of 89.2% in the 75+ age group. An aging population is indicative of a future need for increased transit services. The segment representing 50% of the total population by 2045, ages 20-49 years, is anticipated to increase by 5.6%, this segment is those most likely to be transporting children to school and extracurricular activities, as well as commuting to and from work.



**Table 4: Existing and Future Age of Population**

|                                 |         | Total  | Ages<br>0-4 | Ages<br>5-19 | Ages<br>20-34 | Ages<br>35-49 | Ages<br>50-64 | Ages<br>65-74 | Ages<br>75+ |
|---------------------------------|---------|--------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| 2020                            | Number  | 28,872 | 1,462       | 4,172        | 7,249         | 5,303         | 5,497         | 3,227         | 1,962       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 5.1%        | 14.4%        | 25.1%         | 18.4%         | 19.0%         | 11.2%         | 6.8%        |
| 2025                            | Number  | 29,526 | 1,480       | 4,446        | 7,751         | 5,061         | 4,720         | 3,374         | 2,694       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 5.0%        | 15.1%        | 26.3%         | 17.1%         | 16.0%         | 11.4%         | 9.1%        |
| 2030                            | Number  | 28,894 | 1,306       | 4,410        | 7,735         | 5,212         | 3,711         | 3,207         | 3,313       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 4.5%        | 15.3%        | 26.8%         | 18.0%         | 12.8%         | 11.1%         | 11.5%       |
| 2035                            | Number  | 28,106 | 1,207       | 4,229        | 7,525         | 5,607         | 3,114         | 2,672         | 3,752       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 4.3%        | 15.0%        | 26.8%         | 19.9%         | 11.1%         | 9.5%          | 13.3%       |
| 2040                            | Number  | 27,293 | 1,262       | 3,935        | 7,543         | 5,839         | 2,742         | 1,995         | 3,977       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 4.6%        | 14.4%        | 27.6%         | 21.4%         | 10.0%         | 7.3%          | 14.6%       |
| 2045                            | Number  | 26,400 | 1,241       | 3,713        | 7,454         | 5,801         | 2,896         | 1,582         | 3,713       |
|                                 | Percent | 100%   | 4.7%        | 14.1%        | 28.2%         | 22.0%         | 11.0%         | 6.0%          | 14.1%       |
| 2020-2045<br>Percent Change (%) |         | -8.6%  | -15.1%      | -11.0%       | 2.8%          | 9.4%          | -47.3%        | -51.0%        | 89.2%       |

Source: California Department of Finance (DOF) July 19, 2021, Report P-2B: County Population Projections by Individual Year of Age

## **DEMOGRAPHICS**

The following section includes a brief overview of the current population demographics of Lassen County with particular emphasis on sensitive transit dependent populations that are most reliant on public transportation or non-motorized forms of transportation for mobility.

### **Transit Dependent Populations**

Nationwide, transit system ridership is drawn largely from various groups of persons who make up what is often called the “transit dependent” population. This category includes youths, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, low-income persons, and households with no available vehicles for use. There is considerable overlap among these groups. Table 5 summarizes the current non-incarcerated transit dependent population by Census Tract in Lassen County from the 2020 American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census. Visual representations of this information are presented in more detail within the 2021 Lassen County Transportation Development Plan.

- The largest concentration of youth (19 percent) is located just north of Susanville (Census Tract 403.05).
- Janesville (Census Tract 405) and the areas surrounding Susanville (Census Tracts 401 and 402) have the greatest population (25 percent) of those who are ages 65 and older.
- Households living below the poverty line are located just east of Susanville in Census Tracts 403.3 and 403.4.
- Zero Vehicle Households are also most concentrated in the areas just east of Susanville (Census Tracts 403.3 and 403.4).

### **Ethnicity**

As seen in Figure 4, although Lassen County continues to be a predominantly White community (60 percent), this figure represents a 24 percent decline from 2015. The Hispanic population saw the greatest increase with 29 percent growth during this same period, currently making up 23 percent of the Lassen County population.

As of the 2020 US Census, the Susanville Indian Rancheria was home to 334 Native Americans, with many more residing throughout the county.

### **Housing**

The 2020 ACS estimated that there is a total of 12,216 housing units in Lassen County (Table 6). Since the 2015 Census, the total amount of housing has decreased by 517 housing units, or 4.1 percent. While overall housing units have decreased in Lassen County over the last five years, the number of units located within Susanville has increased by 13 percent, from 3,785 to 4,277 housing units.

### **Median Household Income**

The median household income in Lassen County was estimated at \$56,971 in 2020 (Table 7). On a countywide level, Lassen County’s median household income is 73 percent of the statewide average. This classifies some census tracts as disadvantaged communities.

**Table 5: Lassen County Characteristics by Census Tract**

| Census Tract | Area   | Total Population |       | Institutionalized? |               | Youth (ages 5-17) |              | Ages 65 +    |            | Below Poverty |            | Total Households | Zero Vehicle Households |             |
|--------------|--|------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|---------------|------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
|              |  | #                | %     | Yes                | No            | #                 | %            | #            | %          | #             | %          | Total            | #                       | %           |
| 401          | Bieber/Nubieber, Ash Creek Wildlife Area, and Madeline/Termo | 1,627            | 5.0%  | 212                | 1,415         | 236               | 15%          | 411          | 25%        | 175           | 11%        | 898              | 22                      | 2.4%        |
| 402          | Spaulding, Westwood, Norville, Lasco, and Coppervale         | 2,459            | 7.5%  | -                  | 2,459         | 256               | 10%          | 609          | 25%        | 280           | 11%        | 2,180            | 74                      | 3.4%        |
| 403.02       | Susanville and Johnstonville                                 | 4,343            | 13.3% | 29                 | 4,314         | 736               | 17%          | 811          | 19%        | 220           | 5%         | 1,840            | 84                      | 4.6%        |
| 403.03       |  | 3,204            | 9.8%  | 403                | 2,801         | 421               | 13%          | 336          | 10%        | 538           | 17%        | 1,558            | 114                     | 7.3%        |
| 403.04       |  | 1,804            | 5.5%  | 154                | 1,650         | 329               | 18%          | 260          | 14%        | 475           | 26%        | 896              | 59                      | 6.6%        |
| 403.05       |  | 4,169            | 12.7% | -                  | 4,169         | 796               | 19%          | 495          | 12%        | 440           | 11%        | 1,815            | 58                      | 3.2%        |
| 404          | Litchfield   | 8,786            | 26.8% | 8,657              | 129           | 227               | 3%           | 346          | 4%         | 235           | 3%         | 546              | 0                       | 0.0%        |
| 405          | Janesville   | 3,045            | 9.3%  | -                  | 3,045         | 268               | 9%           | 757          | 25%        | 240           | 8%         | 1,336            | 20                      | 1.5%        |
| 406          | Herlong, Patton Village, and Milfoil                         | 3,293            | 10.1% | 1,428              | 1,865         | 290               | 9%           | 396          | 12%        | 330           | 10%        | 1,147            | 18                      | 1.6%        |
| <b>Total</b> |  | <b>32,730</b>    |       | <b>10,883</b>      | <b>21,847</b> | <b>3,559</b>      | <b>16.3%</b> | <b>4,421</b> | <b>20%</b> | <b>2,933</b>  | <b>13%</b> | <b>12,216</b>    | <b>449</b>              | <b>3.7%</b> |

Note 1: Institutionalized population includes persons incarcerated or living in a skilled nursing facility.

Note 2: Institutionalized Population based on 2010 Census proportion to current population.

Source: ACS 2020 and the 2020 Decennial Census.



Figure 4: Lassen County Race/Ethnicity




Table 6: Housing Units in Lassen County

|                | 2015   | 2020   | Percent Change (%) |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------------------|
| Lassen County  | 12,733 | 12,216 | -4.1%              |
| Susanville     | 3,785  | 4,277  | 13.0%              |
| Unincorporated | 8,948  | 7,939  | -11.3%             |

Source: US 2020 Decennial Census, 2016-2020 American Community Survey

Table 7: Median Household Income

|               | 2015     | 2016     | 2017     | 2018     | 2019     | 2020     | Annual Change (%) | Percent Change 2015-2020 |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Lassen County | \$51,555 | \$51,457 | \$54,083 | \$56,362 | \$56,352 | \$56,971 | 2.0%              | 10.5%                    |
| California    | \$63,636 | \$66,637 | \$69,759 | \$70,489 | \$78,105 | \$77,358 | 4.1%              | 21.6%                    |
| United States | \$56,516 | \$59,039 | \$61,372 | \$63,179 | \$68,703 | \$67,521 | 3.7%              | 19.5%                    |

Source: American Community Survey 2020: ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables

## Employment

According to the California Employment Development Department (EDD), approximately, 7.5% of the Lassen County labor force was unemployed in January 2021 (Table 8). Between January 2021 and January 2022, the Lassen County unemployment rate decreased and aligned with the unemployment rate for the State of California. However, in January 2022, Lassen County began to trend higher than the unemployment rate for the United States.

|                      | January 2021 | October 2021 | November 2021 | December 2021 | January 2022 | Annual Change (%) |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|
| <b>Lassen County</b> | 7.5%         | 4.3%         | 4.2%          | 4.2%          | 5.4%         | -28.0%            |
| <b>California</b>    | 9.2%         | 5.8%         | 5.2%          | 4.8%          | 5.5%         | -40.2%            |
| <b>United States</b> | 6.4%         | 4.6%         | 4.2%          | 3.9%          | 4.0%         | -37.5%            |

*Source: California Employment Development Department; Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor*

## Major Employers

A list of major employers in Lassen County is shown in Table 9. Historically, the economy of Lassen County was dependent upon mining and lumber as well as farming. Currently Government positions, including those in the Army, the prisons, and education, constitute a major source of employment in the County.

| Employer                          | Location   | Industry                                 | Employees   |
|-----------------------------------|------------|--|-------------|
| Sierra Army Depot                 | Herlong    | Federal Government - National Security   | 1,000-4,999 |
| United States Dept of the Army    | Herlong    | Government Offices - Federal             | 1,000-4,999 |
| US Army Depot                     | Herlong    | Government Offices - Federal             | 500-999     |
| Banner Lassen Medical Center      | Susanville | Hospitals                                | 100-249     |
| Lassen Community College          | Susanville | Junior-Community College-Tech Institutes | 100-249     |
| Lassen National Forest            | Susanville | Cabin Rentals                            | 100-249     |
| Lassen Union High School          | Susanville | Schools                                  | 100-249     |
| Lassen Union High School District | Susanville | School Districts                         | 100-249     |
| Northeastern Rural Health         | Susanville | Clinics                                  | 100-249     |
| Safeway                           | Susanville | Grocers - Retail                         | 100-249     |
| Walmart                           | Susanville | Department Stores                        | 100-249     |
| Army National Guard               | Susanville | Government Offices - State               | 50-99       |
| Credence Continuation High School | Susanville | Schools                                  | 50-99       |
| Diamond Mountain Casino           | Susanville | Casinos                                  | 50-99       |
| Diamond View Middle School        | Susanville | Schools                                  | 50-99       |
| Janesville Union School District  | Janesville | School Districts                         | 50-99       |
| Juniper Ridge Elementary School   | Susanville | Schools                                  | 50-99       |
| Lassen County Adult Detention     | Susanville | Government Offices - County              | 50-99       |
| Lassen Nursing Rehab Center       | Susanville | Skilled Nursing Care Facilities          | 50-99       |
| Long Valley Charter School        | Susanville | Schools                                  | 50-99       |
| Mckinley Elementary School        | Susanville | Schools                                  | 50-99       |
| Red Lion Inn Suites               | Susanville | Hotels & Motels                          | 50-99       |
| Susanville Supermarket            | Susanville | Grocers - Retail                         | 50-99       |
| UPS Customer Center               | Susanville | Mailing & Shipping Services              | 50-99       |
| US Eagle Lake Ranger District     | Susanville | Government Offices - Federal             | 50-99       |

*Source: California Employment Development Department*

## COMMUTE AND TRAVEL PATTERNS

A common trip purpose for public transit trips is “work”. Therefore, a review of commute patterns is vital to an effective transit study. The U.S. Census Bureau maintains the “Longitudinal Employment-Household Dynamics” dataset, which provides detailed information on commute travel patterns. It should be noted that this data is collected based on permanent residence for employees and main office address for employers, so there may be inaccuracies due to where military personnel and seasonal employees identify their permanent residences and there may be differences between what the data shows and where employees report to work. Additionally, the data does not separate employees who work from home. Nonetheless, the data gives some useful insight regarding the general flow of commuters. Table 10 presents commute pattern data for both employed residents of Lassen County and persons traveling to Lassen County for work. Major commute pattern findings include the following:

- Just under half of Lassen County employed residents work within the City of Susanville (47.5 percent or 3,618 employees). Johnstonville (2.5 percent, 190 employees) is another Lassen County community with a relatively high number of jobs for Lassen County residents.
- Of the residents commuting out of the county for work, the largest number travel to Redding (204 employees or 2.7 percent). Other out-of-county locations include Sacramento and Chico, (3.8 percent or 287 employees, cumulatively).
- Approximately 46 percent, or 3,231 employees, who work in Lassen County live in Susanville.

The 2020 ACS conducted by the US Census Bureau provides additional commute data for Lassen County, including means of transportation to work. According to the survey, 80 percent of workers drove alone, 10.3 percent carpooled, 6.2 percent worked from home, 2.2 percent walked, 0.3 percent used public transportation, and 0.1 percent bicycled. This represents a slight increase in the proportion of residents driving alone to work since the previous 2017 RTP by approximately 2.8 percent. The number of individuals working from home has also increased since the previous RTP from 4.8 percent to 6.2 percent.

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH EQUITY

Appropriate transportation improvement projects can have a positive impact on overall public health. As such, public health and health equity should be factored into regional transportation improvement decision-making. Improvements to existing bicycle paths and sidewalks will increase the safety and appeal of the facility, thereby encouraging more users. New facilities provide a safe active transportation alternative to driving. Roadway or streetscape improvements, which slow down vehicle traffic, also make residents feel more comfortable walking or biking. In a modern society driven by computers and cell phones, providing opportunities for people to walk or bike is becoming increasingly important for public health.

A variety of health statistics for Lassen County gathered from kidsdata.org and the community demonstrate that Lassen County ranks below the statewide average for certain health statistics. Around 36.6 percent of middle school students in Lassen County are considered overweight or obese. This is slightly below the statewide average of 40 percent. When making transportation funding decisions, decision-makers should consider how each project impacts public health, encourages active transportation modes, and includes public health organizations in public outreach efforts.

**Table 10: Lassen County Commuter Patterns**

| Where Lassen County Residents Work |              |       | Where Lassen County Employees Live |              |       |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------|------------------------------------|--------------|-------|
|                                    |              |       | <b>County</b>                      |              |       |
| Lassen County, CA                  | 4,380        | 57.5% | Lassen County, CA                  | 4,380        | 62.2% |
| Shasta County, CA                  | 376          | 4.9%  | Washoe County, NV                  | 566          | 8.0%  |
| Sacramento County, CA              | 279          | 3.7%  | Shasta County, CA                  | 325          | 4.6%  |
| Butte County, CA                   | 234          | 3.1%  | Plumas County, CA                  | 221          | 3.1%  |
| Plumas County, CA                  | 218          | 2.9%  | Butte County, CA                   | 157          | 2.2%  |
| Humboldt County, CA                | 170          | 2.2%  | Sacramento County, CA              | 152          | 2.2%  |
| Jackson County, OR                 | 134          | 1.8%  | Tehama County, CA                  | 137          | 1.9%  |
| Sonoma County, CA                  | 120          | 1.6%  | Modoc County, CA                   | 109          | 1.5%  |
| Tehama County, CA                  | 120          | 1.6%  | Nevada County, CA                  | 104          | 1.5%  |
| Klamath County, OR                 | 103          | 1.4%  | Siskiyou County, CA                | 77           | 1.1%  |
| Alameda County, CA                 | 87           | 1.1%  | Placer County, CA                  | 72           | 1.0%  |
| San Francisco County, CA           | 81           | 1.1%  | Solano County, CA                  | 42           | 0.6%  |
| Placer County, CA                  | 70           | 0.9%  | Fresno County, CA                  | 41           | 0.6%  |
| Modoc County, CA                   | 61           | 0.8%  | Contra Costa County, CA            | 37           | 0.5%  |
| Siskiyou County, CA                | 58           | 0.8%  | Glenn County, CA                   | 34           | 0.5%  |
| Other Locations                    | 1123         | 14.7% | Other Locations                    | 591          | 8.4%  |
| <b>Total Jobs</b>                  | <b>7,614</b> |       | <b>Total Jobs</b>                  | <b>7,045</b> |       |
|                                    |              |       | <b>City</b>                        |              |       |
| Susanville, CA                     | 3,618        | 47.5% | Susanville, CA                     | 3,231        | 45.9% |
| Redding, CA                        | 204          | 2.7%  | Reno, NV                           | 192          | 2.7%  |
| Johnstonville, CA                  | 190          | 2.5%  | Sparks, NV                         | 146          | 2.1%  |
| Sacramento, CA                     | 150          | 2.0%  | Redding, CA                        | 124          | 1.8%  |
| Chico, CA                          | 137          | 1.8%  | Johnstonville, CA                  | 121          | 1.7%  |
| Chester, CA                        | 82           | 1.1%  | Westwood, CA                       | 107          | 1.5%  |
| San Francisco, CA                  | 81           | 1.1%  | Cold Springs, NV                   | 96           | 1.4%  |
| Bieber, CA                         | 79           | 1.0%  | Janesville, CA                     | 64           | 0.9%  |
| Westwood, CA                       | 77           | 1.0%  | Chico, CA                          | 61           | 0.9%  |
| Medford, OR                        | 62           | 0.8%  | Sacramento, CA                     | 54           | 0.8%  |
| Eureka, CA                         | 54           | 0.7%  | Chester, CA                        | 37           | 0.5%  |
| Klamath Falls, OR                  | 48           | 0.6%  | Red Bluff, CA                      | 37           | 0.5%  |
| Quincy, CA                         | 47           | 0.6%  | Alturas, CA                        | 29           | 0.4%  |
| Santa Rosa, CA                     | 46           | 0.6%  | Paradise, CA                       | 26           | 0.4%  |
| Red Bluff, CA                      | 43           | 0.6%  | Spanish Springs, NV                | 26           | 0.4%  |
| Other Locations                    | 2,696        | 35.4% | Other Locations                    | 2,694        | 38.2% |
| <b>Total Jobs</b>                  | <b>7,614</b> |       | <b>Total Jobs</b>                  | <b>7,045</b> |       |

Source: On the Map LEHD Data, 2019

## **LAND USE**

The City of Susanville is the most densely populated community within Lassen County. Population density in Susanville (1,687 persons/square mile) is significantly higher than the average for the County (7 persons/square mile). Land use in Susanville City is surrounded by open space, with a large proportion of residential and commercial in the center. A large proportion of land in Lassen County is designated open space or wilderness area and is managed by local, State, and Federal entities. The USDA Forest Service manages Lassen National Forest and the National Park Service (NPS) manages Lassen National Park.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

Below is a summary of the most relevant existing plans and studies to date that have been taken into consideration during the RTP planning process.

### **EXISTING PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

#### **Lassen County General Plan (2000)**

The Lassen County General Plan Circulation Element includes the following goals as they relate to transportation:

- Develop a safe and efficient transportation system that serves County residents and stimulates economic growth.
- Provide sufficient cost-effective public transit services, with a specific focus on serving the elderly and disabled.
- Maintain safe airports and airfields for public use.
- Use existing railroad lines throughout Lassen County for the transportation of goods and passengers.
- Expand bicycle and pedestrian pathways.

#### **City of Susanville General Plan (1990)**

The Circulation Element within the City of Susanville’s General Plan was last updated in 1990 and the transportation element focused primarily on the roadway system with no mention of transit. The Circulation Element is currently being updated.

#### **Lassen County Transportation Development Plan (2021)**

In 2021, LCTC commissioned LSC Transportation Consultants to update their Transportation Development Plan (TDP). An overview of existing transit conditions, demographics, and service performance was summarized followed by a comprehensive list of recommendations. These recommendations included:

- Eliminating the East County Route.
- Discontinuing the West County Extension.
- Implementing a Non-Emergency Medical Transportation service to Reno 1 day per week beginning FY 2022-23.
- Transferring a small amount of money from the capital fund (as needed).
- Allocating all TDA to public transit, planning and administration, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities (2%).
- Reassessing budget after three years.

#### **2020 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)**

The 2020 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is a program of projects funded through the state gas tax. The ITIP has three simple objectives:

1. Improve state highways.
2. Improve the intercity passenger rail system.
3. Improve interregional movement of people, vehicles, and goods.

While various State Routes that run through Lassen County were identified within the plan, no projects are proposed for any segment of these routes.

### **Lassen County Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (2018)**

In 2018, the LCTC identified projects eligible to be completed with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding. As a result, Lassen County was able to complete six of seven projects with previous partial STIP funding. This RTIP provided the funding necessary to complete infrastructure projects along Skyline Drive and State Route 36 South-East Gateway.

The 2018 RTIP identified over \$14 million of capital improvements on transportation infrastructure (spread over 7 distinct capital projects) during the six-year programming horizon. In addition, \$336,000 for planning programming and monitoring was identified as well.

### **Lassen County Active Transportation Plan (2022)**

The Active Transportation Plan provides a framework for expanding bicycle and pedestrian facilities with the goal of enhancing walking, biking, and multimodal mobility throughout Lassen County. The ATP identifies seven specific goals for the plan as follows:

1. Provide safe and efficient bikeways and pedestrian facilities in Lassen County.
2. Consider active transportation where appropriate in all future developments.
3. Develop a system that encourages commuting using active modes of transportation.
4. Educate and inform all residents and visitors about how to use bikeway facilities safely.
5. Avoid adverse environmental impacts of the implementation of the proposed system.
6. Acquire sufficient funding to construct top-priority projects in 20 years.
7. Develop a program to provide regular bikeway maintenance.

### **Coordinated Public Transit – Human Service Transportation Plan Update (2021)**

In 2021, the LCTC commissioned LSC Transportation Consultants to complete an update to the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan in conjunction with the TDP Update. The plan explored ways in which to improve mobility for the county’s most vulnerable populations such as seniors, and people with disabilities. The plan identified six major strategies to address issues relating to transit connectivity gaps within Lassen County, access to adjacent counties, and affordability of services. These implementation strategies included the following:

- Assist other transportation providers with obtaining FTA 5310 funds to purchase new vehicles.
- Allocate a small amount of funding to Lassen Senior Services to hire an accounting firm to prepare and track invoices and other grant-related processes.



- Designate a Mobility Manager and/or purchase a Mobility Management Application. Apply for FTA 5310 funding to support this strategy.
- Transportation Reimbursement Program.
- Multi-organizational approach to solutions.
- Strengthen efforts to coordinate with Susanville Indian Rancheria.

### **City of Susanville Vehicular Wayfinding Sign Plan (2015)**

The Wayfinding Sign Plan was written to provide directional information, create a sense of place through design, and consolidate existing signage to have a more cohesive look throughout the region. The plan identified six various design options and narrowed the choices to one through public participation and frequent review by city staff. Lastly, the plan identified 35 different destinations throughout Susanville.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## **ROADWAY TRANSPORTATION NETWORK**

A total of 1,706.45 miles of maintained roadways exists in Lassen County according to the 2019 California Public Road Data Report. The mileage includes five State Routes (SR 36, SR 44, SR 70, SR 139, and SR 299) equaling 305.23 miles, City-maintained roads equaling 43.48 miles, and County-maintained roads, which comprises the bulk of the roadway system in the County at 1,065.35 miles.

Federal agencies maintain 641.1 miles of road in Lassen County. USDA Forest Service, which manages the Lassen National Forest, maintains approximately 228 miles of roadway in Lassen County. Other agency roadways in Lassen County are maintained by the U.S. Army, the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the National and State Parks Services, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Most of the federal roadways in the County are not paved.

### **Road Classification**

Most of the existing streets and highways within Lassen County are two-lane roadways of varying width (depending on functional classification and usage). Major roadway classifications include the following:

- Major Arterials provide the highest level of service for the greatest speed for long interrupted distances. Lassen County has two major arterials: US 395 and SR 44.
- Arterials are roadways that provide for moderate-length trips between communities. They are considered to allow through traffic to flow at relatively high speeds with minimum interference from various access points. Within Lassen County, SR 36, SR 139, SR 299, Riverside Drive, and Skyline Road are all classified as minor arterials.
- Collectors connect traffic from local roads to arterials. They provide service to larger towns not directly served by the arterial system and essentially move traffic from one community to the next by providing connections to/from smaller communities to the minor arterials:
  - **Major collectors** are typically longer with higher speed limits. Examples of major collectors within the county are Mooney Road, Pittville Road, and Eagle Lake Road.
  - **Minor collectors** move traffic from traffic generators such as residential areas or commercial centers, to major collectors or minor arterials. Minor collector roadways include Ash Valley Road, Mall Route Road, and Smoke Creek Ranch Road.
- Local Roads serve travel over relatively short distances to access specific properties or adjacent lands. They include all roads not otherwise designated according to the classes above.

The state and federal highways in Lassen County and Susanville are shown in Figures 9 and 10, and described below:

- SR 36 is a two-lane minor arterial running east and west from Humboldt County through to US 395, just east of Susanville.
- SR 44 is a major arterial that begins in Shasta County, ending just west of Susanville at Route 36.

- SR 70 is a two-lane minor arterial segment connecting US 395 (near southern Lassen County) west towards Sacramento.
- SR 139 is a minor arterial that begins in Susanville off of SR 36 and travels northeast towards the Town of Canby.
- SR 147 connects the town of Canyondam near Lake Almanor and SR 89 to SR 36.
- SR 299 is an east-west 2-lane minor arterial that runs approximately 15 miles into Lassen County before turning into Bieber Lookout Road.
- US 395 is a faster-moving two-lane major arterial running north-to-south connecting Lassen County to Reno and Nevada. US 395 runs near Susanville serving the local communities of Herlong, Janesville, Doyle, Ravendale, and Termo.

### **National Scenic Byways and Scenic Roadways**

A Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for the Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway was completed in 2018. The Volcanic Legacy Scenic Byway is a 500-mile highway running from Crater Lake in Oregon south to Lassen Volcanic National Park (Figure 5). This byway includes the following State Routes within Lassen County: SR 36, SR 44, and SR 147. The following is a list of trail and road improvements that are within Lassen County and along the Scenic Byway included in the CMP:

- Construct sidewalks along Riverside Drive between Alexander Avenue and SR 36.
- Widen trails and repair broken asphalt along Susan River Trail.
- Develop a connector trail from Mason Station Trailhead to the Westwood Depot.
- Work with landowners to restore riparian vegetation and develop a public trail system along the Susan River and proposed Wendel Line Rail Trail.
- Provide directional signs on SR 36 to direct visitors to Susanville Ranch Park and trails.

### **Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan**

The 2021 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan identifies 11 Strategic Interregional Corridors throughout California, which have a high volume of freight movement and significant recreation tourism. SR 36 and US 395 have been identified as sub-corridors to the larger North Coast Northern Nevada Connection Corridor. These routes each serve to connect US 101, Interstate (I-) 5, and US 395 to neighboring regions and beyond.



**Figure 5**  
**Volcanic Scenic Byway**



## **Annual State Highway Traffic Volumes**

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume is defined as the total volume over the year divided by 365 days. The Caltrans traffic count year is from October 1st through September 30th. Traffic counting is generally performed by electronic counting instruments, moved to consistent locations throughout the state in a program of continuous traffic count sampling. The resulting counts are adjusted to reflect an estimate of annual average daily traffic by compensating for seasonal fluctuation, weekly variation, and other variables that may be present. The recordation of AADT is used to present a statewide picture of traffic flow, evaluate traffic trends, compute accident rates, plan, and design highways, and for other purposes.

Existing traffic volumes for the most recent 6 years (2014 – 2019) for which data is available on Lassen County state highways were obtained from Caltrans. Volumes at several key locations have been summarized. Though these locations are on state highways and not local roads, they give a fair representation of vehicle volume trends within various areas within Lassen County.

The Annual Average Daily Through Volumes at 13 locations are presented in Table 11. The 13 locations presented in this table were selected to represent areas within Lassen County with higher vehicle traffic volumes, within population centers, or at the borders with neighboring counties. State highways within the Susanville area have generally seen a decrease in traffic volumes over the last ten years except for Ash Street-SR 139.

## **Vehicle-Miles of Travel**

With the passage of Senate Bill 743, California transportation policies (including the requirements of the California Environmental Policy Act) are increasingly focusing on Vehicle-Miles of Travel (VMT) as the key measure of transportation conditions. VMT is the sum of all vehicle travel throughout the county, reflecting that one vehicle traveling for one mile generates one VMT.

For this plan, VMT data from the Federal Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) program was analyzed. HPMS VMT estimates are used to validate baseline travel demand models and to track modeled VMT forecasts over time. HPMS VMT estimates are reported for each county by local jurisdiction, state highway use, and other state/federal land roadways (e.g., State Parks, US Bureau of Land Management, US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service).

Estimates of countywide VMT for the three most recent years available, 2018, 2019, and 2020, are provided in Table 12. As shown, VMT has been trending downward year over year.

**Table 11: Lassen County - AADT Summary**

| YEAR   | SR 36                         |                           |                           |  |                             |                            | US 395                        |                                 |  |                               | SR 139                             |                          | SR 70                 | SR 299        | SR 44            |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|
|  | Plumas/<br>Lassen Co.<br>Line | Susanville,<br>Cottage St | Susanville,<br>Pacific St | Susanville.<br>E of Ash St<br>(SR 139) | Susanville,<br>Riverside Dr | Junction<br>with US<br>395 | Sierra/<br>Lassen Co.<br>Line | Doyle, N.<br>of Garnier<br>Road | Janesville,<br>N of<br>Janesville<br>Grade | Standish<br>County<br>Road A3 | Lassen/<br>Modoc<br>County<br>Line | Susanville<br>N of SR 36 | Junction<br>Route 395 | Lookout<br>Rd | County<br>Rd A21 |
| 2014   | 1,850                         | 6,100                     | 12,000                    | 14,500                                 | 15,900                      | 8,900                      | 8,200                         | 4,350                           | 7,300                                      | 1,400                         | 520                                | 6,700                    | 3,700                 | 1,700         | 1,750            |
| 2015   | 1,850                         | 5,700                     | 11,400                    | 14,500                                 | 15,900                      | 8,900                      | 8,200                         | 4,800                           | 7,300                                      | 1,400                         | 520                                | 6,700                    | 3,700                 | 1,700         | 1,750            |
| 2016   | 2,000                         | 5,600                     | 11,400                    | 15,600                                 | 16,500                      | 9,700                      | 9,900                         | 4,900                           | 7,600                                      | 1,500                         | 520                                | 6,700                    | 4,200                 | 1,700         | 1,900            |
| 2017   | 2,050                         | 5,500                     | 11,300                    | 16,000                                 | 16,700                      | 9,900                      | 9,900                         | 5,000                           | 7,900                                      | 1,650                         | 650                                | 8,500                    | 4,400                 | 1,800         | 1,900            |
| 2018   | 2,000                         | 5,600                     | 11,100                    | 15,200                                 | 16,000                      | 9,400                      | 10,100                        | 5,000                           | 8,100                                      | 1,650                         | 630                                | 8,400                    | 4,550                 | 1,750         | 1,950            |
| 2019   | 2,050                         | 5,500                     | 10,900                    | 15,000                                 | 15,600                      | 9,000                      | 10,100                        | 4,700                           | 7,000                                      | 1,550                         | 660                                | 6,200                    | 4,450                 | 1,800         | 2,000            |
| <i>Percent Change Over Last</i>                  |                               |                           |                           |  |                             |                            |                               |                                 |  |                               |                                    |                          |                       |               |                  |
| 5 yr.  | 11%                           | -10%                      | -9%                       | 3%                                     | -2%                         | 1%                         | 23%                           | 8%                              | -4%  | 11%                           | 27%                                | -7%                      | 20%                   | 6%            | 14%              |
| <i>Note: Estimated volume for missing years.</i> |                               |                           |                           |  |                             |                            |                               |                                 |  |                               |                                    |                          |                       |               |                  |
| <i>Source: Caltrans, Accessed 2022</i>           |                               |                           |                           |  |                             |                            |                               |                                 |  |                               |                                    |                          |                       |               |                  |

**Table 12: Lassen County Daily Vehicle Miles Travelled (DVMT)**

|                                      | 2018            | 2019            | 2020            | Change from 2018-2020 |             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------|
|                                      |                 |                 |                 | #                     | %           |
| Urban                                | 149.36          | 160.37          | 108.63          | -40.73                | -27%        |
| Rural                                | 1,642.65        | 1,346.63        | 983.72          | -658.93               | -40%        |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>1,792.01</b> | <b>1,507.00</b> | <b>1,092.35</b> | <b>-699.66</b>        | <b>-39%</b> |
| Note: In 1,000s of miles.            |                 |                 |                 |                       |             |
| Source: California Road Data Report. |                 |                 |                 |                       |             |

## Pavement Conditions

As of the most recent California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment (2018), the average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for roadways in Lassen County is 60. PCI values range from 0-100, and optimally, pavement improvements will occur when PCI reaches 65 or below.

The PCI in Lassen County is just within PCI scores deemed “at risk” (PCI between 50 and 60). Once pavement reaches this condition, it tends to deteriorate at a faster rate and should be addressed as quickly as possible.

## Traffic and Bicycle Collisions

Automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian crash data from California Highway Patrol’s Statewide Integrated Traffic Record System (SWITRS) and Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) databases for the four years between 2016 and 2019 were reviewed. As shown in Table 13, there were a total of 1,561 injury crashes. Roughly 2 percent of the total crashes resulted in a fatality. Figure 6 graphically displays all types of injury crashes recorded between 2016 and 2019. The figure shows that injury crashes and fatalities occur on all state routes as well as US 395.

| Severity                    | Local Roadways |     | State Highways |     | Total |     |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|-----|-------|-----|
|                             | #              | %   | #              | %   | #     | %   |
| <b>Fatal</b>                | 7              | 1%  | 22             | 2%  | 29    | 2%  |
| <b>Severe Injury</b>        | 21             | 4%  | 48             | 4%  | 69    | 4%  |
| <b>Other Visible Injury</b> | 49             | 10% | 128            | 12% | 177   | 11% |
| <b>Complaint of Pain</b>    | 43             | 9%  | 148            | 14% | 191   | 12% |
| <b>Unknown Injury Type</b>  | 36             | 8%  | 35             | 3%  | 71    | 5%  |
| <b>PDO</b>                  | 322            | 67% | 702            | 65% | 1,024 | 66% |
| <b>Total</b>                | 478            |     | 1,083          |     | 1,561 |     |
| <i>Total Injury</i>         | 149            |     | 359            |     | 508   |     |

Table 14 depicts injury crashes by type, indicating that the greatest proportion of crashes consisted of the motorist hitting an object in the road (31 percent), followed by 18 percent unknown, and 16 percent overturning. Table 15 shows bicycle crashes by severity between 2016 and 2019. During this period there were no accidents resulting in a fatality.

## **RAIL FACILITIES**

There are several operating freight rail corridors in Lassen County. Union Pacific Railroad is the largest rail freight operator, operating the rail line that traverses east/west across Lassen County. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) operates one rail line through Westwood on the western side of the County and Sierra Pacific Industries lumber company operates one rail line connecting their sawmill in Susanville with the Union Pacific line in Wendel. Most of the freight that is transported by rail in Lassen County is merely passing through and is not originating or being unloaded within the County.



**Figure 6**  
**Lassen County Vehicle Crashes 2016-2019**



**Table 14: Summary of Crashes by Crash Type Category in Lassen County**

| Crash Type         | Total Number of Crashes | Percentage of Crashes |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Vehicle/Pedestrian | 9                       | 1%                    |
| Head-On            | 40                      | 3%                    |
| Sideswipe          | 90                      | 6%                    |
| Broadside          | 94                      | 6%                    |
| Rear End           | 81                      | 5%                    |
| Other              | 227                     | 15%                   |
| Overtuned          | 252                     | 16%                   |
| Hit Object         | 481                     | 31%                   |
| Unknown            | 287                     | 18%                   |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>1,561</b>            | <b>100.0%</b>         |

*Source: UC Berkeley TIMS and SWITRS, 2016-2019.*

**Table 15: Lassen County Bicycle Accidents**

| Collision Date | Crash Severity       | Primary Road   | Secondary Road | Distance | Direction |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|-----------|
| 2/26/2016      | Complaint of Pain    | RT 36          | N MESA ST      | 0        |           |
| 6/9/2016       | Other Visible Injury | US 395         | JOHNSON RD.    | 1,056    | S         |
| 4/24/2018      | Severe Injury        | US 395         | ANTELOPE ROAD  | 13,728   | S         |
| 9/14/2019      | Property Damage Only | COUNTY ROAD A3 | MAPES RD.      | 76       | E         |

*Source: UC Berkeley TIMS and SWITRS, 2016-2019.*

There are various locations throughout Lassen County where old tracks have been removed but the railroad grade remains. This provides an opportunity for the development of “rail trails” or scenic active transportation corridors. The Bizz Johnson Trail in Susanville is an example of an established rail trail that is situated on a former rail bed. Both public input and strategic plans identify the utilization of old railroad corridors for active transportation as a priority for the future.

There is currently no passenger rail service in Lassen County.

## **GOODS MOVEMENT**

The primary form of goods movement through the county is trucking. This is particularly important on US 395 as trucks traveling between Oregon and Reno use this corridor.

## Truck Traffic Volumes

As of 2020, SR 299, SR 44, and US 395 have the highest proportion of truck traffic to overall traffic along each route, ranging from 16.7 percent to 18.9 percent of the total traffic (Table 16). By volume number alone, US 395 has the highest number of trucks passing through, with an average of 669 trucks daily in 2020. SR 147 has the most rapidly increasing number and proportion of truck traffic in Lassen County with an average annual increase of 131 percent.

| <b>Table 16: Summary of Truck Traffic in Lassen County</b> |            |       |       |       |       |       |                           |
|--|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------------------|
| Route  |            | 2016  | 2017  | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  | Average Annual Change (%) |
| <b>SR 36</b>   | Truck AADT | 453   | 463   | 444   | 667   | 607   | 34.2%                     |
|  | % Trucks   | 6.9%  | 6.9%  | 6.9%  | 10.4% | 10.5% | 52.3%                     |
| <b>SR 44</b>   | Truck AADT | 345   | 334   | 358   | 334   | 300   | -13.2%                    |
|  | % Trucks   | 19.2% | 18.6% | 19.2% | 17.6% | 17.5% | -9.0%                     |
| <b>SR 70</b>   | Truck AADT | 225   | 236   | 203   | 239   | 228   | 1.3%                      |
|  | % Trucks   | 5.4%  | 5.4%  | 5.4%  | 5.4%  | 5.4%  | 0.1%                      |
| <b>SR 139</b>  | Truck AADT | 60    | 81    | 80    | 84    | 79    | 31.2%                     |
|  | % Trucks   | 3.7%  | 4.0%  | 3.9%  | 4.0%  | 4.6%  | 25.2%                     |
| <b>SR 147</b>  | Truck AADT | 44    | 47    | 44    | 111   | 102   | 131.8%                    |
|  | % Trucks   | 5.1%  | 5.2%  | 5.1%  | 12.9% | 12.9% | 152.4%                    |
| <b>SR 299</b>  | Truck AADT | 305   | 222   | 222   | 222   | 274   | -10.2%                    |
|  | % Trucks   | 20.3% | 15.9% | 15.9% | 15.9% | 18.9% | -7.1%                     |
| <b>US 395</b>  | Truck AADT | 576   | 613   | 605   | 754   | 669   | 16.3%                     |
|  | % Trucks   | 13.9% | 14.0% | 13.8% | 18.0% | 16.7% | 20.5%                     |

*Source: Caltrans 2016 - 2019*

## **TRANSIT SERVICES**

### Lassen Transit Service Agency

The LTSA provides public transportation services in Lassen County. Until 2001, the County of Lassen operated Lassen Rural Bus (LRB), when a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) was signed between the County of Lassen and the City of Susanville creating the LTSA. LTSA has hired a private contractor, Paratransit Services, to perform the day-to-day operations and maintenance functions of LRB.

### Lassen Rural Bus

The LRB system began service in July of 1981 using two wheelchair-accessible vehicles to operate one fixed route and Dial-A-Ride service. The LRB system has since grown to a vehicle fleet of eleven, providing a Susanville City Route and several inter-community routes which are described below. A Dial-a-Ride

service is also provided for those meeting particular criteria. These routes are shown in detail in Figures 7 and 8.

### ***Susanville City Route***

Fixed route service is provided on the Susanville City Route (City Route) on one-hour headways between 7:00 AM and 6:55 PM, Monday through Friday, and from 8:00 AM to 3:55 PM on Saturday. The service area is entirely within the Susanville city limits at designated stops only (no flag stops). City Route serves all the major activity centers in Susanville including Wal-Mart, the Sierra Shopping Center, the Lassen Shopping Center, the Susanville Shopping Center, Lassen Senior Services, the Lassen Banner Hospital, City/County Administrative offices, Meadowview School, Lassen High School, Lassen Community College, and the Sierra Shopping Center.

### ***Susanville Express Route***

The Susanville Express Route was implemented in October 2020 to provide shorter travel times between common destinations in Susanville. The route operates roughly on half-hourly headways between 10:37 AM and 3:46 PM. The route is a one-way clockwise loop which is like the Susanville Fixed Route service but does not serve as many destinations.

### ***West County Route***

The West County Route provides round-trip service between Susanville, Westwood, Lake Almanor, and Chester (in Plumas County) three times per day during the week and twice on Saturdays. Points served on this route include Devil’s Corral, Westwood, Clear Creek, and Hamilton Branch. Within Susanville, stops are scheduled at Riverside Drive, Main and Gay Street, Diamond Mountain Casino, Lassen Community College, and Wal-Mart. In addition, passengers may “flag” the bus anywhere along the route if it is a safe location.

The morning weekday run leaves Susanville Walmart at 5:36 AM, serving Westwood and Chester and returning to Susanville at 7:58 AM. A midday trip leaves Susanville at 12:10 PM, returning to Susanville and Lassen Community College at 2:45 PM. The evening trip leaves Susanville at 5:15 PM, returning to Safeway/Sierra Shopping Center at 7:45 PM. This schedule allows college students to arrive on campus on time for 8:00 AM classes. In addition, the West County Route allows for transfers to Plumas Transit.


On Saturdays, the West County Route has two runs leaving the Susanville Walmart at 8:20 AM and 3:00 PM.

### ***Eagle Lake Route***


The Eagle Lake Route is a seasonal route offered on Saturdays along the west side of Eagle Lake starting and ending in Susanville. Service begins Saturday of the Memorial Day weekend, and ends on Labor Day weekend, or, weather permitting, the final Saturday of September. Service is by appointment only and requires a minimum of 10 riders to make a reservation. Passengers must call by 5:00 PM the Wednesday before their planned trip. The morning route departs Susanville at 10:00 AM, arriving at the Mariner’s Resort at Stone’s Landing at 11:31 AM, departing at 11:35 AM to return to Susanville by 1:15 PM. The late afternoon route departs Safeway/Sierra Shopping Center at 3:00 PM, arriving at Stone’s Landing at 4:31 PM, and returning to Susanville by 6:15 PM.



Figure 7  
Susanville Route Map



**Figure 8  
Lassen County Transit Routes**



## ***Dial-A-Ride***

A Dial-a-Ride (DAR) door-to-door demand response service is provided to qualifying individuals living within the city limits of Susanville and is available 7 AM to 6:52 PM Monday through Friday and 8 AM to 3:52 PM on Saturdays. To use the service, customers must be identified as seniors aged 60 years and over, or as disabled. The DAR service requires a one-day advance reservation and is the ADA complementary paratransit service for the Susanville fixed route.

## **Other Regional Transit Services**

In addition to LTSA, other regional public transit services and social service / non-profit specialized transportation programs exist.

## ***Sage Stage Service to Reno***

For many years, LTSA has contributed approximately \$30,000 annually to the Modoc Transit Agency to share the cost of intercity bus service from Alturas to Reno, Nevada with stops in Likely, Madeline, Susanville, and Doyle. Service was available on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays until a recent surge in the COVID pandemic when services were suspended. Generally, passengers must make a reservation at least one day in advance, although several walk-on stops are available on the route on a space-available basis. The bus will not run unless there is at least one confirmed reservation.

Sage Stage Reno service departs Alturas at 8:00 AM, stops in Likely at 8:20 AM, Madeline at 8:35 AM, Susanville at 9:45 AM, and arrives at the Reno Airport at 11:45 AM. The return trip departs Reno at 1:30 PM, arriving in Susanville at 3:30 PM and Alturas at 5:30 PM.

Single-ride fares are offered to the public, and discounted single-ride fares are offered for children ages 12 and under, seniors aged 60, and ADA-qualified individuals with disabilities. The fare between Alturas and Susanville is \$18.00 for general passengers, and \$13.50 discounted; from Susanville to Reno is \$22.00, discounted to \$16.50; and from Likely or Ravendale to Susanville is \$15.00, discounted to \$11.00.

This service is partially funded with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5311 Intercity Grant funds as it provides transportation to intercity transportation such as the airport and Greyhound. Many passengers use the service to get to medical appointments in Reno. Sage Stage Reno service carried 1,358 one-way passenger trips in FY 2018 – 19. This number decreased to 883 trips in FY 2019 – 20 (presumably because of the pandemic). Roughly 57 percent of passenger boardings in FY 2018 – 19 and 59 percent of boardings in FY 2019 – 20 were made by Lassen County residents.

## ***Lassen Senior Services***

Lassen Senior Services (LSS) provides transportation for seniors (ages 60 and older) living within Lassen County to and from their lunch meal site located in Susanville. Lassen Senior Services also provides trips to medical appointments, shopping, banking, and the post office within Lassen County. In addition, meal and other delivery services are provided to clients living in Westwood and Doyle. Intercity transportation is available from Susanville to Reno (on alternating Tuesdays and Thursdays) with a minimum of two passengers being registered at least 48 hours in advance. Donations of \$1.00 are suggested fare for local rides, and contributions of \$25 (or \$40 per couple) are suggested for Reno trips.

LTSA contracts with LSS to provide transportation services for seniors that LRB is unable to provide. The agreement includes an annual LTSA payment of \$86,000 (with \$5,000 set aside for vehicle maintenance) for the services provided by LSS.

According to LTSA reports, Lassen Senior Services carried 3,364 one-way passenger trips in FY 2019 – 20 and 2,641 trips in FY 2018 – 19 with the funding provided by LTSA. LSS currently has seven vehicles available for use. This includes 2 nine-passenger buses, 1 wheelchair van, and 3 six-passenger vans.

### ***Lassen County Veteran’s Services Office (VSO)***

Once or twice per week, the Lassen County VSO transports veterans from Susanville to the Veteran’s Medical Center in Reno. It also provides more frequent transportation for veterans between Alturas and Reno.

### ***Lassen County Health and Human Services***

The Lassen County Health and Human Services (HHS) provides transportation for social service needs, which must be arranged by a caseworker.

### ***Crossroads Ministries***

Crossroads Ministries is a church-affiliated non-profit organization that provides services to needy individuals who request it, including transportation. With two six-passenger vans, Crossroads serves approximately 40 to 50 passenger trips each week, and the majority is for medical purposes. Crossroads also provides clients with LRB passes and Greyhound vouchers on occasion.

### ***Far Northern Regional Center/North Valley Services/Lassen Life Skills***

Far Northern Regional Center (FNRC) provides transportation for persons with developmental disabilities through contracted service with LRB and through two vehicles owned by North Valley Services. Clients of North Valley Services and Lassen Life Skills receive unlimited trips on both the fixed-route and Dial-A-Ride for a set fee of \$115 per client per month. FNRC riders made up 19.7 percent of LRB ridership in FY 2018 – 19.

### ***Mt. Lassen Motor Transit – also known as “The Mail Truck”***

Mt. Lassen Motor Transit, based in Red Bluff, provides charter bus and tour services throughout the nation. Services are based out of Redding, Red Bluff, and Chico.

### ***Big Valley 50 Plus***

LTSA contracts with Big Valley 50 Plus (BV50Plus) to provide public transportation services to people of all ages in northern Lassen County. A Roundtrip service between Nubieber and Adin is provided on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays between 9:50 AM and 2:45 PM. The route begins at the Nubieber Post Office at 9:50 AM and travels north to the Adin Supply Co. and Adin Post Office around 10:45 AM, before returning to the Bieber Veterans Hall at 11:15 AM. The route then leaves the Veteran’s Hall at 1:15 PM and runs south to Nubieber Post Office at 1:35 PM before returning north to Adin Supply Co and Adin Post Office at 2:30 PM. The route then travels south and ends at the Veteran’s Hall in Bieber at 2:45 PM. Other major stops along this route include the Mountain Valleys Health Center, Big Valley Family Resource Center, and Big Valley Market.



Additionally, trips are provided leaving the Bieber Veteran’s Hall at 7:00 AM to Redding on the first and third Monday, Klamath Falls on the second Monday, and Susanville on the fourth Monday of each month. General fares are \$3 for local trips and \$20-\$25 for regional trips. Reduced fares are available to children and disabled riders, and passengers 60 years and over can ride for free.

LTSA pays BV50Plus \$44,300 to support transportation services, of which \$5,000 is set aside for vehicle maintenance. BV50Plus currently owns three vehicles, however only one is currently operational with the other two needing maintenance. During FY 2018 – 19, BV50Plus provided 2,128 passenger trips.

## **NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES**

Bicycle and pedestrian facility needs have been well documented in Lassen County. Lassen County adopted a Bikeway Master Plan in 2011 which included an overview of existing conditions, general needs, and recommendations for projects. Non-motorized facilities encompass a wide variety of transportation improvements designed to provide safety and greater mobility for bicyclists, pedestrians, skateboards, etc. For pedestrians, this includes sidewalks, crosswalks, push-button signals, and curb ramps. Bicycle facilities are separated into four categories:

- Class I (Bike Path) – Provides a completely separated right-of-way for bicyclists and pedestrians with cross flow by vehicles minimized.
- Class II (Bike Lane) – Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- Class III (Bike Route) – A signed route along a street or highway that provides a shared use with other vehicles.
- Class IV (Bikeway) – A bikeway separated from vehicles using grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible barriers, or on-street parking.

Smaller projects such as bike racks, signage, and education programs are also considered non-motorized transportation improvements.

### **Bicycle Facilities**


Figure 9 demonstrates the various bicycle facilities within Lassen County as described in the most recent 2022 Active Transportation Plan. The bicycle network includes four trails, four Class I Multi-use Paths, one Class II Bike Lane, and one Class III Bike Route.

### **Pedestrian Network**

Implementing a continuous sidewalk network within rural areas remains both impractical and difficult. As a result, most communities in Lassen County do not have substantial pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, signage, and crosswalks. The City of Susanville has the most pedestrian facilities. Throughout the city, there are approximately 47 miles of sidewalks, covering about 48 percent of the roadsides (Figure 10).



**Figure 9  
Lassen County Existing and Proposed Bike Facilities**





**Figure 10**  
**Susanville Existing and Proposed Bicycle Facilities**



## **AVIATION**

There are five airports in Lassen County: Susanville Municipal Airport, Southard Field in Bieber, Ravendale, Herlong, and Spaulding. Only the Susanville Municipal Airport is on the Nation Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPAIS), meaning this is the only airport eligible for federal funding. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) collects a variety of data for individual airports. Descriptions of each airport are included below.

### ***Susanville Municipal Airport***

Susanville Municipal Airport is located southeast of Susanville and is owned and operated by the City of Susanville. This public airport has two runways and a helipad. As of May 2023, 30 fixed-wing aircraft and three helicopters were based at the airport. For the twelve months ending December 2021, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 12,470, including 20 military operations.

### ***Spaulding Airport***

Spaulding Airport is located north of Susanville near Eagle Lake and is owned and operated by the County of Lassen. This public airport has one runway. As of May 2023, two fixed-wing aircraft were based at the airport. For the twelve months ending December 2020, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 2,750.

### ***Southard Field***

Southard Field is located near Bieber and is owned and operated by the County of Lassen. This public airport has one runway. As of May 2023, two fixed-wing aircraft were based at Southard Field. For the twelve months ending November 2021, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 1,500.

### ***Herlong Airport***

Herlong Airport is located in southeastern Lassen County between US 395, Honey Lake, and the Nevada State border. This public airport is owned and operated by the County of Lassen and has one runway. For the twelve months ending November 2021, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 700. No aircraft are based out of Herlong.

### ***Ravendale Airport***

Ravendale Airport is located in Ravendale on the eastern side of Lassen County. The airport is owned and operated by the County of Lassen and has one runway. For the twelve months ending November 2021, annual operations (takeoffs or landings) totaled 365. No aircraft are based out of Ravendale.

The purpose of the Policy Element of the RTP is to provide guidance to regional transportation decision-makers and to promote consistency among Federal, State, regional, and local agencies. As required by the State of California, the Policy Element must:

- Describe transportation issues in the region.
- Identify and quantify regional needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons.
- Maintain internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

This chapter provides goals, objectives, and policies to assist in setting transportation priorities.

### **GOALS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES**

An important element of the RTP process is the development of valid and appropriate goals, objectives, and policies. The RTP guidelines define goals, objectives, and policies as follows:

- A goal is general and characterized by a sense of timelessness; it is something desirable to work toward, the result for which effort is directed.
- A policy is a directional statement that guides decisions with specific actions.
- An objective is a measurable point to be attained. Objectives are capable of being quantified and realistically attained considering probable funding and political constraints. Objectives represent levels of achievement in the movement toward a goal.

The goals, objectives, and policies for each component of the Lassen County regional transportation system are discussed below. They cover both short-range (0-10 years) and long-range (11-20 years) desired outcomes. They are consistent with the policy direction of the LCTC, the Lassen County General Plan Circulation Element (2000), the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (2015), and the California Transportation Plan (CTP 2050).

The comprehensive goals, objectives, and policies that have been developed for this RTP meet the needs of the region and are consistent with the regional vision and priorities for action. These objectives are intended to guide the development of a transportation system that is balanced, and multi-modal, and will maintain and improve the quality of life for residents and visitors of Lassen County.


### **Highways and Local Roadways**

***Goal 1: Develop and maintain a comprehensive, efficient, and safe transportation system to serve the needs of County residents and to stimulate the economic progress of the County.***

**Policy 1.1:** Classify existing roadways using the functional classifications set forth in this document.

**Objective 1A:** Use Figure 11 of this document to identify service classifications for existing roads.

**Figure 11  
Lassen County Road Classifications**



**Policy 1.2:** Periodically update the classification system to account for advances in methodologies used to determine roadway carrying capacities.

**Objective 1B:** Use methods approved by the LCTC, Caltrans, Lassen County, and the City of Susanville that provide adequate steps to determine the carrying capacity of roadways. County roads, city streets, and Tribal road classifications should be reviewed and updated annually.

**Policy 1.3:** Require that the classification system developed helps determine design standards for new roadway placement and assessment of existing roadways as future development occurs.

**Objective 1C:** Review new roadway plans and determine the classification based on connectivity to local and regional facilities. Ensure the design meets the intended use of the new roadway.

**Policy 1.4:** The LCTC shall pursue all possible state, federal, and local funding to address high-priority (i.e., public health and safety) road and bridge maintenance needs.

**Objective 1D:** Support state-only funds for maintaining roads and state-only funds for matching federal funds for bridge projects. Local streets and roads have the greatest maintenance deficiencies. With this in mind, state-only funding can be used on local streets and road projects that are not eligible for federal funds.

**Policy 1.5:** Maintain as many County roads for year-round travel as financially feasible.

**Policy 1.6:** Encourage federal agencies (e.g., U.S. Forest Service) to consult with the County in the planning of major road projects, and to adequately maintain their road systems to serve tourism, local residents and businesses that rely on the use of resources on or near public lands.

**Policy 1.7:** Encourage leveraging funds by coordination of multi-jurisdictional agency cooperation/considerations for partnership projects.

**Policy 1.8:** Work cooperatively with Caltrans, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Lassen County, and the City of Susanville in the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan.

**Policy 1.9:** Expand the interaction and consideration of land use planning issues and capital facility plans during the preparation of the RTP.

**Policy 1.10:** Continue to review and, if warranted, formulate improved standards for the necessary improvement and maintenance of roads serving new development, including standards for the incremental improvement or development of public roads.

**Policy 1.11:** Prioritize funding for capital improvement projects which address safety issues and/or system preservation of the regional transportation system.

**Policy 1.12:** The LCTC offers support in the prioritization of incremental addition of lanes on U.S. 395 to a four-lane expressway and work with Caltrans in the consideration and implementation of access management policies to protect traffic efficiency and safety and to facilitate future highway improvements. Such measures include the limitation of new encroachments onto U.S. 395. The LCTC shall support an increased number of passing lanes where a four-lane expressway is not feasible.

Objective 1E: Support the completion of the Project Study Reports and the decisions and actions by the involved agencies to facilitate the progressive resolution of needed highway improvements. This implementation measure applies to Policies 1.11 and 1.12.

Policy 1.13: The LCTC supports completion of project-specific environmental impact analysis of each improvement listed in the RTP in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) when applicable. Full disclosure of all potentially significant impacts should occur at the appropriate stage of the project approval process.

Objective 1F: The LCTC shall work with Caltrans, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Lassen County, and the City of Susanville in the consideration of highway realignments and new public roads. The LCTC also may propose mitigation measures to reduce the adverse environmental impacts from any such improvements. As part of the purchase of right-of-way involving agricultural lands for transportation projects, the LCTC shall consider the following:

- Purchase agricultural conservation easements on land of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land, as well as for the mitigation of growth-inducing and cumulative impacts on agricultural land.
- Mitigation by the outright purchase of conservation easements tied to the project or by donation of mitigation fees to an appropriate agency whose purpose includes the purchase, holding, and maintenance of agricultural conservation easements.
- Evaluation of agricultural land designated for transportation improvements using the LESA model (land, evaluation, site assessment) to ensure that potentially significant effects on the environment of agriculture land conversions are quantitative and consistently considered in the CEQA process.
- Following guidelines for the preparation of agriculture conservation easements appraisals as outlined on the Department of Conservation Land Resources website (<http://www.conservation.ca.gov>).

Policy 1.14: The LCTC supports the use of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology on state highways and major roads to improve traveler safety, traffic flow, and road and traffic conditions.

Policy 1.15: The LCTC shall support the efforts of the City, County, and Susanville Rancheria in working toward a local transportation network that provides safe and adequate multiple/emergency evacuation access opportunities for existing and future development, to be consistent with City and County General Plan(s).

Objective 1G: Facilitate the coordination between City or County and other affected agencies to identify areas with inadequate multiple/emergency evacuation access opportunities and to develop plans and funding options for improvements.

## **Public Transportation**

***Goal 2: To provide adequate cost-effective public transit services, especially to accommodate the needs of the elderly and handicapped.***



**Policy 2.1:** Continue to aggressively pursue federal, state, local, and private contracting funds and grants for additional transit capital and operational expenses.

**Policy 2.2:** Continue to update the Regional Transit Plan to identify transit needs and opportunities to expand facilities to better serve transit users.

**Objective 2A:** The LCTC shall work closely with Lassen County, the City of Susanville, and transit providers to plan for transit needs as identified in the Regional Transit Plan, as well as needs apparent through public inquiry and input from unmet needs hearings and other public meetings.

## **Goods Movement – Freight and Rail**

***Goal 3: Promote the continuous flow of goods in, out of, and through the County in a safe and economically efficient manner.***

**Policy 3.1:** Support efforts that will implement and improve freight and rail service in the region, including in neighboring counties.

**Policy 3.2:** If current use of railroads within Lassen County ceases, Lassen County will coordinate with rail agencies and operators to plan the retention of railroad rights-of-way for alternative uses, including but not limited to buried utility corridors, access to and through public lands, alternative transportation routes and trails, and routes for railroad reactivation if rail use becomes feasible in the future.

**Policy 3.3:** Encourage and partner with Caltrans to meet the needs of local shippers, and businesses moving freight by truck when planning truck routes in and out of the County.

**Objective 3A:** Continue to implement roadway improvement projects along state highways which will improve safety and reliability for trucks as well as reduce conflict with other motorized and non-motorized travel.

## **Airports**

***Goal 4a: Provide an adequate number of safe, efficient airports and airfields.***

**Policy 4.1:** Support maintenance of airfields in safe condition pursuant to applicable state and federal requirements.

**Policy 4.2:** Support land use decisions that discourage, and when possible, prevent, development in the vicinity of airfields and airports that may present significant public safety issues and/or which could constrain the continued operation and needed expansion of those facilities.

**Objective 4A:** The LCTC shall continue to rely upon Airport Land Use Plans and the recommendations of the Airport Land Use Commission in consideration of proposed land uses around airfields and airports. Acquire airport funds for various improvement projects.

***Goal 4b: Support the expansion of economical, efficient air services.***

**Policy 4.3:** The LCTC supports the expansion of the Susanville Municipal Airport for purposes of public safety and to expand its capacity to accommodate larger aircraft and new air services, if funding is available.

**Policy 4.4:** The LCTC supports the consideration of development and use of the Sierra Army Depot airfield for public or limited special commercial use if and when such uses are invited and supported by the Depot.

## **Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities**

***Goal 5: Provide a safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian circulation system that takes advantage of the natural scenery and physical characteristics of Lassen County.***

**Policy 5.1:** Work with Lassen County, the City of Susanville, Susanville Indian Rancheria, Caltrans, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to implement the current Active Transportation Plan.

**Policy 5.2:** Where feasible and practical, support provision of shelters and off-street facilities to promote bicycle and pedestrian travel. This includes connections to local and regional schools and recreational facilities in Lassen County with primary consideration to providing for the safety of school children and local residents.

**Objective 5A:** Review the status of ongoing circulation plans for various projects and require that some provisions be made for bicycle travel where appropriate. This could include requiring wider roadways from developers to accommodate on-street bike paths, or additional bike facilities to connect to existing or planned bikeways.

**Objective 5B:** Maintain and update the Lassen County Active Transportation Plan to support the acquisition of State and federal funds for improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian system.

**Objective 5C:** Apply for Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds for the purpose of constructing projects listed in the Active Transportation Plan.

## **Management of the Transportation System**

***Goal 6a: Minimize traffic congestion by increasing the efficiency of the existing transportation system through Transportation System Management (TSM) techniques.***

**Policy 6.1:** Periodically review traffic operations along State highways and major county roads. Promote signal timing, access management, transit priority treatments, accident scene management measures, and closed-circuit TV to help increase traffic flow.

***Goal 6b: Where feasible, reduce the demand for travel by Single Occupant Vehicles (SOVs) through Transportation Demand Management (TDM) techniques.***

**Policy 6.2:** Increase the mode share for public transit by implementing recommendations in Regional Transit Plans.

**Policy 6.3:** Increase mode share for non-motorized travel by implementing projects in the Active Transportation Plan.

**Policy 6.4:** Establish a formal, county-wide ride-share program within the County. Promote public awareness of Lassen Rural Bus and rideshare opportunities through media and promotional events.

## **Climate Change and Resiliency**

***Goal 7: Reduce GHG emissions from transportation related activities within the Lassen County boundaries to support the state's efforts under AB-32 and to mitigate the impact of climate change.***

**Policy 7.1:** Consider GHG emissions as part of every transportation capital improvement project decision.

**Policy 7.2:** Pursue projects with positive GHG impacts that are realistic given the very rural nature of Lassen County, including transit programs, ridesharing programs, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, Intelligent Transportation Systems strategies, Smart Mobility and Smart land use decisions, and maintenance of existing roadways to reduce vehicle emissions.

**Policy 7.3:** Pursue projects to improve the resiliency of the transportation system to extreme weather events and aid in emergency evacuation/response.

*This page intentionally left blank*

This chapter presents a plan to address the needs and issues of all transportation modes, in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies outlined in the Policy Element. It is within the Action Element that projects and programs are prioritized as short-term or long-term improvements, consistent with the identified needs and policies. These plans are based on the existing conditions, forecasts for future conditions, and transportation needs discussed in the Background Conditions Section, Modal Element, and Policy Element and are consistent with the Financial Element.

## **PLAN ASSUMPTIONS**

In addition to the data discussed above, it is necessary to base the Action Element on a series of planning assumptions, as presented below:

- **Environmental Conditions**—No change is assumed in attainment status for air or water quality affecting transportation projects.
- **Travel Mode**—The private automobile will remain the primary mode of transportation for residents and visitors. Public transportation will remain a vital service for the elderly, low-income, and persons with mobility limitations. Bicycle and pedestrian travel will increase modestly, for both recreational and utility purposes.
- **Changes in Truck Traffic**—The proportion of truck traffic on State highways will increase slightly during the planning period as goods movement increases along the US 395 corridor.
- **Through Travel**—Through travel will continue to have a major impact on US 395 and SR 36 as visitors travel between the states of Nevada and Oregon.
- **Transit Service**—Public transportation will continue to be a vital service for the elderly, low-income, and persons with mobility limitations, particularly as the county ages in place. The vehicle fleet will need to be transitioned to Zero-Emission Vehicles (ZEV) to meet state and federal requirements.
- **Population Decrease**—Lassen County will experience a slow population decrease over the next twenty-five years. According to the Department of Finance, the County is expected to shrink by an annual average of 0.8 percent. One major contributor to the decrease is the prison closure.
- **Fuel Consumption** - Per the US Energy Information Administration, motor gasoline consumption will decrease by .8 percent, and diesel fuel consumption in the transportation sector is projected to decrease by only .4 percent by 2050. Hydrogen fuel consumption is projected to increase by 5.2 percent and electricity is projected to increase by 9.7 percent by 2050.
- **Cost Estimates** - Inflation will continue at a rate consistent with the growth of the Consumer Price Index over the previous 20 years. Fuel tax revenues will begin to decline over the long term as more vehicles move to electric battery powered.
- **Planning Requirements**—New state and federal requirements concerning climate change and greenhouse gas emissions will continue to shape the planning process in the future. This RTP is a dynamic document, which will be updated as requirements change.

- **Emergency Preparedness**—Transportation and regional coordination will continue to play a vital role in emergency preparedness in Calaveras County.
- **Climate Change**—The region will continue to be affected by climate change. Particularly the impacts of wildland fires, flooding, and subsequent erosion. Bridges and culverts will be particularly affected by this environmental change.

## **TRANSPORTATION SAFETY**

Addressing transportation safety in a regional planning document puts the region on a path to improve health, financial, and quality of life issues for travelers. In the past, transportation safety has been addressed in a reactionary mode. There is a need to establish methods to proactively improve the safety of the transportation network. In response to this, California developed a Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) in 2006 which was last updated in 2022. The goal of the plan is “Toward Zero Deaths” by using the 5E approach of engineering, enforcement, education, emergency medical services, and emerging technologies. The latest update of the SHSP identifies the following Challenge Areas:

### State High-Priority Areas

- Active Transportation: Pedestrians & Bicyclists
- Impaired Driving
- Intersections
- Lane Departures
- Speed Management/Aggressive Driving

### State Focus Areas

- Aging Drivers (equal to or greater than 65)
- Commercial Vehicles
- Distracted Driving
- Driver Licensing
- Emergency Response
- Emerging Technologies
- Motorcyclists
- Occupant Protection
- Work Zones
- Young Drivers (15–20)

The policy element of this RTP includes safety goals and objectives that comply with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Transportation improvement projects that specifically address safety for all types of transportation modes are included in the project list tables in this chapter. Transportation safety is a main concern for roadways and non-motorized transportation facilities in the Lassen region.

## **TRANSPORTATION SECURITY/EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

Transportation security/emergency preparedness is another important element in the RTP. Separate from transportation safety, transportation security/emergency preparedness addresses issues associated with large-scale evacuation due to a natural disaster such as wildfire or flood. Emergency preparedness involves many aspects including training/education, planning appropriate responses to possible emergencies, and most importantly communication and coordination.

As this region is rural and not densely populated, it is not likely that Lassen County would be the focus of a terrorist attack. Forced evacuation due to a natural disaster such as wildfire is the most likely scenario. Identifying evacuation routes and other methods of evacuation is pertinent to the scope of the RTP. The principal arterials traversing Lassen County are US 395 and SR 36. These highways act as the primary evacuation route for many Lassen County communities, such as Susanville, Westwood, Janesville, and Doyle. SR 139 is an important roadway for residents near Eagle Lake. Wildfire is likely to come from the west side of Lassen County and travel east with the prevailing southwest winds, however, isolated fire behavior can be challenging to predict. In 2021, the Dixie Fire forced evacuations in Lassen and Plumas Counties, destroyed many structures, and jumped state highways. This underscores the importance of multiple ingress/egress options for rural communities.

Another aspect of emergency preparedness and transportation security is designing new transportation facilities and rehabilitating existing facilities to withstand more frequent flooding and erosion from extreme weather events. This includes raising bridges, replacing culverts, and evaluation of floodplains.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION**

As recommended in the 2017 RTP Guidelines, in addition to conducting an environmental review, per CEQA, this document includes a discussion of potential environmental mitigation activities and areas, including those mitigation activities that might maintain or restore the environment that is affected by the plan.

All RTP projects that have a potential impact on natural resources in the region will undergo individual CEQA environmental review. When considering a transportation improvement project, the first course of action will be to consult with natural resource agencies to determine the potential impact of the project. Any changes or reconfiguration to the project that will limit environmental impact will be pursued. BMPs will be followed, and mitigation measures employed, to reduce project impacts. Before implementing the RTP project, LCTC will consider the potential for the release of hazardous substances during construction and follow standard evaluation and mitigation practices for toxic substances.

As part of the public participation process (described in Chapter 1 and documented in Appendices A through C), state and federal resource agencies were contacted and maps of natural resources under each agency's jurisdiction were requested. Multiple agencies were contacted at the beginning of the RTP update process and will be notified of the availability of the Draft RTP document. Natural resource agency maps and documents were compared to this RTP to find potential conflicts between transportation improvement projects and natural resources. The details of these comparisons and natural resource agency input are summarized in the Consultation section of Chapter 1.

## LASSEN COUNTY STRATEGIES TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS

Global climate change is an important issue that is closely related to transportation. Climate change is caused by the release of greenhouse gases (GHGs) such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride into the atmosphere; these gases trap heat and increase temperatures near the earth's surface. Motorized vehicles emit carbon dioxide and are large contributors to GHG emissions. In fact, according to the CARB GHG Inventory for 2016, transportation accounts for roughly 41 percent of total GHG emissions in California. Forecasted, long-term consequences of climate change range from a rise in the sea level to a significant loss of the Sierra snowpack. Despite potentially devastating long-term effects, climate change does not have immediately visible effects such as smog. However, GHG emissions are an important air quality issue that needs to be addressed in regional transportation planning documents.

RTPAs that are not located within the boundaries of a metropolitan planning organization (which LCTC is not) are not subject to the S375 provisions, which require addressing regional GHG targets in the RTP and preparation of sustainable community strategies. As traffic volumes are generally low in the region, Lassen County is not a significant contributor to GHG emissions. Regardless, this RTP identifies improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities that will encourage residents and visitors to use alternatives to private vehicles for transportation, thereby helping to reduce GHG emissions.

Given the importance of the consideration of climate change in transportation planning, this RTP outlines the following strategies to reduce GHG emissions:

- **Continue to Prioritize Regional Transportation System Maintenance over Expansion**—One GHG reduction strategy that is repeatedly identified in legislation and policy documents is to reduce VMT by implementing smart growth strategies, which concentrate land use expansion in urbanized cores where public transportation is available and increase the “walkability” of communities. Through the Board workshops conducted as part of this RTP update, it is clear that maintaining the existing transportation instead of increasing the capacity of the regional transportation system is a top priority for the region.
- **Implement Active Transportation Project Improvements**—Encouraging residents and visitors to walk or bike for short-distance trips is another common strategy to reduce GHG emissions. LCTC has recently conducted an update of the Lassen County Active Transportation Plan. These projects have been incorporated into the project lists.
- **Implement Transit System Improvements**—Although there is limited funding available for public transit in Lassen County, the need for transit has been demonstrated. Continuing to improve public transit service by replacing aged vehicles and improvements to passenger facilities would make the transit system more visible and thereby encourage non-regular riders or visitors to utilize the bus system. Converting the transit fleet to a ZEV fleet is in line with state climate change goals.

## PERFORMANCE MEASURES

As available transportation funding is not sufficient to cover all project costs, it is important to establish a method of comparing the benefits of various transportation projects and considering the cost-effectiveness of proposed projects. According to the RTP guidelines, performance measures outlined in



the RTP should set the context for judging the effectiveness of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) as a program. More detailed project-specific performance measures used to quantitatively evaluate the benefit of a transportation improvement project should be addressed every two years in the region's RTIP.

Performance targets are numeric goals established to enable the quantifiable assessment of performance measures. Performance monitoring indicators or metrics include field data such as VMT, mode share, accident rates, etc. These performance measures build on performance measures identified in the 2017 RTP and the Performance Monitoring Indicators Study conducted by the Rural Counties Task Force. These performance measures continue to be used to help select RTP project priorities and to objectively monitor how well the transportation system is functioning, both now and in the future.

The following criteria were used in selecting performance measures for the Regional Transportation Plan, ensuring the feasibility of data collection and monitoring of the performance of the transportation investments:

- Performance measures align with California State transportation goals and objectives.
- Performance measures continue to inform the current goals and objectives of Lassen County.
- Performance measures are applicable to Lassen County as a rural area.
- Performance measures are capable of being linked to specific decisions on transportation investments.
- Performance measures do not impose substantial resource requirements on Lassen County.
- Performance measures can be normalized to provide equitable comparisons to urban regions.

### ***Performance Measure 1 – Transportation Systems Investment***

This performance measure monitors the condition of the roadway in Lassen County, which can be used in deciding transportation system investments. Distressed lane miles and a Pavement Conditions Index (PCI) should be monitored tri-annually. This performance measure has a high level of accuracy and can be used indirectly for benefit/cost analysis by estimating the costs of bringing all roadways up to a minimum acceptable condition. Transportation System Investment also applies to public transit infrastructure.

### ***Performance Measure 2 – Safety***

This performance measure monitors safety through the total accident count and should be monitored annually. To access this data, staff may be required to access secondary data sources. The data is reasonably accurate and can be used directly for benefit/cost analysis. The Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), a database that collects and processes data gathered from collision scenes, can be used to monitor the number of fatal and injury crashes by location to see if added improvements are needed. Comparisons with the crash rate (crashes per 1,000,000 VMT) for Caltrans District 2 and the State of similar facilities do not exist. However, if the County does track the number of collisions on local roads, these can be monitored to identify safety improvements. LCTC recently completed a Local Roadway Safety Plan which includes a thorough analysis of crashes in the county and recommended safety projects.

### ***Performance Measure 3 – Congestion/Delay/Vehicle Miles Traveled***

Measuring levels of congestion and delay on roadways has long been used as a tool for evaluating performance and the need for transportation improvement projects. Congestion measured in terms of LOS was considered an “impact” in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Historically, agencies would increase the capacity of the transportation system to correct the problem. This only leads to more cars on the roadway and increased GHG emissions.

SB 743 changed the way that congestion should be mitigated through the CEQA environmental process. Congestion in terms of LOS can no longer be considered a significant impact resulting from a development project which is subject to CEQA review. Now, through the CEQA process, it must be determined how the project will impact VMT. The goal is to reduce the amount of driving instead of increasing it. Methods of reducing VMT include increasing transit options, facilitating biking and walking, changing development patterns, and charging for parking. VMT per capita is an accepted performance measure for determining a transportation project’s impact on congestion. VMT estimates are available through the Highway Performance Monitoring System California Public Road Data.

### ***Performance Measure 4 – Environmental and Health Sustainability***

The state of California has established environmental goals to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions to 40 percent and 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2030 and 2050, respectively. Vehicle emissions are a significant contributor to GHG emissions. One way to measure a change in vehicle emissions is by looking at commute mode split through the US Census. Capital improvement projects that make walking and bicycling safer and more convenient will increase the walk/bike mode split and decrease vehicle emissions. These types of non-motorized facility projects also have the additional benefit of improving overall public health.

Sustainability also refers to the concept of preparing the regional transportation system for changing climate conditions. Climate change has already brought increasing levels of flooding and wildfires to the region. Although there is no quantitative measure to be applied here, prioritizing projects that would prepare the regional transportation system for these events is prudent. Examples include bridge/culvert replacement and emergency access roadways.

### **Transportation Systems Management**

Transportation systems management (TSM) is a term used to describe low-cost actions that maximize the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and systems. Urbanized areas can implement strategies using various combinations of techniques. However, in rural areas such as Lassen County, many measures that would apply in metropolitan areas are not practical.

With limited funding, Lassen County must look for the least capital-intensive solutions. On a project basis, TSM measures are good engineering and management practices. Many are already used to increase the efficiency of traffic flow and movement through intersections and along interstates. These types of actions will remain part of the RTP planning process for 20 years. Long-range TSM considerations can include:

- Signing and striping modifications.
- Parking restrictions.

- Installing or modifying signals to provide alternate circulation routes for residents.
- Re-examining speed zones on certain streets.

### **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)**

ITS, as defined in law, refers to the employment of “electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.” The implementation of ITS is a priority for the U.S. Department of Transportation. A key component of that nationwide implementation is the National ITS Architecture, a framework devised to encourage functional harmony, interoperability, and integration among local, regional, State, and Federal ITS applications. ITS includes technology improvements that enhance the safety and reliability of roadways. Common examples include Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) and Changeable Message Signs (CMS) which provide travelers with roadway closure information on detours, road closures, and weather conditions. CMS notifies travelers of seasonal roadway closures. The addition of HAR to the Lassen County regional transportation system would increase traveler reliability.

### **TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

As a method of developing responses to the transportation needs and issues discussed in the earlier portions of this document, this RTP includes a list of transportation system improvements for each mode of transportation applicable to Lassen County. Determining the exact construction costs of transportation projects is difficult, especially for long-range projects. The proposed transportation improvement projects and implementation status listed in this chapter are categorized by transportation type and funding status. Projects for each type of transportation mode are divided into financially constrained and financially unconstrained improvements. Financially constrained projects are funded over short-range periods (0-10 years) as demonstrated in the Financial Element. The financial constraint is defined as revenues that can reasonably be assumed to be available for identified projects. The unconstrained project list (11-20 years) is considered the long-term list of projects that would provide benefit to the region without an identified and available funding source. It is prudent to develop projects in the long-range project lists in the event funding should become available.

#### ***Project Purpose and Need***

The RTP guidelines require that an RTP “provide a clearly defined justification for its transportation projects and programs”. This requirement is often referred to as the Project Intent Statement or the Project Purpose and Need. Caltrans’ Deputy Directive No. DD 83 sets a project’s “Need” as an identified transportation deficiency or problem, and “Purpose” is the set of objectives that will be met to address the transportation deficiency. Purpose and need statements are identified below for top-priority projects.

### **Recently Completed Projects**

Table 17 lists recently completed and in-progress transportation capital improvement projects in the Lassen County region. A total of \$31 million in projects has been delivered over the past 8 years. The majority of these projects are roadway overlay/rehabilitation projects and bridge replacements. One project of note is the Skyline Extension Phase 2 project which provides an alternative route to SR 139 North, the hospital, and the college without traveling through downtown.

**Table 17: Summary of Recently Completed Projects**

| Location                      | Description   | Year Completed     | Actual Cost         | Funding Source        |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Maidu Lane                    | Overlay from north end to south end                         | 2015               | \$7,900,000         | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| County Road 215               | County Rehab C  | 2018               | \$3,400,000         | STIP                  |
| North Spring Street           | Overlay from Fourth Street to Paul Bunyan Road              | 2018               | \$78,000            | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Mill Street                   | Overlay from South Pine Street to Carroll Street            | 2018               | \$189,800           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Riverside Drive               | Overlay from Alexander Street to Riverside Drive Extension  | 2018               | \$119,600           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| South Gay Street              | Overlay from Main Street to Cottage Street                  | 2018               | \$72,800            | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Skyline Road Extension        | Roadway extension, phase 2 (14S-16).                        | 2019               | \$7,900,000         | STIP                  |
| Hackstaff Road, CR 322        | Long Valley Creek Bridge 7C-12                              | 2021               | \$2,500,000         | HBP                   |
| Hackstaff Road, CR 322        | Long Valley Creek Bridge 7C-81                              | 2021               | \$2,230,625         | HBP                   |
| Punkin Center, Ash Valley Rds | County Rehab B  | 2022               | \$275,000           | STIP                  |
| Various Streets               | City Street rehab (SC4)                                     | In progress (2023) | \$955,000           | STIP                  |
| Various Streets               | City street rehab (SC5)                                     | In progress (2023) | \$956,000           | STIP                  |
| Various Streets               | City Street rehab (FC) (14-S-10)                            |                    | \$1,846,000         | STIP                  |
| Route 36                      | Goodrich Creek - Replace deck and barrier or replace bridge | 2023               | \$2,715,000         |                       |
|                               |   |                    | <b>\$31,137,825</b> |                       |

Source: Updated 2023

## **Short-Term High Priority Roadway Projects**

State highway projects are listed in Table 18. The State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds Caltrans state highway maintenance projects. Over the next 10 years, Caltrans plans to conduct a variety of maintenance projects such as paving, culvert repair, and curve realignment. to maintain the state highways in Lassen County. Also listed in Table 18 are proposed financially unconstrained projects which are seen as particularly important to the region. Increasing the number of passing lanes on US 395 is important for reducing unsafe passing and the potential for fatal collisions. With truck traffic growing along this corridor, this project will become more important. Main Street in Susanville has been a topic of safety discussions for years. Table 18 references complete Streets improvements on SR 36. The need for these projects has been demonstrated through separate studies and are summarized below:

**US 395 Passing Lanes** - Currently, US 395 is a two-lane highway from a point 3.5 miles north of the intersection with SR 70 (Hallelujah Junction) and SR 36 near Susanville. There is currently a total of five passing lanes in the northbound direction and five passing lanes in the southbound direction over this 53-mile-long section. The original concept for US 395 was a four-lane facility from Washoe County to SR 36. A project of this magnitude would be very expensive and may not be warranted. An extensive study has been conducted to analyze the safety and economic benefits of making this section of US 395 4 lanes. The studies indicated that passing lanes on a section of US 395 between SR 70 and Standish Rd would have the greatest safety benefit. Increasing the facility to a four-lane highway will also help expand the economy in Susanville as well as create travel time savings for commuters.

A more cost-effective concept is to construct a total of 11 additional passing lanes along the corridor: five in the southbound direction and six in the northbound direction. At present, there is a distance of up to 25.0 miles between passing lanes in the northbound direction and 27.3 miles in the southbound direction. This, coupled with the traffic volumes and a high proportion of heavy vehicles tends to encourage hazardous passing behavior. The addition of the new passing lanes would reduce the maximum distance between passing zones to 7.6 miles in the northbound direction and 5.3 miles in the southbound direction. By providing more frequent passing opportunities that do not have the potential for conflict with oncoming traffic, the expectation is that overall driver behavior will be improved and less risky passing in the oncoming lane would occur.

**SR 36 Complete Streets** - In 2020, the SR 36 Complete Streets and Safe Mobility Report outlined a series of improvements along Main Street in Susanville to increase safety for bicyclists and pedestrians as well as increase the attractiveness of downtown. Improvements range from gateway features, landscaping, lighting, pedestrian bulb-outs, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, ADA-compliant curb/gutter/sidewalk, and lane reallocation to allow for a bicycle lane. The area of Main Street between Mesa and A27 has no pedestrian crossings and has been brought up multiple times as part of public input as unsafe for pedestrians.

**TABLE 18: State Highway Projects in Lassen County**

| Project Description   | Route | Back Post Mile | Ahead Post Mile | Project Location  | Project Cost (\$1,000s) | Program - Status                        |
|---|-------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Caltrans District 2 SHOPP Projects</b>                           |       |                |                 |   |                         |   |
| Red Rock Pavement   | 395   | 5.6            | R20.0           | Hallelujah Junction to Doyle  | \$ 28,495               | 2024 SHOPP                              |
| Lassen County Traffic Management Systems                            | 395   | R1.5           | R61.1           | Various   | \$ 9,590                | 2024 SHOPP                              |
| Secret Valley Safety Roadside Rest Area                             | 395   | 103.6          | 103.9           |   | \$ 15,354               | 2024 SHOPP                              |
| Susan River Pavement  | 36    | 16.7           | 22.4            |   | \$ 20,719               | 2024 SHOPP                              |
| Collision Reduction Safety Project on Lassen 395                    | 395   | 7.5            | R19.0           |   | \$ 67,071               | SHOPP                                   |
| Lassen 299 Seismic  | 299   | 13.4           | 14.06           | Pit River Overflow and Pit River Bridge   | \$ 3,763                | SHOPP - Programmed                      |
| Devil's Corral Safety - Curve improvement                           | 36    | 14.5           | 16.786          |   | \$ 10,500               | SHOPP - Programmed                      |
| 139 Susanville Paving   | 139   | 0.74           | 11              | In Lassen County in and near Susanville from 0.08 mile north of Hall Street to 2.6 miles south of Horse Lake Road | \$ 18,664               | SHOPP - Programmed                      |
| Lake Leavitt Pavement   | 395   | 56.5           | R71.2           | Near Lake Leavitt   | \$ 21,533               | SHOPP - Future                          |
| Fred to Susan Culverts  | 36    | 0.5            | 22.2            | Various   | \$ 3,700                | SHOPP - Future                          |
| Red Rock to Susan Culverts  | 395   | 28.5           | 59              | Various   | \$ 7,400                | SHOPP - Future                          |
| Ash Street Pavement & Complete Streets                              | 139   | 0              | 0.74            | Susanville - Ash St   | \$ 24,000               | SHOPP - Future                          |
| Doyle Pavement  | 395   | R20.0          | 29.84           | Near Doyle  | \$ 14,300               | SHOPP - Future                          |
| Far East Culverts   | 395   | 94             | 135.1           | Various   | \$ 5,500                | SHOPP - Future                          |
|   |       |                |                 |   | <b>\$ 250,589</b>       |   |
| <b>Other Non-Programmed State Highway Projects in Lassen County</b> |       |                |                 |   |                         |   |
| SR 36 Complete Streets and Safe Mobility Improvements               | 36    |                |                 | Downtown Susanville   | \$ 16,000               | STIP, ATP, CDBG, HSIP                   |
| Wildlife Mitigation Improvements                                    | 395   |                |                 | Hallelujah Junction to Bass Hill  | NA                      | Wildlife Conservation Board and Unknown |
| Additional Passing Lanes  | 395   |                |                 | Between Washoe County Line and SR 36  | \$ 56,000               | Unknown                                 |
|   |       |                |                 |   | <b>\$ 72,000</b>        |   |
|   |       |                |                 |   | <b>Total \$322,589</b>  |   |

Table 19 displays constrained capital roadway projects in the jurisdiction of Lassen County. Roadway rehabilitation and overlay are the greatest roadway needs in Lassen County. The expected cost is \$57 million for the period from 2022 to 2033.

Local Roadway Safety Plan Projects - LCTC recently conducted a local roadway safety study. Three high-priority safety projects were identified as part of this process which could be funded with Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant money.

- Johnstonville Road/Center Road (CR A27) -Install edge rumble strips, centerline rumble strips, and high friction surface treatment along the length of the corridor and advance curve warning and chevron signs at two curves. It is anticipated that this project will reduce crashes by 59 total crashes over ten years. This project was awarded an HSIP grant through Cycle 11.
- Herlong Access Road (CR A25) - Centerline rumble strip and high friction surface treatment are recommended.
- Eagle Lake Road (CR A1) - Crashes could be reduced on this two-lane rural road by posting warning signs, edge line striping, and high friction surface treatment.

The City of Susanville also has a long list of high-priority roadway rehabilitation as demonstrated in Table 20. One project of note is the Southeast Gateway project which will construct a curb, gutter, and sidewalk, and add lighting at the entrance to the city.

## **LONG-TERM AND FINANCIALLY UNCONSTRAINED ROADWAY PROJECTS**

Table 21 presents long-term roadway improvement projects for Lassen County, the City of Susanville, and the Susanville Indian Rancheria. These projects will total at least \$17 million and do not have funding sources identified.

### **Bridge Projects**

Table 22 presents the bridge projects in Lassen County roadways and on state highways, totaling around \$32 million over the planning period. Keeping bridges in a good state of repair will become increasingly important as the weather becomes more extreme.

**Table 19: Lassen County Constrained Roadway Projects (Short-Term, 10 Years)**

| Location                                | Description   | Inflation Adjusted Cost Estimate | Anticipated Construction Year | Funding Source              |
|---|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| County Rehab D                          | Standish-Bintingville Rd (CR 301) US 395 East to Honey Girl Lane - Roadway rehabilitation                         | \$2,015,000                      | 2024                          | STIP                        |
| County Rehab E                          | Standish-Buntingville Road (CR 301) from Mapes Lane to US 395 north - Roadway rehabilitation                      | \$2,015,000                      | 2025                          | STIP                        |
| CR 215                                  | Rice Canyon Road to State Hwy 395 - Roadway repair  | \$3,576,825                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| CR A-3                                  | Cappezoli Lane to State Hwy 395- Roadway repair   | \$2,543,520                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| CR A-1                                  | Gallentin Road to 5 miles north- Roadway repair   | \$1,987,125                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| CR 208                                  | State Route 395 to Plumas County Line- Roadway repair   | \$3,137,925                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| CR 413                                  | State Hwy 299 to end of pavement- Roadway repair  | \$1,669,185                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| CR 235                                  | State Hwy 395 to Janesville Grade- Roadway repair   | \$2,625,000                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Eagle Lake Road (CR A-1)                | Reconstruct, new alignment at the Summit, new shoulders including on-street bikeways from SR 36 to Gallentin Road | \$31,395,000                     | by 2032                       | FLAP, HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Constantia Road                         | Overlay from SR 395 to SR 395   | \$883,155                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Lake Crest Road                         | Overlay from SR 395 to SR 395   | \$514,605                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Garnier Road                            | Overlay from SR 395 to end  | \$518,700                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Herlong Access Road                     | Overlay from SR 395 to end  | \$150,150                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Four Corners                            | Rehabilitation of Paved Portion   | \$327,600                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Kramer Road                             | Rehabilitation of Portions  | \$273,000                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Doyle Old Highway                       | SH 395 to SH 395  | \$884,520                        | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Bassett Road                            | Overlay from SR 299 to Susanville Road  | \$1,016,925                      | by 2032                       | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF       |
| Johnstonville Road/Center Road (CR A27) | Shoulder rumble strips, centerline rumble strips, curve advance warning signs, high friction surface treatment    | \$315,600                        | 2024                          | HSIP                        |
| Herlong Access Road (CR A25)            | Centerline rumble strips and high friction surface treatment  | \$24,800                         | 2026                          | HSIP                        |
| Eagle Lake Road (CR A1)                 | Advance warning signs, edge line striping, high friction surface treatment  | \$1,870,500                      | 2028                          | HSIP                        |
| <b>County Total</b>                     |   | <b>\$57,744,135</b>              |                               |                             |

*Source: Updated from 2017 RTP Project List and discussions with County Public Works*



**Table 20a: City of Susanville Short-Term Roadway Projects (0 - 10 years)**

| Location                       | Description   | Inflation Adjusted Cost Estimate | Construction Year | Funding Source                         |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Susanville Southeast Gateway   | On SR 36 construct curb, gutter, sidewalk, ADA ramps, widen shoulders, safety lighting, landscape and irrigation  | \$2,500,000                      | 2024              | STIP                                   |
| Various Streets                | City street rehab (FD)  | \$84,000                         | 2023-2024         | STIP                                   |
| Paiute Lane                    | Overlay from Calvary Baptist Church to Glenn Drive  | \$300,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF, FD Change Order |
| Alexander, Riverside, Modoc    | Overlay   | \$1,200,000                      | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Russell Ave                    | Overlay between Paul Bunyan and SR 36   | \$300,000                        | by 2032           | RSTP, STIP                             |
| Main Street Johnstonville road | In Susanville between Johnstonville Road and Main Street located approximately at the High Country Inn parking lot. Construct approximately 500 ft long road connection with drainage crossing. | \$105,000                        | 2023-2025         | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| North Street                   | Widen bridge/culvert at Paiute Creek  | \$1,200,000                      | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Chestnut Street                | Overlay from west of Parkdale Ave to west of North Weatherlow St  | \$260,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Court Street                   | Overlay from Miller Road to South Pine Street   | \$25,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| North Mesa Street              | Overlay from Main Street to Second Street   | \$115,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| North Roop Street              | Overlay from Glenn Drive to Cherry Terrace  | \$85,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Campbell Road                  | Overlay from North Weatherlow Street to end   | \$98,800                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Court Street                   | Overlay from east of S Roop Street to S Lassen Street   | \$78,800                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| N Weatherlow Street            | Overlay from Chestnut Street to north end   | \$125,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |
| Orchard Street                 | Overlay from Richmond Road to South Railroad Avenue   | \$85,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF                  |

Source: Updated from 2017 RTP Project List and discussions with City of Susanville

**Table 20b: City of Susanville Short-Term Roadway Projects (0 - 10 years)**

| Location                       | Description  | Inflation Adjusted Cost Estimate | Construction Year | Funding Source        |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Parkdale Avenue                | Widen bridge/culvert at Paiute Creek   | \$1,400,000                      | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Plumas Street                  | Overlay from Modoc Street to south of Modoc Street   | \$75,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Riverside Drive                | Overlay from west of Alexander Ave to Richmond Road  | \$531,960                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Spring Ridge Road East         | Construction from Spring Ridge Road to Skyline Road East and intersection improvements at SR 139 | \$2,300,000                      | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Alexander Ct                   | Overlay from Cornell Street to end of right of way   | \$18,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Johnstonville Road             | Overlay from Riverside Drive to city limits  | \$650,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| N Fairfield Avenue             | Overlay from Fourth Street to Paul Bunyan Road   | \$94,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| South Street                   | Construct portion (Lassen County and City of Susanville portions)                                | \$600,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Wildwood Way                   | Overlay from Cherry Terrace to west end  | \$25,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Hall Street                    | Overlay from North Street to Fourth Street   | \$102,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Miller Road                    | Overlay from Court Street to end of right of way   | \$25,000                         | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Modoc Street                   | Install sidewalk from city limits to Main Street   | \$390,000                        | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| Chestnut/Grand Ave/Paul Bunyan | Safety intersection improvements for both motorists and bicyclists/pedestrians                   | NA                               | by 2032           | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF |
| <b>Susanville Total</b>        |  | <b>\$12,772,560</b>              |                   |                       |

Source: Updated from 2017 RTP Project List and discussions with City of Susanville

**Table 21: Lassen County Unconstrained Projects 10+ years**

| Lead Agency  | Funding Source        | Project Type?<br>(Road, Bike/Ped,<br>Bridge, Transit) | Location                  | Description   | Estimated Cost      | Construction Year |
|--|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>State Highway Projects</u></b>   |                       |   |                           |   |                     |                   |
| LCTC   | STIP                  | Road  | US 395                    | Passing Lanes between Sierra County and Susanville  | NA                  | UNK               |
| <b><u>Lassen County Projects</u></b>   |                       |   |                           | <b>Lassen County Projects</b>   |                     |                   |
| Lassen County  | STIP                  | Road  | County                    | ARTA Recommendations: From A-13 to SR 147, .5 mile passing lane each direction and signalize SR36/147 intersection. | \$7,350,000         | 2032+             |
| Lassen County  | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF | Road  | Various throughout County | New Park and Ride Facilities  | \$2,730,000         | 2032+             |
| Lassen County  | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF | Road  | County near Susanville    | Emergency access road between the east end of Spring Ridge Road south to Skyline Road east and south.               | \$6,825,000         | 2032+             |
| <b>County Total</b>  |                       |   | <b>Total</b>              |   | <b>\$16,905,000</b> |                   |
| <b><u>City of Susanville Projects</u></b>  |                       |   |                           | <b>City of Susanville Projects</b>  |                     |                   |
| City of Susanville   | HSIP, RSTP, STIP, LTF | Road  | SR 36                     | SR 36 Town Hill Project   | NA                  | 2032+             |
| <b>City Total</b>  |                       |   | <b>Total</b>              |   |                     |                   |
| <b><u>Susanville Indian Rancheria Projects</u></b>   |                       |   |                           | <b>Susanville Indian Rancheria Projects</b>   |                     |                   |
| SIR  | TBD                   | Road  | Near Susanville           | Spring Ridge Road to Paiute   | NA                  | 2032+             |
| SIR  | TBD                   | Road  | Near Susanville           | Paul Bunyan Road  | NA                  | 2032+             |
|  |                       |   | <b>Total</b>              |   |                     |                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |                       |   | <b>Total</b>              |   | <b>\$16,905,000</b> |                   |
| <i>Source: Updated from 2017 RTP Project List and discussions with local jurisdictions</i> |                       |   |                           |   |                     |                   |

**Table 22: Lassen County Bridge Projects**

| Location                     | Description                                       | Total Cost          | Local Match        | Construction Year |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Pittville Road, CR 111       | Beaver Creek Bridge 7C-82 (HBP Match), replace    | \$2,520,000         | \$504,000          | 2025              |
| Punkin Center Road, CR 417   | Muddy Slough Bridge 7C-89                         | \$2,140,000         | \$428,000          | 2028              |
| Punkin Center Road, CR 417   | Muddy Slough Bridge 7C-89                         | \$2,152,500         | \$430,500          | 2032              |
| Various County Roads         | BPMP Bridge Deck Treatment                        | \$365,000           | \$73,000           | 2032              |
| Capezolli Road, CR 306       | Whitehead Slough Bridge 7C-70                     | \$2,422,500         | \$484,500          | 2032              |
| Johnstonville Road, CR 238   | BPMP Bridge Railing Replacement                   | \$550,000           | \$110,000          | 2032              |
| Mapes Road, CR 305           | Hartson Slough Bridge 7C-40                       | \$2,250,000         | \$450,000          | 2032              |
| Mapes Road, CR 305           | Whitehead Slough Bridge 7C-41                     | \$2,750,000         | \$550,000          | 2032              |
| Pittville Road, CR 111       | Replace Beaver Creek Bridge 7C-82                 | \$2,822,000         | \$504,000          | 2032              |
| Alexander Lane, CR 304       | Whitehead Slough Bridge 7C-52                     | \$2,500,000         | \$500,000          | TBD               |
| Alexander Lane, CR 304       | South Fork Dill South Bridge 7C-54                | \$2,750,000         | \$550,000          | TBD               |
| Galeppi Lane, CR 303         | Hartson Slough Bridge 7C-67                       | \$2,000,000         | \$400,000          | TBD               |
| Fish and Game Road, CR 318   | Susan River Bridge 7C-77                          | \$2,500,000         | \$500,000          | TBD               |
|                              | Subtotal  | \$27,722,000        | \$5,484,000        |                   |
| <b>State Highway Bridges</b> |   |                     |                    |                   |
| Route 395                    | Bridges - Deck rehabilitation, paint, joints, etc | \$3,763,000         |                    | TBD               |
| Route 299                    | Bridges - Deck rehabilitation, paint, joints, etc | \$3,138,000         |                    | TBD               |
|                              |   | <b>\$34,623,000</b> | <b>\$5,484,000</b> |                   |

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

LCTC recently updated the Active Transportation Plan for Lassen County which included a thorough outreach process and resulted in a comprehensive list of bicycle and pedestrian projects. These projects are listed in Appendix D. Top priority projects include:

- *Riverside Drive Bike Path* - This project will build a separate facility between low-income neighborhoods and goods and services downtown. This project was recently awarded an Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant for construction.
- *Skyline Bike Path Connection to Bizz Johnson Trail* - To create a safe, non-motorized route around the City of Susanville that bypasses Main Street, a connection between the existing Skyline Bike Path and the Bizz Johnson Trail is proposed. This will provide good connections between recreation, neighborhoods, and services.

## Transit Projects

Table 23 summarizes the planned transit projects for LTSA over the next ten years. Most capital improvements represent regular vehicle replacement to maintain a safe and cost-effective fleet. LCTC is currently conducting a ZEV study in partnership with the Plumas County Transportation Commission. This study will likely result in additional projects (vehicles and infrastructure) needed to transition the LTSA vehicle fleet to 100 percent ZEV by 2040. Additional funding sources beyond the normal FTA programs will be required to make this transition.

| <b>Table 23: Lassen County Transit Services Agency - Capital Improvement Projects</b>  |                    |                    |             |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Description</b>   | <b>Total Cost</b>  | <b>Local Match</b> | <b>Year</b> |
| Facility Parking Expansion   | \$10,000           | \$10,000           | 2024        |
| Vehicle Replacement  | \$600,000          | \$120,000          | 2025        |
| Bus Wash   | \$45,000           | \$45,000           | 2025        |
| Vehicle Replacement  | \$600,000          | \$120,000          | 2026        |
| Vehicle Replacement  | \$1,500,000        | \$300,000          | 2028        |
| Vehicle Replacement  | \$1,500,000        | \$300,000          | 2029        |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$4,255,000</b> | <b>\$895,000</b>   |             |
| Note: Vehicle Replacement schedule including transition to a ZEV fleet will be finalized after the completion of the Lassen/Plumas ZEV Study |                    |                    |             |

## Aviation Projects

Table 24 presents the Airport Improvement Programs for all the Lassen County airports. As shown, only the Susanville Airport is eligible for FAA funding, making it difficult to finance many of the projects listed in the table.

| Table 24: Lassen County Aviation Projects |  |              |              |                  |                    |                      |                    |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Location                                  | Description  | Project Type | Program Year | FAA Grant Amount | State Grant Amount | Local Matching Grant | Total Project Cost |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | Apron Reconstruction, Phase II - Construction              | AIP          | 2024         | \$1,012,500      | \$50,625           | \$61,875             | \$1,125,000        |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | TW Rehabilitation Phase I, Bid Alt 1 - Construction        | AIP          | 2021         | \$891,000        | \$44,550           | \$54,450             | \$990,000          |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | TW Rehabilitation Phase I - Construction                   | AIP          | 2021         | \$666,000        | \$33,300           | \$40,700             | \$740,000          |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | Perimeter Fence - Design                                   | AIP          | 2022         | \$108,000        | \$5,400            | \$6,600              | \$120,000          |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | TW Rehabilitation Phase II - Construction                  | AIP          | 2022         | \$234,900        | \$11,745           | \$14,355             | \$261,000          |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | Pavement Maintenance Management Plan                       | AIP          | 2023         | \$135,000        | \$6,750            | \$8,250              | \$150,000          |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | RW Sealcoat - Design                                       | AIP          | 2025         | \$67,500         | \$3,375            | \$4,125              | \$75,000           |
| Susanville Municipal Airport              | RW Sealcoat - Construction                                 | AIP          | 2026         | \$225,000        | \$11,250           | \$13,750             | \$250,000          |
| Herlong Airport                           | Pavement Maintenance & Remarking Runway and Taxiway        | A&D          | 2022         | \$0              | \$108,000          | \$12,000             | \$120,000          |
| Herlong Airport                           | Update Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)         | A&D          | 2022         | \$0              | \$225,000          | \$25,000             | \$250,000          |
| Spaulding Airport                         | Pavement Maintenance & Remarking Runway, Taxiway & Tiedown | A&D          | 2022         | \$0              | \$108,000          | \$12,000             | \$120,000          |
| Spaulding Airport                         | Design & Relocate Beacon & Reconstruct Segmented Circle    | A&D          | 2023         | \$0              | \$90,000           | \$10,000             | \$100,000          |
| Southard Field Airport                    | Pavement Maintenance & Remarking RW, TW & Tiedown          | A&D          | 2022         | \$0              | \$135,000          | \$15,000             | \$150,000          |
| Southard Field Airport                    | Segmented Circle Repair                                    | A&D          | 2021         | \$0              | \$27,000           | \$3,000              | \$30,000           |
| Ravendale Airport                         | Pavement Maintenance & Remarking Runway and Taxiway        | A&D          | 2022         | \$0              | \$103,500          | \$11,500             | \$115,000          |

Source: Caltrans Division of Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan 2021-2030  
A&D = Acquisition and Development AIP = Airport Improvement Program

The Financial Element is fundamental to the development and implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan. This chapter identifies the current and anticipated revenue resources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments that are described in the Action Element in support of the goals, policies, and objectives presented in the previous Policy Element. The intent is to identify and define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. The following provides a summary of the federal, state, and local programs and funding sources available to the Lassen County region for roadway improvements. The next section examines future regional transportation revenues and compares anticipated transportation revenues with proposed transportation projects. The last section provides a summary and conclusions. From a practical perspective, finances and funding availability ultimately determine which projects are constructed.

It is important to note that there are different funding sources for different types of projects. The region is bound by strict rules in obtaining and using transportation funds. Some funding sources are “discretionary,” meaning they can be used for general operations and maintenance, not tied to a specific project or type of project. However, even these discretionary funds must be used to directly benefit the transportation system for which they are collected. For example, funds derived from gasoline taxes can only be spent on roads, and aviation fuel taxes must be spent on airports. State and federal grant funding is even more specific. There are several sources of grant funds, each designated to a specific type of facility (e.g., bridges or state highways), and/or for a specific type of project (e.g., reconstruction or storm damage). This system makes it critical for the county to pursue various funding sources for various projects simultaneously, and to have the flexibility to implement projects as funding becomes available.

The majority of RTP Action Element projects will be funded by recurring or non-competitive federal or state grants. In addition to recurring money, many competitive grants are available for transportation projects, but success in obtaining these types of funds is difficult to predict. A wide variety of funding sources, which could be employed by Lassen County to complete the Action Element financially constrained and unconstrained projects, are listed below. For reference, recurring funding sources are marked with an (R), and competitive grant sources are marked with a (C).

## **ROADWAY IMPROVEMENT FUNDING**

### **Federal Sources**

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act (2020) and the Coronavirus Response and Consolidated Appropriations Act (2021) provided fast and direct economic assistance for American workers, families, small businesses, and industries impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Transportation was one of these industries. This was a temporary source of revenue available during 2020 and 2021 with spillover into 2022. The following section describes ongoing and continuous programs and funding sources.

## ***Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (Public Law 117-58, also known as the “Bipartisan Infrastructure Law”)***

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) or Bipartisan Infrastructure Law: Over the years, the federal government has provided guaranteed funding for surface transportation improvements through legislation. The IIJA is the most recent version and replaces the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act). The IIJA was signed into law on November 21, 2021. The IIJA funds surface transportation programs, including but not limited to federal highways, at over \$567.5 billion for fiscal years 2022 through 2026. This represents a \$274 billion increase over previous levels of funding through the FAST Act. Traditionally, the federal transportation bill has been funded through federal gas taxes, however as vehicles have become more efficient, there is less revenue to draw from. The passage of the IIJA represents a concerted effort to increase federal funding for transportation and implement several new funding programs that were not available previously. Many of the following programs are directly funded under the IIJA and are potential funding sources for Lassen County transportation improvement projects.

- **Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP)** —Generally, the Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides flexible funding that may be used by States and localities for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge, and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. During 2023, STBG will provide \$14.1 billion in flexible funding nationwide. This program includes a set aside for the **Transportation Alternatives Program** (non-motorized improvements and traffic calming techniques) that funds the California Active Transportation Program and Recreational Trails. Typically, RTPAs exchange these federal funds for state RSTP funds as described below.
- **National Highway Performance Program (NHPP)** - This core program focuses on repairing and improving the National Highway System. The Highway Bridge Program (HBP), which funds the repair of highway bridges according to federal safety standards, is a part of NHPP. State and local bridge replacement projects are funded through Caltrans with HBP grants. The goal of the program is to rehabilitate or replace public highway bridges when it has been determined that the bridge is significantly important and unsafe. The federal share of an HBP project is 80 percent. To be eligible for rehabilitation a bridge must be rated Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete with a sufficiency rate of less than 80. Under the IIJA, the NHPP can fund projects that increase resiliency to climate change impacts.
- **Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) (C)**—During the most recent HSIP Cycle 11 the program will authorize roughly \$225.6 million in annual funding for projects to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The FAST Act also sets aside \$3.5 million per year from HSIP for work zone and guardrail safety training, Operation Lifesaver, and safety clearinghouses. Safety projects include railway-highway crossing and infrastructure safety needs, in addition to safety programs such as education, enforcement, and emergency medical services. California's Local HSIP focuses on infrastructure projects with nationally recognized crash reduction factors (CRFs). Local HSIP projects must be identified based on crash experience, crash potential, crash rate, or other data-supported means. Fatality rates on rural roads must be tracked to determine the allocation to the High-Risk Rural Road Program. Beginning with HSIP Cycle 11 (April 2022), applicants must have



developed a Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP). An LRSP follows a similar process to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and provides a framework for organizing stakeholders to identify, analyze, and prioritize roadway safety improvements on local and rural roads.

- **Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)**—This program replaces and expands the Forest Highways program by providing \$260 million for projects that improve access to all Federal Lands. Funds are distributed to each state by a formula based on recreational visitation, land area, public road mileage, and the number of public bridges. States must provide a non-federal match.
- **Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ)**—This program provides a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas).
- **Federal Lands Transportation Program (FLTP)** —This program was established under MAP-21 and continued under the FAST Act to improve transportation facilities for Federal Land Management Agencies such as the National Park Service (NPS) Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), USDA Forest Service (USFS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), and Independent Federal Agencies with natural resource and land management responsibilities (IFAs). The program provides roughly \$355 million to projects annually.
- **Tribal Transportation Program**—This program continues the Indian Reservation Roads program and adds set-asides for tribal road projects and tribal safety projects. It continues to provide set-asides for program management and oversight and tribal transportation planning. Roughly \$600 million will be available annually.
- **Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects**—A new discretionary grant for large federal land or tribal land projects.

### ***Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE)***

RAISE, formerly known as BUILD and TIGER, is a highly competitive federal Department of Transportation discretionary grant program. Congress has dedicated nearly \$8.9 billion for twelve rounds of National Infrastructure Investments to fund projects that have a significant local or regional impact. Multi-modal and multi-jurisdictional projects are eligible.

### ***Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA)***

In FY 2022, \$1.5 billion was available in discretionary grant funding for infrastructure projects that advance the Administration’s priorities of rebuilding America’s infrastructure and creating jobs by funding highway and rail projects of regional and national economic significance.

### ***Secure Rural Schools and Self Determination Act (Forest Reserves)***

After the National Forest System was created in 1905, the government established a program to provide revenue sources for rural counties whose tax base was limited by federally protected lands. A portion of Forest Service funds generated through multi-use activities, such as grazing, timber production, and special use permits, are distributed to eligible counties to help maintain local roads and schools.

### ***Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program***

The SS4A Grant Program was established by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) in 2021. Under this program, \$5 billion will be distributed between 2022 and 2027. The SS4A program funds regional, local, and Tribal initiatives through grants to prevent roadway deaths and serious injuries. In FY 2022, \$800 million was allocated to 510 communities nationwide. The fiscal year 2023 Notice of Funding Opportunity is expected to open in April for the second round of SS4A grants.

### ***Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects***

This is a discretionary grant for large federal land or tribal land projects.

### ***Highway Safety Research and Development***

This new grant program provides \$970 million over five years for highway safety research and development activities. Counties, cities, tribes, educational institutions, and nonprofits are eligible to apply.

### ***National Culvert Removal, Replacement Grant***

This competitive grant program provides \$1 billion over five years for the replacement, removal, and repair of culverts. Local governments and tribes are eligible to apply.

### ***Advanced Transportation Technologies and Innovative Mobility Development Grant***

This new competitive grant program provides \$900 million over five years to deploy, install, and operate advanced transportation technology. Local governments, RTPAs, and transit agencies are eligible to apply.

### ***Pilot Program for Transit-Oriented Development***

This competitive grant program is focused on the integration between land use and transportation planning by funding projects that include multimodal connectivity and transit access and accessibility for active transportation users. IIJA ensures that this grant program provides \$14 million annually for five years. Local governments are eligible to apply.

### ***Federal Transportation Loan Programs***

Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) Rural Project Initiative (RPI)– This program provides low-interest loans and lines of credit to support large-scale rural surface transportation improvement projects. Eligible projects include roadway and bridge, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, aviation, and transit projects. Eligible applicants include state and local governments, transit agencies, and private entities.

### ***National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program***

Provides \$1 billion in annual funding for EV charging infrastructure. Funding can only be used for public charging stations and must be used on an Alternative Fueling Corridor (US 395 is one) until the corridor has sufficient charging infrastructure, at which time funding can be used for any public road or facility. This funding is allocated to the states to award.

## DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR CHARGING AND FUELING INFRASTRUCTURE

IIJA provides competitive grant funding for the development of ZEV charging infrastructure along Alternative Fueling Corridors and within communities. States, MPOs, local governments, RTPAs, and tribes are all eligible to apply for these grants.

### State Sources

Transportation funding in California is both complex and full of uncertainty. Generally, revenue sources for transportation improvements are generated from fuel excise taxes, fuel sales taxes, and the statewide sales tax. In recent years, California transportation funding has become dependent on motor fuel sales tax. Since 2001, proceeds from these taxes have been diverted from the transportation program to address the general fund deficit, despite legislation prohibiting these actions except in the case of severe state fiscal hardship. As a result, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds (primary funding programs for the state highway system) as well as transit funding sources have been raided for general fund purposes.

The struggle to balance the state budget and adequately fund transportation projects in California is ongoing. Various state legislation and ballot propositions in recent years have changed revenue flows for state transportation sources. The “gas tax swap” eliminated the sales tax on gasoline and implemented the price-based excise tax on gasoline to fund transportation improvements. As part of the legislation, an increase in the diesel fuel sales tax was offset by a decrease in the diesel fuel excise tax. The objective of the gas tax swap was to provide a mechanism to fund transportation bond debt service (gasoline sales tax revenues have more stringent restrictions on uses). At the same time, voters passed Proposition 22, which restricted diversions of fuel excise tax revenues in the State Highway Account for non-transportation purposes. Therefore, new legislation was passed that swapped weight fees previously used for Caltrans operations to be used for bond debt service.

The result is that STIP roadway projects (State Highway Account) will be funded through fuel excise taxes. STIP Transit and transportation planning projects (Public Transportation Account) and public transit operations are funded primarily through sales tax on diesel fuel. State excise fuel taxes flow through the Motor Vehicle Fuel Account to fund the STIP, SHOPP, Active Transportation Program, and City and County Road Funds. Every year, Caltrans compiles a *Transportation Funding in California* booklet, which includes illustrative charts and tables of all the funding sources discussed below. A link to the 2022 booklet is provided here: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/data-analytics-services/transportation-economics/transportation-funding-booklet/2022/final-2022-transportation-funding-a11y.pdf>

In 2017, California passed the Road Repair and Accountability Act also known as Senate Bill 1. This legislation provides additional funding for existing transportation programs such as State Transit Assistance (STA) and funding for local streets and roads, while creating new initiatives through the Roadway Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA). Effective November 1, 2017, and adjusted for inflation starting in 2020, SB 1 increases the excise motor fuel rate by:

- Increasing the gasoline excise tax by an additional \$0.12 per gallon
- Increasing the diesel fuel excise tax by \$0.20 per gallon

- Increasing the sales tax on diesel fuel by 4 percent

In addition to the excise tax increases, SB 1 creates a Transportation Improvement Fee (TIF), a new vehicle registration fee, and a Road Improvement Fee, a registration fee for ZEVs model year 2020 and newer. Revenue from the TIF and Road Improvement Fee along with the excise tax increases provides significant additional revenue for the STIP, SHOPP, ATP programs, local roadway projects, and bridge maintenance, as well as for public transit. The following section lists the transportation funding sources available through the State of California.

### **Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)**

This account is an important source of funding for priority roadway maintenance, rehabilitation projects, and safety projects. These funds are available for basic projects identified by counties in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). As this account collects funds from the excise tax, TIF, and Road Improvement Fee, the RMRA is poised to become an increasingly critical source of funding for local roadway maintenance.

### **State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

The STIP consists of two broad transportation improvement programs: (1) the regional program funded by 75 percent of new STIP funding and (2) the interregional program funded by 25 percent of new STIP funding. Summaries of these funds are provided below along with other state funding sources.

#### ***Regional Improvement Program (RIP)***

RIP funds account for 75 percent of STIP funding. The 75 percent portion is subdivided by formula into county shares. The LCTC program funds are apportioned to the region. These funds may be used to finance projects that are both “on” and “off” the state highway system. This “regional share” must be relied on to fund capacity-increasing projects on much of the state highway system. Critical to rural California counties, regional STIP funding may be used for local rehabilitation projects.

#### ***Interregional Improvement Program (IIP)***

The IIP receives the remaining 25 percent of the STIP funding. The IIP funds collectively form the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). This program is controlled and programmed by Caltrans, although regional agencies provide input on the specific ITIP projects for their region. One of the goals of the program is to encourage regional agencies and the state to establish partnerships to conduct certain projects. For rural California counties, a challenge to use IIP funding is the very limited availability of “local match” for IIP-funded programs. (However, RIP funds can be used as a match for the ITIP program.) Caltrans receives 15 percent for state highway projects on the interregional system; potential projects must compete statewide for the remaining funds. Much of the state highway system is not eligible for interregional funding and must rely on the regional share to fund capacity improvement projects. US 395 is an eligible highway.

### **Planning Programming and Monitoring Funds**

The programming of these funds comes from county shares and can be programmed for each year of the STIP. The CTC STIP Guidelines define eligible PPM activities as regional transportation planning (including the development and preparation of the regional transportation plan), project planning (including the

development of project study reports or major investment studies, conducted by regional agencies or by local agencies in cooperation with regional agencies), program development (including the preparation of RTIPs and studies supporting them), and monitoring the implementation of STIP projects (including project delivery, timely use of funds, and compliance with State law and the CTC guidelines).

Caltrans estimates the amount of funding available for the STIP program for five years every two years. The most recent STIP Fund Estimate was developed in 2022. Based on that fund estimate and the STIP Guidelines, the LCTC develops a program of projects for five years. The LCTC submits this program of projects called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The RTIP specifies cost per project component and fiscal year over five years. When the CTC approves the RTIP, it becomes part of the STIP.

### **State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)**

The purpose of the SHOPP is to maintain the integrity of the state highway system. Funding for this program is provided through gas tax revenues. Projects are nominated within each Caltrans District office. Proposed projects are sent to Caltrans Headquarters for programming on a competitive basis statewide. Final project funding determinations are subject to the CTC review. Individual districts are not guaranteed a minimum level of funding. SHOPP projects are based on statewide priorities within each program category (i.e., safety, rehabilitation, operations, etc.) within each Caltrans district. SHOPP funds cannot be used for capacity-enhancing projects.

### **SHOPP Minor Programs**

The “Minor A” Program is a Caltrans discretionary funding program based on annual statewide allocations by the district. This program allows some level of discretion to Caltrans district offices in funding projects up to \$1,250,000. The “Minor B” Program funds are used for projects up to \$333,000. The advantage of the program is its streamlined funding process and the local district’s discretion for decision-making. Funding is locally competitive within each district and limited to the extent of its allocation.

### **Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)**

Rural counties can currently exchange federal Surface Transportation dollars for State Highway Account (SHA) funds (a process known as “RSTP Exchange”). This is advantageous to RTPAs as federal funds have more stringent requirements such as a 20 percent local match, while state funds do not require any local match. The state also provides additional state funds to the county, as a match to the exchanged federal dollars. Eligible RSTP projects include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements on Federal Aid Highways (any highways that are not classified as local or rural minor collectors) and bridges (on public roads of all functional classifications).
- Environmental mitigation for an RSTP project
- Capital transit projects
- Carpool projects
- Highway and transit safety projects
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring

- Surface transportation planning programs
- Transportation enhancement activities
- Transportation control measures
- Highway and transit R&D and technology transfer programs

### **Recurring Revenue Source for Local Roadway Projects**

**Fuel Excise Tax Revenues, Highway Users Tax Account** - Roughly 36 percent of the state base excise tax and 44 percent of the price-based fuel excise tax, gas tax swap, (after revenue used to backfill weight fees which have been diverted) are allocated to cities and counties for road projects. Allocation formulas are complex and based on population, proportion of registered vehicles, and proportion of maintained county road miles. These funds can be used for maintenance, new construction, engineering, administration, right of way, and other uses.

**Vehicle License Fees**—Revenue from motor vehicle license fees is allocated back to local jurisdictions for any purpose.

### **Local Partnership Program**

This program is funded through a continuous appropriation of \$200 million annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (SB 1) to local and regional transportation agencies that have sought and received voter approval of taxes or that have imposed fees dedicated solely to transportation improvements.

### **Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program**

The purpose of the EEM is to offer state-level funding to remedy the environmental impacts of new or improved transportation facilities. Mitigation can include highway landscapes and urban forestry or the development of roadside recreational facilities such as roadside rest stops, trails, scenic overlooks, trailheads, parks, and snow parks. The bill appropriates \$7 million annually from the Highway Users Tax Account for these purposes and generally limits grants to \$500,000 each. The program is administered by the California Natural Resources Agency.

### **The Active Transportation Program (ATP)**

Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359, and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354, were signed into law on September 26, 2013. The ATP consolidated existing federal and state transportation programs, including Transportation Alternatives Program, Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program with a focus on making California a national leader in active transportation.

Furthermore, disadvantaged communities must receive at least 25 percent of the program’s funding. The purpose of ATP is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation by achieving the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals;

- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding;
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

There is a local match of 11.47 percent except for projects predominately benefiting a disadvantaged community. The program is very competitive but is the primary funding source for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

### **Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)**

This recurring state grant program provides funds to rural RTPAs, on a reimbursement basis, specifically for purposes of transportation planning. Activities and products developed using these funds are governed by an annual Overall Work Program, prepared by the region, and approved by Caltrans.

### **Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program**

This grant program was created to support Caltrans' current Mission: Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The overarching objectives of this grant program are to ensure consideration of these major efforts in transportation planning, including sustainability, preservation, mobility, safety, innovation, economy, health, and equity. There are two separate grant programs: Strategic Partnerships and Sustainable Communities, which effectively replace former Environmental Justice, Community-Based Transportation Planning, and Transit Planning grant programs. Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant was recently awarded to LCTC to fund the Joint Lassen and Plumas Counties ZEV Rollout Feasibility Study.

### ***Strategic Partnerships***

Funded through the FHWA, for transportation planning studies of interregional and statewide significance in partnership with Caltrans. The minimum grant award is \$100,000 with a maximum award of \$500,000. RTPAs and MPOs are eligible primary applicants with transit agencies, local governments, tribal governments, universities, and non-profit organizations eligible to apply as sub-applicants. There is a 20 percent minimum local match. Example transportation planning studies include corridor studies, transportation demand management strategies, system investment prioritization plans, and studies that identify interregional or statewide mobility and access needs.

### ***Sustainable Communities***

Funded through FTA Section 5304 and the SHA, to study multimodal transportation issues which assist in achieving Caltrans' mission and overarching objectives. Primary eligible applicants include RTPAs, MPOs, transit agencies, local governments, and tribal governments. Non-profit organizations and other public entities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants. The minimum grant award is \$50,000 (underserved communities) or \$100,000 (all other applicants) with a maximum award of \$700,000. A local match of 11.47 percent is required. Example projects include:

- Studies that advance a community's effort to reduce transportation related greenhouse gases;
- Studies that assist transportation agencies in creating sustainable communities;

- Studies that advance a community’s effort to address the impacts of climate change and sea level rise;
- Community to school studies or safe routes to school studies or plans;
- Jobs and affordable housing proximity studies;
- Context-sensitive streetscapes or town center plans;
- Complete street plans;
- Bike and pedestrian safety enhancement plans;
- Traffic calming and safety enhancement plans;
- Corridor enhancement studies;
- Health equity transportation studies;
- Climate change adaptation plans for transportation facilities;
- Transit planning surveys and research;
- Identification of policies, strategies, and programs to preserve transit facilities and optimize transit infrastructure;
- Studies that evaluate accessibility and connectivity of the multimodal transportation network;
- Short-range transit development plans;
- Transit marketing plans;
- Social service improvement studies;
- Student Internships (Only for Rural Agencies); and
- Studies that address environmental justice issues in a transportation-related context.

### ***Climate Adaptation***

New for FY 2023-24, this state-funded planning grant will fund the development of climate adaptation plans and the identification of adaptation needs in transportation systems. Primary eligible applicants include MPOs, RTPAs, transit agencies, local governments, and tribal governments. Non-profit organizations and other public entities are eligible to apply as sub-applicants. The minimum grant award is \$100,000 with a maximum award of \$1.5 million (for a single organization) or \$3 million (for a partnership). A local match of 11.47 percent is required, although this match requirement is waived for tribal governments.

Example projects include:

- Studies that advance a community’s effort to reduce transportation related greenhouse gases
- Studies that assist transportation agencies in creating sustainable communities
- Studies that advance a community’s effort to address the impacts of climate change and sea level rise
- Community to school studies or safe routes to school studies or plans
- Jobs and affordable housing proximity studies
- Context-sensitive streetscapes or town center plans



- Complete street plans
- Bike and pedestrian safety enhancement plans
- Traffic calming and safety enhancement plans
- Corridor enhancement studies
- Health equity transportation studies
- Climate change adaptation plans for transportation facilities
- Transit planning surveys and research
- Identification of policies, strategies, and programs to preserve transit facilities and optimize transit infrastructure
- Studies that evaluate accessibility and connectivity of the multimodal transportation network
- Short-range transit development plans
- Transit marketing plans
- Social service improvement studies
- Student Internships (Only for Rural Agencies)
- Studies that address environmental justice issues in a transportation-related context

### **Clean California Local Grant Program**

This new competitive grant program was launched to support the beautification of communities and public areas along roadways and remove trash and debris statewide. \$1.1 billion is available over three years. Cities, counties, transit agencies, tribal governments, and government agencies are eligible to apply. A Clean California Grant was recently submitted to rehabilitate the Susan River Bike Path.

### **Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP)**

The objective of this competitive grant is to provide funding for infrastructure improvements on federally designated Trade Corridors of National and Regional Significance, on California's portion of the National Highway Freight Network, as identified in the California Freight Mobility Plan, and along other corridors that have a high volume of freight movement. This program is funded through SB 1 and the federal National Highway Freight Program.

### **Solutions for Congested Corridors**

The purpose of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program is to provide funding to achieve a balanced set of transportation, environmental, and community access improvements to reduce congestion throughout the state. This statewide, competitive program makes \$250 million available annually through SB 1 for projects that implement specific transportation performance improvements and are part of a comprehensive corridor plan by providing more transportation choices while preserving the character of local communities and creating opportunities for neighborhood enhancement.

### **Urban Greening Grant**

This competitive grant distributed through the California Natural Resources Agency is funded with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) revenues. Eligible projects must include one of the following elements:

- Sequester and store carbon by planting trees;
- Reduce building energy use by strategically planting trees to shade buildings; and
- Reduce commute vehicle miles traveled by constructing bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools.
- In addition to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, SB 859 requires all projects to achieve measurable benefits. Per statute, all projects must do at least one of the following:
  - Acquire, create, enhance, or expand community parks and green spaces, and/or use natural systems or systems that mimic natural systems to achieve multiple benefits.
  - Priority is given to projects in disadvantaged communities. Roughly \$47.5 million was available for the funding cycle in 2023. It is unknown if additional funding cycles will be available in the future.

### **Clean Transportation Program (Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program)**

This program is managed by the California Energy Commission and provides for annual investments of up to \$100 million that promote accelerated development and deployment of advanced transportation and fuel technologies. The program is financed through vehicle and vessel registration, vehicle identification plates, and smog abatement fees. The funds must be used to:

- Expedite development of conveniently located fueling and charging infrastructure for low-and zero-emission vehicles;
- Accelerate advancement and adoption of alternative fuel and advanced technology vehicles, including low-and zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles;
- Expand in-state production of alternative, low-carbon renewable fuel from low-carbon pathways; and support manufacturing and workforce training to help meet the needs of the state’s growing clean transportation and fuels market; and
- Support manufacturing and workforce training to translate clean technology investments into sustained employment opportunities.

### **Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project (HVIP)**

Administered by CARB, this program aims to accelerate the adoption of cleaner, more efficient trucks and buses by providing fleets based in California with vouchers when they purchase zero-emission buses. The amount of the voucher depends on vehicle weight class, type of use, and whether it is in a disadvantaged community. For a large transit vehicle purchase, a transit agency could receive around a \$150,000 voucher. The California State Budget for FY 2022-23 proposes a \$1.7 billion investment in zero-emission vehicles. This could create additional funding sources for Lassen Rural Bus to meet CARB’s goal to have a zero-emission bus fleet by 2040. A variety of smaller credit and voucher programs are available through the state to assist with the transition to ZEVs.

## **LOCAL SOURCES**

### **Traffic Mitigation Fees**

Traffic mitigation fees are one-time charges on new developments to pay for required public facilities and to mitigate impacts created by or reasonably related to development. There are several approaches to charging developers for the provision of public facilities. In all cases, however, the fees must be related to the costs incurred as a result of the development. Passed to govern the imposition of development fees, AB 1600 requires that a rational connection be made between a fee and the type of development on which the fee is based. Furthermore, fees cannot be used to correct existing problems or pay for improvements needed for existing development. A county may only levy such fees in the unincorporated area over which it has jurisdiction, while a city must levy fees within the city limits. Any fee program to pay for regional facilities must have the cooperation of all jurisdictions in which future growth is expected to take place.

## **TRANSIT IMPROVEMENT FUNDING**

A wide range of potential transit funding sources is available, particularly within California. The following discussion provides an overview of these programs.

### **Federal Funding Sources**

The following are discussions of federal transit funding programs available to rural areas:

#### ***FTA Capital Program Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Grants***

Capital projects to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment, and to construct bus-related facilities. A sub-program provides competitive grants for bus and bus facility projects that support low and zero-emission vehicles (Low or No Emission Vehicle Program).

#### ***FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities***

This program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds for programs to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services. (This program consolidates the old New Freedom Program with the Elderly and Disabled Program.) Grants are available for both capital (20 percent local match) and operating purposes (50 percent local match) to areas with less than 200,000 in population. Projects to be funded with FTA 5310 funds must be derived from a Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan.

#### ***FTA Section 5311 Public Transportation for Rural Areas***

Federal transit funding for rural areas (population of less than 50,000) is currently provided through the FTA Section 5311 Non-urbanized Area Formula Program. In California, an 11.47 percent local match is required for capital programs and a 44.67 percent match for operating expenditures. These funds, administered by Caltrans, are segmented into “apportioned” and “discretionary” programs. The bulk of the funds are apportioned directly to rural counties based on population levels. The remaining funds are distributed by Caltrans on a discretionary basis and are typically used for capital purposes. This is a primary source of operating revenue for Lassen Rural Bus.

## ***Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP)***

The RTAP (49 USC. 5311(b)(3)) provides a source of funding to assist in the design and implementation of training and technical assistance projects and other support services tailored to meet the needs of transit operators in non-urbanized areas. RTAP has both state and national program components. The state program provides an annual allocation to each state to develop and implement training and technical assistance programs in conjunction with the state's administration of the Section 5311 formula assistance program. The national program provides for the development of information and materials for use by local operators and state administering agencies and supports research and technical assistance projects of national interest. There is no federal requirement for a local match.

## **State Funding Sources**

A mainstay of funding for transit programs in California is provided by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). The TDA provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), which began in 1972, and the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, established in 1980.

## ***Local Transportation Fund***

The major portion of TDA funds is provided through the LTF. These funds are generated by a one-fourth cent statewide sales tax and returned to the county of origin. Consequently, LTF funds are based on local population and spending. The LTF may be allocated by LCTC for the following prioritized purposes:

- A reasonable amount is needed by LCTC for TDA administration. This amount varies between RTPAs.
- Up to 3 percent of annual LTF revenues may be allocated to the RTPA for the conduct of the transportation planning and programming process.
- Two percent of the remaining amount may be provided for pedestrian and/or bicycle facilities.
- Up to five percent of remaining funds may be allocated for coordinated community transit services (Article 4.5).
- The remaining funds must be spent for transit and paratransit purposes unless the LCTC finds either no unmet transit needs or that unmet needs cannot be reasonably met.
- If there are no reasonable-to-meet unmet transit needs, remaining funds in rural areas may be allocated to local streets and roads to jurisdictions based on population.

## ***State Transit Assistance***

In addition to LTF funding, the TDA includes an STA funding mechanism. The sales tax on diesel fuel is used to fund public transit operations and capital improvements. This amount was recently augmented by the diesel fuel sales tax increase from SB1.

## ***State of Good Repair (SGR)***

The RRMA (SB 1) includes a program that provides additional revenues for transit infrastructure repair and service improvements. This investment in public transit will be referred to as the State of Good

Repair (SGR) Program. As of 2022, this program receives funding of approximately \$105 million annually. SGR funds are to be made available for eligible transit maintenance, rehabilitation, and capital projects.

### ***The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)***

This is one of several programs that are part of the Transit, Affordable Housing, and Sustainable Communities Program established by the California Legislature in 2014 by Senate Bill 862. The LCTOP was created to provide operating and capital assistance for transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility, with a priority on serving disadvantaged communities. Eligible projects include new or expanded bus or rail services, and expanded intermodal transit facilities, and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, maintenance, and other costs to operate those services or facilities, as long as each project reduces greenhouse gas emissions. For agencies whose service area includes disadvantaged communities, at least 50 percent of the total money received shall be expended on projects that will benefit disadvantaged communities. This program is administered by Caltrans in coordination with the Air Resource Board (ARB) and the State Controller's Office (SCO). Transit agencies often use LCTOP funds to pay for revenue loss when offering free fares to passengers.

### ***Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (C)***

Also created by SB 862, this program provides funding from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, for rail or intercity rail feeder bus projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Eligible applicants must be public agencies, including joint powers agencies, that operate or have planning responsibility for existing or planned regularly scheduled intercity or commuter passenger rail service (and associated feeder bus service to intercity rail services), urban rail transit service, or bus or ferry transit service (including commuter bus services and vanpool services).

### **Local Transit Operating Funding Sources**

In addition to the above programs, Lassen Transit Services Agency collects passenger fare revenue on board the buses, receives revenue through advertisements placed on the buses, and has funding agreements with local organizations such as Lassen College. These revenue sources are generally used to pay for annual operating and maintenance expenses.

## **AVIATION**

### **Funding Sources**

#### ***Federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP)***

The AIP provides 90 percent federal funding (requiring a 10 percent local and state match) for public-use airports that are part of the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). Available for most capital expenditures, this funding program must be approved annually by Congress. In recent years it has experienced major funding reductions. AIP funds are derived from user charges such as aviation fuel tax, civil aircraft tax, and air passenger fare surcharges. The Susanville Airport is the only airport in Lassen County on the NPIAS.

## **State of California Airport Grants**

The California Division of Aeronautics makes grant funds available for airport development and operations. Three types of state financial aid to publicly owned airports are available.

- Annual grants for up to \$10,000 per airport per year - These funds can be used for a variety of purposes from runway reconstruction, and obstruction removal, to radios.
- Acquisition and Development (A&D) Grants - These grants provide funds for the cost of qualified airport developments on a matching basis, to the extent that state funds are available. Grant amounts can range from a minimum of \$20,000 to a maximum of \$500,000. The local match requirement is set annually by the CTC and can vary from 10 to 50 percent of total project costs. A&D grants cannot be used as a local match for FAA grants. A&D projects must be listed in the CIP and A&D grants are available to both NPIAS and non-NPIAS airports. The amount available for A&D grants is what is left in the Aeronautics Account after funding State Operations, Annual Grants, and AIP Matching.
- Local Airport Loan Program - This program provides discretionary low-interest State loans to eligible airports for projects that enhance an airport's ability to provide general aviation services (hangars, terminals, utilities, fueling facilities, A&D-eligible projects, etc.). A loan may also provide the local share for an AIP grant. Such a loan can be used in conjunction with a State-funded AIP Matching grant. The maximum term of a loan is 17 years.

Funding for airport improvements is limited. At the state level excise taxes on AVGAS and General Aviation jet fuel are the only source of revenue for the Division of Aeronautics. AIP Grant funding has increased by only four percent over the past five years.

## **PROJECTED REVENUES**

Projecting revenues and expenditures over a 20-year horizon is difficult, in that funding levels can dramatically fluctuate or be eliminated by legislation and policy changes. In addition, many projects are eligible for discretionary funds, which are nearly impossible to forecast as discretionary funds are allocated through a competitive grant process.

Recurring regional transportation revenues were projected over the next 20 years, as shown in Table 25. As referenced in the RTP Guidelines and required in Government Code Section 65080(b)(4)(A), STIP revenue projections over the first four years of the planning period are consistent with the 2022 STIP Fund Estimate. The level of revenue available through the STIP and SHOPP are ultimately dependent on the demand for gasoline and diesel fuel. As prices go up there may be more demand for alternative fuels. Generally, the projections in Table 25 assume that over the short-term and mid-term period (up to FY 32-33), revenues are expected to increase by 3 percent annually, after which they are assumed to increase by 2 percent annually.

Around 56 million in recurring transportation revenue is anticipated to be available over the 20-year planning period for roadway and bridge capital improvement projects. Transportation Operations and Maintenance funding is anticipated to total \$187 million over the planning period. Recurring funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects are very limited and competitive; therefore, it is not projected. Aviation capital revenues over the planning period totaled only \$1.3 million. Roughly \$11.5

million in total transit capital and operating revenue is projected, which will not likely be sufficient to meet the state goal of transitioning to a zero-emission fleet.

### **Roadway and Bridge Revenue to Expenditure Comparison**

Table 26 compares regional transportation capital improvement projected recurring revenues to expenditures over the 20-year planning period. As can be seen in the table, the first five years of RTP projects are fiscally constrained. However, for the mid-term and long-term periods, there is a significant shortfall in recurring revenues, roughly \$32 million in regional roadway projects. Additionally, this figure does not include long-term projects with unknown project costs. Specific implementation dates for projects will depend on the actual revenue available.

LCTC applies for competitive grant funding when applicable which may add to the revenue sources. Table 25 demonstrates that obtaining funding through discretionary grants and taking advantage of new programs through IJA and state grant sources will be key to implementing all the regional transportation capital improvement projects required to meet the needs identified in this RTP. The Lassen County region will continue to plan and program transportation projects that are consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives in the Policy Element.

### **Operations and Maintenance Costs**

In addition to ensuring that the implementation of new or reconstructed transportation facilities identified in this RTP is financially constrained, it is also important to consider if there will be sufficient funds over the planning period to operate and maintain the facilities once constructed. Funds for roadway operation and maintenance stem from a variety of sources depending on the operator of the facility. SHOPP funds can be used to maintain the state highways. Gas tax funds are used to maintain roadways at the county and city levels. Table 25 shows projections for transportation planning, operations, and maintenance. The Lassen County Roadway Maintenance budget allocates around \$350,000 per year for professional and specialized services. SB 1 is one of the potential funding sources for roadway maintenance activities and totals around \$800,000 annually. In the City of Susanville, the FY 2023-24 budget projects \$398,000 in SB 1 revenue with maintenance costs in the \$101,000 level. These revenue projections are based on historical funding levels. These funding levels do not include a level of projects which will improve Lassen County and the City of Susanville's pavement conditions, but rather a minimum level of expenditure to maintain the system.

### **Transit Revenue Expenditure Comparison**

In terms of transit capital projects, generally, FTA 5339 funds are used to replace transit vehicles. A 20 percent local match is required. Although FTA 5339 funds are competitive, transit agencies are generally able to obtain grants for vehicle replacement. TDA funds can be used as the local match. Over the long term, transit agencies in California will need to construct the infrastructure to have zero-emission fleets. Lassen Transit Services Agency is currently planning for this effort. Although the process is not complete, it has become apparent that transitioning to zero-emission vehicles will require the purchase of larger or additional vehicles which will increase capital costs significantly.

**Table 25: RTP Forecast Revenue Summary**

All Figures in 1000s, adjusted annually for inflation

| Funding Source/Program   | Fiscal Years   |                 |                  | Total            |
|--|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
|  | 23/24 - 27/28  | 28/29 - 32/33   | 33/34 - 42/43    |                  |
| <b><u>Recurring Roadway and Bridge Capital Revenues</u></b>                |  |                 |                  |                  |
| STIP <sup>(1)</sup>  | \$4,307  | \$4,823         | \$11,418         | \$20,548         |
| SHOPP/Minor <sup>(2)</sup>   | \$125  | \$125           | \$252            | \$503            |
| HBP/Toll Credits <sup>(3)</sup>  | \$6,016  | \$5,468         | \$12,948         | \$24,432         |
| Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) <sup>(4)</sup>              | \$2,365  | \$2,587         | \$6,124          | \$11,076         |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$12,813</i>                                      | <i>\$13,003</i> | <i>\$30,742</i>  | <i>\$56,558</i>  |
| <b><u>Competitive Roadway Transportation Funding</u></b>                   |  |                 |                  |                  |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) <sup>(5)</sup>                   | \$315  | \$0             | \$0              | \$315            |
| Federal Land Highway Program (FLAP) <sup>(6)</sup>                         | \$0  | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$315</i>   | <i>\$0</i>      | <i>\$0</i>       | <i>\$315</i>     |
| <b><u>Transportation Planning, Operations and Maintenance Revenues</u></b> |  |                 |                  |                  |
| STIP PPM <sup>(1)</sup>  | \$200  | \$219           | \$548            | \$966            |
| Highway Users Tax (Gas) <sup>(4)</sup>                                     | \$32,000   | \$34,998        | \$82,865         | \$149,862        |
| County SB 1 and RMRA <sup>(4)</sup>  | \$4,000  | \$4,000         | \$9,865          | \$17,865         |
| S1608/HR2389 (Forest Reserves) <sup>(4)</sup>                              | \$3,000  | \$3,281         | \$7,769          | \$14,050         |
| City of Susanville Street Maintenance                                      | \$2,855  | \$3,122         | \$7,393          | \$13,371         |
| City of Susanville SB 1 <sup>(7)</sup>                                     | \$2,000  | \$2,187         | \$5,179          | \$9,366          |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$44,055</i>                                      | <i>\$47,807</i> | <i>\$113,618</i> | <i>\$205,480</i> |
| <b><u>Bicycle and Pedestrian Revenues</u></b>                              |  |                 |                  |                  |
| ATP  | Discretionary and competitive. Difficult to project. |                 |                  |                  |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$0</i>   | <i>\$0</i>      | <i>\$0</i>       | <i>\$0</i>       |
| <b><u>Aviation Capital Revenues</u></b>                                    |  |                 |                  |                  |
| State CAAP <sup>(8)</sup>  | \$250  | \$250           | \$500            | \$1,000          |
| AIP  | \$293  | \$0             | \$0              | \$293            |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$543</i>   | <i>\$250</i>    | <i>\$500</i>     | <i>\$1,293</i>   |
| <b><u>Transit Capital Revenues</u> <sup>(9)</sup></b>                      |  |                 |                  |                  |
| State of Good Repair   | \$265  | \$316           | \$662            | \$1,244          |
| Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)                              | \$155  | \$174           | \$365            | \$694            |
| Federal Transit Administration Funds <sup>(10)</sup>                       | \$2,204  | \$2,340         | \$5,035          | \$9,579          |
| <i>Subtotal</i>  | <i>\$2,624</i>                                       | <i>\$2,831</i>  | <i>\$6,062</i>   | <i>\$11,517</i>  |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$60,350</b>                                      | <b>\$63,891</b> | <b>\$150,922</b> | <b>\$275,163</b> |

Note: Assumed inflation rate is 3 percent for mid-term projections (FY 28/29-32/33) and 2 percent for long-term projections (FY 33/34-42/43).

Note 1: Short-term based on 2022 STIP Fund Estimate and 2022 RTIP. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 2: Based on short-term and mid-term SHOPP project lists. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 3: Based on short-term project lists. Long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 4: Based on Lassen County FY 22-23 Recommended Budget. Mid-term and long-term projections increase by assumed inflation rates.

Note 5: Based on project lists. HSIP is a discretionary funding source. Additional funds may potentially be available for future projects.

Note 6: Based on project lists. FLAP is a discretionary funding source. Additional funds may potentially be available for future projects.

Note 7: based on City of Susanville FY 2023-2024 Budget.

Note 8: Assumed annual CAAP grant of \$10K per year for five Lassen County Airports.

Note 9: Short-term projections based on LTSA FY 2022-23 Budget. Mid-term and long term increased by assumed inflation rate.

Note 10: Based on public transit project lists. Mid-term and long-term projections based on ESTA FY 2022-23 budget and increase by assumed inflation rates.



## Table 26: Lassen RTP Revenue/Expenditure Comparison

### Recurring Revenue Funded Projects

All Figures in 1000s, adjusted annually for inflation

| Program  | Short-Term                    | Long-Term                     |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|  | Fiscal Years<br>23/24 - 27/28 | Fiscal Years<br>28/29 - 42/43 |
| <b>Revenues (Table 29)</b>                                 |                               |                               |
| STIP Regional Revenues - Programmed                        | \$4,307                       | \$43,745                      |
| SHOPP/Minor  | \$125                         | \$377                         |
| HBP/Toll Credits   | \$6,016                       | \$18,416                      |
| Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)             | \$2,365                       | \$8,711                       |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>\$12,813</b>               | <b>\$71,249</b>               |
| <b>Expenditures<sup>(1)</sup></b>                          |                               |                               |
| STIP Regional Project LCTC Costs - Programmed              | -\$6,614                      | -\$63,903                     |
| SHOPP/Minor Projects                                       | -\$125                        | -\$377                        |
| Bridge Projects  | -\$4,660                      | -\$39,283                     |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>-\$11,399</b>              | <b>-\$103,563</b>             |
| <b>Balance</b>   | <b>\$1,414</b>                | <b>-\$32,314</b>              |
| Note 1: 2022 RTIP , short-term project for County and City |                               |                               |

### Aviation Revenue Expenditure Comparison

AIP grants are assumed for airport improvement projects listed in the state plans and therefore, assumed to be financially constrained.

*This page intentionally left blank*

*Appendix A*

**LCTC PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN AND POLICY**

---



## Public Participation Plan

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) recognizes the importance of public participation as well as interagency and intergovernmental participation for this project. Without input and involvement from members of the public, affected agencies, community groups, and other interested parties it would be difficult to develop a planning document that effectively meets the needs of the county and its communities.

This plan will provide a clear directive for the public participation activities of LCTC, particularly as they pertain to the agency's responsibility to develop the Regional Blueprint Plan, titled *Envision Lassen County*.

### **PUBLIC & AGENCY PARTICIPATION GOALS & STRATEGIES**

Goal 1: Provide all interested parties and agencies reasonable opportunities for involvement in the transportation planning process.

Strategy 1.1: Provide adequate public notice of public participation opportunities and activities and time for public review of regionally significant plans and documents.

Strategy 1.2: Evaluate plans, programs, and projects to determine the most appropriate and effective tools and strategies for public and agency involvement and outreach.

Strategy 1.3: Provide the opportunity to comment on draft planning documents to affected local, state and federal agencies.

Strategy 1.4: Make information available for viewing on the Envision Lassen County website. Regionally significant documents shall also be made available at key locations throughout the County.

Strategy 1.5: In developing the regional blueprint plan and other regionally significant plans, LCTC will consult with state, federal and local agencies and officials that may be affected by proposed planning activities, including planning, transportation, environmental, economic development, housing, private industry, and resource agencies, as appropriate.

Strategy 1.6: Prior to adoption, provide additional opportunity for public and agency review and comment if the regional blueprint plan differs significantly from the draft that was made available for public review and raises new material issues which could not reasonably have been foreseen from the public involvement efforts.



Strategy 1.7: During the transportation planning process, LCTC and its advisory bodies shall conduct open public meetings in accordance with the Brown Act (CGC Sec. 54950 et seq).

Goal 2: Increase public awareness and understanding of the planning process in Lassen County.

Strategy 2.1: Employ visualization techniques as part of public involvement when appropriate.

Strategy 2.2: Provide information on regionally significant plans and projects to the local media for inclusion in their publications and/or reports.

Strategy 2.3: Maintain the Envision Lassen County website with current transportation planning activities, including reports and plans, as well as agendas and minutes for stakeholder and community meetings.

Strategy 2.4: When appropriate, present information about specific plans and projects at public forums, such as City Council and Board of Supervisors meetings for increased public and governmental awareness.

Goal 3: Ensure accessibility to the transportation planning process and information for all members of the community.

Strategy 3.1: Hold public meetings at locations that are convenient and accessible to the public.

Strategy 3.2: When selecting meeting locations for community outreach activities, prioritize those locations that are accessible by means of public transit.

Strategy 3.3: Make transportation planning documents available for viewing on the Envision Lassen County website. Regionally significant documents shall also be made available at key locations throughout the County.

Strategy 3.4: Make every effort to accommodate requests for accessibility opportunities, including physical accessibility to public meetings as well as accessibility to information.

Goal 4: Maintain contact with interested individuals and agencies throughout the process of developing plans and projects.

Strategy 4.1: Encourage early involvement in the transportation planning process by providing timely notification and access to information regarding the development of plans and projects.

Strategy 4.2: Utilize citizen and/or agency advisory groups as a means of providing input to the transportation planning process.

Strategy 4.3: Maintain a contact list of agencies and individuals that may be interested in a specific project or plan.



Strategy 4.4: Identify key individuals and organizations, including small community organizations that may be interested in or affected by a plan or program.

Goal 5: Increase opportunities for those traditionally under-served, including the elderly, low income, disabled, and minority households, to participate in the planning process.

Strategy 5.1: Attempt to offer key information, such as notices and announcements, in alternative languages when appropriate or requested.

Strategy 5.2: Provide the opportunity for alternative forms of public input (website, email, etc.) for individuals who are unable to be physically present at public meetings or workshops.

Strategy 5.3: When appropriate, utilize alternative media outlets that may target minority or underserved segments of the community.

Strategy 5.4: Advertise the availability of an interpreter when appropriate or requested.

Goal 6: Consider public and agency input and comments as an integral part of LCTC's decision making process.

Strategy 6.1: Utilize citizen and/or agency advisory groups as a means of providing input to the transportation planning process.

Strategy 6.2: Conduct public opinion surveys to help identify the needs, interests and concerns of the population when appropriate.

Strategy 6.3: Consider the input of federal, state and local agencies during the decision making process.

Strategy 6.4: As appropriate, incorporate concerns, issues, and suggestions of the public and agencies when developing plans and projects.

Goal 7: Consult with tribal governments within Lassen County and provide opportunities for tribal government input into the planning process.

Strategy 7.1: Provide early notice of the development of transportation plans and programs to all tribal governments within Lassen County.

Strategy 7.2: Provide the opportunity for direct consultation with tribal councils and/or administrators as part of the planning process.

Strategy 7.3: Provide the opportunity for tribal governments and the tribal community to review the regional blueprint plan.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION TOOLS**



This section contains highlights of regional blueprint plan public involvement policies and measures used by LCTC, for the Lassen County 2005 and 2012 Regional Transportation Plan efforts.

**Contact Lists/Direct mailing:** LCTC staff will maintain a mailing list of interested persons who desire to be kept informed about progress on the regional blueprint plan, its related documents, and meeting dates.

**Public Notices:** When posting notices for public meetings, a notice is posted at the County Public Works office and local newspaper. All notices of public meets or hearings will include date, time, and place of public meeting/hearing, and a general description of the matter to be considered.

**Project Workshops/Open-Houses:** It is vital that the public has the opportunity to participate early in the planning stages for development of the regional blueprint plan. Their input will be used as a review of proposed regional blueprint scenario models. The best venue to receive public input will be at the two Community meetings to be held. Additionally, public input can be provided directly to members of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee as well as through the Envision Lassen County website comment section.

The public input results (comments and/or suggestions) will be summarized by the consultant and/or County and presented to the LCTC at regularly scheduled meetings. Public input/comments will be considered by the LCTC for making modifications to the final regional blueprint plan.

**Public Hearings:** Public hearings will be held prior to the adoption of the regional blueprint plan and other documents which require a public hearing. Public hearings will be held prior to a decision point as a formal means to gather citizen comments and positions from all interested parties for public record and input into the decision making process. LCTC hearings are required for the adoption of major plans, programming of money and for the annual Unmet Transit Needs analysis. Specific regional blueprint plan decision points include: Approval of base case scenario model, alternative scenario models, draft regional blueprint plan, and final regional blueprint plan.



**News Releases:** If requested, the LCTC will provide news releases or communicate with reporters working for local newspapers, radio stations, or television in the effort to provide public information and insight about LCTC plans, programs, or projects.

**Posters and Flyers:** When feasible flyers and/or newsletters will be used to encourage involvement of the underserved and transit-dependent citizens in throughout the blueprint process.

**Other Relevant Public Involvement Measures:** The LCTC will continue to comply with all State and Federal requirements regarding public participation, including those not explicitly provided for in this document. The LCTC will periodically review the public involvement procedures and implementation measures relative to their effectiveness in assuring that the process provides full and open access to all citizens of Lassen County. When needed, the public involvement procedures will be updated or revised.

## **REVIEW OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN**

Regional blueprint plans are not required to have a 45-day comment period or board action on the Public Participation Plan pursuant Government Code 65080.



## LCTC Communications - Outreach

| WE        | PROJECT/DELIVERABLE   | Frequency   | April                            | May   | June                       |
|-----------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
|           |   |   |                                  | SSTAC 05/01/23<br>LCTC 05/08/23                   | LCTC 06/17/23<br>TAC Date? |
| 100       | Overall Work Program (OWP) - Draft<br>OWP Amendments<br>OWP Final   | March<br>As needed<br>Annual  |                                  |   | Due 06/30/2023             |
| 601A      | RTP-Regional Transportation Plan<br>RTP Update Solicit Feedback<br>RTP-State of Good Repair<br>RTP-Transit Asset Management Plans<br>SB1 - Roads & Bridges<br>US 395 Coalition  |   |                                  | SSTAC 05/01/23                                    | TAC Date?                  |
| 601A/601B | State Route Development/System Management Plans (State Route 36)  |   |                                  |   |                            |
| 601B      | RTP-Regional Transportation Plan - Update/Approve<br>RTP-CEQA & Update Draft  | 5 Years<br>As Needed  |                                  |   |                            |
| 601C      | ATP-Active Transportation Program Improvement Program<br>Bicycle Master Plan<br>ATP-Report to LCTC the status of the Trail Maintenance Plan<br>ATP-Updated inventory catalog for trails in County as new trails are added   | Qrtly/<br>As Needed<br>2x/Year<br>2x/Year   |                                  | SSTAC 05/01/23<br>LCTC 05/08/23<br>LCTC 05/08/23  |                            |
| 601D      | Transit Development Plan<br>Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan-<br>Lassen Rural Bus  | 2x/Year<br>2x/Year  |                                  |   | TAC Date?<br>TAC Date?     |
| 602       | RTIP/STIP amendments  | As Needed   |                                  |   |                            |
| 705       | ZEV Outreach  |   |                                  | SSTAC 05/01/23                                    | TAC Date?                  |
| 603       | Community Engagement, Outreach and Interagency Coordination<br>ATP-Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)<br>ATP-Complete Streets and SR 36-Main Street (Leverage outreach of this audience for RTP)<br>* Gateway & Other CalTrans Projects<br>* Volcanic Scenic Byway<br>* Inventory catalog for trails<br>* Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)<br>* Proposition 1B funds projects<br>* State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)<br>* Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)<br>* Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) (Amedee Army Airfield Update & Remaining public use airports plan)<br>* Update 2019 Public Participation Plan<br>Deliverables created & distributed for key projects: Factsheets, FAQs, PR, Surveys | 2x/Year<br>2x/Year<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>5 years<br>This FY<br>As Needed | Outreach to City, Tribe, Chamber | CalTrans Mtg 5/2 or 5/11 ??<br><br>SSTAC 05/01/23 | TAC Date?                  |
| 604       | Transportation Development Act (TDA)<br>Meetings & Workshops: Lassen County Transportation Commission;<br>Social Services Technical Advisory Council; Caltrans, Regional Transportation Planning Agency working group, California Transportation Commission, CalACT (planning related activities), and the Rural Transit Assistance Program   |   |                                  |   |                            |
| 604       | Unmet Transit Needs Analysis and Findings (Public Hearing)  |   | April -May 2023                  |   |                            |
| TBD       | * Wildlife crossing<br>* Other?   |   |                                  |   |                            |

## LCTC Communications - Outreach

### Newsletters/Email Lists

Lassen Newsletter  
Sierra Newsletter  
Email Lists

|   | April                                    | May                 | June            |   |
|---|--|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| Lassen County Transportation Commission                                 |  | 05/08/23            | 06/17/23        | <a href="https://www.lassencctc.com/meetings-agendas">https://www.lassencctc.com/meetings-agendas</a>   |
| Social Services Technical Advisory Council                              |  | 05/01/2023          | 06/2023         | <a href="https://www.lassencctc.com/sstac-1">https://www.lassencctc.com/sstac-1</a>   |
| California Transportation Commission                                    |  | 05/17-18/2023       | 06/28-29/2023   | <a href="https://catc.ca.gov/meetings-events">https://catc.ca.gov/meetings-events</a>   |
| CalTrans Regional Transportation Planning Agency Working Group          |  |                     |                 |   |
| CalACT (planning related activities)                                    |  |                     |                 | <a href="https://calact.org/">https://calact.org/</a>   |
| Rural Transit Assistance Program  |  |                     |                 | <a href="https://calact.org/programs/rtap/">https://calact.org/programs/rtap/</a>   |
| Citizen Participation Process Public Hearing for Unmet Needs Commission |  |                     |                 |   |
| North State Super Region Task Force                                     |  |                     |                 | <a href="https://superregion.org/">https://superregion.org/</a>   |
| The Rural Counties Task Force   |  | 05/19/23            |                 | <a href="https://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/">https://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/</a>   |
| MEETINGS<br>CalTrans  |  |                     |                 |   |
| Susanville City Council   | 04/05 & 04/19/2023                       |                     |                 | <a href="https://www.cityofsusanville.net/rooptown/city-council/agendas-and-minutes/">https://www.cityofsusanville.net/rooptown/city-council/agendas-and-minutes/</a> |
| Susanville Planning Commission  | 4/11/2023 & 04/25/2023                   |                     |                 | <a href="https://www.cityofsusanville.net/rooptown/city-council/agendas-and-minutes/">https://www.cityofsusanville.net/rooptown/city-council/agendas-and-minutes/</a> |
| Lassen County Board of Supervisors                                      | 04/11, 04/18, 04/25, 05/09, 05/16, 05/23 | 05/09, 05/16, 05/23 |                 | <a href="https://www.lassencounty.org/dept/board-supervisors/board-supervisors">https://www.lassencounty.org/dept/board-supervisors/board-supervisors</a>             |
| Tribal Business Council   | 04/06/23                                 |                     |                 | <a href="https://www.sir-nsn.gov/">https://www.sir-nsn.gov/</a>   |
| Chamber of Commerce   | Every 3rd Thurs                          | Every 3rd Thurs     | Every 3rd Thurs | <a href="https://www.lassencountychamber.org/">https://www.lassencountychamber.org/</a>   |
| Economic development meetings   |  |                     |                 | ??  |
| Social service agencies   |  |                     |                 | ??  |

### Community Events

Lassen Chamber of Commerce list of community events:  
 April 14th - 16th All Indian Mens & Women's Basketball Tournament  
 April 22nd Lassen Family Services for a 5K color run  
 April 29th Spring Home & Garden Show @ Lassen County Fairgrounds;  
 Lassen County 4-H  
 May 12th Lassen County Fairground Spring Craft Fair  
 May 15th Lassen County 4-H Family Fun Night  
 May 20th Golf Tournament 2023  
 May 20th Lassen Sportsmens Club Jr Fishing Derby  
 May 20th CASA Gala  
 May 27th Susanville Area Bicycle Association's annual cross-country mountain bike race  
 May 27th Camp Ronald McDonald: Annual Eagle Lake Memorial Day Pancake Breakfast  
 June 6th & 17th Susanville Farmers Market

## LCTC Communications – Outreach

| <b>Websites</b>                                      |  |
|--|--|
| LCTC   | <a href="https://www.lassenctc.com/">https://www.lassenctc.com/</a>  |
| CalTrans   | <a href="http://rebuildingca.ca.gov/map">http://rebuildingca.ca.gov/map</a>  |
| CalTrans Projects                                    | <a href="https://sb1map.dot.ca.gov/SB1MAP/SB1_Table.html?ProgramCodes= STIP &amp;CountyCodes= LAS ">https://sb1map.dot.ca.gov/SB1MAP/SB1_Table.html?ProgramCodes= STIP &amp;CountyCodes= LAS </a><br><a href="https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-2">https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-2</a> |
| Public Works / Roads                                 | <a href="https://www.lassencounty.org/">https://www.lassencounty.org/</a><br><a href="https://www.sir-nsn.gov/public-works/">https://www.sir-nsn.gov/public-works/</a>   |
| Lassen county project list                           | <a href="https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-2">https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-2</a>  |
| Lassen Transit Service Agency                        | <a href="https://www.lassentransportation.com/">https://www.lassentransportation.com/</a>  |
| Lassen County Senior Services (Transportation links) | <a href="https://www.211lassencounty.org/seniors/">https://www.211lassencounty.org/seniors/</a>  |
| Lassen County Times                                  | <a href="https://www.lassennews.com/">https://www.lassennews.com/</a>  |
| Lassen County Chamber of Commerce                    | <a href="https://www.lassencountychamber.org/">https://www.lassencountychamber.org/</a>  |
| Sierra Daily News                                    | <a href="https://www.sierradailynews.com/">https://www.sierradailynews.com/</a>  |
| Lassen County HOAs                                   | <a href="https://california-homeowners-associations.com/california_hoa_p_list.php?mastertable=california-counties&amp;masterkey1=Lassen">https://california-homeowners-associations.com/california_hoa_p_list.php?mastertable=california-counties&amp;masterkey1=Lassen</a>                                      |
| Lassen Land & Trust                                  | <a href="https://lassenlandandtrailstrust.org/">https://lassenlandandtrailstrust.org/</a>  |
| Seniors: Lassen Cares                                | <a href="https://lassencares.org/senior-services">https://lassencares.org/senior-services</a>  |
| Planning Division Susanville                         | <a href="https://www.cityofsusanville.net/">https://www.cityofsusanville.net/</a>  |
| Susanville   | <a href="https://susanvillestuff.com/">https://susanvillestuff.com/</a>  |
| Susanville Indian Rancheria                          | <a href="https://www.sir-nsn.gov/">https://www.sir-nsn.gov/</a>  |
| Westwood Mountain Valley Living Magazine             | <a href="https://mountainvalleyliving.com/">https://mountainvalleyliving.com/</a>  |
| Westwood Community Services District                 | <a href="https://www.westwoodcsd.org/">https://www.westwoodcsd.org/</a>  |
| Westwood Chamber of Commerce                         | <a href="https://westwoodareachamber.net/">https://westwoodareachamber.net/</a>  |
| Chester-Lake Almanor California Chamber of Commerce  | <a href="https://www.lakealmanorarea.com/">https://www.lakealmanorarea.com/</a>  |
| Big Valley 50+ (Bieber)                              | <a href="https://www.bigvalley50plus.com/">https://www.bigvalley50plus.com/</a>  |
| Far Northern Regional Center                         | <a href="https://www.farnorthernrc.org/about-us/">https://www.farnorthernrc.org/about-us/</a>  |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Susanville Click &amp; Fix App</b> | Allows citizens to report concerns, but also to view, comment on, and vote to fix problems submitted by their neighbors |
|---------------------------------------|---|

## LCTC Communications - Outreach

### Facebook Groups

- Lassen Rural Bus 820 followers
- I love Lassen Volcanic National Park 16,000 Members Active
- Lassen County Chamber of Commerce : 1,400 followers Active
- Lassen Crime and Community Concerns : 4,400 members Active
- Lassen Land & Trails Trust : 3,000 followers Active
- Lassen County Information : Private group 1,175 members Somewhat Active
- Everything Lassen County : Private 960 members Active
- Lassen County Neighbors (United Way community group) : 378 members – Active
- Lassen County Political Discussion : Private group 359 members Low activity
- Lassen Senior Services : 683 followers
- Susanville Information : Private 4,400 members Active
- City of Susanville Administration : 1,900 followers Active
- Susanville Public Works : 459 followers Active
- Susanville's Actual Crime and Community Concerns : 1,000 members Active
- What's Going on in Susanville, CA : Private 2,000 members Active
- Susanville Bulletin : Private 2,200 members Active
- Susanville Community Group (for events) : Private 275 members Low activity

\* Have not looked for FB groups in smaller cities in Lassen county

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| <b>Twitter</b> | <p>@SusanvilleCA (nothing since 2020)<br/>         @yoloneco465 (nothing since 2010)<br/>         @SusanvilleStuff 654 followers<br/>         @CaltransD2 – Caltrans District 2 13.5K followers<br/>         @LassenNF Lassen National Forest 8.7K followers<br/>         @LassenNPS Lassen Volcanic NP 50.7K followers<br/>         @5Clerici John Clerici</p> |
|----------------|---|

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>Instagram</b> | <p>@visitsusanville 1,348 followers<br/>         @Susanvillefarmersmarket 131 followers<br/>         @sierradailynews 150 followers<br/>         @lassenlandandtrailstrust 700 followers (11/22 last post)<br/>         @susanville_ffa 996 followers<br/>         @lassencollege 830 followers</p> |
|------------------|---|

|                  |                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>NextDoor</b>  | Recommend looking into this community |
| <b>YouTube</b>   | Would not recommend                   |
| <b>LinkedIn</b>  | Would not recommend                   |
| <b>Pinterest</b> | Would not recommend                   |
| <b>TikTok</b>    | Would not recommend                   |
| <b>SnapChat</b>  | Would not recommend                   |

*This page intentionally left blank*

*Appendix B*

**AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

---

## *Agency Notifications*

---





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Lassen National Forest  
2550 Riverside Drive  
Susanville, CA 96130

Dear Lassen National Forest Representatives,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Lassen National Forest Service may have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on forests within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

*Justine Marmesh*

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Bureau of Land Management  
2550 Riverside Drive  
Susanville, CA 96130

Dear Mr. Bales,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Bureau of Land Management may have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on BLM lands within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

*Justine Marmesh*

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Central Valley Regional Water Control Board Erik Edholm  
364 Knollcrest Drive, #205  
Redding, CA 96002

Dear Ms. Coster,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal, or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Central Valley Regional Water Control Board have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on water quality within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

June 12, 2023

Xuan Wang  
Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission  
1105 Terminal Way  
Reno, NV 89502  
775-348-0400

Re: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Xuan,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by California State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. To accomplish this, we are seeking your input with regard to the Lassen County 2022 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Washoe County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Washoe County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Washoe County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Washoe County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Washoe County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Lassen County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Acadia Davis, Transportation Planner  
acadia@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Susanville Indian Rancheria  
745 Joaquin Street  
Susanville, CA 96130

Re: Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2022 update. The LCTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Lassen County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Lassen County, and is updated every five years. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Lassen County region. This letter serves as formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

*Justine Marmesh*

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

June 29, 2022

Bryan Davey  
101 Courthouse Square  
P O Box 98  
Downieville, CA 95936

Re: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Davey,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. To accomplish this, we are seeking your input with regard to the Lassen County 2022 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Sierra County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Sierra County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Sierra County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Sierra County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Sierra County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Lassen County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

June 29, 2022

Sean Tiedgen  
1255 East Street, Suite 202  
Redding 96001, CA  
Re: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Tiedgen,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. To accomplish this, we are seeking your input with regard to the Lassen County 2022 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Shasta County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Shasta County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Shasta County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Shasta County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Shasta County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Lassen County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

*Justine Marmesh*

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

June 29, 2022

Jim Graham  
520 Main Street  
Room 309  
Quincy, CA 95971

Re: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Graham,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. To accomplish this, we are seeking your input with regard to the Lassen County 2022 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Plumas County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Plumas County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Plumas County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Plumas County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Plumas County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Lassen County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING &  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

June 28, 2022

Debbie Pedersen, Executive Director  
108 S. Main Street  
Alturas, CA 96101

Re: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Pedersen,

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. An important element of the RTP process (and as required by State guidelines) is coordination with adjacent counties. To accomplish this, we are seeking your input with regard to the Lassen County 2022 RTP. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following questions by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Modoc County?
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Modoc County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Modoc County?
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Modoc County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Modoc County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.
6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation in the Lassen County RTP development process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Lassen Land and Trails Trust  
601 Richmond Road  
Susanville, CA

Dear Ms. Norton and Ms. Holmen,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal, or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Lassen Land and Trails Trust have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on trails within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

*Justine Marmesh*

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Tina Bartlett, Regional Manager  
Northern Region  
601 Locust St., Redding, CA 96001  
(530) 225-2300

Dear Ms. Bartlett,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the California Department of Fish and Wildlife may have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on fish and wildlife within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/\\_files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/_files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

Lassen County Air Pollution Control District  
Erik Edholm  
720 South St.  
Susanville, CA 96130

Dear Mr. Edholm,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal, or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the Air Pollution Control District have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on air quality within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/\\_files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/_files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctahoe.com

June 28, 2022

Native American Heritage Commission  
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2022 Update. The LCTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Lassen County. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document, which must be updated every five years. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County.

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Lassen County region. In an effort to include the Tribal Governments in the RTP planning process, we request you provide us with contact information for tribes in Lassen County that are on the "AB 52 Consultation List". We would appreciate receiving this information at your earliest convenience (in an effort to include the Tribal Governments in each step of the RTP process). Please send this information to the address or fax above, or via email to [justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com).

Please contact me with any questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'.

Justine Marmesh, AICP  
Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants

# Local Government Tribal Consultation List Request

## Native American Heritage Commission

1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691  
916-373-3710  
916-373-5471 – Fax  
[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)

### Type of List Requested

CEQA Tribal Consultation List (AB 52) – *Per Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subs. (b), (d), (e) and 21080.3.2*

General Plan (SB 18) - *Per Government Code § 65352.3.*

#### Local Action Type:

\_\_\_ General Plan \_\_\_ General Plan Element \_\_\_ General Plan Amendment

\_\_\_ Specific Plan \_\_\_ Specific Plan Amendment \_\_\_ Pre-planning Outreach Activity

### Required Information

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Local Government/Lead Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Specific Area Subject to Proposed Action

County: \_\_\_\_\_ City/Community: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Project Description:

### Additional Request

Sacred Lands File Search - *Required Information:*

USGS Quadrangle Name(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Township: \_\_\_\_\_ Range: \_\_\_\_\_ Section(s): \_\_\_\_\_

## NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

August 27, 2022

Justine Marmesh  
Lassen County Transportation Commission

Via Email to: [justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)

**Re: Native American Tribal Consultation, Pursuant to the Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), Amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), Public Resources Code Sections 5097.94 (m), 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3, 21083.09, 21084.2 and 21084.3, Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update Project, Lassen County**

Dear Ms. Marmesh:

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (c), attached is a consultation list of tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the above-listed project. Please note that the intent of the AB 52 amendments to CEQA is to avoid and/or mitigate impacts to tribal cultural resources, (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)) ("Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource.")

Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21084.3(c) require CEQA lead agencies to consult with California Native American tribes that have requested notice from such agencies of proposed projects in the geographic area that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the tribes on projects for which a Notice of Preparation or Notice of Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration has been filed on or after July 1, 2015. Specifically, Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) provides:

*Within 14 days of determining that an application for a project is complete or a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, the lead agency shall provide formal notification to the designated contact of, or a tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, which shall be accomplished by means of at least one written notification that includes a brief description of the proposed project and its location, the lead agency contact information, and a notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation pursuant to this section.*

The AB 52 amendments to CEQA law does not preclude initiating consultation with the tribes that are culturally and traditionally affiliated within your jurisdiction prior to receiving requests for notification of projects in the tribe's areas of traditional and cultural affiliation. The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) recommends, but does not require, early consultation as a best practice to ensure that lead agencies receive sufficient information about cultural resources in a project area to avoid damaging effects to tribal cultural resources.

The NAHC also recommends, but does not require that agencies should also include with their notification letters, information regarding any cultural resources assessment that has been completed on the area of potential effect (APE), such as:

1. The results of any record search that may have been conducted at an Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), including, but not limited to:



CHAIRPERSON  
**Laura Miranda**  
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON  
**Reginald Pagaling**  
Chumash

PARLIAMENTARIAN  
**Russell Attebery**  
Karuk

SECRETARY  
**Sara Dutschke**  
Miwok

COMMISSIONER  
**William Mungary**  
Paiute/White Mountain  
Apache

COMMISSIONER  
**Isaac Bojorquez**  
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER  
**Buffy McQuillen**  
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki,  
Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER  
**Wayne Nelson**  
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER  
**Stanley Rodriguez**  
Kumeyaay

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
**Raymond C. Hitchcock**  
Miwok/Nisenan

**NAHC HEADQUARTERS**  
1550 Harbor Boulevard  
Suite 100  
West Sacramento,  
California 95691  
(916) 373-3710  
[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)

- A listing of any and all known cultural resources that have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE, such as known archaeological sites;
- Copies of any and all cultural resource records and study reports that may have been provided by the Information Center as part of the records search response;
- Whether the records search indicates a low, moderate, or high probability that unrecorded cultural resources are located in the APE; and
- If a survey is recommended by the Information Center to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. The results of any archaeological inventory survey that was conducted, including:

- Any report that may contain site forms, site significance, and suggested mitigation measures.

All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure in accordance with Government Code section 6254.10.

3. The result of any Sacred Lands File (SLF) check conducted through the Native American Heritage Commission. The request form can be found at <http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Local-Government-Tribal-Consultation-List-Request-Form-Update.pdf>

4. Any ethnographic studies conducted for any area including all or part of the APE; and

5. Any geotechnical reports regarding all or part of the APE.

Lead agencies should be aware that records maintained by the NAHC and CHRIS are not exhaustive and a negative response to these searches does not preclude the existence of a tribal cultural resource. A tribe may be the only source of information regarding the existence of a tribal cultural resource.

This information will aid tribes in determining whether to request formal consultation. In the event that they do, having the information beforehand will help to facilitate the consultation process.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from tribes, please notify the NAHC. With your assistance, we can assure that our consultation list remains current.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: [Cameron.vela@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:Cameron.vela@nahc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Cameron Vela*

Cameron Vela  
Cultural Resources Analyst

Attachment



**Native American Heritage Commission  
Tribal Consultation List  
Lassen County  
8/27/2022**

**Greenville Rancheria of Maidu  
Indians**

Kyle Self, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 279  
Greenville, CA, 95947  
Phone: (530) 284 - 7990  
Fax: (530) 284-6612  
kself@greenvillerancheria.com

Maidu

**Tsi Akim Maidu**

Don Ryberg, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 510  
Browns Valley, CA, 95918  
Phone: (530) 383 - 7234  
tsi-akim-maidu@att.net

Maidu

**Honey Lake Maidu**

Paul Garcia, Chairperson  
7029 Polvadero Drive  
San Jose, CA, 95119  
Phone: (408) 499 - 1565  
drinkwiz@sbcglobal.net

Maidu

**Tsi Akim Maidu**

Grayson Coney, Cultural Director  
P.O. Box 510  
Browns Valley, CA, 95918  
Phone: (530) 383 - 7234  
tsi-akim-maidu@att.net

Maidu

**Honey Lake Maidu**

Ron Morales, Chairperson  
1101 Arnold Street  
Susanville, CA, 96130  
Phone: (530) 257 - 3275

Maidu

**Wadatkuta Band of the  
Northern Paiute of the Honey  
Lake Valley**

Harold Dixon, Chairperson  
Phone: (916) 257 - 4908

Northern Paiute

**Mooretown Rancheria of Maidu  
Indians**

Benjamin Clark, Chairperson  
#1 Alverda Drive  
Oroville, CA, 95966  
Phone: (530) 533 - 3625  
Fax: (530) 533-3680  
frontdesk@mooretown.org

KonKow  
Maidu

**Washoe Tribe of Nevada and  
California**

Serrell Smokey, Chairperson  
919 Highway 395 North  
Gardnerville, NV, 89410  
Phone: (775) 265 - 8600  
serrell.smokey@washoetribe.us

Washoe

**Pit River Tribe of California**

Agnes Gonzalez, Chairperson  
36970 Park Ave  
Burney, CA, 96013  
Phone: (916) 372 - 9720  
Fax: (530) 335-3140  
1010@gmail.com

Pit River  
Wintun

**Washoe Tribe of Nevada and  
California**

Darrel Cruz, Cultural Resources  
Department  
919 Highway 395 North  
Gardnerville, NV, 89410  
Phone: (775) 265 - 8600  
darrel.cruz@washoetribe.us

Washoe

**Susanville Indian Rancheria**

Deana Bovee, Chairperson  
745 Joaquin Street  
Susanville, CA, 96130  
Phone: (530) 257 - 6264  
Fax: (530) 257-7986  
dovee@sir-nsn.gov

Maidu  
Paiute  
Pit River  
Washoe

This list is current only as of the date of this document. Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for consultation with Native American tribes under Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 for the proposed Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update Project, Lassen County.

**From:** [Justine Marmesh](#)  
**To:** ["justine@lsctrans.com"](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)  
**Bcc:** ["kself@greenvillerancheria.com"](mailto:kself@greenvillerancheria.com); ["drinkwiz@sbcglobal.net"](mailto:drinkwiz@sbcglobal.net); ["tsi-akim-maidu@att.net"](mailto:tsi-akim-maidu@att.net);  
["serrell.smokey@washoetribes.us"](mailto:serrell.smokey@washoetribes.us); ["darrel.cruz@washoetribes.us"](mailto:darrel.cruz@washoetribes.us); ["frontdesk@mooretown.org"](mailto:frontdesk@mooretown.org);  
["1010@gmail.com"](mailto:1010@gmail.com); ["dovee@sir-nsn.gov"](mailto:dovee@sir-nsn.gov)  
**Subject:** Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2023 Notification  
**Date:** Friday, June 9, 2023 1:39:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [Lassen County RTP 2022 Notification.pdf](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

Our office is currently conducting the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update and would like to give you an opportunity to send us comments for consideration. Please take a look at the attached document and let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Thank you,

**Justine Marmesh, AICP**

Senior Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants**

2690 Lake Forest Rd, Ste. C, PO Box 5875,  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

O: [530-583-4053](tel:530-583-4053) C: 530-448-2550

[justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)

[www.lsctrans.com](http://www.lsctrans.com)



**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND  
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 9, 2023

Re: Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update

LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC) has been retained by the Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) to prepare the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2022 update. The LCTC is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Lassen County region. The RTP is a federally required long-range transportation-planning document for the region within geographic Lassen County, and is updated every five years. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements (street rehabilitation, bike path construction, public transit facilities, airport improvements, etc.) and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/\\_files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/_files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

The RTPA is committed to developing Government-to-Government relationships with the Tribal Governments within the Lassen County region. This letter serves as formal request for AB 52 consultation. If you wish to conduct formal tribal consultation, please contact me within 30 days:

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

*Agency Comments*

---



**108 S. Main Street  
Alturas, CA 96101  
(530) 233-6410 Phone**

**Meets First Tuesday of  
Even Numbered Months  
at 1:30 p.m.**

Commissioners

*John Dederick  
Chairman  
City Representative*

*Kathie Rhoads  
Vice Chairman  
County Supervisor III*

*Bobby Ray  
Commissioner  
City Representative*

*Elizabeth Cavasso  
Commissioner  
County Supervisor IV*

*Cheryl Nelson  
Commissioner  
City at Large Member*

*Mark Moriarity  
Commissioner  
County at Large Member*

*Ned Coe  
Alternate Commissioner  
County Supervisor I*

*Loni Lewis  
Alternate Commissioner  
City Councilmember*

Staff

*Debbie Pedersen  
Executive Director*

*Niki Witherspoon  
Chief Fiscal Officer*

*Michelle Cox  
Executive Assistant Secretary*

LSC  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

August 2, 2022

Dear Ms. Marmesh,

The Modoc County Transportation Commission offers the following responses to your inquiries regarding the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan:

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Modoc County? Conditions are good Lassen and Modoc coordinate passenger service at Susanville. Sage Stage has experienced impacts with COVID, driver shortages, and reduced the Reno Intercity route which caused difficulties for passengers.
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Modoc County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years? The uncertainty of funding, rising costs, and the reduction of personal spending. Modoc's demographics are projected to continue to decline.
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Modoc County? Continue to communicate for roads that cross county lines.
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Modoc County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP? None, at this time.
5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Modoc County and Lassen County? If so, please describe. None, that I am aware of.

Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP. The MCTC has been pursuing and encouraging Caltrans to relocate the Sage Hen Summit Roadside Rest Area located in Lassen County. Please include this in the State highway project list.

Thank you,  
s/ Debbie Pedersen  
Executive Director  
MCTC/MTA





**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
& TRAFFIC ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS**

2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145  
(530) 583-4053 FAX: (530) 583-5966  
info@lsctrans.com

June 29, 2022

California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Tina Bartlett, Regional Manager  
Northern Region  
601 Locust St., Redding, CA 96001  
(530) 225-2300

Dear Ms. Bartlett,

The Lassen County Transportation Commission (LCTC) is conducting a 2022 update of the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) with assistance from LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. The Lassen County RTP provides a coordinated 20-year vision of the regionally significant transportation improvements and policies needed to efficiently move goods and people within Lassen County. We would appreciate receiving your written, verbal or electronic response to the following by July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Current federal regulations require Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to consult with resource agencies early in the regional transportation planning process. We would appreciate any input the California Department of Fish and Wildlife may have regarding the effect of any type of transportation improvement such as roadway improvements, airport improvements, new transit facilities, bicycle path construction may have on fish and wildlife within Lassen County.

The current 2017 RTP can be downloaded here:

[https://www.lassenctc.com/\\_files/ugd/f4e832\\_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf](https://www.lassenctc.com/_files/ugd/f4e832_9e62bc2585ac486a9b54d5228b55be8d.pdf)

Once the Public Draft 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan is completed, we will notify you and provide you with instructions on how to view the document electronically. Thank you in advance for your input and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Justine Marmesh'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
justine@lsctrans.com  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

**From:** [Orange, Todd -FS](#)  
**To:** [Justine Marmesh](#)  
**Cc:** [Guy, Shantae -FS](#); [Bumpus, Deb- FS](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [External Email]RE: Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update - Notification  
**Date:** Monday, August 1, 2022 4:16:59 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

Hello Justine,

We must have missed your first email.. A few of our points are the same as last year.

- A. Improve the 5-way intersection (Chestnut St./Grand Ave/Paul Bunyan Rd) at the corner of the US Forest Service yard in the City of Susanville. Intersection sees many property damage incidents over the years due to a grade coming down the hill from the casino. Motorists come down the hill at an increased speed and either don't have enough reaction time or a delayed reaction time to see the abrupt turns of the intersection. Only stop signs exist so added visibility, round-a-bout and other safety features (crash barriers, grooved pavement, pedestrian walkways/lights, raised islands/curbs) for not only motorists but pedestrians and bicycles will greatly improve the safety at the intersection. This is a semi-main route through town carrying people to/from the casino, residential area on the hill/center of town, cemetery, county jail, sheriff, and other county offices. A dedicated path for pedestrians/bicycles alongside Paul Bunyan Rd from this intersection to the casino will improve safety and access along the grade. On a side note, thefts do occur at the Forest Service yard. LMUD has installed upgraded light bulbs at the Forest Service yard to help with better lighting. One of the yard access gates for heavy equipment trucks and transfers is at/near the intersection.
- B. E-bike access and safety.
- C. Improving pedestrian and bicycle access to Lassen College. Only a sloped widened shoulder exists on the side of highway 139. Improving a more dedicated, level and safe path for pedestrians and bicycles will provide easier and safe access to the college for students, city of Susanville and the community. Such improvements would be beneficial to the CA139/Skyway Rd intersection proceeding in all four road directions or crisscrossing to the sports field and college parking lot as a user-created path over the lava rock is visible (dedicated pedestrian/bicycle paths that are more level reducing weed thorns that puncture bike tires/ stick to shoes/ prick pets, having see-through or hard barriers separating different modes of traffic). Skyway does have a paved dedicated trail that people use however weed stickers, steep hill just west of the intersection and lack of a safety barrier limits use for some. The community would benefit by having easier and safe access from the main part of Susanville to the college for sporting events, other events, for staff, rancheria, residential areas/casino, hospital, etc.

Thank you and if we come up with more ideas, we will send them your way!

**Todd Orange**  
**Civil Engineer**





**Forest Service**  
**Lassen National Forest**

**c: 530-388-8265**  
[todd.orange@usda.gov](mailto:todd.orange@usda.gov)

2550 Riverside Dr.  
Susanville, CA 96130

[www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)



**Caring for the land and serving people**

---

**From:** Justine Marmesh <justine@lsctrans.com>

**Sent:** Monday, August 1, 2022 1:13 PM

**To:** Orange, Todd -FS <todd.orange@usda.gov>; Guy, Shantae -FS <shantae.guy@usda.gov>;  
debora.bumpus@usda.gov

**Subject:** [External Email]RE: Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update - Notification

[External Email]

If this message comes from an **unexpected sender** or references a **vague/unexpected topic**;

Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Please send any concerns or suspicious messages to: [Spam.Abuse@usda.gov](mailto:Spam.Abuse@usda.gov)

Good Afternoon,

I am just following up to inquire whether your organization has any comments relating to transportation within Lassen County for our consideration in the updated Regional Transportation Plan. If so, please let me know by the end of this week.

Thank you,



**Justine Marmesh, AICP**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants**

2690 Lake Forest Rd, Ste. C, PO Box 5875,  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

O: [530-583-4053](tel:530-583-4053) C: 530-448-2550

[justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)

[www.lsctrans.com](http://www.lsctrans.com)

---

**From:** Justine Marmesh <[justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2022 3:17 PM

**To:** '[todd.orange@usda.gov](mailto:todd.orange@usda.gov)' <[todd.orange@usda.gov](mailto:todd.orange@usda.gov)>; '[shantae.guy@usda.gov](mailto:shantae.guy@usda.gov)' <[shantae.guy@usda.gov](mailto:shantae.guy@usda.gov)>; '[deborabumpus@usda.gov](mailto:deborabumpus@usda.gov)' <[deborabumpus@usda.gov](mailto:deborabumpus@usda.gov)>

**Subject:** Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update - Notification

Good Afternoon,

Our office is currently conducting the Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan 2022 Update and would like to give you an opportunity to send us comments for consideration. Please take a look at the attached document and let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Thank you,



**Justine Marmesh, AICP**

Transportation Planner

**LSC Transportation Consultants**

2690 Lake Forest Rd, Ste. C, PO Box 5875,  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

O: [530-583-4053](tel:530-583-4053) C: [530-448-2550](tel:530-448-2550)

[justine@lsctrans.com](mailto:justine@lsctrans.com)

[www.lsctrans.com](http://www.lsctrans.com)

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and

delete the email immediately.



1255 East Street, Suite 202 • Redding, CA 96001 • 530-262-6190 • Fax: 530-262-6189  
E-mail: [srta@srta.ca.gov](mailto:srta@srta.ca.gov) • Website: [www.srta.ca.gov](http://www.srta.ca.gov)

---

Sean Tiedgen, AICP, Executive Director

August 5, 2022

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

Dear Justine Marmesh,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Please find responses to your questions below.

**1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Shasta County?**

- Shasta and Lassen counties share two primary regional corridors (i.e., State Route (SR) 299 and Highway 44) where the regions could coordinate on maintaining and improving facilities in coordination with Caltrans District 2, to meet community and external transportation needs.
- SRTA was disappointed to learn that the Susanville Indian Rancheria discontinued running transit service to Red Bluff and Redding. That service was a piece of the larger North State Intercity Bus System that SRTA has been working on along with transit agencies in the North State Super Region.

**2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Shasta County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?**

- Major economic and demographic factors that could impact transportation demands in Lassen County include recreational opportunities (Lassen Volcanic National Park and surrounding forests), permanent and temporary population changes due to extreme climate events such as wildfires, connections to family and friends, increased airport service at the Redding Regional Airport (previously named the Redding Municipal Airport), intercity bus coordination for the Intermountain Region, and the new Shasta County jail being built. There may also be opportunities for increased alternative fuels infrastructure that may impact transportation demand.

**3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Shasta County?**

- The Lassen County RTP could focus on interregional corridors and intercity transportation to enhance mobility in Shasta County. The Lassen County RTP could highlight assistance to complete a North State east/west “alternative fuels” corridor from Arcata, CA to Reno, NV, which would include SR 44, SR 36, and US Route 395. SRTA has started early efforts on this working with Caltrans D2, Trinity County Transportation Commission, and the Redwood Coast Energy Authority.

**4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Shasta County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?**

- LCTC should be aware of the North State Intercity Bus System and coordination of zero emission vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure.
- Caltrans District 2 is seeking funding to refurbish or replace the Pit River Bridge which carries both rail and highway traffic across a portion of Shasta Lake. The Bureau of Reclamation wishes to relinquish the bridge by 2040, which will impact Interstate 5 and the Union Pacific Railroad Valley Subdivision.
- The replacement and realignment of Lake Britton Bridge on Highway 89 is an important long-term Caltrans project and may have an impact on SR 299 traffic in Lassen County as well as access across to the communities of McCloud and Mt. Shasta.

**5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Shasta County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.**


- Support for ZEV infrastructure (DC fast chargers or hydrogen refueling stations) on interregional corridors and the North State Intercity Bus System should be jointly considered.

**6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP.**

- No response.

Should you have any questions related to our responses above or have any follow up inquiries, please contact Senior Transportation Planner Jennifer Pollom by phone at 530-262-6195 or by email at [jpollom@srta.ca.gov](mailto:jpollom@srta.ca.gov).

Respectfully,



Sean Tiedgen, AICP, Executive Director  
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (MPO)



## PLUMAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1834 East Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971 – Telephone (530) 283-6268 Fax (530) 283-6323  
Jim Graham, Executive Director – jimgraham@countyofplumas.com

August 3, 2022

Justine Marmesh, Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Subject: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Marmesh,

The Plumas County Transportation Commission thanks the Lassen County Transportation Commission for the opportunity to provide comments concerning the development of 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan. Below are our italicized comments to your questions presented in your letter dated June 29, 2022.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Plumas County?

*The coordination of transit services between Lassen Rural Bus and Plumas Transit has the greatest potential to impact transportation in Plumas County. Our two agencies have successfully achieved an integrated transit system that serves the needs of both Counties. We anticipate that this coordination will continue.*

*With respect to our shared SR 36 corridor, the PCTC would appreciate coordination of projects that have the potential to modify the route or it's usage.*

2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Plumas County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years?

*Demographic factors that could impact Lassen County is Plumas County's current housing shortage, which was exacerbated by the loss of many homes from the Dixie Fire. There may be an increase in demand in Lassen County as a result. Economic factors include the continued emphasis on our county's recreation economy.*

3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Plumas County?

*The continued coordination of our transit systems is of primary importance.*

4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Plumas County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP?

*Other than continued coordination between our two transit agencies, the other project that may be of interest is the construction of the roundabout at the intersection of SR 36 and County Road A13 (scheduled to start in late 2023) and the Chester Complete Streets and Context Sensitive Streetscape Plan which hopes to make Chester Main Street more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.*

5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Plumas County and Lassen County? If so, please describe.

*No projects presently come to mind.*

If you have any questions concerning any of our comments, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jim Graham".

Jim Graham, Executive Director  
Plumas County Transportation Commission

**SIERRA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

P.O. Box 98  
Downieville, California 95936  
(530)289-3201 FAX (530) 289-2828



**Tim H. Beals**  
Executive Director

September 15, 2022

Ms. Justine Marmesh  
Transportation Planner  
LSC Transportation Consultants  
2690 Lake Forest Road, Suite C  
Post Office Box 5875  
Tahoe City, California 96145

SUBJECT: Lassen County 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Marmesh:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2022 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan. Although we have very limited connection to the transportation system of Lassen County, we do share one key corridor on State Route 395. Please find our responses to your questions below.

1. How would you characterize transportation conditions in Lassen County as they impact Sierra County? *The only direct connection to the Lassen County transportation System Route 395, we also share an indirect connection on State Route 70 with Plumas County. Both of these routes are key connections to Sierra County. Much of the goods movement from and into Sierra County occur on these two routes especially for the east side of Sierra County.*
2. What do you see as the major economic and demographic factors in Sierra County that can be expected to impact transportation demands in Lassen County over the next 20 years? *We do not expect much change in economic and demographic factors in Sierra County with little to no impact on Lassen County, the majority of traffic from Sierra County on both SR 70 and 395 goes to Nevada. There is only negligible traffic entering Lassen County from Sierra County with little to no change in this pattern expected over the next 20 years.*
3. How can the Lassen County RTP enhance mobility in Sierra County? *The two routes that interconnect Sierra and Lassen Counties are critical to both counties and should be a priority for coordination with Caltrans to maintain these routes.*
4. What transportation-related projects and proposals does Sierra County have that LCTC should be aware of in developing their RTP? *Sierra County does not currently have any related transportation proposal that would impact Lassen County.*



5. Are there potential transportation-related improvement projects that you believe can be jointly pursued between Sierra County and Lassen County? If so, please describe. *Continued coordination of any project to improve the 395 corridor would be of interest to Sierra County, this has been a potential project in the past.*

6. Please include any other input you might have for the Lassen County RTP. *No additional input at this time.*


Sincerely,

Sierra County Transportation Commission

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bryan Davey". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Bryan Davey  
Deputy Director






# 2023 Lassen County Regional Transportation Plan Virtual Workshop and Survey

The Lassen County Transportation Commission is updating the Regional Transportation Plan that outlines transportation improvement projects and funding for the next 20 years. We need the community's input to identify needs and priorities for all modes including automobile, bicycles, pedestrians, transit, aviation, and trucks.



**What do you think are the most needed transportation  
improvements in Lassen County?**

**Check out the Virtual Workshop  
and take a short survey!**



[www.lassenctc.com](http://www.lassenctc.com)

Or contact:  
Genevieve Evans  
LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.  
[genevieve@lsctahoe.com](mailto:genevieve@lsctahoe.com)






# What transportation improvements are most needed in Lassen County?

## Share your opinion!

- Where is it unsafe to walk or bike?
- What road needs the most improvement?
- Is it hard for you to get around?
- How can roads, bike paths, sidewalks be improved?



Check out the Virtual Workshop and take a short survey!



[www.lassenctc.com](http://www.lassenctc.com)

TELL US WHAT COULD BE BETTER



*Appendix C*

**RELEVANT COMMUNITY SURVEYS**

---

# Active Transportation Plan Appendix C

## ONLINE COMMUNITY SURVEY SUMMARY

---

### Introduction

A survey was designed to seek input from Lassen County residents regarding their opinions on active transportation. Surveys were completed from communities throughout the county, and included information about the residents’ demographics, employment, travel patterns, and desires for improvements to all modes of transportation.

A total of 247 people participated in the online community survey which was conducted during February of 2021. The surveys were advertised through various local news outlets, stakeholders, and social media. The survey consisted of 13 questions. A copy of the survey instrument is provided at the end of this appendix.

### General Demographics (Questions 1, 2, and 3)

Approximately 72 percent of those taking the survey live in Susanville, followed by Janesville (12 percent), Westwood (2 percent), Standish (2 percent), and Milford (less than 1 percent), as shown in Table A-1. Of the 8 percent who answered “Other”, these answers included Johnstonville, Lake Almanor Bieber and those who live outside of Lassen County.

As about 51 percent of all respondents were between the ages of 41 and 64 years old, followed by 34 percent between the ages of 26 and 40 years old, and 14 percent who are ages 65 or older. Only 1 participant was under the age of 18 years old.

| Answer Choices         | %   | #   |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Susanville             | 72% | 177 |
| Janesville             | 13% | 31  |
| Other (please specify) | 8%  | 20  |
| Westwood               | 2%  | 6   |
| Standish               | 2%  | 5   |
| Lake Forest            | 2%  | 5   |
| Milford                | 1%  | 2   |
| Litchfield             | 1%  | 2   |

When asked about occupational status, respondents stated that 66 percent were employed full-time, followed by nearly 19 percent who are currently retired. Of those who answered “Other”, responses included stay-at-home parent, self-employed, and currently looking for work.

## Trip Patterns and Commute Modes (Questions 4 and 5)

Respondents were asked which community they travel to for various trips including work, doctor/medical appointments, school, recreation/social, grocery shopping, and banking (Table A-2). The following summarizes major destinations by type:

- 80 percent of those commuting to *work* travelled to Susanville, followed by 5 percent who travel to Johnstonville. “Other” destinations (4 percent) included Leavitt Lake, Litchfield, and Sierra Army Depot.
- For *doctor or medical* appointments, 50 percent travel to Susanville, followed by Reno, Nevada (41 percent) and Redding (1 percent). “Other” destinations included Sparks, Nevada, San Francisco, and Auburn.
- Susanville is the most frequent *school* destination with 63 percent of respondents stating this as their destination. This was followed by Janesville (8 percent), Johnstonville (4 percent), and Chico (2 percent). Another 2 percent indicated that they currently attend classes online.
- Almost half of all *Recreational and social trips* are made to Susanville (46 percent), followed by Reno (16 percent). Another 5 percent travel to Janesville. Of the 6 percent who responded “Other”, these destinations included Lake Tahoe, Klamath Falls, Oregon, and Eagle Lake.
- Susanville is a popular destination for *Shopping* trips (73 percent), followed by 20 percent who travel to Reno.
- *Banking* is primarily done in Susanville (86 percent), with 5 percent of respondents travelling to Reno.


When asked how respondents get to and from work, 65 percent answered that they drive alone. As shown in Figure A-1, 5 percent bicycle, 5 percent walk, 3 percent carpool, and 1 percent ride Lassen Rural Bus. Of the 5 percent who answered “Other”, answers primarily included “Retired”. Lastly, 16 percent of respondents do not commute at all and either work remote or attend classes online.

## Active Modes of Travel (Questions 6 through 11)


While 32 percent of respondents said that they rarely walk to a destination that takes 5 minutes or more to get to, another 25 percent mentioned they walk more than four times a week, as shown in Figure A-2. Another 24 percent responded that they walk to a destination 1 to 3 times per week, with another 19 percent responding that they walk 1 to 3 times per month.

Table A-2: Q4 - Which community do you typically travel to for...

|               | Work  | Doctor / Medical | School | Recreation / Social | Grocery Shopping | Banking |
|---------------|-------|------------------|--------|---------------------|------------------|---------|
| Susanville    | 78.4% | 50.0%            | 62.7%  | 45.5%               | 73.0%            | 86.0%   |
| Bieber        | 1.2%  | 0.0%             | 1.2%   | 0.0%                | 0.4%             | 0.0%    |
| Reno          | 0.0%  | 41.0%            | 1.2%   | 16.4%               | 20.1%            | 5.2%    |
| Auburn        | 0.0%  | 0.5%             | 0.0%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Chico         | 0.0%  | 0.9%             | 2.4%   | 1.6%                | 1.2%             | 0.0%    |
| Redding       | 0.0%  | 1.4%             | 1.2%   | 2.5%                | 1.6%             | 0.0%    |
| Sacramento    | 0.6%  | 0.5%             | 0.0%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Plumas County | 0.0%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 2.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.5%    |
| Chester       | 1.2%  | 0.9%             | 0.0%   | 3.7%                | 1.2%             | 2.1%    |
| Janesville    | 0.6%  | 0.0%             | 8.4%   | 4.9%                | 0.4%             | 0.0%    |
| Online        | 0.0%  | 0.0%             | 2.4%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 3.6%    |
| Chester       | 1.2%  | 0.9%             | 0.0%   | 3.7%                | 1.2%             | 2.1%    |
| Almanor       | 1.2%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 2.5%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Standish      | 1.2%  | 0.0%             | 1.2%   | 1.6%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Johnstonville | 5.4%  | 0.0%             | 3.6%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Retired       | 1.8%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Westwood      | 0.0%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 4.1%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Herlong       | 1.8%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 0.0%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Lassen County | 0.6%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 2.9%                | 0.4%             | 0.5%    |
| Lake Almanor  | 1.2%  | 0.0%             | 0.0%   | 2.5%                | 0.0%             | 0.0%    |
| Other         | 3.6%  | 3.8%             | 15.7%  | 6.1%                | 0.4%             | 0.0%    |







In questions 7 and 8, the survey asked how often respondents bicycle for recreational and non-recreational purposes (commuting, errands, etc.). As depicted in Figure A-3, the majority, 71 percent, responded that they never bicycle for non-recreational purposes, followed by 16 percent ride a bike for non-recreational purposes 1 to 3 times per month. Approximately, 5 percent of respondents ride for more utilitarian (non-recreational) purposes on a regular basis or 4 times per week. When asked how often respondents bicycle for recreational purposes, nearly 32 percent ride 1 to 3 times per month followed by 15 percent answered that they ride their bike for recreation 4 times per week, as shown in Figure A-4. However, 39 percent said that they never bicycle for recreation. These answers indicate that a significant portion of the population in Lassen do not bicycle for any purpose.

Poorly maintained bicycle and pedestrian facilities is the primary reason respondents do not use active transportation more frequently. When asked why respondents do not walk or bike more often (respondents were allowed to choose more than one response), 49 percent answered “poor road and bike lane conditions” (Figure A-5). Another 37 percent answered “poor sidewalk conditions”, followed by “weather” (32 percent), “distance from destination” (30 percent), and “safety concerns” (29 percent). Additionally, 10 percent of those surveyed mentioned that they would potentially bike more often if they owned a bicycle.

Figure A-3: Q7 - How often do you bicycle for non-recreational purposes?




Figure A-4: Q8 - How often do you bicycle for recreational purposes?





Figure A-5: Q9 - Why do you not walk or ride your bike more often?



Personal health and the desire to be outside are the largest motivators getting people to walk and ride their bikes in Lassen County at 85 percent and 83 percent, respectively (Figure A-6). Another 28 percent stated that they walk and ride their bike to socialize with others. Of the 10 percent who answered “Other”, answers included walking their dog and spending time with their family. There were also some who indicated that they do not walk or bicycle at all. Respondents were encouraged to identify all answers that applied.

Table A-3 presents respondents’ thoughts on how much improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network would encourage more active transportation. Overall, respondents indicated that physical changes to the bicycle and pedestrian transportation network such as new and improved facilities would encourage a higher level of walking and biking in the community. As for other improvements such as education, marketing efforts and law enforcement, respondents were more skeptical that these programs would encourage active transportation.

### Open Comments and Mapping

The final question (question 12) asked respondents to share their comments, and to follow a web link to map specific locations where they would like to see improvements. The comments were categorized into

Figure A-6: Q10 - Why do you walk and/or ride your bike?




Table A-3: Q11 - What improvements would encourage you to walk and/or bicycle more often?

| Characteristics   | Would not make a difference | Neutral | Yes, I would walk/bike more |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| New sidewalks   | 26%                         | 28%     | 46%                         |
| Improve existing sidewalks                                      | 25%                         | 26%     | 49%                         |
| New separated bike paths  | 19%                         | 14%     | 67%                         |
| New bicycle lanes   | 26%                         | 20%     | 54%                         |
| Improve existing bicycle paths/lanes                            | 24%                         | 18%     | 59%                         |
| Improved walking and biking connections to transit              | 33%                         | 30%     | 37%                         |
| Increase safety for children walking/biking to school           | 19%                         | 26%     | 55%                         |
| Better enforcement of traffic laws                              | 28%                         | 36%     | 36%                         |
| Marketing efforts to encourage walking and biking               | 34%                         | 37%     | 30%                         |
| Education programs (walking, biking, and driving safety)        | 37%                         | 35%     | 29%                         |
| More rural bus shuttles to trails to hike or ride back to town. | 30%                         | 29%     | 42%                         |

location-specific suggestions (Table A-4) and general suggestions and concerns (Table A-5). The location-specific comments were grouped by the following locations:

- Modoc Line Rail Trail
- Janesville
- Paul Bunyan Road
- Fredonyer
- Skyline Road/Trail
- Riverside Trail
- Uptown Susanville
- Richmond Road
- Bizz Johnson

The general suggestions and concerns listed in Table A-5 were grouped into the following categories of concern:

- Cleaning / Maintenance
- Safety Concerns
- More Amenities
- Implement Previous Plans

The major themes gleaned from the comments are peoples' desire for improved active transportation with consideration to the vehicle-dominated environment. While some whole-heartedly support improving bicycle and pedestrian access, others believe it to be a waste of resources. For those who would like to see improvements, major concerns are safety (in particular, conflicts with vehicles and discomfort and fear from engaging with the vagrant population), maintenance (keeping paths free of debris, free of thorns, and cleaner), and adding amenities. Additionally, several people mentioned that previous plans should be implemented—including the Wayfinding Plan and the Bike Improvement Plan.

## Survey Conclusions

The survey provides insight into active transportation (walking and bicycling) uses, who currently does not, and why. Responses throughout the survey echoed themes of improving safety, expanding existing infrastructure, and an overall desire for better connectivity between destinations. While there were respondents who did not feel additional bicycle/pedestrian facilities would encourage more active transportation, there seemed to be an agreement that walking paths and sidewalks are important to the region. The following includes a summary of major findings from the survey:

- Susanville is a major destination among all types of trips (work, doctor's appointments, school, recreation, and banking). However, increased connectivity to Reno is essential to serve those who need access to doctor's appointments (41 percent) and shopping (about 20 percent).

- While many respondents drive alone to work (65 percent), there are some who use alternative methods of transportation through bicycling (5 percent), walking (5 percent), carpooling (3 percent), and LRB (1 percent).
- According to the survey, improving road safety and sidewalk conditions would encourage more Lassen residents to either bicycle or walk more frequently in Lassen County.
- Safety concerns related to the growing homeless population along the Bizz Johnson and Riverside Trail were expressed throughout the survey. Other major safety comments included a need for more lighting and overall trail maintenance.
- Common requests for specific improvements include:
  - Expand recreational trails and access to recreational trails in communities. (Modoc Rail Trail and near Fredonyer Pass)
  - Sidewalks/separated path along Main Street in Janesville (Safe Routes to School)
  - Lighting and safer place for pedestrians on Paul Bunyan Road. This connects residential areas to the Diamond Mountain Casino.
  - Maintenance for existing paths
  - Continue Skyline Extension Trail (To Casino?)

| Table A-4: Suggestions - Location Specific (page 1 of 2) |  |
|--|--|
| Modoc Line   | 1) improve access and signage for the <b>Modoc Line rail trail</b> 2) work to obtain recreation access from Westwood to National Forest land on Keddie Crest.  |
|  | I'd love to see access and interpretive materials for the <b>Modoc line rail trail</b> be improved. As well as off-road connections between Susanville and Westwood (although that's already pretty good)  |
|  | Please improve access from communities to surrounding national forest land, especially from <b>Westwood to Keddie Crest</b> , and improved access to the <b>Modoc line rail trail</b> .  |
|  | More trails and signage for <b>modoc rail trail</b>  |
| Janesville   | A bike path in <b>Janesville</b> , main st. would be nice.   |
|  | Many people/school children walk along <b>Janesville Main Street</b> . It is very unsafe with no shoulder/path/sidewalk. A walking path along Janesville Main Street would help residents walk and bike more and make it safer for children to walk to school. |
|  | We need more sidewalks. Especially <b>Main Street Janesville</b> . People drive crazy there's not enough room to get off the side of the roads. It's not safe  |
|  | Please finish the bike/hike paths on the <b>standish side of hill off of Thomas Lane</b> making it possible to bike from one side to the other. Currently there is one entrance on the Janesville side. Please and Thank You                                   |
|  | <b>Wingfield road in Janesville</b> is unsafe to walk or ride bikes most of the time <b>Main st Janesville</b> is also unsafe.   |
| Paul Bunyan  | <b>Paul Bunyan Rd</b> gets a lot of auto and pedestrian traffic and there is not a place for them to safely be on that road. A pedestrian lane and lighting would be so helpful.   |
|  | A lot of people would probably bike/walk to/from <b>Diamond Mountain casino if Paul Bunyan Rd had lighting</b> and shoulder for pedestrians  |
|  | Fix the walking path up <b>buyan road</b> so when people walk - and <b>skyline</b> no where for people to walk without getting hit   |
| Fredonyer  | Build the 'Gathje' trails up around <b>Fredonyer!</b>  |
|  | Consider potential bus stop near <b>Devils Corral</b> that would enable return trip for bicycles on trail. Consider safe walking option on A-3/395, not just to accommodate people that don't live in town.  |
|  | I would love to see the 20+ miles of single track completed from <b>Fredonyer</b> to Susanville.   |
| Skyline Rd/<br>Trail                                     | <b>Skyline Bypass trail</b> needs to be improved. This is a great area to walk but the weeds are not cut back, it's not maintained, and there's trash everywhere. So disappointing this path was paved but it's not maintained!                                |
|  | The bike trail that was added by the <b>skyline extension</b> is one of the nicest trails- that would be great to <b>continue that kind of trail</b> where possible  |

Table A-4 : Suggestions - Location Specific (page 2 of 2)

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Riverside Trail   | Improving the <b>Riverside paved trail</b> would be greatly appreciated. Use to ride it on a longboard all the time before pavement damage caused by the flood of 2017. Thanks   |
|                   | Explore the idea of bike lanes on <b>Richmond Road to Diamond View Middle School</b> . Install <b>bike lanes on Main Street in Uptown Susanville</b> as per CalTrans suggestion to the Susanville City Council in 2019 (City Council voted it down).   |
|                   | Several years ago, the city was going to put a paved path off the roadway running from <b>Riverside Park to Walmart</b> . They were getting a grant to do this project. It never happened and needs to. I see pedestrians and bike riders on this stretch of <b>Riverside Drive</b> daily and have seen several people nearly get hit on the roadway.  |
| Uptown Susanville | I don't normally bike on sidewalks but on the road or bike paths. I feel like it's dangerous to be on the sidewalk with pedestrians but if there were sidewalks that had a bike lane I would ride on that. The only reason I ride in sidewalks is if the car traffic is heavy and dangerous. <b>Also blinking cross walks that you can activate for safe crossing would make me feel safer walking and biking through Susanville especially uptown</b>   |
|                   | It would be nice to have at the crosswalks orange flag you would carry across the street so the cars would see you and signs on <b>Main Street</b> say crosswalk ahead.  |
|                   | I live in uptown on north pine street. Many people walk up <b>north pine to inspiration point</b> and there is <b>no sidewalk</b> . It's not safe for my kids and I walking up there or the other families who walk without any sidewalks. The sidewalks that are there have huge potholes that get my stroller or kids bikes wheels caught. It's frustrating.   |
|                   | Plant shade trees along trails and in the <b>business district</b> . Implement a city beautification plan to provide a lot more shade trees along city streets. Walking or biking in the city in the summer months is brutally hot. Provide more walking and bike infrastructure - shaded resting benches, bike racks, picnic tables in desirable locations with views or bike parking to access businesses. "Share the road" signs don't improve a biker's sense of security that these narrow, winding roads are safe to ride. More bike lanes are needed. |
| Richmond Rd       | Sidewalks or bike paths in the district of <b>Richmond School (Richmond Rd. not just in front of the school)</b>   |
|                   | In the existing bike lanes, ask Lassen County Road Dept to monitor the lanes by keeping goat head/puncture weeds from encroaching into the bike lane. Bicyclist cannot always see what is growing in the cracks nor swerve left into traffic lane safely to avoid them. <b>Very bad section on Richmond Road, north side, between Susan Hills Street and DV School.</b>  |
| Bizz Johnson      | Would love for the <b>Bizz Johnson to be paved</b> so that it is more stroller friendly. So bumpy and tough to push a stroller on.   |
|                   | Keep up with <b>maintainable</b> on the <b>bizz!</b> Add more trash cans too   |



| Table A-5: Suggestions / Concerns (Page 1 of 4) |  |
|---|--|
| Cleaning/<br>Maintenance                        | Cleaning <b>debris</b> (sand/gravel/glass/weeds) <b>from existing bike lanes</b> so they can be safely used.   |
|   | Freshen up exterior of homes and cimmercuak, public benches, gathering safe type spots, contest to encourage homeowners and out of area folks to clean up properties. Its deoressing to ride by junky properties and all beige bldgs.  |
|   | <b>Goat head abatement</b> is a major issue and reduces willingness of many to ride. Constant flat tires are a major deterrent.  |
|   | Please clear the side walks for people who like to walk when it snows  |
| Safety<br>Concerns                              | <b>Crosswalk safety</b> is a major concern for me. Thank you for working to make the community safer for walking & biking!   |
|   | If I were to walk or bike anywhere I would have my kids with me. Often I do not feel the routes are safe enough or the roads are <b>too busy to take my kids</b> where we would want to go from our house. We live off of Richmond Road. I would love to have more walking/bike paths in town similar to the river walk but without as many safety concerns. <b>A directory/map of all walking or bike paths</b> would also be a really nice reference to have.  |
|   | People drive like maniacs and little is done about it. Drivers do not wait for people to cross completely before going. I live on a busy corner intersection and do you know who I see blow through/doesn't come to a full stop at the stop sign the most? The police. On Main, there should be better signage and visibility for pedestrian/bicycle traffic (light up crosswalks similar to larger cities). Most people who do bike in town ride on the sidewalls which isn't safe for pedestrians, but main street has no legitimate bike lane and drivers aren't willing to safely let them on the roads. So who can blame them for riding on the sidewalk?   |
|   | Sections of Hwy 36 to Chester have <b>no shoulder</b> . That makes it very unsafe to ride to Westwood and Chester.   |
|   | Lassen county is a <b>great place for biking of all kinds</b> . Mountain biking and road biking opportunities are endless. There are wonderful connections out to dirt trails via paved roads. I have lived in Lassen County for 30 years, and started biking as a child to get to school. My main concern biking has always been at major intersections and places where there are stoplights because cars are fast, impatient and there is no safe lane to go in as a bike - especially in a place where most people are driving large trucks and vehicles. For this reason when in town, I often will get off my bike to use crosswalks and walk my bike across the street in designated areas. If we had improved bike lanes this would help immensely. I think also reminding people that bikes are out there and increasing awareness of sharing the road with bikes and pedestrians would improve current conditions. |

Table A-5: Suggestions / Concerns (Page 2 of 4)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Safety<br/>Concerns<br/>(continued)</p> | <p>I love the trails in town, but my husband works odd hours and between the homeless population and mountain lions, I am <b>afraid to walk the trails</b> with my young children. I have not come up with a solution to this problem, but I would love to be able to walk and feel safe.</p>  |
|  | <p>The <b>Bizz is the only trail where I feel safe</b>. Skyline park and SRP are too far from view for me to feel safe running or walking on my own. There aren't any areas that I know of near Milford where I can bike or walk close to home. Bald Mt is too steep for regular training runs for me in my current fitness level and it's either really muddy I'm worried about rattlesnakes because of the narrow trail. I would love a park or more trails alongside roadways where I feel safe to run on my own.</p>   |
|  | <p>The <b>sidewalk system definitely needs to be improved</b> as most people walking for leisure are in the street unless they are on the main road. Vehicle traffic is not always respectful of bikers and our main roads are very unsafe for biking. With all of the semi traffic we have it will take a more than just a white stripe to make a bike lane because people's lives are at stake.</p>  |
|  | <p>The city of <b>Susanville is not designed for ease of walking/biking</b> for every day purposes. Many of the businesses are spread to far apart, causing it to be inconvenient. Motorists seem to be to distracted, placing the safety of individuals in jeopardy. I run several times a week on the streets and throughout the entire course I feel unsafe.</p>  |
|  | <p>I used to like biking the <b>Bizz Johnson trail</b>. Unfortunately, now it's <b>no longer safe</b> to do so.</p>  |
|  | <p>It is appalling how many <b>motorist do not stop</b> for pedestrians, and it is appalling there is no cross walk to cross main street between Kurts Works and Walgreens!!!</p>  |
|  | <p>The width of Main St is one of largest concerns concerning safety while walking, biking or even crossing while in a car.</p>  |
|  | <p>Unfortunately Johnstonville School has decided to not have a school bus. Richmond School never had a school bus. Susanville School district doesn't provide transportation for students who live within a closer distance to the schools. <b>None of these areas</b>, especially Johnstonville <b>are safe for students to walk to school</b>. Crossing Hwy. 395 at Diane Dr. is dangerous, especially for young students walking and riding bikes. Even worse is the crossing at Johnstonville Rd. and Hwy. 395 across from the school. Only a matter of time before a child gets hit by a car. None of these areas are safe biking or walking. The narrow bridge going towards Travis Lane is also dangerous and vehicles should yield the right of way to pedestrians and bikes. Very unsafe as cars go way too fast in that area. No shoulders, no bike lanes no sidewalks. This area should be a priority!!!</p> |
|  | <p>I can't take my dogs on bike path right next to busy highway. A fence along crossover road would be great.</p>  |

Table A-5: Suggestions / Concerns (Page 3 of 4)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| More<br>Amenities   | Would like the <b>street light to recognize that a bike</b> is there.   |
|   | We could have some of the best mountain bike trails in the world considering the relatively gentle mountain terrain in our area, and I would like to see <b>bike lanes on our rural roads.</b>  |
|   | As a motorist there are areas of the county frequented by cyclists that should perhaps have a separate bike path or at minimum (probably more appropriate) have a paved shoulder on the roadway to keep them off of the highway.<br><b>Johnstonville road</b> for example   |
|   | I love to ride my bike and walk. It would be great to have a biking/walking trail from <b>Johnstonville to Susanville</b> and from <b>Johnstonville to Janesville.</b>  |
|   | Please do not pave the <b>Bizz Johnson Trail!!</b> More crosswalks are needed <b>between Fairfield and the Johnstonville Road.</b>  |
|   | Wider shoulders, dedicated lanes for road bikes. <b>More trails for mtn bikes!</b>  |
|   | <b>Sidewalks on residential streets</b> would be great and increase safety for pedestrians.   |
|   | Need more places/businesses/restaurants/cafe/pub uptown to walk to  |
|   | Running paths   |
|   | it would be nice to have more scenic bike paths   |
|   | If we had outdoor cafes Uptown I would walk or ride my bike everyday.   |
|   | Our community at large is missing out on certain tourist industries due to a lack of concentration on outdoor recreation. our city and County need to do more to cultivate our area and what it has to offer. Many of our residents don't just see our areas economy as agriculture centered. We need to look beyond, consider what other similar sized and geo-located cities have done. there are many examples to choose from. People in the Bay Area, Reno and other areas are out exploring and want other destination options other than Tahoe or Shasta. This are has more to offer! |
|   | I dont bike, I want <b>improvements to sidewalks and lighting</b> but not to be a bike rider we need them to clean up our city as a whole not for 1 specific population of bike riders  |
|   | I appreciate the purpose of this survey. I love Lassen County and all the work that has been done with local trail systems in the recent past. Some <b>paved connectivity between trail systems</b> would be wonderful to keep people outside and recreating while dirt trails are not accessible during winter months. I would love to give detailed feedback if there is an interest dshartrum@ucdavis.edu  |
|   | I would like <b>better lighting and bike paths</b>  |
| Would be nice for most area to least have <b>side walks</b> and not so many cars parked alongside the roads |   |

Table A-5: Suggestions / Concerns (Page 4 of 4)


|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <p>Implement Previous Plans</p> | <p>The Bike Master Plan in the Transportation Plan is great, offering aspirational goals. Unfortunately, there is no effort once the plan is adopted and the infrastructure built to maintain them. The shoulders of roadways are poorly maintained and full of debris, forcing you to ride in the roadways. The paved trails are poorly maintained, lots of goatheads and encroaching vegetation that obscure visibility of small animals and rodents posing a safety hazard. A Maintenance Plan needs to be added to the Bike Master Plan and resources committed on a regular schedule to keep the shoulders free of debris and trails safe and useable year round. I think more people would ride their bikes more often if we were committed to be a "Bike Friendly Community." Thanks for asking and listening!</p> <p>LCTC created a <b>Wayfinding</b> Plan that was adopted by the City and should be considered for the ATP</p> |
|---------------------------------|--|

## SR 36 Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study On-Line Survey Summary

The on-line survey was developed using Survey Monkey. A total of 383 people responded to the survey. A summary of each question is presented below. A complete list of comments is presented as Appendix 1 to this document. Materials used to advertise the survey are included in Appendix 2 of this document.

**Question 1:** *Gateway features are signs or artwork at the entrance to a community. They can provide a sense that one has arrived at their destination and help to show arriving drivers that they are entering a commercial district. Do you agree that there should be a gateway feature on the western end of Main Street? (Respondents were referred to a map to show the location of the gateway at the corner of N. Pine and SR 36).*


**Total Respondents: 377**



**Summary of Comments:** Many found a gateway feature to be a good idea and an opportunity to help beautify the town. Some respondents suggested moving the gateway to another location; not as close to Town Curve and easier to see. Others were concerned that it would only provide a distraction from driving or another obstacle for trucks to hit. Some felt that money would be better spent on other improvements.

**Question 2:** *Street trees encourage lower traffic speeds and can beautify a community. Do you agree that there should be more trees along Main Street?*

**Total Respondents: 372**




**Summary of Comments:** The majority of respondents liked the idea of street trees. However, some did caution that if not placed properly, trees could block store fronts or a driver’s view of pedestrians. The type of tree is important to many, one that would not drop an excessive amount of debris and could be easily maintained.


**Question 3:** *"Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB) can be placed mid-block to warn motorists of pedestrians crossing the roadway. They are activated by a pedestrian push button. Do you agree that RRFB's should be placed at Sacramento Street and McDow Street along Main Street?"*

**Total Respondents: 368**

**Summary of Comments:** RRFB’s are a popular strategy among respondents. Some provided suggestions of other locations to place RRFB’s: near Gay, Mesa, Roop, Lassen, Laurel, and Robbs Way.



**Question 4:** *One technique to increase pedestrian safety is to incorporate aesthetic paving patterns on all side street crosswalks such as stamped brick or different colors. This would improve upon the recently constructed ADA ramps and bulbouts. Do you agree that colored concrete banding should be added to the crosswalks and intersections along Main Street?*




**Total Respondents: 365**

**Summary of Comments:** Overall, respondents were positive about this type of improvement. Many respondents were concerned that the concrete banding would be damaged by snow removal equipment and necessitate increased maintenance. Other see colored concrete as a way to improve visibility of crossings when the sun is at low angles.

**Question 5:** *Attractive wayfinding signs help people find destinations and encourage visitors to stop and explore the community. Do you agree that more wayfinding signs should be added at various locations along Main Street?*

**Total Respondents: 361**


**Summary of Comments:** Although only 22 percent of respondents were opposed to the idea, many do not rank this technique as high priority. Some do not feel that signs would be helpful to navigate around Susanville and others feel that there are already too many signs.





**Question 6:** *Street lighting improves safety and security for all users. Do you agree that more street lighting should be provided along Main Street?*

**Total Respondents: 361**



**Summary of Comments:** Very few respondents disagree with adding more street lighting. A number of locations were suggested, and many felt they should be placed everywhere along Main Street. Respondents like the idea of attractive street lighting as opposed to the traditional orange colored lights.

**Question 7:** *Portions of sidewalk along Main Street are distressed and cracked. A smooth sidewalk enables a continuous free path of travel for pedestrians and disabled users. Are there particular segments of sidewalk along Main Street which you feel are the most important to fix?*


**Summary of Comments:** Specific suggestions included:

- Near the bowling alley
- Near Mazatlán Restaurant
- From Mesa to Riverside Street
- North Street and Park
- Near Napa Auto Parts
- Between Sears and the movie theater
- From Riverside to Walmart/Walgreens
- Between Burger King and the dentist office
- Roop Street

- From Weatherlow to Riverside
- Between Fairfield and Grand
- First four blocks at the west end of Susanville
- Between Weatherlow and Pine Streets
- Between Grand and Park
- From Russel to McDow
- Between Mesa and Walmart

**Question 8:** Lane reallocation is a safety countermeasure which involves reducing the number of travel lanes in each direction from 2 to 1 and providing continuous left-turn access and additional space for potential bike lanes or parking. This relatively inexpensive technique can reduce crashes, lower vehicle speeds and provide increased safety for non-motorized users. Lane reallocation is proposed for the seven blocks along Main Street between Roop Street and Grand Ave/Foss Street. Do you agree with this concept?

**Total Respondents: 349**



**Summary of Comments:** Overall opinion was fairly evenly split, with 52 percent either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, 40 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing and 8 percent neutral. Although a larger number of respondents disagree with this concept than agree, there appears to be an increase in the number of Susanville residents willing to explore the idea as compared to previous public forums. Respondents in opposition are fearful that reducing the number of lanes in Uptown will cause a large bottleneck; particularly as there appears to be an increase in the proportion of truck traffic travelling through Susanville. Others fear that lane

reduction will limit the ability to evacuate quickly in the case of a fire. Respondents were also worried about a lack of parking and how this concept would affect the High School. Proponents of lane reallocation see it as a needed safety improvement as crossing four lanes of traffic is considered by them to be unsafe, particularly if one lane of traffic stops for a pedestrian while the other lane does not. Others feel that lane reallocation would slow down drivers and therefore provide increased safety.

**Question 9:** Of the 8 above mentioned techniques to improve safety and mobility along Main Street, rank in order of importance to you (1 = most important and 8 = least important).

Average weighting of concepts by respondents:

**Priority 1:** Street lighting

**Priority 2:** Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons

**Priority 3:** Sidewalk repair

**Priority 4:** Street trees

**Priority 5:** Colored concrete banding

**Priority 6:** Wayfinding signage

**Priority 7:** Gateway feature


**Priority 8:** Lane reallocation

## On-line Survey Complete Results

---

## Q1 Gateway Features

Answered: 377 Skipped: 6



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 35.01%    | 132        |
| Agree             | 31.30%    | 118        |
| Neutral           | 15.38%    | 58         |
| Disagree          | 10.34%    | 39         |
| Strongly disagree | 7.96%     | 30         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>377</b> |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study


| #  | COMMENTS  | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Not to interfere with existing lanes  | 11/12/2020 9:19 AM  |
| 2  | I would rather see it at the other end of town or closer to roop in a way you can drive under. Statues do not draw enough attention and would be a waste of money. I only like the Roseville option.  | 11/3/2020 11:03 AM  |
| 3  | At what cost to the taxpayer?   | 10/29/2020 12:15 PM |
| 4  | Both  | 10/29/2020 4:11 AM  |
| 5  | not needed  | 10/26/2020 3:18 PM  |
| 6  | This is great for people who are driving through our town   | 10/26/2020 11:38 AM |
| 7  | Gateway on each end of Susanville.  | 10/26/2020 10:45 AM |
| 8  | Waste of money. Any direction people are traveling longer distances, they know the town is coming and you can tell immediately when you arrive.   | 10/26/2020 8:57 AM  |
| 9  | Yes but luck a different location   | 10/26/2020 6:23 AM  |
| 10 | Nobody will see it in that location. Bummer to spend all that money and not see it.   | 10/26/2020 6:22 AM  |
| 11 | Comming from the west u would waist money nobody would care to busy butt puckerd coming down hill and making corner   | 10/20/2020 9:18 PM  |
| 12 | we have natural beauty in out are and we already have a gate way feature at the s. end of main st. that is not regularly maintained as is. Why put up another one have it look seedy like the one we have now   | 10/20/2020 1:21 PM  |
| 13 | unnecessary expenditure of funds  | 10/20/2020 7:32 AM  |
| 14 | I like the idea of something that rrpresents Susanville like logging, ranching or incarceration   | 10/19/2020 5:55 PM  |
| 15 | Not sure of that location, for visibility. It may not be effective on that side of the street, with turning speeds. I think it could be a missed impact.  | 10/18/2020 6:07 AM  |
| 16 | Fix up what's there before adding flair   | 10/17/2020 7:53 PM  |
| 17 | There is no good place to put this. You enter so quickly into town it would be a waste of \$  | 10/17/2020 6:22 PM  |
| 18 | I think the money would be better utilized to improve the safety of pedestriians crossing uptown.   | 10/17/2020 1:40 PM  |
| 19 | Why pay for this when we can't pay for police and fire?   | 10/17/2020 1:38 PM  |
| 20 | Potential for more accidents; drivers need to concentrate on the turn, speed and the fact of still coming off the grade. Gay St. Would be a better location would be first choice; Lassen St. Would be 2nd choice. From what source is the funding coming from? What benefit is suggested toward the economy of Susanville? What agency is suggesting this? | 10/17/2020 1:22 PM  |
| 21 | It seems pointless  | 10/16/2020 9:24 PM  |
| 22 | If having a gateway means giving up safety features, then I don't think we need it. If we have the funding I think it could be a nice addition  | 10/16/2020 9:10 PM  |
| 23 | I agree but what would the cost be?   | 10/16/2020 4:25 PM  |
| 24 | What a wonderful way to welcome visitors into our community and show we are proud of our little town!   | 10/16/2020 1:48 PM  |
| 25 | That is a very tricky curve where we don't need anymore distraction, also would it be beneficial to have one on each end of town, as traffic coming from the opposite way would be viewing it as they had already passed through town, which I feel like would be where the gateway sign would have the best view point                                     | 10/15/2020 11:32 PM |
| 26 | unnecessary expenditure of funds  | 10/15/2020 5:46 PM  |
| 27 | Only if it slows traffic entering Susanville  | 10/15/2020 12:37 PM |
| 28 | distracting - looking to the left not straight might hit pedestrian coming off the hill dumb idea   | 10/15/2020 12:14 PM |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |  |                     |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 29 | Is there room?   | 10/15/2020 8:14 AM  |
| 30 | As long as the highway gets a bypass. Do you know how many semi trucks will hit that?  | 10/15/2020 7:04 AM  |
| 31 | Perhaps the gateway should be on the western side of the intersection of Roop and Main. I feel like drivers might miss the gateway while navigating the curve.   | 10/14/2020 7:39 PM  |
| 32 | One more distraction to pull your attention from the already most dangerous crosswalk on main street.  | 10/14/2020 6:07 PM  |
| 33 | When the city is having issues with budget, this is not the time to commit money to such a project.  | 10/14/2020 11:01 AM |
| 34 | If you don't know you're in Susanville, you shouldn't be driving.  | 10/14/2020 9:18 AM  |
| 35 | great more stuff to slow runaway trucks  | 10/14/2020 9:12 AM  |
| 36 | Entrance to town here is confusing and requires many driving decisions. Monument sounds nice but could be a dangerous distraction. Maybe place further west?   | 10/14/2020 8:35 AM  |
| 37 | Agree to the need of sign, but not as an excuse to get rid of the current striping pattern in the Uptown Susanville district.  | 10/14/2020 8:18 AM  |
| 38 | Where they want it on a dangerous curve is silly. To me it say let's take our eyes off the road and look at the sign.  | 10/14/2020 5:36 AM  |
| 39 | is this a thing we're gonna have to do every year? THE PUBLIC ALREADY OVERWHELMINGLY SAID NO.  | 10/14/2020 3:49 AM  |
| 40 | No lane reductions   | 10/14/2020 3:44 AM  |
| 41 | I love the idea but it can't block the Christmas tree, the elks lodge or the fireworks display   | 10/13/2020 3:34 PM  |
| 42 | We want people to know that they are in Susanville and that it is a great place to stop.   | 10/13/2020 8:52 AM  |
| 43 | That turn coming in to town requires all eyes on the road especially to see that first intersection at Roop st. A sign at that location would only distract a driver.  | 10/13/2020 7:06 AM  |
| 44 | Big trucks and RVs will take those signs out. Stop trying to make us like the City, if you like Roseville and their decorations, move there. We have plenty of tourism in the form of outdoors people, Hunting, Fishing, Atv riding, camping. We aren't the big City and like it that way!   | 10/13/2020 6:36 AM  |
| 45 | a gateway would be nice, but it might be lower on the priority list than safety, bike or pedestrian features   | 10/13/2020 5:52 AM  |
| 46 | This is such an amazing idea! Beautiful welcome to our town!!  | 10/13/2020 1:38 AM  |
| 47 | INCREDIBLE! Perfect location and I do love the grandness of the overhead arch entry idea... I believe Susanville has a ton of potential for uptown tourism in it's future, so the more grand the better and more likely people will be willing to match the aesthetic in other aspects of the city   | 10/12/2020 6:56 PM  |
| 48 | Maybe rethink the gateway monument. Possibly Roop and SR 36/Main. Nobody will see it coming in or around that corner. Everyone driving in is eager to get out or around to the double road especially if they have been following a semi truck all the way down the hill. Too expensive to put up a monument to have nobody recognize/see it. Maybe a suggestion would be to have two options to give members of the community, post this survey with a larger audience, not just through the chamber. I promise nobody will pay attention to the beautiful sign you spend hours designing on that corner. | 10/9/2020 11:37 AM  |
| 49 | I thought we already had a gateway plan?   | 10/8/2020 8:10 PM   |
| 50 | I don't think it is a good idea to create another driver distraction at this location.   | 10/8/2020 2:48 PM   |

## Q2 Street Trees

Answered: 372 Skipped: 11



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 41.40%    | 154        |
| Agree             | 24.46%    | 91         |
| Neutral           | 12.10%    | 45         |
| Disagree          | 10.48%    | 39         |
| Strongly disagree | 11.56%    | 43         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>372</b> |



## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | COMMENTS   | DATE                |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1  | Who is going to keep up maintenance on the trees   | 11/11/2020 12:09 PM |
| 2  | Would look good, maintenance would be the issue  | 11/11/2020 11:55 AM |
| 3  | Trees are great, but don't take away any of the street. Will need that in case the town needs to evacuate during a fire. Use existing sidewalk uptown, plenty of room.   | 11/3/2020 2:31 AM   |
| 4  | Tree debris clog the gutters and drains. Untrimmed trees will present dangers for drivers and pedestrians  | 11/1/2020 9:12 AM   |
| 5  | will they be an issue for business, who will maintain them for broken branches etc? will they interfere with lights, viewing of addresses as you pass by???  | 10/31/2020 2:59 PM  |
| 6  | At what cost to the taxpayer?  | 10/29/2020 12:15 PM |
| 7  | Yes please   | 10/29/2020 4:11 AM  |
| 8  | reduce number of trees from proposed level   | 10/26/2020 3:20 PM  |
| 9  | If we ever get real Winter's again the trees could be damaged by snow removal and it's also cleanup costs  | 10/26/2020 2:17 PM  |
| 10 | Uptown is not very beautiful, all we really have is decaying artwork   | 10/26/2020 11:39 AM |
| 11 | Around town there are several trees the block the street names and stop signs.   | 10/26/2020 8:58 AM  |
| 12 | It'll be nice but it won't slow down traffic   | 10/26/2020 6:23 AM  |
| 13 | It won't slow down traffic. But it'll look nice  | 10/26/2020 6:22 AM  |
| 14 | Yes! Summer flower baskets too.  | 10/25/2020 10:51 AM |
| 15 | I would love to see our town beautified with the addition of trees, but the issue is who is going to maintain it? This is already an issue. Parks are falling apart, buildings are falling apart, fountains are falling apart. | 10/22/2020 6:30 PM  |
| 16 | We really need the trees our town does not look inviting.  | 10/20/2020 9:18 PM  |
| 17 | Raises maintenance costs. Bird droppings on cars. Children can be hidden behind trees causing a safety issue when parking.   | 10/20/2020 7:33 AM  |
| 18 | As long as branches are maintained and kept cut  | 10/19/2020 9:42 PM  |
| 19 | Fruitless pears or Japanese honey locust. Irrigation? I am all for it!!  | 10/19/2020 5:56 PM  |
| 20 | You won't be able to see any of the business's signage, and the mess.  | 10/19/2020 2:32 PM  |
| 21 | I hesitate here, there are no businesses to sit outside underneath the trees, and very little pedestrian traffic.  | 10/18/2020 6:08 AM  |
| 22 | Like the idea of more trees, but concerned they may block storefronts signage so people won't know what businesses are there.  | 10/17/2020 11:15 PM |
| 23 | Planting trees sounds good till they get big have to be maintained. We so be doing things such as lamp posts. The city can't maintain the trees they have  | 10/17/2020 6:30 PM  |
| 24 | we are told routinely to conserve water as a community. Trees would not help this.   | 10/17/2020 1:42 PM  |
| 25 | Trees block your view of oncoming traffic. Plus we are being told that we must conserve water so why plant more trees that would use up that water. Plus increases in maintenance costs  | 10/17/2020 1:40 PM  |
| 26 | I think they are pretty but think that if they were too dense it might be harder to see pedestrian traffic.  | 10/16/2020 10:06 PM |
| 27 | What about watering. We are told to conserve water. Will the trees die in the harsh winter   | 10/16/2020 9:47 PM  |
| 28 | Seems like it would be nice  | 10/16/2020 9:25 PM  |
| 29 | I agree, but our city already can't maintain the trees we have. Will a position of arborist be added as well? Bare minimum a technician or two who do vegetation maintenance in Susanville?                                    | 10/16/2020 9:12 PM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 30 | with the blessing of shop owners whose stores front new trees   | 10/16/2020 6:33 PM  |
| 31 | Also develop one alternative that shows an "esplanade" along Main St. with center island of trees.  | 10/16/2020 4:23 PM  |
| 32 | Trees would help us see the beauty surrounding us and can be decorated for the holidays.  | 10/16/2020 1:48 PM  |
| 33 | I think this would be better dispensed throughout town rather than just uptown, a ton of improvements uptown will make the rest of town look that much more sparse as well and those areas have just as much if not more business activity  | 10/15/2020 11:35 PM |
| 34 | you cant take care of the trees you got now   | 10/15/2020 12:14 PM |
| 35 | Make sure you know who is going to make sure that they are cleared of ice for the students and others who will use them daily. I can foresee someone thinking about a lawsuit.  | 10/15/2020 9:13 AM  |
| 36 | Be careful which trees are chosen (size,dropping), and make sure they get adequate water.   | 10/15/2020 8:17 AM  |
| 37 | But only if you have a bypass highway. Do you know how many semis are going to wipe those out?  | 10/15/2020 7:05 AM  |
| 38 | trees block vision of traffic. Trees are messy and who will clean the sidewalks. Tree roots damage sidewalks.   | 10/14/2020 8:58 PM  |
| 39 | Who is going to pay for the maintenance of the trees, clean up in the fall, storm drain repair and maintenance  | 10/14/2020 7:33 PM  |
| 40 | It makes it difficult for drivers to see pedestrians. Flashing signs are better and policemen writing citations.  | 10/14/2020 7:23 PM  |
| 41 | its hard enough to see that the lane merges as leaving town, imagine if the sidewalks had trees!  | 10/14/2020 1:43 PM  |
| 42 | It would be a visibility issue. Better to have awnings over the sidewalks.  | 10/14/2020 12:50 PM |
| 43 | Trees also require extensive maintenance . Leaves clog drainage. Speed is not reduced.  | 10/14/2020 12:38 PM |
| 44 | Will the city take care of the trees or will they end up being an eyesore?  | 10/14/2020 11:48 AM |
| 45 | No, with the short growing season we have, and the traffic now, the clean up, when the trees drop leaves adds extra cost to clean up.   | 10/14/2020 11:03 AM |
| 46 | Raises maintenance costs. Bird droppings on cars.   | 10/14/2020 9:19 AM  |
| 47 | thats been tried before   | 10/14/2020 9:13 AM  |
| 48 | Like trees, but, RW is too narrow except for only smaller trees. As trees grow problems could arise. Suggest decorative sculptures of historic significance - refer to recent Carson city freeway work.   | 10/14/2020 8:39 AM  |
| 49 | Please plant low maintenance trees.   | 10/14/2020 8:32 AM  |
| 50 | This could be a start to positive changes in this area; maybe more will want to take up business with a little more curb appeal.  | 10/14/2020 8:20 AM  |
| 51 | In the fall and summer the pavement is littered with leaves and fruit that has fallen from the trees. Uptown is mostly empty buildings, who will clean up the sidewalks?  | 10/14/2020 5:38 AM  |
| 52 | Seriously, please stop. Susanville is already broke. Spending more \$ wont fix anything.  | 10/14/2020 3:50 AM  |
| 53 | No lane reductions, also buildings should have covered front sidewalk where possible for beautification and comfort of pedestrians  | 10/14/2020 3:45 AM  |
| 54 | Too many maintenance and safety issues. Not necessary   | 10/13/2020 3:35 PM  |
| 55 | While I do agree trees make a wonderful appearance, for the businesses tress can attract insects and pests. The also block the view of the business front from the street. Since the prevailing winds come from the west side of uptown, the leaves are often a nuisance, all summer we have leaves from last falls in the store, and it's only worse as the season changes. The city doesn't maintain the sidewalks currently, we have goatheads and other invasive weeds growing on the sidewalks. Add a few more trees would be great, but again all | 10/13/2020 9:24 AM  |


## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

over town where the Chinese Elms are, like clock work they attract box elder bugs and spiders that eat the bugs. We should plant native species.

|    |  |                    |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 56 | The city will fail to maintain the trees and views will be blocked causing accidents.  | 10/13/2020 8:51 AM |
| 57 | The plan below i think is too dense, will block too much store front and cause excessive maintainence. Trees should preferably be native, definitely non fruiting.   | 10/13/2020 8:39 AM |
| 58 | In the past, Street trees were left for dead or heavily pruned to keep a business sign visible. In the 40 years I've been here Street trees have been proposed many times.   | 10/13/2020 7:09 AM |
| 59 | Trees make a mess, check out the uptown side streets where the side walks are raised into tripping hazards from the tree roots and the leaves and nuts or fruit whatever it is makes a mess  | 10/13/2020 6:37 AM |
| 60 | trees are also good for the environment, but safety should be considered when choosing the type of tree. They should not restrict driver's vision of the crosswalk as they grow.   | 10/13/2020 5:53 AM |
| 61 | Yes! Trees are beautiful!!   | 10/13/2020 1:38 AM |
| 62 | Susanville really needs this restoration of our beautiful city.  | 10/12/2020 9:13 PM |
| 63 | So amazing! Yes please! This is insanely exciting... what the community has wanted for years. Everything in this plan is a huge yes! I will be getting tons of community members filling out this survey so you know! Trees trees trees please!! | 10/12/2020 6:57 PM |
| 64 | Tree roots will tear up the sidewalk   | 10/9/2020 1:14 PM  |
| 65 | Not sure if you need an enhanced bus stop right across from the high school and where more homeless can stay. But the trees would be beautiful!  | 10/9/2020 11:39 AM |
| 66 | How do these trees fit with snow removal techniques?   | 10/9/2020 8:45 AM  |
| 67 | Street trees should frame the street and compartmentalize the sidewalk, not be in the middle of the sidewalk like the ones between roop and lassen on the south side of main street  | 10/8/2020 8:15 PM  |
| 68 | Currently is is very haphazard Needs to be uniform and the correct species.  | 10/8/2020 5:14 PM  |
| 69 | BUS STOP LOCATION IS TERRIBLE!   | 10/8/2020 4:28 PM  |

## Q3 Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB)s

Answered: 368 Skipped: 15



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 54.89%    | 202        |
| Agree             | 24.73%    | 91         |
| Neutral           | 8.97%     | 33         |
| Disagree          | 5.71%     | 21         |
| Strongly disagree | 5.71%     | 21         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>368</b> |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | COMMENTS   | DATE                |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1  | And uptown also  | 11/12/2020 9:20 AM  |
| 2  | Visibility, great idea   | 11/11/2020 11:55 AM |
| 3  | Needs to be all over town. Think about how many pedestrians get hit each year  | 11/3/2020 11:04 AM  |
| 4  | YES!!! That stretch can be dark and hard to see when its raining at night. So many people just run out in front of cars.   | 11/3/2020 2:32 AM   |
| 5  | Yes! We need these more so then trees and welcome signs, and probably at more intersections than these as well   | 11/2/2020 10:46 PM  |
| 6  | Gay and Mesa   | 10/31/2020 10:03 PM |
| 7  | Near Mesa also   | 10/31/2020 7:07 PM  |
| 8  | they should be placed on the roadway like reno airport it flashes and has a speedbump add speedbump before x ing just to alert pedestrian or not.  | 10/31/2020 3:01 PM  |
| 9  | Police the river and dismantle the tenants that live down there  | 10/29/2020 4:12 AM  |
| 10 | I would also think about putting in a cross walk in front of cross roads, that is where most people get hit or almost hit trying to get across   | 10/26/2020 11:40 AM |
| 11 | The amount of deaths and accidents should have prompted this long ago!   | 10/26/2020 8:58 AM  |
| 12 | Also at select intersections without traffic lights, e.g Main and Gay.   | 10/26/2020 8:35 AM  |
| 13 | Try uptown Susanville instead  | 10/26/2020 6:24 AM  |
| 14 | On everyone cross walk through Main Street there are so many cross walks and so many times you have to really pay attention and with double lanes hard to see and sunsets at parts of the year going down right in your eyes, need more lights too | 10/26/2020 5:46 AM  |
| 15 | 15 mph all of main Street just like sisters Oregon catches with people and let some stop and shop  | 10/21/2020 1:47 PM  |
| 16 | Ya, add cross walks where people cross u know at the shell station where they get hit  | 10/20/2020 9:19 PM  |
| 17 | simply enforce traffic laws in summer tourists come tearing down main st. with their trailers in tow. we don't need more flashing beacons. i moved to a small town to get away from all the flashing lights.                                       | 10/20/2020 1:24 PM  |
| 18 | Safety should be our #1 concern.   | 10/20/2020 7:34 AM  |
| 19 | I feel that some kind of flashers on the street also! Crosswalks are so dangerous on Main Street   | 10/19/2020 9:44 PM  |
| 20 | Normally I am not a fan but Main St is accessibly wide for peds  | 10/19/2020 5:56 PM  |
| 21 | There should be one uptown as well.  | 10/19/2020 2:33 PM  |
| 22 | Mesa & spring too  | 10/18/2020 7:46 PM  |
| 23 | My 13-year-old daughter hesitates to cross main Street with her bike, it is actually a kid that would use this.  | 10/18/2020 6:09 AM  |
| 24 | Need to be up town also  | 10/17/2020 6:32 PM  |
| 25 | I've been hoping CalTrans would install these. They are needed.  | 10/17/2020 6:07 PM  |
| 26 | They would be better served at the theater intersections   | 10/17/2020 1:44 PM  |
| 27 | They need to be uptown on the hill where there is more congestion.   | 10/17/2020 1:43 PM  |
| 28 | Put them up town also  | 10/16/2020 10:07 PM |
| 29 | The druggies that lay in the street don't need the signs. The kids going to and from the movies need these at the uptown area like rip and union.  | 10/16/2020 9:49 PM  |
| 30 | Yes, we absolutely need these as many locations as is practical.   | 10/16/2020 9:12 PM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study


|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 31 | Place at Lassen St., at high school crossing, at SR 139, at Fairfield   | 10/16/2020 4:28 PM  |
| 32 | I feel as though we could use these on the Gay St crosswalk and Lassen St crosswalk as well especially with the dance studio being on the busy corner of main st.                                 | 10/16/2020 1:50 PM  |
| 33 | I think there should be at least one of these in Uptown Susanville (perhaps at Gay St) as well, and we may not need both Sacramento and McDow   | 10/16/2020 11:57 AM |
| 34 | I agree that we need those, but cross walks are needed more between Fairfield and the Walmart intersections more.   | 10/15/2020 11:37 PM |
| 35 | Not mid-block but also intersections to alert motorists.  | 10/15/2020 12:41 PM |
| 36 | There should also be one near crossroads / N Mesa   | 10/15/2020 10:53 AM |
| 37 | If you put in a bypass highway then you wont have vehicles zooming down Main St.  | 10/15/2020 7:06 AM  |
| 38 | I've found RRFBs to be potentially dangerous..... I didn't realize what they were and blew through one in the Bay Area once. I think they can give pedestrians a false sense of security          | 10/14/2020 9:12 PM  |
| 39 | Should be at the Gay st crosswalk   | 10/14/2020 9:00 PM  |
| 40 | I think they should be uptown.  | 10/14/2020 8:38 PM  |
| 41 | Very very very important! Of all the things you do, PLEASE do this!!!!  | 10/14/2020 7:35 PM  |
| 42 | And uptown  | 10/14/2020 1:54 PM  |
| 43 | There shouldnt be a cross walk at all at the top of main near the theater. You cannot have traffic bottling up right there. It is super dangerous.  | 10/14/2020 1:44 PM  |
| 44 | Just west of Union St.  | 10/14/2020 12:51 PM |
| 45 | Sacramento and McDow streets have way less pedestrian traffic than some other locations on Main st.   | 10/14/2020 11:04 AM |
| 46 | All main street crosswalks  | 10/14/2020 9:55 AM  |
| 47 | All crosswalks on Main St.  | 10/14/2020 9:50 AM  |
| 48 | Safety should be our #1 concern.  | 10/14/2020 9:20 AM  |
| 49 | The WORST crosswalk in Susanville is at Gay St. It should be the first consideration. Then one at the high school. Then several more scattered down Main St. clear down to the East end of town!  | 10/14/2020 9:10 AM  |
| 50 | Also further east where no xings exist!   | 10/14/2020 8:40 AM  |
| 51 | I think they should be uptown.  | 10/14/2020 8:33 AM  |
| 52 | The pedestrian death at McDow St. would not have prevented by this. These signs would be better served at Union St. than Sacramento or McDow. The pedestrian travel and risk are higher on Union. | 10/14/2020 8:22 AM  |
| 53 | However, I also think one should be placed at Main and Mesa St. There have been a few accidents there on the curve as people try to get to Crossroads.  | 10/14/2020 5:40 AM  |
| 54 | This wont stop people from getting hit. Main St in the afternoon looks straight into the setting sun. Flashing signs will mean diddly.  | 10/14/2020 3:52 AM  |
| 55 | Also at Gay St and Roop street, also need additional crosswalk and light at River or Russell  | 10/14/2020 3:45 AM  |
| 56 | Mesa st needs one badly   | 10/13/2020 3:38 PM  |
| 57 | Also at Gay St and Main. More important than others   | 10/13/2020 9:50 AM  |
| 58 | Should have done it last year when cal trans was re paving main street. If we did not have the money then where is this extra money coming from to pay more for it now.                           | 10/13/2020 8:41 AM  |
| 59 | We also need more cross walks in general. Especially in the areas of Dollar General and Round Table going across Main St. I see Jaywalkers in this area all of the time.                          | 10/13/2020 7:20 AM  |
| 60 | In front of the high school   | 10/13/2020 7:17 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 61 | I think most motorists know to be watching for pedestrians along the entire portion of Main st where there are intersecions every 300 feet. It's the section from Mesa to Walmart that needs to be addressed  | 10/13/2020 7:13 AM  |
| 62 | Should put something at the top of the hill by the Pioneer. Very hard to see if people are crossing up there especially in the evening  | 10/13/2020 6:47 AM  |
| 63 | These are the only MUST-HAVE and I would not limit to just two...SO MANY intersections are hazardous both DAY and NIGHT and we should be encouraging pedestrian traffic (for health and for increased economic benefit) everywhere and at all times!at all times                      | 10/13/2020 5:56 AM  |
| 64 | We definitely need this uptown!!  | 10/13/2020 2:54 AM  |
| 65 | I got these installed in my community in Southern California and found them effective in protecting pedestrians.  | 10/12/2020 9:15 PM  |
| 66 | They are needed at the Mesa Street intersection as well. Many senior citizens use that crosswalk. I personally know of 3 people who have been hit in the intersection.  | 10/11/2020 12:38 PM |
| 67 | Also Gay Street crossing  | 10/9/2020 1:13 PM   |
| 68 | You Strongly need to look at this for Roop and Lassen st. Some of those vehicles are flying up and down that hill and you cannot see pedestrians crossing. I run across because I know drivers are speeding to get up the hill or pass another vehicle before it turns into one lane. | 10/9/2020 11:40 AM  |
| 69 | Should be available at other locations as well  | 10/8/2020 8:39 PM   |
| 70 | What about Laurel st where there is a sharp curve where many pedestrians cross unsafely   | 10/8/2020 8:31 PM   |
| 71 | Also at Gay St.   | 10/8/2020 4:39 PM   |
| 72 | There should also be a warning on the west end townhill for people crossing Main St on Roop   | 10/8/2020 2:48 PM   |

## Q4 Colored concrete banding

Answered: 365 Skipped: 18



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 36.16%    | 132        |
| Agree             | 24.93%    | 91         |
| Neutral           | 17.81%    | 65         |
| Disagree          | 11.78%    | 43         |
| Strongly disagree | 9.32%     | 34         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>365</b> |



## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study


| #  | COMMENTS  | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Costs? This looks expensive, looks great though   | 11/11/2020 11:56 AM |
| 2  | It makes it easier to see, we need more lights on all of Main Street.   | 11/3/2020 2:32 AM   |
| 3  | not cost effective  | 11/1/2020 9:26 AM   |
| 4  | Our uptown has decreased in vehicle and foot traffic dramatically. Virtually no businesses exist. Who are we trying to attract uptown, tourist??  | 11/1/2020 9:15 AM   |
| 5  | this is only good during non snow days, therefore other methods should be used for both seasons. yellow would be a good color, this shown color is just pretty but doesn't say "ped xing"   | 10/31/2020 3:04 PM  |
| 6  | When its sunset or sun rise I have a hard time seeing the white lines, I think the different colors would be helpful.   | 10/26/2020 11:41 AM |
| 7  | Anything to help with sun in the eyes distraction.  | 10/26/2020 8:59 AM  |
| 8  | But not if it's going to cause more construction all summer long  | 10/26/2020 6:24 AM  |
| 9  | This gives both a better apearance and combined with lane plane shows that ped. Maybe crossing st.  | 10/20/2020 9:19 PM  |
| 10 | Increased maintenance costs. Unnecessary expenditure of funds.  | 10/20/2020 7:35 AM  |
| 11 | Looks great and is so safe for pedestrians. Transition from pavement must be engineered for snow plows  | 10/19/2020 5:57 PM  |
| 12 | Pretty but it seems costly. Could possibly get same eye catching with paint.  | 10/17/2020 11:20 PM |
| 13 | With our weather colors will not stay on the pavement. Waste of time can't even keep main st striped  | 10/17/2020 6:33 PM  |
| 14 | I don't see how pretty concrete increases pedestrian safety! If anything it would distract someone who may not be watching for cars cause they are looking at the stamped and colored concrete. And in today's political climate what color would you paint have the concrete be without offending someone? | 10/17/2020 1:48 PM  |
| 15 | Money for this would be better suited for road improvments for high traffic areas such as Weatherlow out to Richmond Road. This road is in bad shaoe and only getting worse.  | 10/17/2020 1:45 PM  |
| 16 | Yes, we need things to slow people down. Tourists and semi drivers alike speed thru town like it's a freeway. It is Not safe for pedestrians or bikes the way we have it currently set-up.  | 10/16/2020 9:14 PM  |
| 17 | if it can be maintained to continually look classy  | 10/16/2020 6:34 PM  |
| 18 | And color bike lanes if included in the final design  | 10/16/2020 4:29 PM  |
| 19 | It would help the pedestrians not be ignored and would feel safer.  | 10/16/2020 1:50 PM  |
| 20 | It would be pretty, but the last time they re-did the sidewalks and ramps it proved very damaging to some of the existing businesses resulting from the lack of immediate access to their buildings   | 10/15/2020 11:39 PM |
| 21 | Will they hold up to extreme weather (snow, ice) and plowing?   | 10/15/2020 8:19 AM  |
| 22 | With a bypass highway, these would last longer and encourage people to walk on crosswalks. Have local artists, like Alison Templeton paint them.  | 10/15/2020 7:07 AM  |
| 23 | colored concrete banding is a distraction and waste of money  | 10/14/2020 9:01 PM  |
| 24 | What happens when the snow plow comes? Then we have bricks all over and having to be replaced every other week?   | 10/14/2020 1:45 PM  |
| 25 | However they do draw more attention to the crosswalks and could improve safety.   | 10/14/2020 11:05 AM |
| 26 | Increased maintenance costs.  | 10/14/2020 9:22 AM  |
| 27 | this shows up under snow?   | 10/14/2020 9:14 AM  |
| 28 | Find funding to enforce the speed limit!!!! THIS WOULD IMPROVE SAFETY THE BEST!   | 10/14/2020 9:12 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                    |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 29 | Needless expense and require much more maintenance. What about snow plowing?  | 10/14/2020 8:41 AM |
| 30 | I like the flashing lights idea better.   | 10/14/2020 8:33 AM |
| 31 | Yes to aesthetic brink, but no to colored concrete as it looks bad after time.  | 10/14/2020 8:25 AM |
| 32 | This has not helped in downtown Reno  | 10/14/2020 5:41 AM |
| 33 | Yes, by all means, lets rip up Main St for another 2 years. Because the bulbout project went SO WELL.   | 10/14/2020 3:54 AM |
| 34 | Funds better spent on crosswalk safety lights   | 10/14/2020 3:45 AM |
| 35 | Naturally slows traffic   | 10/13/2020 9:52 AM |
| 36 | Naturally slows traffic.  | 10/13/2020 9:51 AM |
| 37 | If the "people" did not want this last year why are we bringing it up again and who is paying for it  | 10/13/2020 8:43 AM |
| 38 | I think this type of proposal works better when intersections are not located at 300 foot intervals   | 10/13/2020 7:17 AM |
| 39 | This should be done only after all intersections have flashing lights, then monies should be spent to further increase both safety and appeal | 10/13/2020 5:57 AM |
| 40 | This is beautiful 😊   | 10/13/2020 2:54 AM |
| 41 | Beautiful and safer! Can't wait to see this come to life!   | 10/12/2020 6:58 PM |
| 42 | The snow plow would plow them up and leave a mess   | 10/9/2020 1:14 PM  |
| 43 | These materials don't hold up to snow and gravel in winter. Causes poor appearance and significant maintenance within a few years.            | 10/9/2020 8:46 AM  |
| 44 | Will cause drivers to recognize the cross walks.  | 10/8/2020 5:15 PM  |
| 45 | studded tires erode the 'stamped' brick color   | 10/8/2020 2:50 PM  |

## Q5 Wayfinding Signs

Answered: 361 Skipped: 22



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 39.34%    | 142        |
| Agree             | 29.09%    | 105        |
| Neutral           | 20.22%    | 73         |
| Disagree          | 6.65%     | 24         |
| Strongly disagree | 4.71%     | 17         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>361</b> |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | COMMENTS  | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Definitely needed   | 11/11/2020 11:56 AM |
| 2  | Before these we need to spend money on the beautification of areas to make them appealing to stop at!!  | 11/2/2020 10:49 PM  |
| 3  | only if you can add a layer of plastic for weather and vandalism graffiti and where the trees won't cover them and easy readable for less distraction away from the roadway in a busy town.   | 10/31/2020 3:05 PM  |
| 4  | There should be a single map on main street. If all of the other proposals get passed, people will be driving through slow enough to see a large map and stop & park in an available location and get out to read it. Hopefully, in the meantime, discovering local shops to enter after or instead of reading the map. You want them safe and healthy with the ability to shop & spend money your towns local shops. | 10/27/2020 10:07 AM |
| 5  | I have a lot of people who get lost and ask for directions. Especially for the casino.  | 10/26/2020 11:41 AM |
| 6  | Do we have any now? If we do, do you think people see them already??  | 10/26/2020 6:25 AM  |
| 7  | attractive signs that tell you what to do will not be meaningful addition to our community.   | 10/20/2020 1:28 PM  |
| 8  | Great AND the city has to pass an ordinance to have shop owners remove old (not being used) signs.  | 10/19/2020 5:58 PM  |
| 9  | Need business first to attract  | 10/17/2020 6:37 PM  |
| 10 | Might be ok but most people use the gps on their phones to find places so I don't think it would be a benefit.  | 10/17/2020 1:50 PM  |
| 11 | These signs would be helpful.   | 10/17/2020 1:46 PM  |
| 12 | What destinations would you have? Walmart? Lol  | 10/17/2020 3:45 AM  |
| 13 | This seems pretty cool!   | 10/16/2020 10:07 PM |
| 14 | We don't need signs with google maps. Stop spending tax payers money. I still pay for grants. Crap!   | 10/16/2020 9:51 PM  |
| 15 | Yes, our town needs lots of love.   | 10/16/2020 9:14 PM  |
| 16 | everyone just uses google maps anyway but still classy and appreciated by travelers   | 10/16/2020 6:36 PM  |
| 17 | But make their shape more historic looking than a boxy rectangle  | 10/16/2020 4:30 PM  |
| 18 | There is so much history in this community, it would be great to showcase it and treat it as an important part of our community   | 10/16/2020 1:51 PM  |
| 19 | why - nothing up there to "find"  | 10/15/2020 12:15 PM |
| 20 | As trees grow signage gets obscured. Make sure signage stays unobscured.  | 10/15/2020 8:21 AM  |
| 21 | With a bypass highway, travellers to our city would be able to read them while moving at a slower speed down Main Street  | 10/15/2020 7:08 AM  |
| 22 | Already too many signs on Main Street. Causes a distraction.  | 10/14/2020 9:03 PM  |
| 23 | Whats the difference between reading to many signs on the street or texting on a phone?   | 10/14/2020 6:21 PM  |
| 24 | There's nothing to see here and no decent restaurants for people to eat at.   | 10/14/2020 5:40 PM  |
| 25 | Whats there to point to?  | 10/14/2020 11:49 AM |
| 26 | They do help those finding attractions they might like to visit.  | 10/14/2020 11:07 AM |
| 27 | PURCHASE The Bank of America parking lot! Put an information kiosk next to Main St. Also put an uptown bus stop in the lot for plenty of room and Safety! Dont change the traffic flow on Main St. in the front o   | 10/14/2020 9:22 AM  |
| 28 | Only if other signs are removed and its more concise  | 10/14/2020 9:20 AM  |
| 29 | And, make them more eye appealing with similar "sculpture" works.   | 10/14/2020 8:42 AM  |
| 30 | Only to make the area more appealing. Susanville lacks the real need for these signs as we do   | 10/14/2020 8:26 AM  |


## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

not have many places to go, but they would look nice.

|    |  |                    |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 31 | Nothing like signs to read instead of looking at the road  | 10/14/2020 7:34 AM |
| 32 | With every phone having a navigation system, people are more than likely to use that   | 10/14/2020 5:43 AM |
| 33 | This town is not a tourist destination. why would anyone stop to explore when the first sight theyre presented with is the crack housing on the right side of the hill, and the empty, janky storefronts?                                    | 10/14/2020 3:58 AM |
| 34 | This has been discussed for year's and the answer is alway "we dont have money" or "Cal Trans does not want extra signs"   | 10/13/2020 8:45 AM |
| 35 | If you also eliminate all the other types of signage. East bound traffic coming up to Weatherlow have a hard time reading all the signs  | 10/13/2020 7:19 AM |
| 36 | Very convenient! We have lots of Travelers working at the hospital or prisons who want to explore the area and this could encourage people to stay and live here and we won't be short staffed as much!                                      | 10/13/2020 2:55 AM |
| 37 | Needed so badly! I'm a professional designer and personally I don't love this particular design above, but just having wayfinding signage is better than nothing. Some of the signs from the actual plan were much more pleasing to the eye. | 10/12/2020 7:14 PM |
| 38 | Yep! these are cool signs, are the merchants going to pay to have their name added to it?  | 10/9/2020 11:41 AM |
| 39 | Your Chamber of Commerce arrow is pointing the wrong way   | 10/9/2020 8:47 AM  |
| 40 | For the Bizz and Ranch Park  | 10/8/2020 8:33 PM  |
| 41 | Not my first priority if funding was tight   | 10/8/2020 8:15 PM  |
| 42 | Need to allow Main Street to be aesthetically pleasing.  | 10/8/2020 5:17 PM  |
| 43 | there are already too many CALTRANS signs  | 10/8/2020 2:51 PM  |

## Q6 Street Lighting

Answered: 361 Skipped: 22



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 52.63%    | 190        |
| Agree             | 32.13%    | 116        |
| Neutral           | 10.25%    | 37         |
| Disagree          | 3.32%     | 12         |
| Strongly disagree | 1.66%     | 6          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>361</b> |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | WHERE ALONG MAIN STREET BETWEEN ROOP STREET AND RIVERSIDE DRIVE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE ADDITIONAL STREET LIGHTING?   | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Cost may hinder this, good street lights highly needed  | 11/11/2020 11:57 AM |
| 2  | There is adequate lighting through Main Street. Please bring lighting to other parts of town like the park and down weatherlow  | 11/3/2020 11:06 AM  |
| 3  | Near Burger King and Rite Aid   | 11/3/2020 6:23 AM   |
| 4  | All of Main Street. Dark spots across from Safeway.   | 11/3/2020 2:33 AM   |
| 5  | The entire length of Main Street  | 11/2/2020 10:07 AM  |
| 6  | All of main street especially from Fairfield street to Riverside.   | 11/1/2020 12:20 PM  |
| 7  | lights that don't give off a yellow tinge and that are maintained when needed instead of letting them go out for days. maintained is key  | 10/31/2020 3:09 PM  |
| 8  | Every 100ft   | 10/29/2020 4:13 AM  |
| 9  | Everywhere  | 10/28/2020 10:14 AM |
| 10 | Every block & in front of schools   | 10/27/2020 10:08 AM |
| 11 | current lights are not bright enough on sunny days  | 10/26/2020 3:22 PM  |
| 12 | I would, I always worry I am going to hit someone walking along the road on riverside drive   | 10/26/2020 11:41 AM |
| 13 | Roop st to Weatherlow street  | 10/26/2020 11:23 AM |
| 14 | Uptown; Ash St. intersection; Riverside Park  | 10/26/2020 10:58 AM |
| 15 | All the way down Main   | 10/26/2020 10:47 AM |
| 16 | All of main street. It is always dark along the police station all the way to the riverside dr intersection.  | 10/26/2020 9:51 AM  |
| 17 | Ask in the old subdivisions as well   | 10/26/2020 6:25 AM  |
| 18 | In front of rite aid down to dollar general the entire section is dark hard to see people or deer   | 10/26/2020 5:48 AM  |
| 19 | Anywhere that it is needed  | 10/21/2020 1:49 PM  |
| 20 | At every intersection.  | 10/20/2020 7:35 AM  |
| 21 | Yes. Old fashion lamps would be nice in Uptown  | 10/19/2020 5:59 PM  |
| 22 | All the way down main at intervals  | 10/18/2020 7:48 PM  |
| 23 | Fairfield to Riverside  | 10/17/2020 7:21 PM  |
| 24 | Very concerned about who's gonna pay for the lighting as the city has no money  | 10/17/2020 6:41 PM  |
| 25 | From Grand Street to Walmart intersection   | 10/17/2020 4:31 PM  |
| 26 | Light would be nice but you still need to fund the police and fire first! Still more important than a light.  | 10/17/2020 1:52 PM  |
| 27 | Street lighths should be solar and I think a study would need to be done to determine the best placement for lights.  | 10/17/2020 1:47 PM  |
| 28 | Each corner   | 10/17/2020 12:44 PM |
| 29 | Gay St  | 10/17/2020 8:41 AM  |
| 30 | Towards Panda Express, and also all West from Weatherlow  | 10/17/2020 3:47 AM  |
| 31 | There should be lights at any major pedestrian crossings of course. Lighting at the turn by the Dollar Store. Anywhere there isn't enough light, there should be light. This is far more crucial than lighting our ballparks. | 10/16/2020 9:16 PM  |
| 32 | if it is currently unsafe, agree, but residents whose houses are near main st probably dont need more light shining through their bedroom windows at night  | 10/16/2020 6:37 PM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 33 | From SR 139 to Pine St. Install historic looking lights. Underground ugly utility lines all alone Main St.  | 10/16/2020 4:32 PM  |
| 34 | Between Lassen st and Gay st on Main St   | 10/16/2020 1:52 PM  |
| 35 | Near crossroads   | 10/15/2020 11:40 PM |
| 36 | but it will probably just be destroyed or stolen  | 10/15/2020 12:15 PM |
| 37 | Mid to lower Main.  | 10/15/2020 8:21 AM  |
| 38 | Didnt we already get new lighting for here? Go down some other side streets like Alexander to find lights that are out of date  | 10/15/2020 7:09 AM  |
| 39 | A bit more uptown and then more decorative lighting once you leave the uptown area on down to Riverside Drive   | 10/15/2020 6:07 AM  |
| 40 | Near Mesa Street, Rob Drive   | 10/15/2020 6:04 AM  |
| 41 | Improved street lighting uptown would make the area more inviting and hopefully encourage more business.  | 10/15/2020 2:59 AM  |
| 42 | by Police station   | 10/14/2020 9:06 PM  |
| 43 | Uptown on both side of street   | 10/14/2020 8:39 PM  |
| 44 | All the way down main street  | 10/14/2020 7:41 PM  |
| 45 | Near movie theatre, Tractor Supply and Ross, by the Pioneer,  | 10/14/2020 7:38 PM  |
| 46 | The entire lengh of main down to riverside dr needs new lighting  | 10/14/2020 7:34 PM  |
| 47 | Around the post office uptown.  | 10/14/2020 7:26 PM  |
| 48 | Wherever vagrants hang out.   | 10/14/2020 12:53 PM |
| 49 | anywhere there currently is no lighting   | 10/14/2020 12:07 PM |
| 50 | The curve area of Mesa, Fair drive, Robb's way  | 10/14/2020 11:08 AM |
| 51 | As many as possible   | 10/14/2020 9:55 AM  |
| 52 | It would be great to have as many as possible   | 10/14/2020 9:51 AM  |
| 53 | Do a study and where they are need for safety.  | 10/14/2020 9:24 AM  |
| 54 | At every intersection.  | 10/14/2020 9:23 AM  |
| 55 | Uptown  | 10/14/2020 8:34 AM  |
| 56 | In between Rob's Wy. and Johnstonville Rd. have quite a bit of dark areas. Caltrans would need to insure LMUD replaced bulbs as soon as they are needed.  | 10/14/2020 8:28 AM  |
| 57 | On Ash St all the up to the hospital  | 10/14/2020 5:44 AM  |
| 58 | did we not JUST add lighting within the last 2 years? has that improved anything?   | 10/14/2020 3:59 AM  |
| 59 | All through out that area.  | 10/13/2020 4:24 PM  |
| 60 | All along the area around Les Schwab  | 10/13/2020 8:53 AM  |
| 61 | could we look into just having better light bulbs, not a fan of the classis dim orange  | 10/13/2020 8:46 AM  |
| 62 | It's the style that needs to be revisited. If the city would resolve to a theme style for future installations, that would be nice  | 10/13/2020 7:21 AM  |
| 63 | Gay St, Sacramento, by the police station   | 10/13/2020 6:17 AM  |
| 64 | wherever it is currently darkest. Having lighting that points down instead of throwing light up would also be helpful for pedestrians and increase the feeling of safety while walking at night | 10/13/2020 5:59 AM  |
| 65 | Helps prevent crime and thats always a good thing!  | 10/13/2020 2:56 AM  |
| 66 | All along the sidewalks. My neighborhood near Roop is very dark at night.   | 10/12/2020 9:16 PM  |



## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |  |                     |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 67 | Roop and Lassen, Gay, Small, spring,   | 10/12/2020 9:03 PM  |
| 68 | More decorative lighting with flower hangers in addition to more.  | 10/12/2020 8:50 PM  |
| 69 | I would like to see CUTE street lighting all along this route. I would like it to feel friendly and draw people in to shop, walk, stop and explore. As many darling lights as the budget allows! | 10/12/2020 7:16 PM  |
| 70 | Mesa Street intersection and between Mesa Street and Robs Way  | 10/11/2020 12:39 PM |
| 71 | It would be nice to decorate Main Street   | 10/9/2020 1:15 PM   |
| 72 | Roop st all the way down Main St. and everything in between. Have you been down the side roads at night, can't see anything. Very unsafe.  | 10/9/2020 11:42 AM  |
| 73 | Make sure any lights don't cause light pollution in our skies. We want to see the stars.   | 10/9/2020 8:48 AM   |
| 74 | At least uptown but where ever people are walking and window shopping. Ideally more shops and restaurants will go in   | 10/8/2020 8:36 PM   |
| 75 | Not my first priority  | 10/8/2020 8:15 PM   |
| 76 | Needs to be consistent distancing. We do have some historical lighting that needs to be continued.   | 10/8/2020 5:19 PM   |
| 77 | Everywhere, but decorative   | 10/8/2020 4:30 PM   |

Q7 Portions of sidewalk along Main Street are distressed and cracked. A smooth sidewalk enables a continuous free path of travel for pedestrians and disabled users. Are there particular segments of sidewalk along Main Street which you feel are the most important to fix?

Answered: 124 Skipped: 259

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | RESPONSES   | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | Some are in great need of repairs   | 11/11/2020 11:57 AM |
| 2  | Bowling Alley   | 11/11/2020 5:20 AM  |
| 3  | Unknown   | 11/10/2020 5:38 AM  |
| 4  | All over  | 11/9/2020 6:03 PM   |
| 5  | Uptown.   | 11/9/2020 5:14 PM   |
| 6  | The sidewalks leading to businesses and parallel to main street.  | 11/9/2020 10:31 AM  |
| 7  | Please fix all of them!   | 11/9/2020 10:28 AM  |
| 8  | Yes, all cross walks.   | 11/9/2020 10:23 AM  |
| 9  | It would be nice to see sidewalk added to chestnut and Paul Bunyan and down grand. You guys constantly improve the sidewalks down Main Street and they are fine. Some roads have no sidewalks on either side and are within the city limits.  | 11/3/2020 11:08 AM  |
| 10 | Yes   | 11/3/2020 10:15 AM  |
| 11 | Near Mazatlan Restaurant  | 11/3/2020 6:24 AM   |
| 12 | Where it is needed. If the sidewalk looks like crap or needs repair fix it.   | 11/2/2020 10:08 AM  |
| 13 | From Mesa street to Riverside.  | 11/1/2020 12:21 PM  |
| 14 | Yes, I am thinking of the sidewalk down by where Dr Hlusaks office was.   | 10/31/2020 11:06 PM |
| 15 | Need sidewalks where there aren't any!  | 10/31/2020 7:17 PM  |
| 16 | All of uptown nerts to be fixed.  | 10/31/2020 5:24 PM  |
| 17 | re tree roots that push up the cement, another reason to rethink trees i am a severe tripping hazard and any uneven pavement or sidewalks   | 10/31/2020 3:09 PM  |
| 18 | The entire street.  | 10/29/2020 4:13 AM  |
| 19 | near walmart  | 10/27/2020 3:05 PM  |
| 20 | All of them! Sidewalks should be safe for everyone, always. Unless the city of Susanville enjoys lawsuits?  | 10/27/2020 10:12 AM |
| 21 | North Street please and Park  | 10/27/2020 7:42 AM  |
| 22 | No  | 10/26/2020 3:44 PM  |
| 23 | no comment  | 10/26/2020 3:23 PM  |
| 24 | I can't think of anything that sticks out in particular, I would just say if it broken to repair them.  | 10/26/2020 11:42 AM |
| 25 | All.  | 10/26/2020 9:52 AM  |
| 26 | All of them!  | 10/26/2020 8:59 AM  |
| 27 | Unknown   | 10/26/2020 8:57 AM  |
| 28 | The uptown district to aid in an overall new, fresh, And safe environment. Having Buildings and businesses repaint exteriors would be an excellent idea as well. Focus on making a small area for example, from uptown theater to downtown movie theater, really nice, colored or brick cross walks, well lighted at night, maybe even cameras linked to the Sheriffs office. | 10/26/2020 8:35 AM  |
| 29 | All that need improvement should be repaired for walking safely!  | 10/26/2020 6:56 AM  |
| 30 | No  | 10/26/2020 6:26 AM  |
| 31 | In addition to fixing ALL cracked sidewalks, removal of weeds and grass growing in cracks is vital to remove trip hazards.  | 10/26/2020 6:18 AM  |
| 32 | Do not waist on sidewalks they will take care of them selves when needed.   | 10/20/2020 9:20 PM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |  |                     |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 33 | By Napa, the corner by Walgreens there is a bad rise in the concrete I have tripped on it numerous times walking!  | 10/19/2020 9:48 PM  |
| 34 | Yes. Where it is narrow and there are old landscaping strips between sidewalk and street. These should be spaces to expand width of sidewalk   | 10/19/2020 6:00 PM  |
| 35 | All  | 10/19/2020 4:56 PM  |
| 36 | I think special attention to the vast goat head forests on Main Street is needed. These weeds need to be treated. Fixing cracked sidewalks would help. Areas by little Caesars and on the north side near the fire station.  | 10/18/2020 8:51 PM  |
| 37 | West main from below Sears to upper cinema bldg  | 10/18/2020 5:52 PM  |
| 38 | The City needs to look down both sides of Main Street and repair it all.   | 10/18/2020 7:40 AM  |
| 39 | We have so many vacant businesses. I do wish uptown had nicer sidewalks.   | 10/18/2020 6:10 AM  |
| 40 | Add sidewalk's from riverside to Walmart/ Walgreens  | 10/17/2020 7:23 PM  |
| 41 | Can't really answer these questions till know what \$ is available and the need to prioritize according to safety  | 10/17/2020 6:49 PM  |
| 42 | Not that I am aware of.  | 10/17/2020 1:53 PM  |
| 43 | I think the worse of the areas should be adressed first. Areas that need improvement are wherever there are bulbouts! Those need to go! They are useless!  | 10/17/2020 1:49 PM  |
| 44 | Any and all distressed or cracked or uneven sidewalks  | 10/17/2020 10:11 AM |
| 45 | No   | 10/17/2020 3:47 AM  |
| 46 | I don't walk down main   | 10/16/2020 10:09 PM |
| 47 | Fixing sidewalks is a all year every year project. Public works has a large budget so If it wasn't neglected it wouldn't need to get put to tax payers as a emergency. Didn't the people speak about this striping nonsense with the last mayor and city council. Why are we wasting time and money on this. | 10/16/2020 9:57 PM  |
| 48 | The sidewalks by the intersection of S Lassen and Main st. Any sidewalk that isn't ADA compliant especially because of our weather. The sidewalks around uptown that are lifted and broken because of tree roots etc. Uptown should be a priority for sure.  | 10/16/2020 9:19 PM  |
| 49 | All spaled and cracked   | 10/16/2020 8:14 PM  |
| 50 | Anything that needs replacing should be fixed.   | 10/16/2020 5:59 PM  |
| 51 | Fix all the broken concrete and consider use of colored patterns.  | 10/16/2020 4:33 PM  |
| 52 | In front of the pioneer at 724 main st   | 10/16/2020 1:53 PM  |
| 53 | near the highschool and uptown   | 10/16/2020 12:00 PM |
| 54 | Didn't we just do the darn sidewalks, and they took forever?!  | 10/15/2020 11:41 PM |
| 55 | Between burger King and Dr. Sean Buehler's dental office. Same stretch across the street as well.  | 10/15/2020 7:03 PM  |
| 56 | Yes  | 10/15/2020 5:07 PM  |
| 57 | Sidewalks downtown seem to lack the care the uptown sidewalks get. More people tend to be downtown on a daily basis. From the high school all the way to McDonald's.   | 10/15/2020 4:58 PM  |
| 58 | Anywhere that may limit mobility for wheelchair/scooter users.   | 10/15/2020 2:57 PM  |
| 59 | Roop street!   | 10/15/2020 2:50 PM  |
| 60 | As Needed, but only as NEEDED. . . We should be frugal in our use of taxpayer money in tough times (AKA Covid-19 induced economic distress)  | 10/15/2020 9:30 AM  |
| 61 | Redo all of them to ensure that they are good and perhaps make them wider so that traffic both ways on the sidewalk is comfortable.  | 10/15/2020 9:15 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 62 | Check the whole length. Trees and various factors have impacted different areas.  | 10/15/2020 8:23 AM  |
| 63 | I don't usually walk so unsure  | 10/15/2020 8:18 AM  |
| 64 | All of it needs to be redone. But that would be a moot point without a bypass highway. People already dont walk uptown because the traffic coming down the hill is dangerous. Fix the right hand turn lane on s. Weatherlow. You know what I mean, CalTrans "fixed" it 3 times last summer.   | 10/15/2020 7:11 AM  |
| 65 | From Weatherlow down to Riverside   | 10/15/2020 6:08 AM  |
| 66 | Any and ALL that you can repair, we'll take! There needs to absolutely NO parking along Main Street as well as wider sidewalks. Possible bike lanes would be a nice touch too!  | 10/15/2020 5:03 AM  |
| 67 | On the north side of Main St. between Fairfield and Grand there are some bumpy parts.   | 10/15/2020 3:01 AM  |
| 68 | All   | 10/14/2020 9:13 PM  |
| 69 | Complete an overall inspection and repair or replace all that is needed the entire length of the city.  | 10/14/2020 9:11 PM  |
| 70 | No  | 10/14/2020 9:01 PM  |
| 71 | It seems that there is high correlation between empty buildings and dilapidated sidewalks. West of the high school until Gay street seems in need of attention. Also, I know it isn't Main Street, but River Trail is almost inaccessible to mobility limited people. In addition to fixing sidewalks, they should be maintained, including snow removal in the winter. This usually happens in front of occupied businesses but not so much in front of vacant buildings. Makes for treacherous walking. | 10/14/2020 7:45 PM  |
| 72 | Wont work with our weather patterns the same issues will arise in 3-5 years due to salt and chemical usage on the roads   | 10/14/2020 7:35 PM  |
| 73 | A safe pedestrian crossing by rite aide and Grocery warehouse should be addressed. Most handicapped people can never cross safe before the light turns to no walk. Several were almost hit by 18 wheeler trucks this past summer. Winter snow will make it worse for them. Not enough is being done in this town to protect the safety of handicapped people.   | 10/14/2020 7:29 PM  |
| 74 | Not that I can think of right now...  | 10/14/2020 6:56 PM  |
| 75 | No  | 10/14/2020 5:41 PM  |
| 76 | None that I know of.  | 10/14/2020 2:14 PM  |
| 77 | All of it   | 10/14/2020 1:55 PM  |
| 78 | Any sidewalk that is not smooth is not good. BUT if you add trees all along the sidewalks ..... the risk of distresses, cracked and uneven sidewalks intensifies immensely. Look where there are already trees. Look at those broken sidewalks. And we aren't doing anything with them now. Why would we do better in the future when we haven't shown a history of correcting what we currently have?  | 10/14/2020 1:48 PM  |
| 79 | Only large cracks that cause unlevel segments of sidewalks  | 10/14/2020 1:37 PM  |
| 80 | Wherever needed.  | 10/14/2020 12:54 PM |
| 81 | most  | 10/14/2020 12:39 PM |
| 82 | The first four blocks at the west end of Susanville.  | 10/14/2020 11:15 AM |
| 83 | The south side of Main st. in the area from Robb's way to the turn in at Walmart.   | 10/14/2020 11:11 AM |
| 84 | In front and side of county offices   | 10/14/2020 9:56 AM  |
| 85 | All broken or cracked sidewalks and in front of county office buildings.  | 10/14/2020 9:52 AM  |
| 86 | Only when it creates a safty hazard! My question is WHO IS FOOTING THE BILL?  | 10/14/2020 9:26 AM  |
| 87 | Anywhere the sidewalk is cracked or needs repair.   | 10/14/2020 9:24 AM  |
| 88 | no  | 10/14/2020 9:15 AM  |
| 89 | Adequate sidewalks for those with wheels chairs or strollers should be available throughout   | 10/14/2020 8:54 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study


|     |  |                     |
|-----|--|---------------------|
| 90  | main st.<br>No opinion without walking entire Main Street.   | 10/14/2020 8:43 AM  |
| 91  | If money is left over from sidewalk improvements, look into installing sidewalks from Johnstonville Rd. to Riverside Dr.   | 10/14/2020 8:29 AM  |
| 92  | In front of Grocery Outlet's parking lot   | 10/14/2020 8:24 AM  |
| 93  | Nope don't patronize main street   | 10/14/2020 7:35 AM  |
| 94  | 1. the parts where the trash blows like tumbleweeds. 2. the parts where the homeless junkies pass out. we should make it comfortable for them *eyeroll*  | 10/14/2020 4:02 AM  |
| 95  | North pine street desperately needs side walks. Lots of people walk it to go to inspiration point and it's not safe with cars driving, there needs to be a sidewalk on north pine street.  | 10/13/2020 7:30 PM  |
| 96  | All of Main St. needs to be repaired, or paved.  | 10/13/2020 9:26 AM  |
| 97  | All up town areas should be in great condition to enjoy the area   | 10/13/2020 8:55 AM  |
| 98  | All the sidewalks need repaired. Many of the streets have been narrowed causing trucks with trailers difficulty when maneuvering in and out of corners.  | 10/13/2020 8:55 AM  |
| 99  | Between the High School and IGA is the only sidewalk that gets any heavy use   | 10/13/2020 8:48 AM  |
| 100 | Uptown all the way to The police station   | 10/13/2020 8:36 AM  |
| 101 | Leave Main Street FOUR lanes   | 10/13/2020 7:43 AM  |
| 102 | We just need more sidewalks period.  | 10/13/2020 7:21 AM  |
| 103 | No   | 10/13/2020 7:21 AM  |
| 104 | The most foot trafficked sidewalks I've seen are pretty well maintained right now.   | 10/13/2020 6:26 AM  |
| 105 | I can't think of any   | 10/13/2020 6:18 AM  |
| 106 | anywhere there are bumps which cause a significant height or terrain change from one section to another and can cause falls. it would be easy to mark the sidewalks on a walking journey up one side and down the other of the street; this would be more inclusive than asking for suggestions :) | 10/13/2020 6:01 AM  |
| 107 | All of them  | 10/13/2020 5:46 AM  |
| 108 | Not off hand at the moment   | 10/13/2020 2:57 AM  |
| 109 | The side streets uptown  | 10/13/2020 12:52 AM |
| 110 | All of the broken walks.   | 10/12/2020 9:17 PM  |
| 111 | Uptown   | 10/12/2020 8:38 PM  |
| 112 | As many as the budget allows!  | 10/12/2020 7:17 PM  |
| 113 | I have not seen where they are distressed, no opinion.   | 10/12/2020 4:37 PM  |
| 114 | Uptown - between Weatherlow and Pine Streets. Also midtown - from Russell to McDow streets   | 10/12/2020 12:02 PM |
| 115 | Safe passage between Mesa Street and Walmart is incredibly important to me. There are many seniors who walk to and from Walmart for their shopping. Doing so safely is important.  | 10/11/2020 12:40 PM |
| 116 | Most of the sidewalks have already been replace...   | 10/9/2020 1:16 PM   |
| 117 | Really, we need additional sidewalk repair, didn't they make a big enough mess the first time when the street was dirt and then they had to come redo some of them? How big of an impact is this going to have on the city again? Merchants lost money because customers couldn't park on Main st. | 10/9/2020 11:44 AM  |
| 118 | No, you did a poor job last time. Some corners were jackhammered and redone 3 times  | 10/9/2020 8:49 AM   |
| 119 | Unsure as I haven't walked in it for a while   | 10/8/2020 8:36 PM   |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|                |   |                              |
|----------------|---|------------------------------|
| <del>120</del> | <del>Mostly uptown. In front of Crossroads</del>  | <del>10/8/2020 8:23 PM</del> |
| 121            | There are many areas in all of the Main Street corridor that need to be repaired/replaced. There are many unsafe portions that are tripping hazards, etc. | 10/8/2020 5:22 PM            |
| 122            | Everywhere  | 10/8/2020 4:30 PM            |
| 123            | sections of sidewalk containing landscaped strips, the landscape strip should be filled with concrete because the landscaping is dead and ugly            | 10/8/2020 2:53 PM            |
| 124            | Between Grand Ave and Park St (northside)   | 10/8/2020 2:50 PM            |

## Q8 Lane Reallocation

Answered: 349 Skipped: 34



| ANSWER CHOICES    | RESPONSES |            |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Strongly agree    | 27.79%    | 97         |
| Agree             | 12.03%    | 42         |
| Neutral           | 8.31%     | 29         |
| Disagree          | 11.17%    | 39         |
| Strongly disagree | 40.69%    | 142        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>      |           | <b>349</b> |



## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

| #  | COMMENTS  | DATE                |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 1  | No changes to lanes. This could result in traffic backups and and emergency access problems   | 11/12/2020 9:22 AM  |
| 2  | This has been addressed several times stop wasting time and money on this   | 11/11/2020 12:11 PM |
| 3  | This has been voted on many times   | 11/11/2020 11:58 AM |
| 4  | Both wildfires and Amazon in Reno have created many more large trucks on our Main Street. Someone needs to stand up for our citizens when it comes to these crazy ideas. I've seen large trucks slide down Main Street on ice, our citizens need two lanes to avoid them.   | 11/10/2020 5:50 AM  |
| 5  | Dumb idea   | 11/9/2020 6:04 PM   |
| 6  | How will people who live on North Roop, North Gay and South Lassen get into Main Street...it's a set up for delays for these residents.   | 11/9/2020 5:17 PM   |
| 7  | I was in Phoenix, OR during the fire that completely destroyed 80% of the town. They reduced down the lanes a few years back. It was a disaster during the evacuation. We thought we were going to have to leave our car and try to flee on foot. Please DO NOT reduce the lanes. PLus its a HUGE pain in the rear during the busy parts of the day.  | 11/3/2020 2:35 AM   |
| 8  | I avoid Main street and will continue to do so. It is a circus.   | 11/2/2020 10:10 AM  |
| 9  | Truck traffic in that area will make this a nightmare traffic situation. If there was a way for trucks to go around it may be good  | 11/1/2020 12:04 PM  |
| 10 | we need the extra lane for safety and flow of traffic   | 11/1/2020 9:16 AM   |
| 11 | too many people get impatient with others and pass only to realize they stopped due to a pedestrian crossing. only one lane each area would greatly discourage this. and also allow us to look around more when stopped at a light.   | 10/31/2020 3:12 PM  |
| 12 | Traffic is bad already, reducing lanes will make travel more difficult, increase traffic on side streets and be counter productive to safety.   | 10/29/2020 12:18 PM |
| 13 | It's a highway people!!   | 10/27/2020 10:13 AM |
| 14 | I don't think anyone will support this, they worry about getting stuck behind the big rigs that frequent our town.  | 10/26/2020 11:43 AM |
| 15 | The city has said no several times, so stop this  | 10/26/2020 11:24 AM |
| 16 | Parking is a nightmare and people speed so this would be a good option.   | 10/26/2020 9:01 AM  |
| 17 | Main street should remain 2 lanes each way. Town hill westbound should be restructured to remain 2 lanes, eliminating need for merge when exiting town.   | 10/26/2020 8:40 AM  |
| 18 | It certainly would make pedestrian traffic easier but a nightmare for vehicles/semi coming into town  | 10/26/2020 8:37 AM  |
| 19 | Don't do this. Stupid idea. Think about winter and when the semi trucks get stuck, how are you going to get around them? How about around the high school. There is already a significant amount of traffic and to reduce it to one lane will make that even worse! Where are we supposed to park for those businesses??? Why is this idea being revisited? I thought it was turned down. Show the town your proof of how many accidents have happened in this area. Not enough to do this. | 10/26/2020 6:30 AM  |
| 20 | Should have been done when the paving project was completed. Think of everyone's needs, not the few who complain.   | 10/26/2020 6:21 AM  |
| 21 | And lower speed limits to 15 mph that way people see different businesses and have a chance to stop and frequent them   | 10/21/2020 1:51 PM  |
| 22 | This WILL slow traffic TRUCKS and allow safe crossing for ped.  | 10/20/2020 9:20 PM  |
| 23 | lets reduce the number of travel lanes on congested main st. . thats sounds great. used to be only summer travelers but now its all year by all mean. lets make it worse.   | 10/20/2020 1:31 PM  |
| 24 | Reducing 4 lanes of traffic into 2 increases congestion causing safety issues.  | 10/20/2020 7:37 AM  |
| 25 | No!! It's way to dangerous to ride a bike on main and to put traffic down to one lane and than  | 10/19/2020 9:50 PM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

where do they go when they get down by the high school???

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 26 | Absolutely! And it slows traffic which helps drivers to park and shop. People are now driving 10 mph over the speed limit. We need to slow them down!   | 10/19/2020 6:02 PM  |
| 27 | This is the most critical need. It's is the most reasonable and cost effective solution. All designs should include this.   | 10/18/2020 8:52 PM  |
| 28 | Will deliver a death blow to uptown   | 10/18/2020 7:50 PM  |
| 29 | This idea is horrible! There are many reasons: snow removal, big trucks unable to break coming into town with no lane to divert into, congestion for our residents attempting to get on Main Street uptown, etc...  | 10/18/2020 7:43 AM  |
| 30 | We are not a strong biking community, but this is an opportunity space.   | 10/18/2020 6:12 AM  |
| 31 | Bike lanes vs parking.  | 10/17/2020 7:57 PM  |
| 32 | If you had attended the meetings you would know the majority doesn't want this. Why the hell is this being addressed again?   | 10/17/2020 6:51 PM  |
| 33 | Would cause more congestion and accidents on Main not less  | 10/17/2020 1:55 PM  |
| 34 | there are already issues daily where the lanes going out of town reduce to one lane! Also if this means there will be no parking on Main in front of all the business's then this will slowly kill the uptown business's. Main street is already congested as it is and this would make it worse! This will create faster speeds once it goes back into two lanes down Main St. | 10/17/2020 1:54 PM  |
| 35 | Also : hardly anyone rides a bike up and down Main Street. Most smart people use side streets   | 10/16/2020 10:10 PM |
| 36 | You will keep a single lane until the school area. People will want to pass and get around the trucks or slow vehicles. How about buy liDAR and get the streets surveyed so the police can enforce the speed zones.   | 10/16/2020 10:00 PM |
| 37 | Yes, we have to make changes or more people will die. Hopefully this doesn't just push them over to the next street over like they already do. Will there be any deterrents to stop people from speeding down church st I believe it is? This is already an issue...  | 10/16/2020 9:22 PM  |
| 38 | provided that this concept is deemed practical by people who study and implement this sort of thing   | 10/16/2020 6:39 PM  |
| 39 | Please do NOT mess with the street lanes  | 10/16/2020 6:00 PM  |
| 40 | I agree, but extend it all the way to SR 139 and provide a linear strip of trees in the middle.   | 10/16/2020 4:36 PM  |
| 41 | Yes, definitely! I don't feel safe having my kids cross main st roght now because if there is a car stopped for them, the other lane may assume the car is turning and rushes past in the next lane which could injure a pedestrian   | 10/16/2020 1:54 PM  |
| 42 | Shouldn't we bring the lack of parking to this discussion as well?  | 10/15/2020 11:44 PM |
| 43 | Going west, having to follow semis up the hill would be an awful idea, travel would back up.. With travel 2 lanes can even be congested at times. The speed limit needs to be enforced more. Hindrance for speeders is necessary  | 10/15/2020 7:06 PM  |
| 44 | eliminate this chokepoint!  | 10/15/2020 5:24 PM  |
| 45 | I've only been a resident for 8 months, and have almost been struck by moving traffic 3 times as a pedestrian/bicyclist.  | 10/15/2020 2:59 PM  |
| 46 | Motor Vehicle rules of the road already provide for sharing the road. ENFORCEMENT of existing law is needed.  | 10/15/2020 12:44 PM |
| 47 | no no no no   | 10/15/2020 12:17 PM |
| 48 | I get the point, but because the high school is on Main Street it will make it VERY congested.  | 10/15/2020 9:17 AM  |
| 49 | Adequate parking is an issue as well as traffic flow.   | 10/15/2020 8:25 AM  |
| 50 | It will create a bottleneck. Most accidents don't happen there. They are further down. Only semis going to fast have accidents there. If it goes down a lane you will have people racing to   | 10/15/2020 8:20 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 51 | get ahead of each other.<br>Once again, this would only work if you put in a bypass highway. The semis going through town are a hazard and a real danger. People dont walk uptown because of 2 things. No stores, dangerous streets, means no reason to linger uptown.  | 10/15/2020 7:12 AM  |
| 52 | Puts kids at risk, traffic speeds up when a second lane is available, availability happens right before a school zone. Dangerous, bad idea  | 10/15/2020 6:47 AM  |
| 53 | This area is congested enough, confusing enough and has had enough issues with the truck crashes coming into town. We do not need lane restrictions and more construction. Focus money on beautification and not on lane restrictions.  | 10/15/2020 6:09 AM  |
| 54 | Would there be a marked bike lane?  | 10/15/2020 3:03 AM  |
| 55 | it's not permanent, worth a try   | 10/14/2020 10:10 PM |
| 56 | I know there has been a lot of pushback on this idea but being someone who has lived in another small town that implemented this idea and saw a major increase in downtown foot traffic, I strongly support this idea. I also do not feel safe crossing Main Street uptown with my children given the current two lane set up.  | 10/14/2020 9:51 PM  |
| 57 | One lane in each direction would definitely be beneficial and have limited impacts on traffic flow. I've never observed a situation where two lanes in the same direction are necessary. I'm glad to see this alternative being brought up again.   | 10/14/2020 9:16 PM  |
| 58 | the stream of traffic will be overwhelming. The one lane we have now heading out of town from Gay to Roop Street is already dangerous. No way! the last questions want an order from 1-8. they are all not important to spend funds.  | 10/14/2020 9:15 PM  |
| 59 | I agree with the concept of lane reallocation, but wonder if it wouldn't cause major backed up traffic.   | 10/14/2020 7:47 PM  |
| 60 | This is a tough one. There can be so much traffic on Main Street because of the high school and parents all driving to get to work and kids to elementary school. I think it will back up traffic and really make things frustrating. I feel the biggest and most important thing is to have flashing lights at all crosswalks, bright reflectors at all crosswalks with lights flashing. | 10/14/2020 7:42 PM  |
| 61 | This was voted on Twice not to change anything stop wasting taxpayers time and money  | 10/14/2020 7:36 PM  |
| 62 | I think single lanes will create more road rage and therefore a more dangerous area.  | 10/14/2020 6:34 PM  |
| 63 | I disagree with the above mentioned theory. Infact I thing the opposite will happen.  | 10/14/2020 1:48 PM  |
| 64 | One lane in each direction will cause terrible congestion and rear end accidents. Planning a bypass route south of Main Street should start now as it may take many years to complete. Make the uptown area like Truckee, California if you want uptown to survive.   | 10/14/2020 12:59 PM |
| 65 | This does not provide sped control for trucks on icy roads. This is a potential liability. People have said no to this many times.  | 10/14/2020 12:41 PM |
| 66 | It could help slow the speeding along this area and make it more safe.  | 10/14/2020 11:12 AM |
| 67 | WAKE UP PEOPLE!!!! This would create more safety issues for Everyone especially in front of the high school!  | 10/14/2020 9:29 AM  |
| 68 | this would cause congestion.  | 10/14/2020 9:25 AM  |
| 69 | Whenever I travel through town, this doesn't seem to be a problem now. We don't like alotnof bike traffic as it is.   | 10/14/2020 8:55 AM  |
| 70 | Need to address Highway 36 bypass south of Susanville before this concept can be implemented. Through bound truck traffic would cause problems!   | 10/14/2020 8:46 AM  |
| 71 | These areas become congested during the day with the current striping pattern. Construction equipment and semitrucks may pose higher risk with reduced lanes.   | 10/14/2020 8:32 AM  |
| 72 | To much traffic for two lanes   | 10/14/2020 7:37 AM  |
| 73 | Voted down twice, move on!  | 10/14/2020 6:08 AM  |
| 74 | Seeing how this has been done on Virginia St in Reno, I think it's a horrible idea. The ADA   | 10/14/2020 5:46 AM  |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study


|    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 75 | curbs make the street smaller, and people don't use the crossing areas.<br>stop. stop. STOP. zThe town has resoundly said NO for the last 2 or 3 years. NO!   | 10/14/2020 4:03 AM  |
| 76 | No lane reallocation this has been voted down twice by City council with public notice meetings   | 10/14/2020 3:46 AM  |
| 77 | It is still a highway. Getting stuck behind a truck is a nightmare. I absolutely disagree with this idea. Keep Main Street two (2) lanes in each direction.   | 10/13/2020 8:25 PM  |
| 78 | My only concern is when it snows. Sometimes traveling uptown gets icy and scary. One lane is a risk.  | 10/13/2020 7:31 PM  |
| 79 | This would cause traffic jams in the uptown area. There have been many occasions when traffic is stopped exiting town put with 4 lanes local traffic still has the ability to move. Two lanes would bring everything to a halt. I recently was behind an antique vehicle traveling at 5 MPH but with 2 lanes in the western direction traffic was able to go around this vehicle. With only one lane the traffic, including many semi-trucks, would have been backed up for several blocks.   | 10/13/2020 4:50 PM  |
| 80 | This would make traffic infuriating for visitors and locals. There is nowhere near enough bicycle traffic to justify restriping.  | 10/13/2020 3:46 PM  |
| 81 | I support this change but i think it would cause a huge stink. If this were to take place it would be nice to know that it could be undone. I know that before the current striping Caltrans was willing to try it and change it back if it didnt work as predicted. Its hard to guess what outcome this change would have.   | 10/13/2020 10:26 AM |
| 82 | Seasonal travelers with camp haulers and semi-trucks would bottleneck this area. Speed humps or speed tables would rattle vehicles traveling at a high rate of speed. People in this town don't properly use the center turn lanes on the east end of Main St. or on Riverside Dr. currently. This is a terrible idea, adding pedestrian signals and eliminating the parking between Union and Gay Streets would increase the visibility of pedestrians in conjunction with speed tables. Often between Union and Gay Streets are when vehicles increase their speed. | 10/13/2020 9:34 AM  |
| 83 | Unsure how the flow of traffic would be improved. I suggest the stop lights be synchronized prior to lane relocations.  | 10/13/2020 8:56 AM  |
| 84 | Sounds like this should have been done last year when Cal Trans proposed to do it for free  | 10/13/2020 8:51 AM  |
| 85 | Leave Main St. four lanes   | 10/13/2020 7:44 AM  |
| 86 | Since we have so many stoplights, one lane doesn't work very well. I would prefer to see the 2 lanes in each direction with a left turn center lane all the way through town similar to the area between Mesa and Spring. And yes, do away with the on-Street parking if necessary.   | 10/13/2020 7:26 AM  |
| 87 | We also need one near Spirit Gas station because of the blindspot where Cross roads is at.  | 10/13/2020 7:24 AM  |
| 88 | That would be in front of the high school, ridiculous   | 10/13/2020 6:40 AM  |
| 89 | as long as there are turn lanes and traffic flow is not greatly reduced, the benefits will outweigh the difficulties. Increased bike lanes and safety for pedestrians will also increase the appeal for those traveling through   | 10/13/2020 6:03 AM  |
| 90 | Reroute Commercial Truck traffic to an alternate route  | 10/13/2020 5:46 AM  |
| 91 | I absolutely agree with this amazing change and I believe that we should trust the experts suggesting it! It seems like the perfect solution to so many problems and will help the long term goals of tourism uptown! I have talked to many people who also love this concept and will be sharing their opinions soon!  | 10/12/2020 7:18 PM  |
| 92 | I can't tell what this means from the map. But if it's talking about reducing traffic to only one lane in each direction I VERY STRONGLY disagree.  | 10/12/2020 4:40 PM  |
| 93 | It's not enough. Even though it would bug me to sit in traffic longer, I think it needs to be through out the whole town. We have serious pedestrian safety problems.   | 10/11/2020 12:41 PM |
| 94 | You would bottel neck traffic. Dangerous to exit if there is a fire   | 10/9/2020 1:21 PM   |
| 95 | Exiting town to the west (town hill) can be two lanes with small change to striping and relocating center barrier. would eliminate any westbound lane merge requirements.   | 10/9/2020 1:16 PM   |

## Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

|     |  |                    |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 96  | By putting in one lane you think will reduce crashes and lower vehicle speeds? Have you been down Main st. when the high school is out for lunch?? Sorry this is not a smart idea at all. What about the safety concerns. If Susanville were on fire, you are telling me we have to all be in one lane to evacuate! Address the fire evacuation concern first. | 10/9/2020 11:46 AM |
| 97  | NO!!!! This is a terrible idea and will cause an increase in traffic and accidents. Bikes don't ride Main Street, they use the multiple recreational bike trails in the area.  | 10/9/2020 8:51 AM  |
| 98  | It's just paint ...for those having a hard time with this  | 10/8/2020 8:38 PM  |
| 99  | This will help with pedestrian safety very much.   | 10/8/2020 5:23 PM  |
| 100 | This will cause unintentional consequences. For example, congestion of traffic. P  | 10/8/2020 3:45 PM  |
| 101 | Only if combined with CHP actively conducting traffic speed enforcement.   | 10/8/2020 2:54 PM  |

Q9 Of the 8 above mentioned techniques to improve safety and mobility along Main Street, rank in order of importance to you.(1 = most important, 8 = least important)

Answered: 332 Skipped: 51



| Technique                | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      | Total | Avg Rank |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| Lane reallocation        | 14.15% | 2.89%  | 3.54%  | 4.50%  | 4.18%  | 5.14%  | 11.25% | 54.34% | 311   | 2.86     |
| Wayfinding signage       | 3.81%  | 6.67%  | 13.65% | 14.29% | 18.73% | 16.51% | 15.87% | 10.48% | 315   | 3.97     |
| Colored concrete banding | 1.92%  | 15.06% | 11.22% | 19.23% | 14.42% | 19.55% | 13.46% | 5.13%  | 312   | 4.33     |
| Gateway feature          | 18.79% | 8.28%  | 8.92%  | 12.42% | 13.38% | 10.19% | 14.65% | 13.38% | 314   | 4.51     |
| Street trees             | 7.69%  | 15.71% | 13.78% | 11.86% | 14.74% | 15.38% | 16.35% | 4.49%  | 312   | 4.56     |
| Sidewalk repair          | 8.98%  | 12.69% | 16.10% | 16.41% | 15.17% | 11.76% | 13.62% | 5.26%  | 323   | 4.68     |
| Street lighting          | 17.70% | 19.88% | 19.57% | 13.35% | 12.42% | 10.25% | 4.97%  | 1.86%  | 322   | 5.57     |

# Susanville Highway 36 (Main St.) Complete Street and Safe Mobility Study

---

|                  |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |      |
|------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|------|
| Flashing Beacons | 100 | 67 | 46 | 23 | 20 | 25 | 23 | 17 | 321 | 5.85 |
|------------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|------|

*This page intentionally left blank*



## **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

---

### **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

This Appendix contains tables summarizing high, medium, and low priority active transportation projects for both the City of Susanville and Lassen County that were developed based on feedback from stakeholders and public input. Each table contains details about the project types, the facilities being worked on, and the estimated costs.

**Table D-1: Susanville High Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Map ID            | Project Name/Location                              | Project Description  | Project Type | Facility  | Estimated Cost (\$1,000s) |
|-------------------|--|--|--------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| <b>Susanville</b> |  |  |              |           |                           |
| 1                 | Riverside Drive Bike Path                          | Class I facility on the south side of Riverside Dr. from Fruit growers Park to where the Susan River Trail crosses Riverside Drive. Includes pedestrian bridge.  | Bike/ped     | Class I   | \$2,800                   |
| 2                 | Skyline Bike Path Connection to Bizz Johnson Trail | Continuation of Class I facility from Skyline Trail terminus at SR 36 to Bizz Johnson Trail  | Bike/ped     | Class I   | \$1,388                   |
| 3                 | Riverside Skyline/Bizz Connection                  | Class I trail connecting the Riverside Bike Path to the proposed Skyline Extension to the Bizz Johnson Trail   | Bike/ped     | Class I   | \$348                     |
| 4                 | Skyline to Susanville Ranch Park Connection        | Class I/II facility from Skyline Trail terminus along Skyline Rd, Paul Bunyan Logging Rd and Cherry Terrace to Susanville Ranch Park   | Bike         | Class I   | \$690                     |
| 5                 | Paul Bunyan Road                                   | Proposed bike route along Paul Bunyan Road, from Chestnut Street (N) to Derek Drive  | Bike         | Class III | \$30                      |
| 6                 | Paul Bunyan Bicycle Path                           | Class I trail from the intersection of Chestnut and Paul Bunyan north to Skyline Trail   | Bike/ped     | Class I   | \$750                     |
| 7                 | SR 36 Complete Streets Projects                    | A variety of improvements to increase safety and mobility along SR 36 in downtown Susanville. This includes bulbouts, raised pedestrian refuge islands and rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB). A particularly dangerous area is near Mesa St. | Ped          | Various   | Up to \$16,000            |
| 8                 | SR 139 bicycle lanes in Susanville                 | Class I/II facility along SR 139 (Ash) between downtown and the Hospital, also connecting to the college   | Bike/Ped     | Class II  | \$247                     |
| 9                 | Richmond Road                                      | Crosswalk between Bizz Johnson Trail and Depot parking lot   | Ped          | Crosswalk | \$5                       |
| 10                | North Street                                       | Proposed bike route along North Street, from N Roop Street (W) to Ash Street (E).  | Bike         | Class III | \$28                      |
| 11                | Richmond Road Bike Lanes                           | Class III -from Depot to High School Driveway  | Bike         | Class III | \$58                      |

**Table D-2: Lassen County Regional High Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Project Name  | Project Description  | Project Type | Facility | Estimated Cost (\$1,000s) |
|---|--|--------------|----------|---------------------------|
| <b>Lassen County</b>                                    |  |              |          |                           |
| Mooney Road (A 21)                                      | Class II route on Mooney Road between SR 36 and downtown Westwood. Most importantly, between Old Town Road and Ash St. Includes widening of Robbers Creek Bridge | Bike/Ped     | Class II | \$1,000                   |
| Richmond Road from Diamond View School to Johnstonville | Provide Class II facility from Susanville to Johnstonville (currently Class III)   | Bike         | Class II | \$814                     |

**Table D-3: Susanville Medium Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Project Name/Location                  | Project Description   | Project Type | Facility              |
|--|---|--------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Susanville</b>                      |   |              |                       |
| Alexander Avenue                       | Proposed bike route along Alexander Avenue, from Main (NE) to Modoc (SW) streets.   | Bike         | Class III             |
| Cherry Terrace                         | Proposed bike route beginning at the top of Cherry Terrace (Susanville Ranch Park), heading S to N Roop Street, and connecting to Main Street.          | Bike         | Class III             |
| Cherry Terrace Bike/Ped facilities     | Class II bicycle lanes or sidewalk along full length of roadway to connect to Susanville Ranch Park and Meadowview School                               | Bike/Ped     | Class II              |
| Gaps in sidewalk network in Susanville | Fill in gaps in sidewalk network  | Ped          | Sidewalk              |
| Grand Avenue                           | Extend sidewalks along Grand Avenue toward five-way intersection with Chestnut and Paul Bunyan  | Ped          | Sidewalk              |
| Numa Road                              | Proposed bike lane along Numa Road, from Skyline Road (S) up to Spring Ridge Road (N).  | Bike         | Class II              |
| Paul Bunyan Bicycle Path               | Class I trail from the intersection of Chestnut and Paul Bunyan north to Skyline Trail  | Bike/ped     | Class I               |
| Paul Bunyan Rd to Casino Bicycle Lanes | Class II bicycle lane along Paul Bunyan Road from Chestnut to Diamond Mountain Casino   | Bike         | Class II              |
| Riverside Drive Bike Lanes             | Class II bicycle lane from Richmond Road to SR 36   | Bike         | Class II              |
| Skyline Bike Path Access from College  | Provide a paved path behind the college and Banner/Lassen Hospital on roads already cleared of brush between the Skyline North path on Anderson Street. | Bike/ped     | Class II              |
| SR 36 bicycle lanes in Susanville      | Class II bicycle lanes through town   | Bike         | Class II              |
| SR 139                                 | Complete Streets between SR 36 and Chestnut - close gaps in sidewalks, crosswalks, bicycle lanes  | Ped          | Sidewalk<br>Crosswalk |
| SR 36/Main Street                      | Proposed bikeway upgrade--from Class III to Class II--running from S Pine Street (W) and out of town on Hwy. 36.  | Bike         | Class II              |
| Susan River Bike Path Extension        | Continuation of Class I facility from Alexander Road to Richmond Road   | Bike/ped     | Class I               |
| Wayfinding Plan Projects               | Various   | Bike/ped     | Various               |
| Weatherlow Street                      | Proposed bike route along Weatherlow Street, beginning at the Memorial Park (N) and ending at Riverside Drive (S).                                      | Bike         | Class III             |

**Table D-4: Lassen County Regional Medium Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Project Name   | Project Description   | Project Type | Facility  |
|--|---|--------------|-----------|
| <b>Lassen County</b>   |   |              |           |
| Standish-Buntingville (A3)                                       | Widen shoulders   | Bike         | Road      |
| Eagle Lake Road  | Widen shoulders   | Bike/Ped     | Road      |
| SR 299 from Shasta County Line to Modoc County Line              | Bike lane on SR 299 from Shasta County Line to Modoc County Line                      | Bike         | Class II  |
| Center Road/A-27   | Widen shoulders   | Bike/Ped     | Road      |
| SR 36 from Plumas County Line to Jct with US 395 near Janesville | Class II bicycle lanes (Susanville section included in separate table)                | Bike         | Class II  |
| SR 44 from Shasta County Line to SR 36                           | Existing Class III, proposed to become Class II, rom Shasta County line to SR 36      | Bike         | Class II  |
| Janesville Bicycle Path  | Class I bicycle path along Main Street from US 395 to SR 36                           | Bike         | Class I   |
| SR 139 from Susanville to Modoc County Line                      | Bike lane along SR 139 from Susanville City Limit to Modoc County Line                | Bike         | Class II  |
| US 395 Litchfield to Jct SR 36                                   | Bike lane along US 395 between Litchfield and SR 36                                   | Bike         | Class II  |
| US 395 Sierra County Line to Jct SR 36                           | Bike lane from Sierra County line north to the junction with SR 36                    | Bike         | Class II  |
| Westwood   | Sidewalks   | Ped          | Sidewalks |
| Westwood to Clear Creek  | Class II/III bicycle lanes between Westwood and Clear Creek along 3rd St/A 21 and 147 | Bike         | Class III |
| Westwood SR 36 and A 21  | Pedestrian crossing at intersection   | Ped          | Crosswalk |

**Table D-5: Susanville Low Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Project Name/Location                      | Project Description  | Project Type | Facility  |
|--|--|--------------|-----------|
| <b>Susanville</b>                          |  |              |           |
| Alexander Avenue                           | Proposed bike route along Alexander Avenue, from Main (NE) to Modoc (SW) streets.  | Bike         | Class III |
| Cherry Terrace                             | Proposed bike route beginning at the top of Cherry Terrace (Susanville Ranch Park), heading S to N Roop Street, and connecting to Main Street. | Bike         | Class III |
| Cherry Terrace Bike/Ped facilities         | Class II bicycle lanes or sidewalk along full length of roadway to connect to Susanville Ranch Park and Meadowview School                      | Bike/Ped     | Class II  |
| Gaps in sidewalk network in Susanville     | Fill in gaps in sidewalk network   | Ped          | Sidewalk  |
| Grand Avenue                               | Extend sidewalks along Grand Avenue toward five-way intersection with Chestnut and Paul Bunyan   | Ped          | Sidewalk  |
| Numa Road                                  | Proposed bike lane along Numa Road, from Skyline Road (S) up to Spring Ridge Road (N).   | Bike         | Class II  |
| Paul Bunyan Bicycle Path                   | Class I trail from the intersection of Chestnut and Paul Bunyan north to Skyline Trail   | Bike/ped     | Class I   |
| Paul Bunyan Rd to Casino Bicycle Lanes     | Class II bicycle lane along Paul Bunyan Road from Chestnut to Diamond Mountain Casino  | Bike         | Class II  |
| Riverside Drive Bike Lanes                 | Class II bicycle lane from Richmond Road to SR 36  | Bike         | Class II  |
| Spring Ridge Road to Susanville Ranch Park | Class I connector trail from Spring Ridge Rd (near mobile home park) to Susanville Ranch Park  | Bike/ped     | Class I   |
| SR 36 bicycle lanes in Susanville          | Class II bicycle lanes through town  | Bike         | Class II  |
| SR 36/Main Street                          | Proposed bikeway upgrade--from Class III to Class II--running from S Pine Street (W) and out of town on Hwy. 36.                               | Bike         | Class II  |
| Susan River Bike Path Extension            | Continuation of Class I facility from Alexander Road to Richmond Road  | Bike/ped     | Class I   |
| Wayfinding Plan Projects                   | Various  | Bike/ped     | Various   |
| Weatherlow Street                          | Proposed bike route along Weatherlow Street, beginning at the Memorial Park (N) and ending at Riverside Drive (S).                             | Bike         | Class III |

**Table D-6: Lassen County Regional Low Priority Active Transportation Improvement Projects**

| Project Name                           | Project Description   | Project Type | Facility  |
|--|---|--------------|-----------|
| <b>Lassen County</b>                   |   |              |           |
| 139 -Termo-Ravendale                   | Bike route along Termo-Grasshopper Road from SR 139 to US 395, Juniper Ridge Rd to Chicken Ranch Road in Ravendale          | Bike         | Class III |
| Antola Road                            | Proposed bike route along Antola and Fish and Game roads through Wendell  | Bike         | Class III |
| Cheney Creek Road                      | Proposed bike route on Cheney Creek Road, running SW from Diamond View Middle School.                                       | Bike         | Class III |
| Doyle Loop and Constantina Rd          | Proposed bike route running SE on Doyle Loop Rd and Constantina Rd from Doyle back to US 395                                | Bike         | Class III |
| Garnier Road                           | Proposed bike route on Garnier Road, running S from Herlong Access Road to Hwy. 395   | Bike         | Class III |
| Herlong Access Road                    | Proposed bike route on Herlong Access Road, running NE from Hwy. 395 to Herlong   | Bike         | Class III |
| Janesville Grade                       | Proposed bike route on Janesville Grade, running from Hwy. 395 (NE) to Rd28N01  | Bike         | Class III |
| Little Valley Rd Bicycle Route         | Class III bicycle route on Little Valley Road from Little Valley to Shasta County Line                                      | Bike         | Class III |
| Mapes Ln in Standish                   | Proposed bike route along Mapes Lane, running E-W from Standish Buntingville Road to US 395                                 | Bike         | Class III |
| Mooney Road (A 21)                     | Proposed bike route on Mooney Road, running from SR 44 (N) to SR 36 (S)   | Bike         | Class III |
| Nubieber - Foothill Road Bicycle Route | Class III bicycle route near Nubieber on Old Cemetery Route to Foothill Road to 4 Corners Road to Kramer Road               | Bike         | Class III |
| Nubieber - Kramer Road Bicycle Route   | Class III bicycle route on Kramer Road from Nubieber to Modoc County Line   | Bike         | Class III |
| Pumpkin Center Rd                      | Proposed bike route NE of New Bieber, from Susanville Road (N) to the intersection of Thompson and Pumpkin Center roads (S) | Bike         | Class III |
| Susanville Road                        | Proposed bike route NE of New Bieber, from Susanville Road (N) to the intersection of Thompson and Pumpkin Center roads (S) | Bike         | Class III |
| US 395 Likely-to-Litchfield            | Proposed bike lane from Modoc County line (near Likely) to Litchfield   | Bike         | Class II  |

**Table D-7: Lassen County Regional Recreational Trails Projects**

| <b>Project Name</b>                      | <b>Project Description</b>  | <b>Project Type</b> | <b>Facility</b> |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Recreational Trails</b>               |   |                     |                 |
| Modoc Rail Trail                         | Improve Access and Signage  | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Bizz Johnson Trail                       | Extend to Town of Westwood from Mason Station with continued connection to Chester in Plumas County   | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Bizz Johnson Trail                       | Extension of Bizz Johnson Trail to Litchfield and Wendel along old railroad alignment   | Multi-use           | Rail Trail      |
| Mountain Meadows Gateway Trailhead       | Provide trailhead facilities  | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Eagle Lake to Spaulding Trail            | Multi-use trail along east side of Eagle Lake through USFS land from the south side of Eagle Lake north to Spaulding  | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Connection to Almanor Rail Trail         | Obtain an easement from private landowners to grade and gravel Big Springs Road to connect with the Almanor Rail Trail at Clear Creek Junction and Chester. | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Fredonyer Pass                           | Construct an approximately 28-mile, stacked loop trail system at Fredonyer Pass off SR 36 that connects to the Bizz Johnson Trail in two places.            | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Diamond Mountain Trail                   | FS NEPA for 12-mile trail has been completed.   | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Susanville Ranch Master Plan             | Master plan for Susanville Ranch Park   | Plan                | Rec             |
| Mountain Meadows Trail North             | Construct 7.3 mile single track, non-motorized, unpaved trail along north shore of Mountain Meadows Reservoir   | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Delwood St. to Gateway Trailhead         | Pave one-quarter mile section of Delwood St. Provide wayfinding signs on SR 36 at Delwood and on A-21 at Third  | Multi-use           | Rec             |
| Idian Ole Dam Day Use Area Entrance Road | Pave and provide wayfinding signs off SR 147, SR 36 and A-21  | Multi-use           | Rec             |



*Appendix E*

**VIRTUAL WORKSHOP SURVEY SUMMARY**

---

# ONLINE VIRTUAL WORKSHOP SURVEY

## INTRODUCTION


A virtual workshop was developed and launched during early summer 2023 to provide the public with an overview of the RTP planning process and gather input on potential transportation improvement projects throughout Lassen County. An online survey was designed to accompany the virtual workshop and was available on SurveyMonkey. The workshop and the survey were advertised on the LCTC website, at outreach events, and by flyer. The workshop and survey were accessible via web link and QR code. In total, the survey received 12 responses.

## Demographics (Question 1 and 2)

Almost all of the survey respondents were full-time residents of Lassen County, with one being part-time or owning a second home. Over 80 percent of respondents lived in Susanville with one living in Eagle Lakes Stones-Bengard and one living in Johnstonville. One respondent skipped each question.

## Allocation of Transportation Funding (Question 3)

Respondents were asked to allocate \$100 of transportation funding dollars among nine types of transportation improvements. As Figure E1 shows, respondents allocated the highest percentage of money towards maintaining and fixing existing streets and roads (32 percent of total funds allocated), followed by improving and/or expanding sidewalks, crosswalks, and other pedestrian facilities (25 percent



of funds). The least amount of money was spent on roadway improvements which would improve fire safety (1 percent) and adding safety features or devices such as signage, striping, guardrails, etc. (3 percent). One respondent skipped the question.

#### **Comments on Capital Improvement Project Lists (Question 4)**

The survey asked participants to review transportation capital improvement projects identified in the RTP and provide input on whether these projects address transportation related issues within their community. Furthermore, participants were asked to suggest other projects. Suggested projects included finishing Skyline Rd from SR 36 to Alexander Ave and repaving Eagle Lake Rd. A list of comments is included in Attachment A.

#### **Top Priority Road or Intersection (Question 5)**

Respondents were asked to identify the intersection or road that is their top priority for repair. Top priority roads and intersections included Riverside Dr Trail and A3 at Janesville. A list of comments is included in Attachment A.

#### **Additional Comments (Question 6)**

The majority of survey respondents provided additional comments, with the need for bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements being identified by most of the comments. A full list of comments is included in Attachment A.

***Comments on Capital Improvement Project Lists***

"1. CR A-1 from SR 36 to Spalding (add Class 2 bike lane and build a pulloff to the overlook of the Honey Lake Valley). 2. Richmond Road from Diamond View School to SR 36/395 (add Class 2 bike lane). 3. Gold Run Rd from Richmond Rd to end of pavement (add Class 2 bike lane). 4. Wingfield Road from Richmond Rd to Janesville Main St. (re-grade the unpaved section with packed, crushed road base for bicycle travel. Or pave that section). 5. A-21 from Ash St. in Westwood to Mason Station Trailhead off A-21 (add Class 2 bike lane to the Bizz Johnson Trail). 6. Delwood St in Westwood (pave to the end of the road to the Gateway Trailhead and local business). 7. Indian Ole Dam Rd from CR-21 to the dam (pave the road and provide a small 5-6 car parking area at the CR-21 intersection to provide parking for winter use by skiers, snowshoers, snowmobilers). 8. A-21 from SR 36 going north just beyond the county maintenance shed (construct a small, 5-6 vehicle parking area for winter sports activities when A-21 is not plowed to the Swain Mountain staging area). 9. A-21 in Westwood (replace the Robbers Creek bridge to provide a bike lane.)"

"Eagle Lake Road needs to be repaved the entire length."

"Signage as addressed in the Vehicular Wayfinding Plan"

"Business Growth Advertising Lassen County"

"Modoc St."

"Finishing Skyline Road from SR 36 to Alexander Ave is no longer on the project list for Susanville. This is a huge oversight as this connection would help out the south Susanville residents. This could have been a safer evacuation route for anything threatening the southern part of town. Also curb, gutter, and sidewalks in Susanville should be uniform and installed everywhere to increase pedestrian safety."

"I would love to see bus transportation provided on Sat/Sun to the South County schedule during the months of late Sept to early November to service the employees living in employer provided housing at Sierra Cascade Nursery during their peak season. This might add quite a bit of revenue during this time as we house approx. 200 employees at this site during this time and they rely on company transportation to town on Sundays."

"No the list does not identify the need to maintain, reconstruct or overlay neighborhood roads, especially need to give attention to roadways and roadway shoulders that receive damage from county snow removal equipment."

***Top Priority Road or Intersection***

"Gold crest lane"

"Construct a 4-way cross + intersection at SR 36 and A-21 north of Westwood (eliminate the A-21 right turn lane)."

"Eagle Lake Road"

“395 additional passing lanes”

“A3 at Janesville”

“Janesville Main St. and Highway 395”

“Riverside Dr trail”

“The old Paul Bunyan Logging Road between Cherry Terrace and Paiute Lane. After speaking with the City I learned that the County maintained ownership of this segment. The road just keep deteriorating and the ditch is a concern too. Can the county give this land to the City or can the County fix this road to maintain our housing prices.”

“I would add a crosswalk only signal at Gay St. and Main St. You cannot see the crosswalk until you're upon it, especially if the sun is in your eyes. It's extremely dangerous. Some small towns have orange crossing flags available at each side of the street so they can be seen to safely cross.”

“Fix: eliminate the speed trap 35 MPH speed limit on Richmond Road. Fix Rice Canyon Road to be asphalt to the Sierra Sportsman Shooting range. Make Rice Canyon Road and OHV route. New: I would like to see the final leg of Skyline road completed.”

### ***Additional Comments***

“Lassen County is eligible for Federal Land Access Program funds particularly for Eagle Lake Road. Why is the county not pursuing this funding source?”

“I would love to see continuous sidewalks in Susanville at least on one side of the road and appropriate lighting.”

“44 could use some passing lanes too”

“Please make walking/bicycling safe for everyone.”

“The Skyline Road and Johnstonville Road signal light needs some attention. I watch it just cycle through like the sensors are not working, often time turning green when no cars are waiting.”

“Allow outdoor sidewalk seating in Uptown Susanville. This would be a HUGE draw for residents and travelers to stop in our historic uptown.”

“Continue to maintain and make better Susanville Ranch Park Trails and continue to build new single-track trails to connect into Bizz Johnson and Susanville Ranch, and to connect to Eagle Lake to Susanville Ranch.”

“Add ped cross walk to Main Street between Fairfield and Old Johnstonville rd.”