

HUMBoldt COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
ROAD EVALUATION REPORT

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

Applicant Name: Brian Southard APN: 208-241-007,006

Planning & Building Department Case/File No.: 11212 11214

Road Name: Ridge Rd (Mad River) *complete a separate form for each road*

From Road (Cross street): 1.5 miles to Saylor-Mad River Rd

To Road (Cross street): Saylor Mad River Rd 6 miles to Hwy 36

Length of road segment: 1.5 miles Date Inspected: 9-15-18

Road is maintained by:  County  Other Private  
(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

9-15-18  
Date

Brian Southard  
Name Printed

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

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

Road Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Inspected: \_\_\_\_\_ APN: \_\_\_\_\_  
From Road: \_\_\_\_\_ (Post Mile \_\_\_\_\_ ) Planning & Building  
To Road: \_\_\_\_\_ (Post Mile \_\_\_\_\_ ) Department Case/File No.:

1. What is the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of the road (including other known cannabis projects)?

Number of other known cannabis projects included in ADT calculations:  
(Contact the Planning & Building Department for information on other nearby projects.) \_\_\_\_\_

ADT: \_\_\_\_\_ Date(s) measured: \_\_\_\_\_

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 *A 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 Post Mile (PM) locations.

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

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

C. Substantial edge rutting or encroachment.

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

D. History of complaints from residents or law enforcement.

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

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

Check one:  No.  Yes.

F. Need for turn-outs.

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

3. Conclusions/Recommendations per AASHTO. Check one:

The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known cannabis projects identified above.

The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known cannabis projects identified above, 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

HUMBoldt COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS  
ROAD EVALUATION REPORT

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

Applicant Name: Brian Southard APN: 208-241-007, 208241-006

Planning & Building Department Case/File No.: 11212 11214

Road Name: Saylor Mad River Rd (complete a separate form for each road)

From Road (Cross street): 6 miles to Hwy 36

To Road (Cross street): Ridge Rd / Saylor Mad River

Length of road segment: 6 miles miles Date Inspected: 9-15-18

Road is maintained by:  County  Other private  
(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. A map showing the location and limits of the road being evaluated in PART A is attached.

Signature

Date

Name Printed

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

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

Road Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Inspected: \_\_\_\_\_ APN: \_\_\_\_\_  
From Road: \_\_\_\_\_ (Post Mile \_\_\_\_\_ ) Planning & Building  
To Road: \_\_\_\_\_ (Post Mile \_\_\_\_\_ ) Department Case/File No.: \_\_\_\_\_

1. What is the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of the road (including other known cannabis projects)?

Number of other known cannabis projects included in ADT calculations: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Contact the Planning & Building Department for information on other nearby projects.)

ADT: \_\_\_\_\_ Date(s) measured: \_\_\_\_\_

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 *A 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 Post Mile (PM) locations.

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

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

C. Substantial edge rutting or encroachment.

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

D. History of complaints from residents or law enforcement.

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

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

Check one:  No.  Yes.

F. Need for turn-outs.

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

3. Conclusions/Recommendations per AASHTO. Check one:

The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known cannabis projects identified above.

The roadway can accommodate the cumulative increased traffic from this project and all known cannabis projects identified above, 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

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



Photo 1 & 38



Photo 2



Photo 3



Photo 4



Photo 5



Photo 6



Photo 7



Photo 8





Photo 9



Photo 10



Photo 11



Photo 12



Photo 13



Photo 14



Photo 15



Photo 16



Photo 17



Photo 18



Photo 19



Photo 20



Photo 21



Photo 22



Photo 23




Photo 24






Photo 25



Photo 26



Photo 27



Photo 28




Photo 29




Photo 30



Photo 31




Photo 32




Photo 33



Photo 34



Photo 35




Photo 36





Photo 37



Photo 38

# Road Evaluation Overview Map

APN: 208-241-007, 006



Google Earth


© 2018 Google

1 mi



# Road Evaluation Map A

Photo Point 2 through Photo Point 10



# Road Evaluation Map B

Photo Point 10 through Photo Point 17



# Road Evaluation Map C

Photo Point 15 through Photo Point 38

