

Appendix C: Workshop Attendance, Polling and Whiteboard Results

Last Chance Grade Permanent Restoration Project Alternatives Analysis Methodology – Workshop #2 Record of Working Group Invitations and Attendance

Cultural Resources Working Group Monday, March 1, 2021, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Stakeholders	
<p><u>California State Parks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Colins, Cultural Resources Program Manager, North Coast Redwoods District <p><u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dale Miller, Chairman • Crista Stewart, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) • Richard Warner, Vice-Chairman, Transportation <p><u>National Park Service / Redwood National & State Parks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Grantham, Chief, Resource Management and Science • Kevin McCardle, Historical Landscape Architect • Saylor Moss, Chief of Planning and Compliance <p><u>Resighini Rancheria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathy Dowd, THPO, Councilperson • Megan Van Pelt, Executive Director <p><u>Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leann Babcock, Chair • Amanda O'Connell, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) <p><u>Tolowa Nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charlene Storr, North Coast Director 	<p><u>California State Parks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amber Barton, Associate State Archaeologist <p><u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kevin Mealue, Cultural Resource Specialist (Att. 3/3) <p><u>Resighini Rancheria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shaunna McCovey, Director of Natural Resources & Governmental Affairs <p><u>Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Levy, Cultural Resource Specialist • Marvin Richards, Senior Tribal Council <p><u>Tolowa Nation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Max Keyes, Chairman • Raja Storr <p><u>Yurok Tribe</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don Barnes, Director, Office of Self-Governance • Rosie Clayburn, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) • Grant Klopmeier, Transportation Planner • Brandi Natt, Transportation (no longer works for Yurok Tribe) • Samantha Reid, Cultural Resource Specialist
Project Staff	
<p><u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven Croteau, Senior Environmental Planner, North Region Environmental • Tim Keefe, Senior Environmental Planner • Alexis Kelso, Project Planning Liaison • Jaime Matteoli, Last Chance Grade Project Manager • Whitney Petrey, District 1 Native American Coordinator, North Region • Stacey Zolnoski, Associate Environmental Planner / Archaeologist <p><u>Project Team (Consultants)</u></p> <p><u>HNTB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dina Potter, Project Manager • John Litzinger, Group Director / Senior Project Manager <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Cook, Environmental Planning Principal <p><u>MIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Chaplick, Public Engagement Manager • Maria Mayer, Senior Project Associate 	<p><u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sara Atchley-Thomas, District Native American Liaison • Alexandra Thiel, Environmental Planning, Biologist (Att. 3/2) <p><u>Project Team (Consultants)</u></p> <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Lilienbecker, Environmental Manager <p><u>Area West Environmental</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimee Dour-Smith (Att. 3/2)

Biological Resources Working Group Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Stakeholders	
<u>California Coastal Commission</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tamara Gedik, Coastal Program Analyst • Amber Leavitt, Transportation Program Analyst • Bob Merrill, North Coast Director <u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lathrop Leonard, Forester I • Keith Slauson, Wildlife Program Leader • Carol Wilson, Environmental Scientist <u>National Park Service / Redwood National and State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leonel Arguello, Chief, Resource Management and Science • Keith Bensen, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Redwood National Park <u>Resighini Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathy Dowd, THPO, Councilperson (Att. 3/1) <u>State Water Resources Control Board</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Stewart, North Coast Regional Water Control Board <u>US Army Corps of Engineers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daniel B. Breen, Senior Regulatory Project Manager <u>US Environmental Protection Agency</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carolyn Mulvihill, NEPA Reviewer - Transportation <u>US Fish and Wildlife Service</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gregory Schmidt, Fish and Wildlife Biologist 	<u>California Coastal Commission</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tami Grove, Transportation Program Manager <u>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Olson, Senior Environmental Scientist, Coastal Conservation Planning <u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Bjelajac, District Superintendent II (Att. 3/3 & 3/4) • Shannon Dempsey, North Coast Redwoods District • Amber Transou, Environmental Scientist - North Coast Redwoods District • Brett Silver, District Superintendent I <u>County of Del Norte</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taylor Carsley, Planner <u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crista Stewart, THPO (Att. 3/1) • Kevin Mealue, Cultural Resource Specialist (Att. 3/3) <u>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dan Free, Fisheries Biologist • Jeffrey Jahn, Branch Chief, West Coast Regional Office • Mike Kelly, Fisheries Biologist <u>National Park Service</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Best, GIS Coordinator, Redwood National Park <u>National Park Service / Redwood National and State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Roemer, Deputy Superintendent (Att. 3/3 & 3/4) <u>Resighini Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brad Norman, Wetlands Coordinator • Megan Van Pelt, Executive Director (Att. 3/1 & 3/4) • Erika Partee, Natural Resources Director • Karin Levy, Cultural Resource Specialist <u>US Army Corps of Engineers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarah M. Firestone • L.K. Sirkin, Lead Biologist <u>US Environmental Protection Agency</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Siu, Wetlands Section <u>Yurok Tribe</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris West, Senior Wildlife Biologist • Dave Hillemeier, Director, Fisheries Department • Joseph James, Chairman • Louisa McCovey, Environmental Director • Matthew Hanington, Water Division Manager • Richard Nelson, Director, Watershed Restoration • Rosie Clayburn, THPO • Suzanne Fluharty, Division Manager, Community and Ecosystems

Biological Resources Working Group Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Project Staff	
<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex Arevalo, NPDES Storm Water Coordinator • Steven Croteau, Senior Environmental Planner, North Region Environmental • Kellie Eldridge, Environmental Planner • Stephanie Frederickson, Senior Resource Specialist • Alexis Kelso, Project Planning Liaison • Jaime Matteoli, Last Chance Grade Project Manager • Alexandra Thiel, Environmental Planning, Biologist <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <p><u>HNTB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dina Potter, Project Manager • John Litzinger, Group Director / Senior Project Manager <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Cook, Environmental Planning Principal <p><u>Area West Environmental</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimee Dour-Smith <p><u>MIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Chaplick, Public Engagement Manager • Maria Mayer, Senior Project Associate 	<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brandon Larsen, Senior Environmental Planner <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Lilienbecker, Environmental Manager

Partner Working Group Wednesday, March 3, 2021, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Stakeholders	
<u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Bejlaiac, District Superintendent II <u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kevin Mealue, Cultural Resource Specialist <u>National Park Service / Redwood National and State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Mietz, Superintendent, Redwood National and State Parks • Dave Roemer, Deputy Superintendent <u>Tolowa Dee-Ni' Nation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zack Chapman, TERO Director 	<u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brett Silver, District Superintendent I <u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crista Stewart, THPO (Att. 3/1) • Richard Warner, Vice-Chairman, Transportation (Att. 3/1) <u>Green Diamond Resource Company</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craig Compton, North Coast Director <u>Resighini Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kathy Dowd, THPO, Councilperson (Att. 3/1) • Moonchay Dowd, Vice-Chairperson, General Assistance Program (GAP) Manager • Megan Van Pelt, Executive Director (Att. 3/1 & 3/4) <u>Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Hoone, Transportation Planning Director • Amanda O'Connell, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) (Att. 3/1) <u>Yurok Tribe</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosie Clayburn, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) • Joseph James, Chairman • Brandi Natt, Transportation (no longer employed by Tribe)
Project Staff	
<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven Croteau, Senior Environmental Planner, North Region Environmental • Alexis Kelso, Project Planning Liaison • Jaime Matteoli, Last Chance Grade Project Manager <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <u>HNTB</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dina Potter, Project Manager • John Litzinger, Group Director / Senior Project Manager <u>ICF</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Cook, Environmental Planning Principal <u>MIG</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Chaplick, Public Engagement Manager • Maria Mayer, Senior Project Associate 	<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sara Atchley-Thomas, District Native American Liaison • Tim Keefe, Senior Environmental Planner (Att. 3/1) • Rebecca Law, Project Management Support <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <u>ICF</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Lilienbecker, Environmental Manager <u>Area West Environmental</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimee Dour-Smith (Att. 3/2)

Huffman Stakeholder Group Thursday, March 4, 2021, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Stakeholders	
<u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victor Bjelajac, District Superintendent II <u>Community Representative</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kurt Stremberg <u>Crescent City</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason Greenough, Mayor <u>Crescent City-Del Norte Chamber of Commerce</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cindy Vosburg, Executive Director <u>Del Norte County Board of Supervisors</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valerie Starkey, Supervisor, 2nd District <u>Del Norte Local Transportation Commission</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gerry Hemmingsen, Commissioner; Del Norte County Board of Supervisors, District 4 <u>EPIC</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom Wheeler, Executive Director <u>Friends of Del Norte</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don Gillespie <u>Green Diamond Resource Company</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Craig Compton, North Coast Director <u>Humboldt County Association of Governments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon Johnson, Council Member, City of Rio Dell <u>Humboldt County Board of Supervisors</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steve Madrone, Supervisor, 5th District <u>Office of Representative Jared Huffman</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ciara Emery, Field Representative • John Driscoll, District Representative <u>Redwood National Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Roemer, Deputy Superintendent <u>Resighini Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Megan Van Pelt, Executive Director 	<u>C. Renner Petroleum</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sabina Renner, CEO / Secretary <u>California Highway Patrol</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lieutenant Larry Depee, Commander <u>California State Parks</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brett Silver, District Superintendent I <u>Elk Valley Rancheria</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richard Warner, Vice-Chairman, Transportation (Att. 3/1) <u>Rumiano Cheese</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gary Smits <u>Save the Redwoods League</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laura Lalemand, Forest Ecologist <u>Yurok Tribe</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph James, Chairman

Huffman Stakeholder Group Thursday, March 4, 2021, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.	
Attended	Invited, Did Not Attend
Project Staff	
<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven Croteau, Senior Environmental Planner, North Region Environmental • Alexis Kelso, Project Planning Liaison • Clayton Malmberg • Jaime Matteoli, Last Chance Grade Project Manager • Charlie Narwold, Chief of Geotechnical Services • Karen Sanders, Transportation Engineer, RE, Emergency LCG Projects • Matt Smith, Design <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <p><u>National Center for Conflict Resolution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joy Keller-Weidman, Senior Program Manager, Huffman Stakeholder Group Facilitator <p><u>HNTB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Litzinger, Group Director / Senior Project Manager <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Cook, Environmental Planning Principal <p><u>MIG</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Chaplick, Public Engagement Manager • Maria Mayer, Senior Project Associate 	<u>Caltrans District 1 Staff</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sebastian Cohen, Construction Management <u>Project Team (Consultants)</u> <p><u>HNTB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dina Potter, Project Manager (attended all other meetings, had conflict on this date) <p><u>ICF</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin Lilienbecker, Environmental Manager <p><u>Area West Environmental</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimee Dour-Smith (Att. 3/2)

Last Chance Grade Working Group Alternatives Analysis Methodology Workshop 2 - Polling Results

What is your level of support for the alternatives assessment process as discussed today?	Highly supportive		Somewhat supportive		Neutral		Somewhat unsupportive		Do not support		Total #
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	
Cultural Resources Working Group	43%	3	14%	1	43%	3	0%	0	0%	0	7
Biological Resources Working Group	82%	9	0%	0	18%	2	0%	0	0%	0	11
LCG Partners	100%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4
Huffman Stakeholder Group	62%	8	31%	4	0%	0	8%	1	0%	0	13

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Cultural Resources Working Group, 3-1-2021
Page 1

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Is X no build or the construction higher up the hill?

Response from Jaime Matteoli: Developed after feasibility study; FHWA requested landslide mitigation

This will improve stability without major change in location

Minor changes in horizontal position of roadway

Potential to retreat toward hill, possibly new retaining walls

Will analyze data to understand if we can remove water

Need time to develop concept

Happy to see that F consistently ranked high

Hoping to discuss cultural resources

Response from JM: More important to have conversation about concerns than use as a metric

Waiting concerns from tribes very heavily, e.g. Wilson Creek

Happy to present and hear concerns at tribal councils

Would like cultural resources documented on map to show how they're being avoided

Show general area, and for tribal council presentations only

I didn't think it was being removed. I thought it was to qualify it as process-based and then use a tiered scale to assess Tribal involvement in that process.

JM: What would tiered scale show - level of involvement?

Response from D1: Showing general significance - plan was not to show as numerical value

Inappropriate for Caltrans to provide values

Previously ranked risk of each location in terms of closeness to site and risk of impacting it

Haven't assessed many factors with cultural resources

Cultural resources working group will get more details for own assessment

Okay, because the other tiered scale assessments are actually based on quantifiable measures then? Am I understanding that right?

Project team responds with footprint maps

D1: Footprint map is preliminary; do not have all data

JM: re footprint map - yes, will give more detail

Have varying amounts of data on different areas

Large fill areas may change to structures, making footprint smaller

I agree that assessing the risk rather than "prioritizing" cultural resources is a better way to be productive in this.

(Agreement received from several stakeholders)

Also, thank you for mentioning traditional cultural properties and gathering areas.

The natural resources are significant culturally to the tribes

Natural resources and cultural resources are one in the same for the Tribes.

Although the laws don't define them that way

- however, gathering areas that don't have archaeological deposits in them are still highly significant for the Tribe

Good map, shows what you're been doing, but more in-depth study needed

Parks - no comments

I know for sure that any oak groves will be a concern of mine. If those can somehow be recorded by biological that would be great.

SOD has entered Del Norte County. Keeping oak groves healthy is a priority as acorns are a staple traditional food.

JM: re. "natural and cultural resources being the same"

Assessing natural resources should also cover cultural values for the purposes of this assessment

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Cultural Resources Working Group, 3-1-2021
Page 2

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

D1: Should natural resources then be given more weight?

D1: can we include oak in the trees category? Or was it already included?

Project Team Response: Different types of trees / vegetation included; no separate category for oaks

Tan oaks mostly in coastal scrub, low density

Can we see vegetation metrics on a map?

Project team: Yes, map can be shown; maps showing other metrics are available as well

This map will be important to have at Tribal Council meeting

Could the map be sent before a meeting with council?

Yes if that vegetation map can be emailed out to our CRWG that would be helpful.

Include the alternatives map that shows topography/elevation and/or "scenery" base map.

So they can clearly see where the alternatives are on the landscape.

In addition to cultural and natural resources, Elk Valley will be interested in discussing operational measures as closures, both temporary and intermittent, have had a profound impact to government.

If cultural value of natural resources were integrated, would that increase their value?

ICF: Yes, would increase weight score but it wouldn't change the outcome of ranking for alternatives

Is that true for all the natural resources and not just Redwood? i.e. animals and other plant species?

ICF: True - demonstration provided using scoring table

Changes resultant score of alts but not their ranking; X and F still top 2

The area of impact is much less for X & F than for A; much smaller footprint

In the near future, preferably before Council meeting, can you email out the breakdown of the natural resources metric.

Important to note concerns expressed even though they don't change score

D1: Yes, that data is included in the overall table tracking all metrics

Will be included in overall report

List of specific vegetation concerns passed on to Caltrans biologist and ICF

Rare, threatened or endangered species will be documented

Can't capture every single plant but areas of high density will be documented

Would still like to see, for instance, oak groves recorded regardless of size

Plan on not mapping trees below a certain size

Have a plan to ID as much info as possible given time / funding constraints

Thanks, also helps us give feedback on these assessments

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Cultural Resources Working Group, 3-1-2021
Page 3

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Haven't seen much
info on fauna located
in area

How much has that
been studied or
documented?

Didn't look at entire
spectrum of
resources for alts
analysis

Looked at most
predictive: owl,
marten, murrelet

Will survey for all
animals later in
process

JM response: Have
connectivity measure:
new edge, stream
crossings, etc.

Alt F would be a one-
mile wildlife crossing;
this factor included

ICF: There are elk, but
picking things easily
quantified for this
study

Will definitely assess
all moving forward

When will the
ethnographic
interviews with tribes
occur?

D1: We hope to begin
this spring/summer. We
will be setting up
another focused
meeting soon.

Probably right after
we address
monitoring for
wetland delineation.

Looking at all 7 alts -
pleased w/those
ranking highest, seem
least impact

Concern re. what is
lost when changes
made

Makes it difficult to
share knowledge with
young people if not
easy access to
resources

Resources impacted
by growing
population, etc.

Will weigh in further at
council meetings

JM: ideally council
mtgs near the end of
March - early April

Will bring more info
re. resources to those
meetings

D1: Need to set up
various meetings -
wetland designations,
ethnographic
interviews

Prioritizing all -
council meetings
sooner than later.

Will have biologists
present

I would also suggest making
sure to have overall timeline
of the project - what studies
are currently going on and
which are coming up soon.

Please contact
[specific contacts w/
Tolowa Dee-Ni' Nation
identified]

Need to communicate
what's happening in
each working group
to all

Need communication
at tribal level and info
from all

Ethnographic
meetings need to
happen soon; please
prioritize

JM: considering one
large meeting for final
workshop

Tolowa Dee-Ni' would
appreciate that

Others agree

Facilitator: Any
feedback from those
who are "neutral" in
support of process
discussed today?

NPS is neutral
because a lot of this
discussion weights on
Tribe input.

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Biological Resources Working Group, 3-2-2021
Page 1

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Based on what we talked about in all the different Biological Resources Working Group meetings, this ranking is entirely consistent with what we discussed.

No big surprises here. Good to see the rigorous analysis process laid out so clearly.

How did climate change resiliency figure into these metrics?

Specifically, planning for extreme weather events

ICF: Not expressly considered; didn't come up in previous meetings

Used a narrower band of factors based on information we have

Will be getting more date later

Not a direct factor but indirect factors that speak to it

Jaime: Geotech team considering potential for higher rainfall events and sea level rise

Plays into risk for alternatives on west side of ridge

HNTB: Goes back to geotech factors

Represented although not considered specifically as a separate factor

Based on BRWG meetings, there have been some preliminary studies

Have you summarized that information to help us understand how you're narrowing range of alternatives?

Can you show us how resources have been assessed thus far?

ICF showing how analysis was done in more detail

Master spreadsheet analyzing all metrics based on first round of workshops

Example: Cost to Construct (see slides)

Does any of the scoring take into account the engineering feasibility?

HNTB: Yes, several criteria assessed and compared between alternatives

Not a baseline but comparative approach

X and L are still in landslide areas; F is below landslide

Geology more favorable on east side

Looked at years for time to construct, impact on existing roadway

Amount of cut and fill and where deposited

A variety of engineering factors; includes earthworks, tunnels, walls & bridges

Has it been figured out that Alt F is actually possible, given the geotechnical/driver safety concerns?

HNTB: At this time, it appears feasible; can be built below slip plain of landslides

Once tunnel is in place, it has resiliency vs. earthquakes and other factors

Free from landslides, slip plains, landflows

Continuing to gather geotech info and refine picture

Jaime: X is in infancy for developing scope; need to know more about water and instability

Uncertainty taken into account in geotech analysis

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Biological Resources Working Group, 3-2-2021
Page 2

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Are \$1M of construction costs weighted similarly to \$1M of mitigation?

ICF: Construction and mitigation costs given highest weight

Not estimating \$ yet; based on engineering / environmental experience

Not dollar for dollar; weighted evenly

Jaime: ROW included in cost of mitigation. Didn't separate by higher or lower

The # of acres is related to that as well?

Jaime: Yes, and location

ICF summarizing how natural resources factors affected the analysis

Can we get a copy of these analyses?

Would like a closer look at fragmentation / new edge

Is that mapped out somewhere?

Some edges might be more dangerous / fragmented than others

Jaime: Will provide these analyses once ready

ICF showing series of maps which show edge effects of each alternative

Have you split new edge in parklands vs. Green Diamond?

Yes, maroon color is Green Diamond land

Park land weighted higher than Green Diamond (known to be diminished natural resources)

Those maps are great. This is the first time I've seen a "true" footprint for each route/alternative. Really informative.

How far below the surface is the tunnel in Alt F in relation to forested landscape on surface / roots?

HNTB: assuming a 20 ft. depth as a no-disturb zone

Bored tunnel at least 60 ft. below ground

Under higher land, several 100 ft. underground

Footprint impact area higher at the ends

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Biological Resources Working Group, 3-2-2021
Page 3

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

MIG: Comfort level
with removing G
alternatives from
study?

No decisions today -
wondering if anything is
missing from analysis that
would make you
uncomfortable in removing
them

Getting rid of the G
alternatives seems very
logical to me based on the
analysis and everything
we've discussed in the past.

Asked about degree
to which there is core
scale analysis so far

No issue with honing
the list to be efficient

Coastal development permit
evaluation - will be
important to track level of
analysis done for all
alternatives to track what
went into honing list

Will want to
understand what went
into eliminating alts

Clearly, some are less
desirable; won't just
be Caltrans relying on
this analysis

Must analyze rejected
alts in EIR to clarify to
public why they are no
longer being studied /
considered

Show why selected
alternatives are best

D1: yes, will be a
robust section
explaining this in the
EIR

Will show evidence
why not moving
forward

HNTB: A alts mostly
drop out because
they are long with
significant disposal

Gs perform similar to
As but have geoflow
issues; also in the
middle of park

L creating more
geotech hazard than
X by going into slope

Will also include alts
eliminated in earlier
rounds

Approximately how
many redwood trees
will be removed per
alternative?

D1: showing
estimated tree
removal table

Rough estimates of
numbers of trees
removed by diameter
for each alternative

Took sample data
throughout area;
extrapolated #s
based on acreage

Oldest trees tended
to be smaller
diameter (due to
instability of area)

Not less valuable, but
not what people
typically think of as
old growth

Those areas mostly in
Alternative L - further
up on slope compared
to other alts

For the L alternative -
highest # of old
growth trees to be
removed

Yet it scored low on
the graph. How do
the two relate to each
other?

ICF: L scored poorly.
X and F scored best.

Great graphs (tree
removal chart)

Jaime: Update from
construction team on
ongoing repair work -
about 20-30 small conifers
have come down

Reminder that trees at
risk even with no-
build option

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Biological Resources Working Group, 3-2-2021
Page 4

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Old growth trees are within portion of park considered to be old growth?

D1: yes, that is considered the community type, not largest trees; includes Doug Firs, etc.

Showing vegetation map; negligible effect on A's and G's, none in X, F, L

Trees in parkland mostly alder and coastal scrub; no old growth or mature site compromised on Green Diamond Land

How and where is Caltrans looking at mitigation?

Are you considering lands offsite, etc.?

Would be ideal to see planning for advanced mitigation

Jaime: have thought more about process than mitigation at this point

Need more data to discuss mitigation - will be engaged, complex, and require agreement on what will best mitigate

Need to know more about impacts, then bring people to and keep them at the table

Caltrans preparing a document for work at Red Schoolhouse; possible opportunities for advance mitigation

D1: mitigation top of our priority list; will have group meetings, make sure all is considered

Are you thinking about costs in terms of land acquisition?

Remind us how you're considering that

Jaime: thinking in terms of some land acquisition

Best approach is to work with working groups; go with what is already considered a good idea!

Neutral on poll because I'm just listening and learning at this point

I agree that you could probably drop the G alternatives

Jaime: what do people think of having one big workshop for Round 3? Any concerns?

I like the idea

Yes, a big meeting would be good

Large group meeting sounds good

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Partner Working Group, 3-3-2021
Page 1

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Please explain why
cultural resources
were removed as a
metric

Jaime: The process of
speaking to the tribes
is more important than
assigning our own
value assessment

Need to respect
tribes' assessment of
resource value

The tribes have all
information; we will discuss
further and get feedback
during meetings with tribal
councils

Please review
alignment of Alt X

Jaime: Assuming
retaining walls entire
length - footprint very
similar with minor cuts
into the hill

Map doesn't show
drainage system; will go
toward ocean. Must be
developed

Curious why L and X
weren't more distinct
in analysis.

Specifically with
regards to
operations.

Hoped that L would
offer advantages for
being upslope,
providing more stable
geometry.

Jaime: Geotech team
doesn't see a huge
increase in stability for
Alt L

HNTB: L and X cross
the same landslide;
need more study &
data to differentiate

L has less hill above it
that can come down,
but still lacking data

HNTB: Performance
was similar but
impacts greater for L

Will the planned
geotech work reveal if
you're able to anchor to
something more
stable?

HNTB: yes, it will.
Also, with L, you're
blazing a new trail up
the slope

Will also create more
edges which shows
up in the rankings as
more impact

Is dewatering needed
for both?

After you log, heavy winds
will create blow-overs; have
you considered whether
there will be blow-overs on
new road edges / ridgeline?

Jaime: have not heard
a discussion of that;
will make a note of it

Can we weigh in on
additional or
eliminating
alternatives?

Have we talked to either
cultural or natural
resource depts. from
Yurok or Tolowa Dee-ni'
about these impacts?

The footprint for the A
and G alts overlaps
those lands

Jaime: yes, they are
involved in working
groups

HNTB: We are
proposing that L, A1,
A2 and G2 be
dropped

That will leave X and
F with a tunnel - minor
cut and fill, no need to
go offroad

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Partner Working Group, 3-3-2021
Page 2

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Thanks for previewing the final scene! I'll be interested to hear the things we've learned about F that keeps it in the analysis.

I had previously thought that the tunnel might land on the dropped alternative side.

Curious to hear more about that. Had heard that tunnel performed low

Jaime: tunnel performed well but thought cost was prohibitive; we were also surprised

Cost estimate was lower than tunnel cost for A1

Put it ahead of A1 and G1; cost comparable and mitigation less

Tunnel entrance and exit clearcut zones - what is the extent of that for each alignment?

ICF: reviewed how costs and impacts were weighted to arrive at these results

Suggest that you label the data points more clearly on the chart in the "Cost to Construct" slide

How were the tree removal estimates arrived at - through LIDAR?

D1: Mapped sample plots and extrapolated

ICF: Plan for a more precise tree census; estimation adequate for assessment

Impressive analysis!

D1: Re slight compromise: identifying areas where trees are in slides

versus trees on the other side or in a more stable geologic formation

If the slides continue to move, the trees will shift as well

Jaime: Some trees have come down in current slide

The video of slide damage is a great demonstration

Estimated tree removal graph is clear and very helpful

Again, surprised that L isn't more of a contender

HNTB: It's virgin ground, gain nothing by going farther uphill

L carves through Green Diamond land; A alternatives more in parkland

A alternatives have huge footprint

What about considering impacts on animals?

ICF / D1: showing how natural resource impacts re animals and habitat were considered

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Partner Working Group, 3-3-2021
Page 3

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Is there an "ask"
today?

D1: It is - are you
comfortable with this
methodology now that
you have seen "under
the hood?"

Will come to you w/a
recommendation in
April w/alts to be
eliminated

First want to ensure
you're comfortable

HNTB: How do you
feel about F and X
going forward?

Makes sense after
seeing the analysis;
seems solid, good
process, I feel satisfied

Happy with
eliminating Alternative
L

Like the analysis and
how well it has been
explained

Makes sense to me

Surprises: thought
tunnel would be
priced out and that L
would be closer to X

Comfortable with
results

HNTB: with Huffman
group, should we
show details first?

"Spoiler" at front end
makes it easier to
understand

This are good metrics;
I was also surprised at
results

Understand now that
L is a new footprint

Would like to see
more map detail on
most likely alts;
hillside

Zoom in on details
and structures

Have you considered
emotional reaction
that people will have
to on-alignment alt?

Probably tunnel vs.
current alignment will be
polarizing

Many will object to
current alignment;
tunnel never popular

Think carefully about
how to frame these
results

Explain that there is
more certainty about
stability of tunnel due
to completed and
ongoing studies

Clarify how metrics
are being used to
make decision

Film aerial view with
outline to give better
impression of how
timber, mountain, etc.
will look

Put it on a loop at the
opening of the
meeting

Note: drones not
usually permitted on
state park land

D1: also have 3D
modeling / topo maps
that may help

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Partner Working Group, 3-3-2021
Page 4

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Thinking ahead: what happens to balance extra costs with tunnel option?

How does Caltrans make that choice between X and F?

Jaime: good question. Will need to have clear concept for Alt X

Will have a better model, conceptual design for de-watering and maybe a preliminary design

Will have a much better design and sense of whether we have confidence in it or not

Hopefully can determine within 3 years

If public support, may be able to accept latent risk in an alt that otherwise performs better

F is a big ask when compared with X

Is there any flat land that could be offered as a new state park or other asset for some additional profit?

Jaime: Biggest economic consideration is having a reliable road

There are opportunities for recreational assets; e.g., Devil's Slide trail

Will be considered and discussed

MIG: what else can we do to increase comfort level with a tunnel?

Bridge outside of Eugene on I-5 plays a melody as you cross

Use similar music or sound effects in tunnel to relieve stress / claustrophobia

Art installations also a possibility; turn it into an amenity

Note how it reduces impacts on surface

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Partner Working Group, 3-3-2021
Page 5

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Have you considered
bike lane in tunnel?

There will be a
standard width
shoulder in tunnel

Jaime: what do you
think people will think
of X?

Everyone's pretty
finished with the
existing alignment

Seems like a
neverending process
of repair

Is it sliding because
we keep digging or
just because that's
what it does?

Jaime: That's what it
does

Haven't detected
movement on the east
side; little risk of
reactivating dormant
slides

Curent road is moving
because of water and
weather

Hope to demonstrate
and prove that water is
the issue

The question: can we
address that root
cause?

Tribes seeking
alternative without
devastation to the
environment

Jaime: haven't yet
taken a global
proactive approach to
addressing landslides

Fixing areas one at a
time; have not
previously considered
proactive mitigation

That's the distinction
between current
situation and Alt X

Characterize X as
proactive, holistic,
global, addressing
root causes

And emphasize that it
is a new build!

Hard to get people to
believe you're not just
fixing the existing road

MIG: do you think
there will be a call for
one more alt because
they don't trust X?

Or will analysis
clarify?

Depends on how you
present it. Use
marketing techniques

If you focus on lack of
tree impacts, it will go
over well

Cost savings to be
put back into existing
road

Tolowa tribal council
is very visual; maps
are helpful

Push the alts that are
the top performers
first, those that
perform less well last

Re. people wanting to bring
A alts back online; be
prepared to clarify how
they perform less well as
demonstrated by metrics

Demonstrate that they
provide no more
advantage for the
larger costs and
impacts

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 1

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Thanks, Caltrans, for the work on keeping the road open during the current slides

I want to just express how impressed I am by all of the good work that Caltrans has put into this project. Nice job y'all! ✓

Have the construction costs for Alt F been revised? They were previously very high.

ICF: F still among highest cost alternatives

Construction cost, along with mitigation cost and old growth impacts, weighted most heavily

However, F is lower impact / smaller footprint than most others so it still comes out on top

The alignment for L has changed. Surprised by the # of old growth redwoods.

ICF: showing maps comparing the footprint of alternatives

F has a smaller footprint than several other alts

L will require a large footprint with lots of tree removal, cut & fill

Can moving higher upslope improve geotech stability?

D1 Geotech: the idea was to retreat from coastal erosion

Also get closer to headscarp and stabilize

There is relief in terms of drainage

However, during studies found a lot of large diameter redwoods on the slope - more than expected

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 2

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

How much would it take in time to find out how X would rank given the research needed to compare?

Jaime: will take a couple years.

Will study geotech, ground water and movement

Will have an answer after publication of EIR but prior to choosing final alternative

D1 Geotech:
Environmental and Engineering progressing at the same time

So it will be carried forward along with other alts to be studied to provide more time to study?

Yes, and we'll continue to study until we know whether or not it's feasible

If it proves unfeasible, we'll drop it from consideration

Based on suggestion from FHWA to consider global mitigation approach

Does X require closing roadway during construction?

Jaime: we'd keep the road open but there would be traffic impacts

Down to one lane at times during construction

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 3

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

If X involves dealing with waterflow on that bank - wouldn't that be part of ongoing process now to salvage road bank we have?

Would you start drilling to capture water and steer it away from the road?

If chosen, will you start spending money on mitigating water problems?

Why is this not happening already?

Jaime: good question! Have never been able to do this.

Have not had global, holistic program to study the groundwater

Had to drop rigs in state parks

Have never understood the groundwater

Took 3 years to get the borings in place; now able to study

Can't just drill a hole and try it; will be a very specific, dynamic design

Will take much design, consideration and analysis

D1 Geotech: lowering the groundwater surface elevation within the landslide

Large dewatering system on I-80: entails large diameter shaft

Thousands of feet of horizontal drains - runs on a series of pumps

Once constructed & turned on; no longer any water in landslide.

If proves to be feasible, will be done.

Like pulling a drain while it's draining

Doesn't removing the groundwater effect the erosion of the toe?

Jaime: part of overall mitigation strategy

Studying whether toe erosion is part of the problem

May be part of Alt X, will generate environmental issues; needs to be studied

Geotech: dewatering only effective if we can mitigate landslide depredation

Must partially retreat as well as mitigate erosion

Jaime: move road inland and also retaining walls along entire length of landslide

Doing everything we can to mitigate, will be millions of \$ of mitigation

I would like to get an electronic copy of all of these excellent slides of the analysis of options. Thanks for all the great work.

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 4

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Can you go back to the "Operations" consideration please?

When discussing operations and closures - seems the whole point of project is to deter that

If picking a project that will spend millions of dollars and still have 3-week closures, what's the point?

Understand need to care for natural resources, but trying to make road safer and open for a long period of time

Finding metrics frustrating

Low marks in metrics equate to safety risk

Jaime: same concerns on our mind.

If X is not a safe, reliable roadway, we won't build it, but there is potential it can be.

Disturbed that it's still at the top - many don't think it's a viable option

Understand it's there as a control group

Geotech / ICF: looked at "what if" scenarios

F and X keep coming out on top even if tripling weight of core factors

Same if trees are weighted more heavily

Even weighting all factors equally, they still come out on top

What would need to change to disrupt that dominance?

If operations are weighted twice as high as all other factors, X would drop to fourth after A1 and A2

What is most disturbing?

Eliminating options without knowing if X is feasible

Jaime: studying A alts - such a large footprint that it would have resource impacts

in addition to more cost and time for studies

Want to spend \$10M on analyzing what seem to be more likely solutions

Will be spending some money on design

If we had all money in the world, would study all of them

Transportation dollars are limited

Take the decision very seriously, won't propose anything that won't keep people safe

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 5

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

So are you
advocating a tunnel
or the existing
roadway?

As a newer member to this
group I remember my shock
when I discovered that ALL
THE OPTIONS came with
great disadvantages.

And I remember Jaime
looking at me and
nodding, that yes, the
choices were not good but
were the best we had.

Looks like "what if"
scenarios would
eliminate the G
options

Are you suggesting
road closure be a
"core" item then? Or
weight it more,
perhaps?

ICF: was in the
operations grouping
with weight of 4

Showed X and L
doing very poorly

If included in core
factors and weighted
more heavily - would
add a few points to
total score

Simply moving it to
core factors wouldn't
change results

Giving it a much
higher weight would
change results

When looking at
current alignment - X
would be a significant
change

If you could dewater
and tore up the toe,
would it lower the
risk?

Jaime: likely, but
possible it remains
high risk and then
we'd weigh heavily

Does this include
funding for current
repairs?

Jaime: No, that is
emergency funding
that is completely
separate

Agree with Jaime re
cost / probability of
litigation with many
alts

We're probably looking
at a long tunnel and
needing to get a billion
in funding

Can eliminate a lot of
alts here

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Is X a relatively new suggestion? Or has this been an option all along?

It has been an option for a number of years. L is a newer option.

Interesting point re time to study As and Gs. Do we have data to decide if F is viable?

Jaime: have early data, need more geotech investigation

In design and possibly in current phase

Trying to grasp X; understand why it's being considered

Is X not an alternative route? Is it subject to this process? Can it be evaluated differently?

Question raised by FHWA; have you considered mitigation alternatives?

Would need that if funding

Introduced to this group in 2018 and group agreed

For NEPA/CEQA purposes, X is a new alternative and not the "no build" alternative.

X would effectively be a "new build" of the road, relatively (but not wholly) within the current alignment. Right?

Yes

It is a build alternative; current highway is no-build, all agree not sustainable

ICF: No build is required to be on the table

G options do not look like viable options

If we eliminate "bypass" alts, does that speed up EIR process?

Jaime: if we can do, that can probably deliver EIR one year early

Will help keep us on schedule, although tunnel will take about 7 years to build

MURAL Whiteboard Notes
Huffman Stakeholder Group, 3-4-2021
Page 7

KEY

Comments

Questions

Responses from Jaime
Matteoli, Caltrans
Project Manager

Responses from
Caltrans D1 /
project team

Was surprised that
cost and impacts of F
were not greater

Also surprised that L
didn't score higher

Walking through
analysis makes it
clear that X and F
perform better

Think there's a strong
rationale for focusing
on those two alts

Second that
response; surprised
by old growth impacts
for L

This process helps to
figure real costs

Still don't like A2 but
surprised impacts
were lower than
expected

This has helped
change my mind

Just what this group is
for; thank you
Caltrans

Agreed

Many in group agree
with idea of one large
meeting for Round 3

Jaime: will also be
presenting same
information to tribal
council meetings

This communication
more important than
including cultural
resources as a metric

This group has been
key; dialogue
between different
backgrounds great

Getting down to
manageable # of alts:
great accomplishment

As stakeholders, our
voice is important

Encourage reaching
out to Jaime with
additional concerns

Jaime: would love to
meet one-on-one

D1 Geotech: Any
benefit to sharing
information from other
groups' workshops?

MIG: Cultural resources
group identified what
would be of greatest
value to tribal councils

Many questions going
deeper into metrics,
high level of support
for process

Jaime: stated
importance of
documenting process

Have mostly heard
supportive, a few
neutral

Great work on the
analysis, much
appreciated. Really
helps the decision
making process!

Looking forward to
seeing the presentation
and dialog with the
Resighini Tribal Council
next month.

NCECR: Often lack of
support for process
rests in concern re. an
outcome

Encourage speaking
to Jaime to determine
what was behind that

I sooo appreciate this
presentation. As the
new kid, I am grateful to
have really understood
the information

Thanks everyone for
your time and work