

HSOM

HUMBLE SERVANTS OF
MATTOLE 600 F STREET ST
ARCATA, CA 95521

Email: hsom16@hotmail.com
707-683-6686

☐ Additional
referrals needs
to be sent due
to project being in
Military training
rate(s) *LD 6/22/18*

SUBMITTAL AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Humboldt County Planning Department acknowledges the C-POD unit for cannabis

Permit Application No: 11889

APN: 210-250-020 Date: June 1, 2018

Description of Documents Submitted:

Road Evaluation for Larabee Valley Farms, LLC

County Date Stamp

Notes:
Hand Delivered to Humboldt County
Planning Department



HUMBOLDT COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
ROAD EVALUATION REPORT

PART A: *Part A may be completed by the applicant*

Applicant Name: LARabee Farm, LLC APN: 210-250-020

Planning & Building Department Case/File No.: ZCC16-283

Road Name: STATE Hwy 36 (complete a separate form for each road)

From Road (Cross street): STATE Hwy 36

To Road (Cross street): DRIVEWAY APPROACH

Length of road segment: 34 miles Date Inspected 5/25/18

Road is maintained by: ☐ County ☒ Other STATE
(State, Forest Service, National Park, State Park, BLM, Private, Tribal, etc)

Check one of the following:

Box 1 ☒ The entire road segment is developed to Category 4 road standards (20 feet wide) or better. If checked, then the road is adequate for the proposed use without further review by the applicant.

Box 2 ☐ The entire road segment is developed to the equivalent of a road category 4 standard. If checked, then the road is adequate for the proposed use without further review by the applicant.

An equivalent road category 4 standard is defined as a roadway that is generally 20 feet in width, but has pinch points which narrow the road. Pinch points include, but are not limited to, one-lane bridges, trees, large rock outcroppings, culverts, etc. Pinch points must provide visibility where a driver can see oncoming vehicles through the pinch point which allows the oncoming vehicle to stop and wait in a 20 foot wide section of the road for the other vehicle to pass.

Box 3 ☐ The entire road segment is not developed to the equivalent of road category 4 or better. The road may or may not be able to accommodate the proposed use and further evaluation is necessary. Part B is to be completed by a Civil Engineer licensed by the State of California.

The statements in PART A are true and correct and have been made by me after personally inspecting and measuring the road.

Signature

Date

Name Printed

Steve Doyle



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

Road Name: STATE Hwy 36 Date Inspected: 5/25/18 APN: 210-250-020
From Road: STATE Hwy 36 (PM 0) Planning & Building
To Road: STATE Hwy 36 (PM 34.0) Department Case/File No.: ZCC16-283

1. What is the Average Daily Traffic of the road?

ADT: 540 Date(s) measured: 5/24

Method used to measure ADT: ☐ Counters ☒ Estimated using ITE Trip Generation Book

Is the ADT of the road less than 400? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, then the road is considered very low volume and shall comply with the design standards outlined in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT ≤400)*. Complete sections 2 and 3 below.

If NO, then the road shall be reviewed per the applicable policies for the design of local roads and streets presented in AASHTO policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, commonly known as the Green Book. Complete section 3 below.

2. Identify site specific safety problems with the road that include, but are not limited to: (Refer to Chapter 3 in AASHTO *Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT ≤400)* for guidance.)

A. Pattern of curve related crashes.

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.

B. Physical evidence of curve problems such as skid marks, scarred trees, or scarred utility poles

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.

C. Substantial edge rutting or encroachment.

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.

D. History of complaints from residents or law enforcement.

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes (☐ check if written documentation is attached)

E. Measured or known speed substantially higher than the design speed of the road (20+ MPH higher)

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes.

F. Need for turn-outs.

Check one: ☒ No. ☐ Yes, see attached sheet for PM locations.

3. Conclusions/Recommendations per AASHTO. Check one:

- ☒ The roadway can accommodate increased traffic from the proposed use.
☐ The roadway can accommodate increased traffic from the proposed use if the recommendations on the attached report are done. (☐ check if a *Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan* is also required and is attached.)
☐ The roadway cannot accommodate increased traffic from the proposed use. It is not possible to address increased traffic.

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

Signature of Civil Engineer

Date

5/25/18

(SEAL)



Humboldt County Web GIS

Planning & Building Department

