

ncra.hiedy@sbcglobal.net

From: Uri Driscoll <humboldthorse@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 8:43 AM
To: ncra.hiedy
Cc: Mitch Stogner; Pete Johnston; Richard Marks; steve Madrone
Subject: Re: Cancellation Notice
Attachments: Bay Rail with Trail meeting notes.rtf; Bay Rail Trail inconsistant with policies.rtf; Untitled attachment 00096.txt

Good morning again Hiedy,

Please see attached communications with Humboldt County public works staff on the subject of the Bay trail south project. To date I have not received a reply.
Please include these communications with the board packet for the rescheduled meeting.

Thank you very much

Uri

From: Uri Driscoll <humboldthorse@yahoo.com>
Subject: Bay Rail Trail
Date: December 2, 2020 at 10:30:07 AM PST
To: Hank Seemann <hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Cc: Tom Mattson <tmattson@co.humboldt.ca.us>, "Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov" <Melissa.Kraemer@coastal.ca.gov>, "Mettam, Brad R@DOT" <Brad.Mettam@dot.ca.gov>, "Ward, Leishara@DOT" <leishara.ward@dot.ca.gov>
Bcc: Pete Johnston <petej@sonic.net>, Bruce Seivertson <thabruce43@gmail.com>, Ronald A Fritzsche <ronald.fritzsche@humboldt.edu>, "kentsawatzky@hotmail.com" <kentsawatzky@hotmail.com>

Good Morning Hank,

After our scheduled Bay trail meeting back in October I had provided a summary of our discussion which I presume you have concurred with since I did not receive a response with any corrections.

The 60% design that was submitted by the county to the Coastal Commission included examples of design features incompatible with several established policies and determinations. Those include but are not limited to violations of current NCRA rail with trail policy, inconsistencies with the 2012 agreements for rail with trail features, inconsistencies with the county's funding application identifying the project as a rail with trail project and more recently the report and recommendations related to the SB 10-29 legislation recognizing the importance of maintaining the Bay rail corridor as rail with trail infrastructure. As you are aware there are current proposals for future rail use which the 60% design does not allow.

My question to you is who or what governing body specifically directed you to pursue a design that contradicted the above mentioned policies and recommendations or was the 60% design as presented developed without such direction?

I would like to have this question answered at your earliest convenience so I may better formulate my comments on this project.

Thank you

Uri

From: Uri Driscoll <humboldthorse@yahoo.com>
Subject: Bay Rail with Trail meeting notes
Date: October 6, 2020 at 7:03:21 AM PDT
To: Tom Mattson <tmattson@co.humboldt.ca.us>
Cc: Hank Seemann <hseemann@co.humboldt.ca.us>, rex bohn
<rbohn@co.humboldt.ca.us>, estell fennell <efennell@co.humboldt.ca.us>, virgina bass
<vbass@co.humboldt.ca.us>, steve Madrone <smadrone@co.humboldt.ca.us>

Please see below

Humboldt County Public Works Director Tom Mattson

Tom,

I wanted to take a moment to recap our conversation regarding the Bay Trail South project during a scheduled zoom meeting between myself, Public Works Director Tom Mattson and deputy director Hank Seeman on October 3, 2020. I am submitting this recap into the public record for this project. If there are corrections or clarifications Public works staff would like to make, I will consider them in an edited version of this submittal.

We discussed the Bay Trail South's project goal of rail with trail and how those goals would not be met by the current 60% design provided by Public Works staff. The stated goal of providing for future rail use would be unfulfilled if the design as submitted were followed.

According the provided design the Eureka Slough trestle would have heavy gauge flange fillers installed, which as tested in September 2019, would compromise and in fact, prevent the standing proposal involving rail bikes, other light weight rail vehicles or transportation systems that may be employed in the future. Mr. Seeman suggested that it was the responsibility of a member of the public (myself) to commission and supply engineered plans other than the inappropriate heavy gauge flange fillers designed for freight trains. It was discussed that Rail Runners USA has a widely supported and active proposal with NCRA and that another rail bike company has also inquired about the use of the bay rail for a concession. This indicates a recognized value of alternative rail uses.

It was discussed that utilizing a wooden deck rather than the concrete and flange fillers

design would likely accommodate identified future rail uses. It was discussed that a wooden deck option was indeed described in the approved grant application for the project and is employed successfully in a similar setting in Astoria, Oregon. That information was provided to Public Works staff several months ago.

Also discussed was any removal of tracks along the existing rail corridor would be a problem considering the project goal mentioned above. Removal of any tracks without replacing them as part of the Bay Trail South Rail with Trail project would also be in conflict with current NCRA policies and the 2012 Rail with Trail agreement developed in Humboldt County through a series of public meetings.

Mr. Seeman confirmed the NCRA directors have not been involved in these design discussions nor have the directors made any decisions to dismantle rails or change their current rail with trail policy along this particular right of way. Nor did he indicate the existing 2012 agreement had been voided. It was not explained why a design was being pursued that directly contradicts existing agreements, policies and the project goal itself.

I strongly suggested that in order for the project to move forward and avoid unnecessary delays in the permitting and funding process the above mentioned issues would need to be resolved.

Respectfully submitted to the public record for the Bay Trail South Rail with Trail Project.

Uri Driscoll

10-6-2020