



# 2019 Tehama County Active Transportation Plan

June 2019



# 2019 Tehama County

## *Active Transportation Plan*

Report Prepared For:



Report Prepared By:



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1	4.2. Bicyclists' General Needs	43
1.1. About the Tehama County Transportation Commission	1	4.3. Pedestrians' General Needs	47
1.2. About the Active Transportation Plan	1	4.4. Trail Users' General Needs	47
1.3. Goals and Objectives	2	4.5. Community-Identified Needs	47
1.4. Benefits of Active Transportation	8	5. Recommended Infrastructure Projects	53
1.5. Planning Process	10	5.1. Project Prioritization Methodology	53
1.6. Community Outreach	10	5.2. Project List	53
2. Setting and Background	12	6. Recommended Programs	55
2.1. Location	12	6.1. Education and Encouragement	55
2.2. Commuting	13	6.2. Enforcement	56
2.3. Population	14	6.3. Evaluation	56
2.4. Socioeconomic Conditions	16	7. Funding	57
2.5. Disadvantaged Communities	18	7.1. Federal	57
3. Existing Conditions	21	7.2. State	57
3.1. Existing Networks	21		
3.2. Existing Gaps and Programmed Projects	29		
3.3. Land Use and Destinations	29		
3.4. Transit	29		
3.5. Collisions	35		
4. Needs Assessment	43		
4.1. Community Outreach Results	43		

## List of Tables

Table 1.1: Tribal Contact List	11
Table 2.1: Vehicle Ownership	13
Table 2.2: Modes of Travel	13
Table 2.3: Tehama County Population Distribution	14
Table 2.4: Selected Housing Characteristics	16
Table 2.5: Median Household Income and Average Home Price	16
Table 2.6: Major Employers in Tehama County	17
Table 2.7: Free or Reduced Price Meals Data 2017-2018.	18
Table 2.8: Disadvantaged Communities Criteria	19
Table 5.1: Tehama County Active Transportation Projects	53

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Physical Health	8
Figure 2.1: Tehama County Location Map	12
Figure 2.2: Tehama County Modes of Travel	13
Figure 2.3: Tehama County Historic Population	14
Figure 2.4: Tehama County Population Forecast	15
Figure 2.5: Tehama County Demographics	15
Figure 2.6: Age of Population Forecast	15
Figure 2.7: Poverty	16
Figure 2.8: Projected Unemployment Rate	16
Figure 2.9: Census Blocks within Tehama County	19
Figure 2.10: Healthy Places Index Compared with Median Household Income.	19
Figure 2.11: Active Commute vs Median Household Income	20
Figure 2.12: Percent of Population with Access to Vehicle vs Median Household Income	20
Figure 3.1: Red Bluff Pedestrian Facilities	22
Figure 3.2: Red Bluff Bicycle Facilities	23

## List of Figures, Continued

Figure 3.3: Corning Pedestrian Facilities	24
Figure 3.4: Corning Bicycle Facilities	25
Figure 3.5: Los Molinos Pedestrian Facilities	27
Figure 3.6: Los Molinos Bicycle Facilities	28
Figure 3.7: Regional Bikeways	29
Figure 3.8: Tehama County Destinations and Land Use	30
Figure 3.9: Corning Active Transportation Destinations	31
Figure 3.10: Red Bluff Active Transportation Destinations	32
Figure 3.11: Red Bluff and Corning Transit Map	33
Figure 3.12: RTR Express Route, Glenn/Tehama Connect Transit Map	34
Figure 3.13: Collisions, 2006-2017	35
Figure 3.14: Number of Collisions per Day of Week per Time	35
Figure 3.15: Pedestrian Collisions	35
Figure 3.16: Bicycle Collisions	36
Figure 3.17: Collision Severity	36
Figure 3.18: Red Bluff Collisions	36
Figure 3.19: Collision Severity - Red Bluff	36
Figure 3.20: Red Bluff Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions Map	37
Figure 3.21: Corning Collisions	38
Figure 3.22: Collision Severity - Corning	38
Figure 3.23: Corning Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions Map	39
Figure 3.24: Tehama and Los Molinos Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions Map	40
Figure 3.25: Unincorporated Collisions	41
Figure 3.26: Collision Severity - Unincorporated	41
Figure 3.27: Tehama County Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions	42
Figure 4.1: Challenges Associated with Biking	43
Figure 4.2: I Would Consider Riding My Bike More If...	44
Figure 4.3: Class I - Shared Use Path	44
Figure 4.4: Class II - Buffered Bike Lane Without Curb and Gutter or Parking	45

## List of Figures, Continued

Figure 4.5: Class II - With Curb and Gutter and Without Parking	45
Figure 4.6: Class II - With Parking	45
Figure 4.7: Class III - Bike Route	46
Figure 4.8: Class IV - Buffered Bike Lane	46
Figure 4.9: Class IV - Buffered Bike Lane with Physical Barrier	46
Figure 4.10: Class IV - Raised Cycle Track	46
Figure 4.11: Challenges Associated with Walking	47
Figure 4.12: Tehama County Community Comments	48
Figure 4.13: Lack of shoulders for students walking or biking to Bend Elementary School.	49
Figure 4.14: Speeding vehicles and lack of shoulders leave no room for pedestrians and cyclists.	49
Figure 4.15: Intersection of SR 36 and SR 172 in Mineral needs crosswalks and re-striping.	50
Figure 4.16: Lack of curb ramps and bike lanes in central Corning, Solano St and 1st St.	50
Figure 4.17: Narrow bridge with no space for walking in Paynes Creek.	50
Figure 4.18: Lack of shoulders for students to walk or bike, and overgrown school zone sign.	50
Figure 4.19: Unpaved streets in rural communities pose challenges to walking, biking, and people with disabilities.	51
Figure 4.20: Dangerous intersection in City of Tehama due to proximity of RR tracks, lack of shoulders, ditches at sides of roadways.	51

## List of Appendices

- A. Outreach Summary
- B. Stakeholder List
- C. Survey Results Summary Pages
- D. School Outreach Summary
- E. Detailed Community Comments



## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 About the Tehama County Transportation Commission

The Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning agency (RTPA) for Tehama County. The Commission administers local, state, and federal funds for the implementation and maintenance of transportation infrastructure throughout the region.

TCTC is governed by a six-member commission, comprised of one elected official each from the cities of Corning, Red Bluff, and Tehama, and three elected officials from Tehama County.

### 1.2. About the Active Transportation Plan

The Tehama County Active Transportation Plan is a planning effort to enhance walking, biking, and multimodal mobility throughout Tehama County. The TCTC aims to improve the health and quality of life in Tehama County by making walking and biking a key component of daily life. This progressive approach to countywide bicycle and pedestrian planning will identify project needs, program recommendations, and priority infrastructure improvements. The Plan will build on previous planning efforts while ensuring that all future active transportation projects are compliant with state and federal goals.

According to the American Community Survey, 80.8 percent of Tehama County residents drove alone while 2.8 percent walked and 0.3 percent biked to work in 2016. 6.36 percent of Tehama County does not have access to a car. People who are dependent on walking and biking rely on the existing infrastructure to travel throughout

Tehama County. Transportation equity is an integral component for a vibrant and active community. Failing to prioritize walking and biking reduces accessibility and puts low-income residents, the elderly, and those with disabilities at a disadvantage. The Active Transportation Plan will help Tehama County develop a strategy to promote mobility and equal access to existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle networks.

Tehama County faces multiple barriers to mobility. The County's rural geography presents a unique challenge to creating efficient connections over long distances. Census-designated places, such as Paynes Creek and Manton, are isolated areas. Schools, public services, employment areas, health centers, and parks and recreation areas are located far from homes. Improving connections to these public destinations will not only enhance health, but spawn economic activity and development. Understanding these obstacles will allow for Tehama County to progress from a predominately "car culture" to an active culture.

There are 43 schools located throughout Tehama County. According to the American Community Survey, approximately one-fourth of the population is under the age of 18. School children who are unable to drive rely on walking, biking, or public transit to get to and from school.

The California Department of Transportation has adopted a State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan titled "Toward an Active California" which presents a vision of all Californians being able to walk and bicycle safely, conveniently, and comfortably by 2040. Goals of the plan include doubling walking, tripling bicycling, and reducing bicycle and pedestrian fatalities by ten percent each year. These statewide goals are ambitious, especially for rural automobile-dependent Tehama County. However, the purpose of the Tehama County Active Transportation Plan is not only to meet state goals; rather, the plan will increase Tehama County's capacity to create a safer, healthy, and more connected community.



### 1.3. Goals and Objectives

The mission of the Tehama County Transportation Commission is to maintain and improve mobility and access for the people, goods and services in and through Tehama County. The TCTC vision is to promote a reliable, flexible, efficient and safe transportation system throughout Tehama County.

A vision defines an organization's purpose. Goals are broad statements that describe a desired product or end result toward which efforts are focused. Objectives are measurable movement toward a goal. Strategies represent a course of action. A policy is a direction statement to guide actions.

TCTC will strive to maintain the current transportation system, meet evolving mobility needs, and address safety and other transportation challenges. This will be accomplished through strategic and timely transportation system improvements and leveraging of funding.

#### Goal #1

Create vibrant, people-centered communities.

##### Objective 1.1

Support local governments in implementing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

##### *Strategies*

- Support the development and use of active transportation choices (i.e. Bicycling and walking, including connections to public transportation).
- Identify and map the region's disadvantaged populations and enhance mobility.

- Develop transportation safety data and seek funding to resolve identified safety issues (long range).

##### *Policy*

Pursue funding resources to move region toward Goal #1.

##### *Strategies*

- Avoid inducing growth and development where community services, public utilities, and transportation infrastructure capacity do not exist or are inadequate to support it.
- Support and encourage local agencies to implement the five "D" factors known to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated emissions (i.e. Density, Diversity of land use, Design of streets and development, Destination accessibility, and Distance to transit) (short range).

##### Objective 1.2

Enhance community health, safety, and well-being.

##### *Strategies*

- Support the development and use of active transportation choices (i.e. bicycling and walking, including connections to public transportation).
- Identify and map the region's disadvantaged populations to enhance mobility.
- Develop transportation safety data and seek funding to resolve identified safety issues (long range).



*Policy*

Pursue funding resources to move region toward Goal #1.

*Performance Measures*

- CO2 emissions per capita from vehicles and light trucks.
- Bicycle and pedestrian collision rates.
- Maintain bicycle and pedestrian GIS inventories.

**Goal #2**

Develop a continuous countywide bicycle system that is part of the multi-modal regional transportation network.

**Objective 2.1**

Develop an integrated, multimodal range of local transportation choices.

*Strategies*

- Improve connectivity between public transportation, bicycling, and walking.
- Fill gaps between sidewalks, trails, bike lanes, and integrate improvements into projects as appropriate.
- Facilitate multimodal connectivity between local and interregional modes, including intercity bus transportation, passenger rail, and air.

*Performance Measures*

- Travel mode share (single occupancy vehicle, carpool, transit, bicycle, and walking).
- Number of miles in non-motorized network.

- Number of households and jobs within 1/2 mile of transit.
- New development projects consider transportation issues.

**Objective 2.2**

Maintain an updated active transportation plan to promote multimodal transportation and to prepare for funding opportunities for active transportation projects.

*Strategies*

- Update the Tehama County Active Transportation Plan every ten years or when necessary.
- Pursue funding opportunities for active transportation projects.

**Objective 2.3**

Continue the coordination and communication between all jurisdictions in Tehama County, the County Transportation Commission, and Caltrans.

*Strategies*

- Create a Bicycle Advisory Committee.
- Hold bi-annual meetings of the Bicycle Advisory Committee (members from each jurisdiction and at-large membership yet to be determined).



### **Objective 2.4**

Coordinate the development of bicycle corridors and routes with adjacent counties.

#### *Strategies*

- Identify inter-county routes and link Tehama County routes where possible.

### **Goal #3**

Make the existing transportation system more bicycle-friendly.

### **Objective 3.1**

Remove barriers to safe bicycle access, wherever economically feasible.

#### *Strategies*

- Improve railroad crossings that intersect routes, lanes, or corridors identified in this plan. (Union Pacific, Northern Pacific)
- Fund and build Class I trailways, wherever economically feasible, including the barrier on Aloha Street and Main Street. (City of Red Bluff)
- Improve safety conditions on major and minor arterials in the City of Red Bluff with Class II bicycle facilities. (City of Red Bluff)
- Improve safety conditions for bicyclists at the Solano and Sixth St. intersection with Class II lanes upon approach, and bicycle “loop” detectors at signals. (City of Corning)

- Improve safety conditions for bicyclists in the City of Corning by establishing Class II and Class III routes and controlling intersections with stop or yield signs. (City of Corning)
- Improve safety and access conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians on route between the City of Tehama and Los Molinos by adding and maintaining Class II bike facilities on Aramayo Way from SR 99E to Tehama. (County of Tehama)
- Improve safety in rural communities by enforcing existing truck regulations. (California Highway Patrol, County Sheriff)
- Improve safety conditions in Tehama by slowing traffic on C St. with cautionary signs. (City of Tehama)
- Separate children on bicycles from vehicle traffic where feasible. (City of Red Bluff)
- Fund and construct Class I trailway bikeways connecting schools and parks and commercial areas. (City of Red Bluff)

### **Objective 3.2**

Maintain bikeways free of debris.

#### *Strategies*

- Add bikeways maintenance to public works priorities. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)
- Initiate volunteer groups to help maintain bikeways/trailways. (City of Red Bluff)



**Objective 3.3**

Provide Secure Bicycle Parking at local destination points.

*Strategies*

- Purchase and place bicycle racks at the City of Red Bluff City Hall, Red Bluff and Corning post offices, and key downtown locations in Red Bluff and Corning. (City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)

**Goal #4**

Promote bicycling as a part of the multimodal transportation system.

**Objective 4.1**

Provide accommodations for bicyclists in the regional transportation system.

*Strategies*

- Purchase and place bicycle parking facilities at the following regional destination points: the Corning Transit Center, I-5 Park and Ride on Bowman Road, the Tehama County Courthouse, St. Elizabeth Community Hospital, and the Tehama County Health Center. (Tehama County Transportation Commission)
- Produce a Tehama County transportation opportunities map that includes local public transportation routes, private transportation opportunities (Greyhound, Amtrak, etc.), and identifies safe bicycle routes. (Tehama County Transportation Commission)
- Continue the bike racks on buses programs throughout Tehama County. (Tehama County Transportation

Commission)

- Continue to advertise the availability of bicycle facilities in transit brochures. (Tehama County Transportation Commission)

**Goal #5**

Modify the transportation system to encourage safe and convenient bicycling.

**Objective 5.1**

Develop local policy to include the consideration of bicycle and pedestrian access as highly valuable.

*Strategies*

- Adopt a policy statement stating that unless specifically excluded in a local plan, all new bridges and those undergoing major reconstruction on established bike routes will provide safe, convenient access for bicyclists and pedestrians, as resources allow. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama, and State of California)
- Adopt policy statement stating that whenever arterials are widened along established bike routes, they will include Class II bike lanes if funding is available. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)

**Objective 5.2**

Expand project reviews to include bike access and safety considerations.



### *Strategies*

- Review local California Department of Transportation projects for their “bicycle friendliness.” Where possible, make recommendations that provide safe access for bicyclists. (County of Tehama, City of Red Bluff, City of Corning)
- Review all local development projects for their bicycle and pedestrian safety and access. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)
- Amend zoning codes to require safe bicycle parking at new work centers. (County of Tehama, City of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)
- Amend zoning codes for multi-family development to require secure bicycle parking. (County of Tehama, City of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)

### **Objective 5.3**

Train project staff on bicycling planning, and design issues.

### *Strategies*

- Send project staff to bicycle planning workshops periodically. (County of Tehama, City of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)
- Provide incentives for city and county employees to commute to work by bicycle. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)

### **Goal #6**

Train and encourage pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists to share the road network in a safe and cooperative manner.

### **Objective 6.1**

Encourage the training of children ages 5-12 on the safe use of bicycles and the pedestrian network.

### *Strategies*

- Create a 1-day and a 1-hour bicycle workshop for all schools where bicycling is encouraged. (Local school districts)
- When developing signage for bike facilities, include arrows or other directional information. In addition, add prohibitive signs to specific sidewalks where biking is a hazard or poses a threat to pedestrian safety. (County of Tehama, City of Red Bluff, City of Corning, City of Tehama)
- Enforce bicycle helmet laws. (California Highway Patrol, County Sheriff, City of Corning Police, City of Red Bluff Police)

### **Objective 6.2**

Enhance the awareness of motorists’ responsibilities in interacting with bicyclists and pedestrians.

### *Strategies*

- Purchase and place pedestrian warning signs and “share the road” signs at C St. in Tehama, along significant county bikeway corridors, and along Bowman Rd. (County of Tehama, City of Tehama)
- Locate and distribute “rules of the road” brochures at schools, driver training courses, Departments of Motor Vehicles, and in other venues.



- When developing bicycle facilities use Caltrans standards in order to ensure a clear, understandable and consistent bicycle system. (County of Tehama, City of Red Bluff, City of Corning, City of Tehama)

**Objective 6.3**

Develop a bicycle and pedestrian encouragement and education program.

*Strategies*

- Include encouragement and education projects in current and future updates to the Active Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Plan.
- Submit education and encouragement projects for funding when available.

**Goal #7**

Integrate bicycle and pedestrian networks with existing and potential recreational opportunities.

**Objective 7.1**

Provide accommodations for bicyclists at major recreational facilities.

*Strategies*

- Purchase and place bicycle parking facilities at the following recreational destination points: the Sacramento River Discovery Center, Ide Adobe State Park, and Jellys Ferry Landing. (County of Tehama)
- Purchase and place bicycle parking facilities at the following local recreational destination points: Yost Park

in Corning, Halbert Park in Tehama, Diamond Park, Ide Adobe Historic State Park, Forward Park, and Samuel Ayer Park. (City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)

**Objective 7.2**

Emphasize local and regional connections to recreational facilities.

*Strategies*

- Plan and design safe connections between off-road and on-road facilities in the City of Red Bluff. (City of Red Bluff)
- Make bikeway and pedestrian connections to the existing Class I trail at the Sacramento River Discovery Center a priority. (City of Red Bluff)
- Explore right of way opportunities for local, regional and recreational trail development on rail corridors, creeks and rivers, canals, and other private/ public corridors. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)

**Goal #8**

Develop bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs that will enhance the County’s appeal as a recreational destination.

**Objective 8.1**

Publicize key bicycle and pedestrian recreational opportunities.



*Strategies*

- Update the Recreation Element of the Tehama County General Plan. (County of Tehama)
- Support local organized (recreational and/or competitive) bicycle rides. (County of Tehama)
- Support local organized walks/runs.

**Goal #9**

Explore all opportunities for funding bicycle and pedestrian projects.

**Objective 9.1**

Encourage the accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a condition for new development projects.

*Strategies*

- Establish funding mechanisms to pay for bikeway development. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff, City of Tehama)
- During project review identify proximate bikeway routes or trails for possible easement opportunities. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)
- Train project staff on latest funding opportunities and techniques. (County of Tehama, City of Corning, City of Red Bluff)


**1.4. Benefits of Active Transportation**

*1.4.1. Health*

According to the Open Data Network, adult obesity in Tehama County was 4 percent higher than the statewide level in 2015 (27.1 percent compared to 22.9 percent – see Figure 1.1). Over 18 percent of Tehama County is physically inactive while only 16.8 percent of California is physically inactive.

Due to a lack of infrastructure, Tehama County residents are missing out on critical opportunities to stay active throughout their day. Walking or biking to work, school, or the store helps prevent obesity, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and high blood pressure.

Engaging in active modes of transportation enhances both physical and mental health. For example, walking and biking reduces stress, depression, and fatigue. When working out, the brain releases endorphins in a response to pain. These hormones trigger positive feelings in the body, ultimately enhancing a person’s self-esteem and mood.





### 1.4.2. Community Livability

Engaging in active transportation enhances quality of life by increasing socialization. When people walk and bike, they are able to increase the amount of interactions with neighbors and other community members. Social interactions play an important role in improving a person's well-being and sense of place. Single-occupant cars increase social isolation. Having more people on the street creates a welcoming and vibrant environment, ultimately encouraging others to be active participants.

Implementing seamless pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure throughout Tehama County will create a well-connected and safer community. Public safety is a pressing issue in rural areas. When areas lack connections between networks, people are discouraged from walking or biking to their destinations. The option to walk or bike should be an integral component of transportation decisions. Diverse users require a diverse selection of transportation options. Improving pedestrian and bicycle connectivity will help prioritize, not only the employed population during peak traffic hours, but those who wish to walk or bike to serve daily needs. In order to increase walkability and bikeability, Tehama County must provide connected alternative transportation networks.

### 1.4.3. Economy

According to Smart Growth America, residents who walk or bike are more likely to spend money at local businesses than those who drive. Active community members support local establishments due to their proximity and accessibility. Rather than spending money on gas and vehicle maintenance, pedestrians and bicyclists are able to spend their excess money within the local economy. Vehicle owners are likely to venture to large-scale shopping centers, but could instead walk or bike downtown to shop at a local business if they felt safer doing so.

Prioritizing walking and biking has the potential to directly and indirectly create jobs locally. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects create jobs for planners, engineers, and construction workers, and stimulate the local economy.

Increasing access to recreation destinations drives tourism. If Tehama County's built environment supported walking and biking, the County could see a boost in tourism. The County's scenic roadways offer both locals and visitors a range of natural landscapes including the Sacramento River, Mendocino National Forest, and Woodson Bridge State Recreation Area. Advertising Tehama County's scenic destinations as easily accessible places will increase pedestrian and bicycle activity for the area.

### 1.4.4. Environment

According to the Air Quality Index, air quality in Tehama County is satisfactory and the air pollution poses little or no risk. The monitor stations have measured the levels of particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers at  $3.0 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$  and ozone levels at 8.4 ppb.

Encouraging Tehama County residents to travel on foot or by bike helps reduce particulate matter as well as greenhouse gas emissions. Vehicles are a major source of air pollution. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, the average vehicle emits an estimated 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide every year. Reducing car trips results in less noise pollution, water pollution, and air pollution.

Developing infrastructure specifically for pedestrians and bicyclists helps preserve open space. These areas are primarily scenic, agricultural, or perform a critical ecosystem function. Prioritizing walking and biking will not negatively affect Tehama County's unique rural aesthetic.



## 1.5. Planning Process

### 1.5.1. Inter-Agency Coordination

Coordination efforts were organized to include local, regional, state, and federal agencies, including Caltrans, in the development of this Active Transportation Plan.

Tehama County, the Cities of Red Bluff, Corning and Tehama, federally recognized Native American tribal governments, and the Caltrans Tribal Liaison were contacted and invited to participate in the identification of transportation project needs.

### 1.5.2. Coordination with Other Plans and Studies

The following plans exist and include items relevant to active transportation. However, some previous planning efforts including the Tehama County Bikeways Plan are in need of updates and no longer accurate. The Active Transportation Plan will build on the information presented in these documents to create a comprehensive, current plan for future active transportation projects.

- Tehama County Bikeways Plan (2008)
- Regional Transportation Plan (2019)
- Tehama County General Plan (2009)
- City of Corning Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Plan (2015)

## 1.6. Community Outreach

Community outreach was conducted in various forms to provide the Tehama County Community with an opportunity to express their needs and suggest improvements regarding active transportation. The outreach campaign included a SurveyMonkey online questionnaire,

social media, public meeting in Red Bluff, and pop-up outreach at community events and central locations in small communities. A full description of the community engagement strategy and results of community outreach are provided in Appendix A.

### 1.6.1. Stakeholders

Stakeholders including regional agencies, businesses, and advocates related to active transportation were invited to provide input in the planning process. Stakeholders were invited to community meetings and provided with the opportunity to review the Draft Active Transportation Plan. A list of stakeholders was developed for the project and can be found in Appendix B.

### 1.6.2. Questionnaire

A 15-question questionnaire was developed through SurveyMonkey to gather input from the Tehama County Community. The questionnaire received 37 responses online and through hard-copy versions. The questionnaire presented questions about walking and biking, including challenges participants face and what they would like to see improved. Many questions allowed the participant to select multiple options and provide open-ended comments. Open-ended comments are displayed in Appendix C.

### 1.6.3. Website and Social Media

A project specific website was developed to inform the community about the Tehama Active Transportation Plan and to solicit input regarding the Plan. The website was utilized to invite the community to public outreach events held during the duration of the Plan development process as well as to promote the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also promoted through the project's social media pages on Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. Additionally, community members could comment on social media pages or contact the project team through the website to provide feedback.



1.6.4. Outreach Events

Physical copies of the questionnaire were available at public outreach events and were later entered into SurveyMonkey to utilize the analysis functions of the platform and for consistency. These events included a community meeting in Red Bluff and pop-up outreach at the Tehama District Fair, Dairyville Orchard Festival, and in the communities of Paynes Creek, Manton, Proberta, and Los Molinos.

1.6.5. Red Bluff Community Meeting

The Tehama County Transportation Commission held a public meeting at the Red Bluff Community Center on Thursday, October 25, 2018. After a presentation on the Plan and the benefits of walking and biking, community members were asked to identify faulty pedestrian and bicycle facilities and potential project areas on large-scale maps.

1.6.6. School Administration Interviews

The project team conducted phone interviews with the administration of rural Tehama County schools to determine unmet active transportation needs in rural communities. Interviews were casual and generally very brief, intended to determine whether students walk and bike to the school and if they are safe doing so. Most administrators reached were excited about the possibility of improving safety at their schools. See Appendix D for notes from these interviews.

1.6.7. Coordination with Native American Tribal Governments

There is one federally recognized Tribal entity in Tehama County. The Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians of California has headquarters in the City of Corning. In addition, a significant portion of the population of the Greenville Rancheria, with headquarters in Plumas County, have relocated within Tehama County due to historical changes in the Rancheria’s federal recognition status. Table 1.1 lists the contact information for the Tribes contacted during the ATP planning process.

Table 1.1 Tribal Contact List		
Name	Contact Person	Mailing Address
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians of California	Andrew Alejandre, Chairman	P.O. Box 709 Corning, CA 96021
Greenville Rancheria	Kyle Self, Chairman	P.O. Box 279 Greenville, CA 95947



## 2. Setting and Background

### 2.1. Location

Tehama County is located in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately halfway between Sacramento and Oregon (see Figure 2.1). Tehama County is bounded by Shasta County to the north, Trinity and Mendocino counties to the west, Glenn and Butte counties to the south, and Plumas County to the east. The western boundary of Tehama County is located in the Pacific Coast Range, and the eastern boundary is in the Cascade Mountains. The county is approximately 2,950 square miles and 1,887,807 acres. The topography consists of rolling foothills, fertile valleys, flat-topped buttes, and vast rangelands. Tehama County is bisected by the Sacramento River Valley, a 20-mile-wide swath through the central portion of the county and contains large amounts of national forests in the hills and mountains to the east and west.

There are three incorporated cities in Tehama County: Corning, Red Bluff, and the City of Tehama. In 1856, the City of Red Bluff was established as the county seat. Its location along the Sacramento River made it an ideal location to serve as a transportation hub to export agricultural and lumber products by steamships up and down the river. Corning, the second largest city in the County, was incorporated in 1907. Corning serves as an agricultural hub for olives, plums, almonds, walnuts, and peaches, as well as cattle and sheep. The City of Tehama, established in 1846, is the oldest and smallest incorporated city at approximately 0.8 square miles. The City of Tehama was originally established as a trading hub due to its adjacency to the Sacramento River.




Figure 2.1: Tehama County Location Map



## 2.2. Commuting

The majority of Tehama County residents commute by driving alone. According to the American Community Survey, vehicle ownership in Tehama County was higher than the United States average in 2016. In Tehama County, 93.64 percent of the population had access to a car (see Table 2.1). This was more than 2 percent higher than the United States average of 91.03 percent. Additionally, Tehama County residents were more likely to own two, three, or more vehicles than the rest of the nation. Tehama County’s rural geography and heavy reliance on cars discourage people from engaging in active transportation.


Single-occupant vehicles are the predominant mode of transportation in Tehama County; 91% of employed Tehama County residents 16 years or older commuted to work with a car. Of the 91 percent, 81 percent were single-occupant vehicles. Community members are less likely to commute to work using active modes of transportation including walking and biking, as well as public transportation which is often combined with active transportation. The average American is 12 times more likely to take public transit than a Tehama County resident. This can be attributed to Tehama County’s historic development pattern, land use and zoning codes, and autocentric human conditioning.

Compared to the US, Tehama County residents are half as likely to bike to work (see Figure 2.2 and Table 2.2). This does not account for non-commute, recreational, or multi-modal trips.

Vehicle Available	Tehama County	United States
None	6.36%	8.97%
1	31.03%	33.55%
2	38.28%	37.34%
3+	24.33%	20.14%

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Figure 2.2  
Tehama County Modes of Travel



	Tehama County	United States
Drove Alone	80.8%	76.4%
Carpooled	10.2%	9.3%
Public Transportation	0.4%	5.1%
Walked	2.8%	2.8%
Bicycle	0.3%	0.6%
Worked at Home	4.4%	4.6%
Other	1.1%	1.2%

Source: 2016 American Community Survey 1-year Estimates



**Table 2.3**  
**Tehama County Population Distribution**

	Population 2010	Population 2011	Population 2012	Population 2013	Population 2014	Population 2015	Population 2016	Population 2017	Population Percent	Average Annual Percent Change
Red Bluff	13,977	14,026	14,063	14,071	14,069	14,065	14,065	14,076	22.18%	1.001%
Tehama	436	383	419	390	397	410	467	418	0.66%	0.998%
Corning	7,546	7,624	7,628	7,619	7,617	7,586	7,548	7,663	12.07%	1.002%
Unincorporated	40,616	40,952	41,090	41,161	41,201	41,091	40,935	41,306	65.09%	1.002%
<b>Total County Population</b>	<b>62,575</b>	<b>62,985</b>	<b>63,200</b>	<b>63,241</b>	<b>63,284</b>	<b>63,152</b>	<b>63,015</b>	<b>63,463</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1.002%</b>

Sources: (1) - 2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates  
(2) - 2017 American Community Survey Population Estimates

## 2.3. Population

### 2.3.1. Current Population

The American Community Survey estimated the population of Tehama County to be approximately 62,575 in 2010 and 63,463 in 2017 (see Table 2.3). On average, the county’s total population increased 1.002 percent each year during the seven-year period from January 2010-2017. In January 2017, unincorporated areas housed 65 percent of the total population, while 22 percent of the County’s population was concentrated in Red Bluff. Corning accounted for 12 percent of Tehama County’s population. The City of Tehama made up the smallest percentage of the population at 0.66 percent. On average, the population of the City of Tehama decreases 0.002 percent annually while the rest of the county experiences slight population growth.

### 2.3.2. Population

According to the US Census Bureau Population of Counties Census, Tehama County doubled its population from 29,517 to 63,463 over the 40 year period from 1970-2010 (see Figure 2.3).

According to the Caltrans Long-Term Socio-Economic Forecasts by County 2018-2050, approximately 7861 new residents will be incorporated into the Tehama County population by 2039 (see Figure 2.4). On average, the population is expected to increase just over 1 percent every 5 years from 2019-2039.

Figure 2.3  
Tehama County Historic Population






Figure 2.4  
Tehama County Population Forecast





Figure 2.5  
Tehama County Demographics




### 2.3.3. Demographics

Figure 2.5 illustrates Tehama County’s race demographics based on the 2016 American Community Survey. The Tehama County population is predominately white (86.5%). Approximately one-fourth of the population is Hispanic (23.7%) with small populations of Native Americans, Asian, and African Americans.

Tehama County residents ages 25 to 64 make up the largest portion of the population as shown in Figure 2.6. Youth 17 years and younger are projected to remain close to one-fourth of the population while residents 65 years and older are projected to increase to one-fifth of the population by 2040. Tehama County is expected to see a decrease in youth and adult populations 0-64 and an increase in the elderly population 65 years and older in the coming years.

Figure 2.6  
Age of Population Forecast





## 2.4. Socioeconomic Conditions

In 2016, Tehama County had an estimated 27,225 housing units. 87 percent of units were occupied, with a vacancy rate of 13 percent, 1.5 times the state average (see Table 2.4). Of occupied dwellings, 66 percent were owner-occupied and 34 percent were renter-occupied.

According to the American Community Survey population estimates, the median household income in Tehama County was estimated at \$40,687 in 2016. This is significantly smaller than the California median household income of \$63,783. However, the median value of a house in Tehama County is less than half that statewide median home value, allowing for a higher homeownership rate than the state average (see Table 2.5).

**Table 2.4**  
Selected Housing Characteristics

	Total Housing Units	Occupied	Vacant	Owner-Occupied	Renter-Occupied
Tehama County	27,225	87%	13%	66%	34%
California	13,911,737	92%	8%	54%	46%


Source: 2016 American Community Survey

**Table 2.5**  
Median Household Income and Average Home Price


	Tehama County	California
Median Household Income	\$40,687	\$63,783
Median Home Value	\$178,600	\$409,300
Median Household Income as % of Average Home Value	22.8%	15.6%

Source: 2012-2016 American Community Survey Population Estimates

**Figure 2.7**  
Poverty



**Figure 2.8**  
Projected Unemployment Rate





According to the 2016 American Community Survey, 21.5 percent of the population in Tehama County was below the poverty level, higher than the rest of the United States (see Figure 2.7) The population with the highest poverty rate (31.9 percent) was the under 18 age group. Youth are very likely to use active modes of transportation to access school and work because most cannot drive. High rates of active transportation use combined with high poverty rates make the under 18 age group an important population to engage in active transportation planning.

According to the Caltrans 2017 California County-Level Economic Forecast, the unemployment rate in Tehama County was 6.3 in 2017 and will be 5.8 percent by 2037, after fluctuations (see Figure 2.8). Job sectors with the highest projected growth rate include manufacturing, transportation and utilities, professional services, health and education, and government.

In 2016, an estimated 23,094 people were employed in Tehama County. The top four major employers in Tehama County are located in Red Bluff and Corning: Ferrellgas, Walmart Distribution Center, 1-5 RV Park: Rolling Hills Casino, and Sierra Pacific Industries (see Table 2.6). The unemployment rate was estimated at 7.1 percent in 2016, according to the Caltrans California County-Level Economic Forecast. This is slightly lower than the state average of 8.7 percent.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Industry</b>	<b>Employed</b>
Walmart Distribution Ctr	Red Bluff	Distribution Centers (whls)	1,000 to 4,999
Rolling Hills Casino	Corning	Casinos	500 to 999
Sierra Pacific Industries	Corning	Lumber-Manufacturers	500 to 999
Bell-Carter Olive Co	Corning	Olives (whls)	250 to 499
Sierra Pacific Industries	Red Bluff	Lumber-Manufacturers	250 to 499
Sierra Pacific Windows	Red Bluff	Windows	250 to 499
St Elizabeth Community Hosp	Red Bluff	Hospitals	250 to 499
Tehama County Dept of Edu	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County	250 to 499
Walmart Supercenter	Red Bluff	Department Stores	250 to 499
CAL Fire	Red Bluff	Fire Departments	100 to 249
Forestry & Fire Protection	Red Bluff	Government Offices-State	100 to 249
Home Depot	Red Bluff	Home Centers	100 to 249
Pactiv	Red Bluff	Packaging Materials-Manufacturers	100 to 249
Petro Stopping Ctr	Corning	Truck Stops & Plazas	100 to 249
Precision Towing	Red Bluff	Wrecker Service	100 to 249
RBNC	Red Bluff	Convalescent Homes	100 to 249
Red Bluff High School	Red Bluff	Schools	100 to 249
Red Bluff Union High Schl Dist	Red Bluff	Schools	100 to 249
State Department Forestry	Red Bluff	Fire Departments	100 to 249
Tehama County Coroner	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County	100 to 249
Tehama County Health Svc	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County	100 to 249
Tehama County Mental Health	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County	100 to 249
Tehama County Social Svc Dept	Red Bluff	Government Offices-County	100 to 249

Source: California Employment Development Department



## 2.5. Disadvantaged Communities

Identifying project locations as disadvantaged communities is important when applying for competitive funding through programs such as the California Transportation Commission’s Active Transportation Program. According to the Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 guidelines, a disadvantaged community can be defined through the following categories:

- Median Household Income – The Median Household Income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract level data from the 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) (<\$51,026). 10 out of Tehama County’s 11 census tracts qualify as disadvantaged communities by this measure, as shown in Table 2.8.
- CalEnviroScreen – An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 3.0. No census tracts in Tehama County qualify as disadvantaged communities using the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 metrics.
- Free or Reduced Price School Meals – At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals (FRPM) under the National School Lunch Program. Applicants using this measure must demonstrate how the project benefits the school students in the project area. Project must be located within two miles of the school(s) represented by this criteria. 21 out of Tehama County’s 43 schools have at least 75% FRPM eligibility, and 71% of all students in Tehama County qualify for FRPM (see Table 2.7).

District Name	School Name	Enrollment (K-12)	Percent (%) Eligible FRPM (K-12)
Tehama County Department of Education	Nonpublic, Nonsectarian Schools	1	0.0%
	<b>Tehama County Juvenile Justice Center</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	Tehama County Special Education	44	25.0%
	<b>Lincoln Street</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>81.3%</b>
Antelope Elementary	<b>Tehama eLearning Academy</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>79.4%</b>
	Nonpublic, Nonsectarian Schools	3	66.7%
	Lassen-Antelope Volcanic Academy (LAVA)	87	47.1%
	Antelope Elementary	473	63.0%
	<b>Plum Valley Elementary</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>84.6%</b>
Corning Union Elementary	Berrendos Middle	251	45.0%
	<b>Woodson Elementary</b>	<b>672</b>	<b>84.4%</b>
	<b>West Street Elementary</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>84.0%</b>
	<b>Olive View Elementary</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>88.5%</b>
	<b>Maywood Middle</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>80.7%</b>
	<b>Rancho Tehama Elementary</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>95.9%</b>
Corning Union High	<b>Columbia Academy</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
	<b>Centennial Continuation High</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>81.5%</b>
	Corning High	947	69.9%
Elkins Elementary	<b>Elkins Elementary</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>86.7%</b>
Evergreen Union	Evergreen Community Day K-5	3	66.7%
	Evergreen Institute of Excellence	102	46.1%
	Bend Elementary	102	64.7%
	Evergreen Elementary	572	57.5%
	Evergreen Middle	444	62.4%
	<b>Evergreen Community Day (5-8)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Flournoy Union Elementary	Flournoy Elementary	26	42.3%
Gerber Union Elementary	<b>Gerber Elementary</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>85.5%</b>
Kirkwood Elementary	Kirkwood Elementary	97	62.9%
Lassen View Union Elementary	Lassen View Elementary	323	52.6%
	Los Molinos Community Day	1	0.0%
	Los Molinos High	199	66.3%
Los Molinos Unified	<b>Los Molinos Elementary</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>86.3%</b>
	<b>Vina Elementary</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>78.0%</b>
	Nonpublic, Nonsectarian Schools	2	50.0%
	<b>Bidwell Elementary</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>75.9%</b>
	<b>Jackson Heights Elementary</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>81.1%</b>
Red Bluff Union Elementary	<b>Vista Preparatory Academy</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>77.7%</b>
	<b>William M. Metteer Elementary</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>79.5%</b>
	Nonpublic, Nonsectarian Schools	2	50.0%
	<b>Salisbury High (Continuation)</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>83.9%</b>
Red Bluff Joint Union High	Red Bluff High	1536	58.5%
	Reeds Creek Elementary	160	58.1%
Richfield Elementary	Richfield Elementary	248	59.7%

Source: California Department of Education 2017/18 Free and Reduced Price Meals



- Other – Projects located within Federally Recognized Tribal Lands (typically within the boundaries of a Reservation or Rancheria), projects located in areas that lack accurate Census or CalEnviroScreen data such as in a small neighborhood or unincorporated area, or regional definition.

Ten out of Eleven of Tehama County’s census tracts qualify as disadvantaged communities by having a median household income less than \$51,026. Tract 4 has the highest median household income and is located in the northern outskirts of Red Bluff, as shown in Figure 2.9.





Figure 2.9: Census Blocks within Tehama County

Table 2.8 Disadvantaged Communities Criteria				
Census Tract	HPI (1)	MHI (2)	Active Commute (1)	Access to Car (1)
1	37.5	\$41,935	9.14%	95%
2	43.6	\$50,245	2.39%	99.50%
3	22.7	\$39,879	5.61%	95.10%
4	51.7	\$57,161	1.02%	96.40%
5	36.8	\$30,907	9.18%	86%
6	41.3	\$36,846	3.51%	89.50%
7	16.1	\$30,703	3.41%	92%
8	41.5	\$40,882	1.18%	97.80%
9	25.4	\$40,000	6.39%	93.90%
10	38.8	\$46,256	5.65%	92.70%
11	29.4	\$38,489	7.44%	95.70%
<b>Tehama County</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>\$40,687</b>	<b>4.93%</b>	<b>94.01%</b>

Source: (1) The California Healthy Places Index  
(2) American Community Survey 2016

According to the California Healthy Places Index (HPI), Tehama County has an average HPI score of 34.9, which means that Tehama County has healthier community conditions than 34.9% of other California census tracts. Disadvantaged communities in Tehama County have HPI scores ranging between 16.1 and 43.6 while the most advantaged community (Census Tract 4) has an HPI score of 51.7. Census tracts with higher Median Household Income (MHI) tend to have a higher HPI score, as seen in Figure 2.10.

Figure 2.10  
HPI vs MHI





On average, 93.72 percent of disadvantaged community residents have access to an automobile. The remaining 6.38 percent relies on walking, biking, and public transit. In the disadvantaged communities, an average of 5.39 percent of the workers 16 years old and older commute to work via transit, walking, or biking. Only 1.02 percent of the highest-earning census tract's residents rely on transit, walking, and cycling to commute to work.

Median household income appears to influence Tehama County residents' preference to commute using active modes. As shown in Figure 2.11, census tracts with higher MHI tend to have a lower percentage of residents who commute by active transportation. Census tract 4 has the highest MHI and highest HPI. This census tract also has the lowest rate of commuting by active transportation at only 1.02%.

This is likely caused by high-income residents' increased access to vehicles, as seen in Figure 2.12.

Tehama County's geography is also important to note, as many residents live too far away from work or school to commute by walking and biking. However, the highest rates of commuting by active modes occur in tracts 1 and 5, which differ greatly in size and location. Tract 1 encompasses nearly all land east of State Highway 99E, while tract 5 is a small, densely populated tract located in Red Bluff.

Figure 2.11  
Active Commute vs MHI





Figure 2.12  
Percent of Population with Access to Vehicle vs MHI





## 3. Existing Conditions

Tehama County is largely automobile-dependent, as described Section 2.2. This is due in part to the county's sparse population, and the lack of safe facilities for walking and biking. Residents of Tehama County have indicated that a safer, more robust network of sidewalks, bikeways, and trails would encourage them to walk and bike more.

### 3.1. Existing Networks

An audit of existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure was conducted for high-use areas of Tehama County. The audit began with selecting areas including commercial corridors, high-use residential roads, streets surrounding schools, and locations where accidents involving bicyclists or pedestrians have occurred. Using Google Earth Imagery, Google Streetview imagery from 2012 through 2018, existing plans, and field observations, GIS layers were created to note sidewalks, crosswalks, and obstacles such as lack of curb ramps along selected roadways. Existing and proposed bicycle route data was obtained from the County of Tehama and edited to match imagery, plans, and field conditions.

#### 3.1.1. Red Bluff

Downtown Red Bluff has a comprehensive network of sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps. However, some main corridors and school zones lack continuous sidewalks, as shown in Figure 3.1 Main Street lacks sidewalks from Crittenden St. to Duncan Rd. Berrendos Middle School lacks sidewalks along the roads leading to the school. An issue noticeable throughout the city is lack of curb ramps, as noted by the red dots. Many alleyways are unpaved and create a gap in sidewalk access mid-block. Railroad crossings frequently lack sidewalks.


Red Bluff's existing bikeway network is limited, with only one route along a major corridor and three additional routes through neighborhoods and parks (see Figure 3.2). Proposed routes would greatly increase connectivity when constructed.

#### 3.1.2. Corning


Corning's sidewalk network suffers from many gaps in continuity (see Figure 3.3). Most locations where sidewalks are present also have curb ramps, although some locations lack curb ramps. The railroad crossing on South Street lacks sidewalks or an otherwise accessible pedestrian crossing. Crosswalks were generally observed to be in poor condition and in need of re-striping.

A Class II bikeway presently exists along Solano Street in downtown Corning (see Figure 3.4). Proposed bikeways are sourced from the City of Corning 2015 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Plan. According to this plan, four Class III regional bikeways are proposed to serve Corning.

- Highway 99 W – Caltrans identifies Highway 99 W as the region's primary cycling route in the Caltrans District 2 Cycling Guide, largely as an alternative to Interstate 5 in regions where bicycles are prohibited. Proposed improvements include signage and marking to identify the corridor as a bike route, as well as the existing and proposed bikeway along Solano Street in Corning.
- Woodson Bridge State Recreation Area – A proposed bike route connecting Corning to Woodson Bridge State Recreation Area would utilize Marguerite Ave, Loleta Ave, and Kopta Rd.
- Black Butte Lake – The proposed regional bike route would connect Corning to Black Butte Lake via Corning Road and Black Butte Road. This route would primarily serve recreational cyclists.
- Rolling Hills Casino – This bike route would provide a connection for visitors and employees of Rolling Hills Casino. The route will spur off the Highway 99 W regional route, utilizing Liberal Ave and Everett Freeman Way.



<p><b>Red Bluff</b></p> <p><b>Pedestrian Facilities</b></p>	<p><b>Figure 3.1</b></p> <p>Tehama County Active Transportation Plan</p>	<p>0      0.5      1      2 Miles</p>		<p><b>TCTC</b> TEHAMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING CENTER</p> <p><b>GREEN DOT</b> GREEN DEVELOPMENT ORIENTED TRANSPORTATION</p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="color: red;">•</span> Obstacles</li> <li><span style="color: blue;">■</span> Schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><span style="color: yellow;">—</span> Crosswalks</li> <li><span style="color: blue;">—</span> Sidewalks</li> </ul>	



**Red Bluff**

**Bicycle Facilities**

**Figure 3.2**

Tehama County Active Transportation Plan



- Existing Bike Route
- - - Proposed Bike Route
- Parks and Public Land
- Red Bluff City Limits
- Schools
- Bike Parking





**Corning**  
**Pedestrian**  
**Facilities**


**Figure 3.3**

Tehama County Active Transportation Plan



- Obstacles
- Crosswalks
- Corning Study Corridors
- Parks
- Schools
- Sidewalks
- Corning City Limits





### Corning

### Bicycle Facilities

Figure 3.4

Tehama County Active Transportation Plan



- Existing Bike Route
- Corning City Limits
- - - Proposed Bike Route
- Parks
- ▬ Schools





### 3.1.3. Tehama and Los Molinos

Most rural areas of Tehama County lack infrastructure for walking and biking. Although incorporated, the small city of Tehama lacks pedestrian and bike facilities.

Los Molinos currently has three existing bike routes: Class II lanes along approximately one mile of State Highway 99, four blocks of Grant Street, and one block of Sherwood Boulevard (see Figure 3.5 for bicycle facilities). A Safe Routes to School project has recently added the bicycle lanes on Grant Street between State Highway 99 and Los Molinos High School. A proposed bike route would connect Los Molinos to Tehama. Another proposed route would follow State Highway 99 and connect Los Molinos to Red Bluff.

The unincorporated community of Los Molinos has few improvements outside of the central Highway 99 corridor, which features sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and crosswalks (see Figure 3.6 for pedestrian facilities.). Curb ramp access is limited near Los Molinos Elementary School along Stanford Ave. Infrastructure improvements have been proposed for Stanford Ave and may resolve this.



**Tehama & Los Molinos**

**Bicycle  
Facilities**


**Figure 3.5**

Tehama County Active  
Transportation Plan



- Existing Bike Route
- - - - - Proposed Bike Route
- Communities
- Parks and Schools





**Tehama & Los Molinos**

**Figure 3.6**

**Pedestrian  
Facilities**

Tehama County Active  
Transportation Plan



- Crosswalks
- Sidewalks
- Obstacles
- Communities
- Study Corridors
- Parks and Schools



### 3.1.4. Other / Unincorporated County

Figure 3.7 shows all proposed and existing bikeways located in unincorporated Tehama County. Regional bikeways shown are proposed in the Tehama County 2015 Regional Transportation Plan or the City of Corning 2015 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Plan. Bicycles are allowed on most existing roadways, but are prohibited on Interstate 5 throughout Tehama County except for one segment between Wilcox Golf Road in Red Bluff and Bowman Road in Cottonwood.




Figure 3.7

### 3.2. Existing Gaps and Proposed Projects

New bicycle facilities have been proposed in the City of Red Bluff (Figure 3.2), the City of Corning (Figure 3.4) and the City of Tehama and community of Los Molinos (Figure 3.5).

### 3.3. Land Use and Destinations


Tehama County residents frequently travel out of the county to access opportunities and services. Figure 3.8 shows the approximate locations of Tehama County’s largest employers, as well as regional destinations for education, health care, shopping, recreation, and travel. Active transportation destinations for the Cities of Corning and Red Bluff are shown in Figure 3.9 and Figure 3.10, respectively.

### 3.4. Transit

A safer, more connected active transportation network will increase access to goods and services within Tehama County, including access to regional transit connections.

Connections to transit are essential for many active users in Tehama County. People who walk and bike are likely to also use transit due to lack of vehicle access, lack of a driver’s license, or other reasons. Those who use transit are likely to walk or bike the first and last mile, meaning the distance to and from the bus stop.

Transit is currently available within Tehama County through Tehama Rural Area Express (TRAX). Few options exist for regional connections to Redding and Sacramento (see Figure 3.11 and Figure 3.12). In Fall of 2019, an intercity electric bus operated by Shasta Regional Transportation Agency will connect Redding to Sacramento, with a stop in Red Bluff.



**Shopping**

- 1 Mt. Shasta Mall
- 4 Walmart Supercenter
- 8 Sacramento Region

**Employment**

- 4 Ferrellgas
- 4 Walmart Distribution Center
- 4 Sierra Pacific Industries & Windows
- 4 St Elizabeth Community Hospital
- 4 Tehama County Office of Education
- 6 Rolling Hills Casino
- 5 Sierra Pacific Industries
- 5 Bell-Carter Olive Co

**Education**

- 1 Shasta College Main Campus
- 4 Shasta College Tehama Campus
- 7 Chico State University
- 7 Butte College
- 8 Sacramento State University
- 8 UC Davis

**Medical**

- 1 Shasta Regional Medical Center
- 1 Mercy Medical Center
- 4 St Elizabeth Community Hospital
- 7 Enloe Hospital
- 8 UC Davis Medical Center

**Flight**

- 1 Redding Municipal Airport
- 8 Sacramento International Airport

**Recreation**

- 2 Lassen National Park
- 3 Bend Ferry BLM Trails
- 4 Mendocino National Forest Trails
- 6 Rolling Hills Casino

**Tehama County Figure 3.8**  
**Destinations & Land Use Map**  
 Tehama County Active Transportation Plan

0 5 10 20 30 Miles


- Communities
- Incorporated Cities
- National Parks

**Land Use**

- Natural Resources
- Water
- Tribal
- Urban
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Habitat Resource
- Residential

**TCTC**  
 TEHAMA COUNTY  
 TRANSPORTATION COORDINATORS

**GREEN DOT**  
 transportation solutions



**Corning**

**Figure 3.9**

**Active Transportation  
Destinations**

Tehama County Active  
Transportation Plan



- Parks
- Public
- Commercial
- Schools
- Corning





**Red Bluff** **Figure 3.10**





**Active Transportation  
Destinations**

Tehama County Active  
Transportation Plan



- Parks and Public Land
- Red Bluff
- Commercial
- Schools







**Red Bluff and Corning**  
**Transit Map**  
**Figure 3.11**  
 Tehama County Active Transportation Plan

- Route 1
- Route 1 - Saturday
- Route 2
- Route 2 - Saturday
- Route 3
- Route 5
- Route 6 - Saturday
- Transit Stops
- Major Roads
- Local Roads
- Sacramento River





**RTR Express Route** Figure 3.12  
**Glenn/Tehama Connect**  
 Transit Map Tehama County Active Transportation Plan

- Transit Stops
- Major Roads
- Local Roads
- Sacramento River
- RTA Express Route
- Glenn/Tehama Connect





### 3.5. Collisions

According to the UC Berkeley Transportation Injury Mapping System, 329 collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians occurred in Tehama County during the years 2006-2017 (see Figure 3.13). The time of highest collision frequency was between 3:00 pm and 6:00 pm, corresponding with times when people are likely to travel home from work or school, as seen in Figure 3.14.

Over 150 collisions involved pedestrians and 179 involved bicyclists (see Figure 3.15 and Figure 3.16). 21 victims were killed and 333 were injured, as seen in Figure 3.17.

Figure 3.13  
Collisions 2006 - 2017




Figure 3.14

Number of Collisions per Day of Week per Time




Figure 3.15  
Pedestrian Collisions







Figure 3.16  
Bicycle Collisions



3.5.1. Red Bluff

Red Bluff has had a high number of collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians compared to the rest of Tehama County. High collision frequency is likely due to Red Bluff having the County’s highest population density. As seen in Figure 3.18, 230 collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians occurred in Red Bluff; 101 pedestrians and 130 bicyclists were injured or killed in these collisions (see Figure 3.19). The majority of collisions occurred along major roadways including Main Street, Walnut Street, and Antelope Blvd. Figure 3.20 shows the location of bicycle and pedestrian injuries and fatalities within and around the City of Red Bluff.

Figure 3.17  
Collision Severity




Figure 3.18  
Red Bluff Collisions






Figure 3.19  
Collision Severity - Red Bluff





**Red Bluff** **Figure 3.20**  
**Bicycle and Pedestrian**  
**Collisions**  
 Tehama County Active  
 Transportation Plan



- Pedestrian Injury
- Bicyclist Injury
- Pedestrian Fatality
- Bicyclist Fatality
- Schools
- Red Bluff





### 3.5.2. Corning

Twenty-seven collisions involving bicyclists and pedestrians occurred within the City of Corning, including 9 pedestrians and 18 bicyclists, as seen in Figure 3.21. None of these incidents were fatalities (see Figure 3.22), although a pedestrian was killed in a collision along Interstate 5 just north of Corning, a pedestrian was killed along Interstate 5 south of Corning, another pedestrian was killed on Hall Road east of the city, and a bicyclist was killed at the intersection of South Ave at Mary Ave (see Figure 3.23).

### 3.5.3. Tehama and Los Molinos

No pedestrian or cyclist collisions have been reported within the incorporated boundaries of Tehama. However, several collisions have occurred within the community of Los Molinos. The majority of these incidents occurred along State Highway 99, which runs through the community’s core. All collisions occurring in Los Molinos are within unincorporated Tehama County, and are included in Figure 3.24.

Figure 3.21  
Corning Collisions






Figure 3.22  
Collision Severity - Corning






**Corning** **Figure 3.23**  
**Bicycle and Pedestrian**  
**Collisions**  
 Tehama County Active Transportation Plan



- Pedestrian Injury
- Bicyclist Injury
- Pedestrian Fatality
- Bicyclist Fatality
- Schools
- Corning






**Tehama and Los Molinos**

**Bicycle and Pedestrian**

**Collisions**

Figure 3.24

Tehama County Active  
Transportation Plan



- Pedestrian Injury
- Bicyclist Injury
- Pedestrian Fatality
- Bicyclist Fatality
- ▲ Schools
- Communities





### 3.5.4. Other / Unincorporated County

Seventy-two collisions were recorded outside the boundaries of an incorporated city from 2006 through 2017 (see Figure 3.25). Most collisions recorded in unincorporated Tehama County occurred just outside of populations centers, in a Census-Designated Place such as Los Molinos, or along a major roadway (see Figure 3.26). Two pedestrians were killed in a collision on Highway 99 West in the unincorporated community of Richfield, north of Corning in 2010. This collision does not have coordinates and does not show up in the previous collision maps.

Eleven fatalities occurred in unincorporated Tehama County – a much higher proportion of collisions to injuries compared to Red Bluff and Corning (see Figure 3.27). Fatalities comprised less than 5% of collisions in Red Bluff, and none of the recorded collisions in Corning. This may be explained by higher automobile speeds on rural roads, as well as difficulty reporting injuries in rural locations.

Figure 3.25  
Unincorporated Collisions






Figure 3.26  
Collision Severity - Unincorporated





**Tehama County** Figure 3.27  
**Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions**  
 Tehama County Active Transportation Plan



- Pedestrian Injury
- Bicyclist Injury
- Pedestrian Fatality
- Bicyclist Fatality

- Communities
- Tehama County





## 4. Needs Assessment

### 4.1. Community Outreach Results

Community outreach provided several methods for community members to express their needs and suggest improvements regarding active transportation. The outreach campaign included a SurveyMonkey online questionnaire, social media, public meeting in Red Bluff, and pop-up outreach at community events and central locations in small communities. A full description of the community engagement strategy and results of community outreach are provided in Appendix A.

#### 4.1.1. Survey

The survey received 37 responses online and through hard-copy versions. The survey presented questions about walking and biking, including challenges participants face and what they would like to see improved. Survey results are included in Appendix C.

#### 4.1.2. Community Meeting

Community members at the meeting were asked to identify faulty pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and potential project areas on large-scale maps. The identified roads lacked bicycle lanes, sidewalks, wide shoulders, and/or connections. Streets included Main Street, Antelope Boulevard, South Jackson Street, Paskenta Road, and Adobe Road. Community members stated that the existing bike trails are poorly maintained and often have goat head thorns lining the path.

Community members wanted to see more connections between existing infrastructure. For example, connections to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, from Adobe Road to River Park, and from the Tehama County Library to Shasta College. Some community members desired

a Class I shared-use path along the Sacramento River from Red Bluff to Bend.

### 4.2. Bicyclists' General Needs

Survey participants identified unsafe driving, lack of bike lanes and shoulders, and lack of accessible trails as their top concerns related to biking (see Figure 4.1). Community members commented, through the survey or at outreach events, that roads are poorly maintained, lack shade, and need bike lanes (see Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.1  
Challenges Associated With Biking





Figure 4.2  
I would consider riding my bike more if...



### 4.2.1. Bikeway Design Standards

Several different types of bikeways including shared routes, lanes, and paths could be constructed in Tehama County. Each style serves different needs and has requirements such as minimum width. The Caltrans Highway Design Manual sets standards for bikeway design, as outlined below.

#### **Class I Bikeways - Bike Paths**

A Class I path is a paved trail with space for both walking and bicycling, with an exclusive right-of-way. Design standards require at least 8 feet of path width, 2 feet shoulder width on each side of the path, and 8 feet of vertical clearance. Class I bike paths are typically located in parks and greenways and alongside rural roadways and railroads.

The minimum paved width of travel way for a two-way bike path shall be 8 feet, 10-foot preferred. The minimum paved width for a one-way bike path shall be 5 feet. It should be assumed that bike paths will be used for two-way travel except for rare situations where there is a need for only one direction of travel.

A minimum 2-foot wide shoulder, composed of the same pavement material as the bike path or of all-weather surface material that is free of vegetation, shall be provided adjacent to the traveled way of the bike path. A shoulder width of 3 feet should be provided where feasible to reduce bicycle conflicts with pedestrians. If all or part of the shoulder is paved with the same material as the bike path, it is to be delineated from the traveled way of the bike path with an edgeline.




Figure 4.3: Class I - Bike Path



A minimum 2-foot horizontal clearance from the paved edge of a bike path to obstructions shall be provided. 3 feet should be provided. Adequate clearance from fixed objects is needed regardless of the paved width. The vertical clearance to obstructions across the width of a bike path shall be a minimum of 8 feet and 7 feet over shoulder. Where practical, a vertical clearance of 10 feet is desirable. Figure 4.3 displays an ideal Class I bike path.

### **Class II Bikeways - Bike Lanes**

Class II bikeways (bike lanes) are located within the roadbed, immediately adjacent to a traffic lane and separated by striping. A buffered bike lane may also be established within the roadbed, separated by a marked buffer between the bike lane and the traffic lane or parking lane.

Bike lanes are designed for bicycle travel in the same direction as adjacent vehicle traffic, although exceptions are allowed on one-way streets. Typical Class II bikeway configurations are illustrated in Figures 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6. A bikeway located behind on-street parking, physical separation, or barrier within the roadway is a Class IV bikeway (separated bikeway), not a Class II bikeway. The minimum Class II bike lane width shall be 4 feet, except where:

- Adjacent to on-street parking, the minimum bike lane should be 5 feet.
- Posted speeds are greater than 40 miles per hour, the minimum bike lane should be 6 feet, or
- On highways with concrete curb and gutter, a minimum width of 3 feet measured from the bike lane stripe to the joint between the shoulder pavement and the gutter shall be provided.




Figure 4.4: Class II - Buffered Bike Lane Without Curb and Gutter or Parking




Figure 4.5: Class II – With Curb and Gutter and Without Parking




Figure 4.6: Class II - With Parking



**Class III Bikeways – Bike Routes**

Class III bikeways (bike routes) are intended to provide continuity to the bikeway system. Bike routes are established along through routes not served by Class I or II bikeways, or to connect discontinuous segments of bikeway (normally bike lanes). Class III facilities are facilities shared with motor vehicles on the street, which may be indicated by placing bike route signs along roadways. Additional enhancement of Class III facilities can be provided by adding shared roadway markings along the route.

To be of benefit to bicyclists, bike routes should offer a higher degree of service than alternative streets. Routes should only be signed if they meet criteria such as providing through and direct travel or having removed street parking. Figure 4.7 displays potential Class III bike routes.




Figure 4.7: Class III - Bike Route

**Class IV Bikeways – Separated Bikeways / Cycle Tracks**

A Class IV bikeway is a bikeway separated from vehicle traffic behind on-street parking, physical separation, or a barrier within the roadway. Some Class IV bikeways are raised vertically to sit above the roadway, while other are separated by parked vehicles, painted buffers, or objects such as curbs or planter boxes. Class IV Bikeways are generally located in urban areas. Figures 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 display potential Class IV Bikeway designs.

Separated bikeways typically operate as one-way bikeway facilities in the same direction as vehicular traffic on the same side of the roadway. However, two-way separated bikeways can also be used. Since there

is a potential for bicycles traveling in two directions simultaneously at intersections, two-way separated bikeways should be designed in lower speed (35 miles per hour or less) environments unless traffic control devices are employed to prohibit the conflict (e.g., use of bicycle signals with protected vehicular right-turn movement).

Where there is on-street parking, the separated bikeway is typically between the parking and the sidewalk. The separated bikeway may also be raised vertically to an elevation higher than the finished grade of the roadway; but should not be raised at intersections, alleys and driveways unless the raised pavement is also for the purpose of traffic calming.




Figure 4.8: Class IV - Buffered Bike Lane




Figure 4.9: Class IV - Buffered Bike Lane with Physical Barrier




Figure 4.10: Class IV - Raised Cycle Track




### 4.3. Pedestrians' General Needs

Two thirds of survey participants identified speeding vehicles as a walking-related challenge. Distracted and aggressive driving were also commonly selected challenges. Over half of participants considered lack of pedestrian infrastructure including sidewalks, shoulders, and trails to be a challenge associated with walking, as shown in Figure 4.11.

Community members frequently commented that they do not feel safe walking because of lack of shoulders or sidewalks, speeding cars, distance, and aggressive dogs. Survey participants responded that many locations on streets and highways need safer crossings, sidewalks, and wider shoulders.

Figure 4.11

Challenges Associated with Walking




### 4.4. Trail Users' General Needs

Trail users are a unique population. People walk, hike, jog, bike, or ride horses on trails in Tehama County. Therefore, each user has different needs. 51 percent of survey participants identified lack of nearby trails as a challenge associated with walking, and 37 percent identified a lack of trails for biking.

### 4.5. Community-Identified Needs

Community members provided comments through the questionnaire, comment cards at outreach events, writing on the outreach maps, and phone interviews with administration of rural schools. The Community Comments Map displays the locations of roadways and facilities which community members identified as insufficient (see Figure 4.12). Each point location is approximate, as comments often referred to an entire roadway or region. Comments not designating a specific location were not mapped. All comments can be found in Appendix E.



**Tehama County** Figure 4.12

**Community Comments**

Tehama County Active Transportation Plan

**Comment Categories**

-  School Safety
-  Lighting
-  Transit
-  Trails
-  Crossings
-  Sidewalks
-  Unspecified
-  Wider shoulders and bike lanes



#### 4.5.1. Facility Needs Summary

Tehama County communities each have unique needs, but many share common issues including missing or overgrown signage and lack of ADA compliant curb ramps, shoulders, sidewalks, and crosswalks. The following photos taken in Tehama County communities illustrate these issues (Figure 4.13 – Figure 4.20).



Figure 4.13: Lack of shoulders for students walking or biking to Bend Elementary School.



Figure 4.14: Speeding vehicles and lack of shoulders leave no room for pedestrians and cyclists.



Figure 4.15: Intersection of SR 36 and SR 172 in Mineral needs crosswalks and re-stripping.



Figure 4.17: Narrow bridge with no space for walking in Paynes Creek.



Figure 4.16: Lack of curb ramps and bike lanes in central Corning, Solano St and 1st St.



Figure 4.18: Lack of shoulders for students to walk or bike, and overgrown school zone sign.



*Figure 4.19: Unpaved streets in rural communities pose challenges to walking, biking, and people with disabilities.*



*Figure 4.20: Unsafe conditions at an intersection in the City of Tehama due to proximity of RR tracks, lack of shoulders, ditches at sides of roadways.*



Blank Page



## 5. Recommended Infrastructure Projects

The purpose of this Active Transportation Plan is to address Tehama County’s active transportation needs. Taking into consideration community input and prior planning efforts, the Tehama County Transportation Commission has identified a list of projects which will address the community’s needs. Developing this Project List will allow the Tehama County Transportation Commission to proceed with acquiring funding and constructing the projects.

### 5.1. Project Prioritization Methodology

Projects were determined based on community needs and the concurrent 2019 Tehama County Regional Transportation Plan update. Corning projects were identified from the 2016 Corning Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Improvement Plan.

### 5.2. Project List

Table 5.1 lists Tehama County’s programmed active transportation projects, sorted by jurisdiction.

Table 5.1 Tehama County Active Transportation Projects				
Project Number	Location	Description	Cost	Const. Year
<b>City of Corning</b>				
ATP-C01	1st Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Blackburn Ave to Fig Lane	\$ 46,000	2019
ATP-C02	Olive View School	Olive View School Connectivity Project	\$ 1,123,000	2022
ATP-C03	West Street School	West Street School Connectivity Project	\$ 1,309,000	2022
ATP-C04	Solano Street	Solano Street from Solano (East City Limits) to Old Hwy 99W	TBD	2027
ATP-C05	Highway 99W	Highway 99W (Colusa to South Ave)	TBD	2027
ATP-C06	Black Butte Lake	Regional Bike Route-Via Corning Road and Black Butte Lake Road	\$ 53,000	2020+
ATP-C07	Blackburn Avenue	Corridor Improvements-Edith Avenue to Edith Avenue	\$ 728,000	2020+
ATP-C08	Blackburn Moon Drain	Class 1 Bike Path-East to Corona Avenue	\$ 844,000	2020+
ATP-C09	Colusa Street	Corridor Improvements-Edith Avenue to Marguerite Avenue	\$ 2,057,000	2020+
ATP-C10	Fig Lane	Corridor Improvements-Houghton Avenue to Marguerite Avenue	\$ 1,576,000	2020+
ATP-C11	Highway 99	Regional Bike Route-South Ave to Gallagher Avenue	\$ 13,000	2020+
ATP-C12	Jewett Creek	Class 1 Bike Path-Highway 99W to Toomes Avenue	\$ 231,000	2020+
ATP-C13	Marguerite Avenue	Crosswalk Enhancements-Fig Lane to Blackburn Avenue	\$ 73,000	2020+
ATP-C14	Rolling Hills Casino	Regional Bike Route-Via Highway 99W and Liberal Avenue	\$ 9,000	2020+
ATP-C15	Solano Street	Streetscape Improvements-Highway 99W to 3rd Street	\$ 5,348,000	2020+
ATP-C16	South Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Houghton Avenue to marguerite Avenue	\$ 538,000	2020+
ATP-C17	Toomes Avenue	Corridor Improvements-Fig Lane to Blackburn Avenue	\$ 1,226,000	2020+
ATP-C18	West Street	Class 2 Bike Lanes-Nroth Street to Fig Lane	\$ 177,000	2020+



ATP-C19	Woodson Bridge Rec.	Regional Bike Route-Via Marguerite Avenue and Loleta Avenue	\$ 16,000	2020+
			<b>\$ 15,321,000</b>	
<b>City of Tehama</b>				
ATP-T01	C Street +	Formalize bike lane with stencils	\$ 5,000	2021
ATP-T02	Citywide	Shoulder maintenance (sweeping)	\$ 16,000	2021
			<b>\$ 21,000</b>	
<b>City of Red Bluff</b>				
ATP-R01	Walnut St.	Walnut St./Monroe Class 2 Bikeway	\$ 500,000	2020
ATP-R02	Diamond Ave.	Diamond Avenue College Connection	\$ 5,000,000	2020
ATP-R03	Vista Way	Vista Way Bikeway (South Jackson to Luther Road via Airport Road)	\$ 100,000	2021
ATP-R04	Sale Lane	Sale Lane Sidewalk/Bike Lane to Sacramento River Discovery Center	\$ 200,000	2020+
ATP-R05	Lake Red Bluff	Lake Red Bluff Bikeway	TBD	2020+
ATP-R06	Reeds Creek	Reeds Creek River Walk (Washington St. to Paskenta Road)	\$ 2,000,000	2020+
ATP-R07	Johnson St.	Johnson St. Bikeway (Walnut St. to Baker Road via Walbridge St.)	\$ 200,000	2020+
ATP-R08	Vista Way	Vista Way Bikeway (Montgomery Road. to Luther Road via Airport Road)	\$ 100,000	2020+
ATP-R09	Washington St.	Washington St. Bikeway (Willow St. to Walton St.)	\$ 200,000	2020+
ATP-R10	Adobe Rd	Adobe Park Bikeway (Dog Island Park to Ide Adobe State Park)	\$ 3,000,000	2020+
ATP-R11	Adobe Rd	Adobe Road Bikeway	\$ 3,000,000	2020+
			<b>\$ 14,300,000</b>	
<b>County of Tehama</b>				
ATP-County01	Los Molinos Elementary	Sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA ramps, on E side of Stanford between Grant and Rose.	\$ 500,000	2019
ATP-County02	Bowman Rd	Bowman Road Bikeway (Evergreen School to I-5)	\$ 3,000,000	2020+
ATP-County03	Aramayo Way	Tehama-Los Molinos Bikeway (City of Tehama and Tehama County)	\$ 1,500,000	2020+
ATP-County04	Kirkwood Elementary	School zone improvements, traffic calming, sign package.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County05	Lassen View Elementary	Safety improvements on 99 to mitigate ingress/egress dangers.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County06	Bend School	Multi-use path from Ash Lane to Bend School parking lot. Move Driscoll fence line.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County07	Bend School	School zone improvements (crosswalks, shoulder widening, parking lot definition.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County08	Vina Elementary	Formalize parking and school zone area. Crosswalks, sign package, rural standard shoulder for	TBD	2020+
ATP-County09	Flournoy Elementary School	School zone improvements, striping on Osbourne Rd. signage and formalize transition zone.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County10	Gerber Elementary School	Traffic calming and school zone crossing/marking on Chard Avenue.	TBD	2020+
ATP-County11	Elkins Elementary School	Multi-use path from school to community center. N.side of Toomes-Wannatoddy to Crane Mill	TBD	2020+
ATP-County12	RR Corridor	Railroad Bikeway (Red Bluff to Los Molinos)	TBD	2020+
ATP-County13	Baker Rd	Baker Road Bikeway (SR 36 to Walnut St.) (City of Red Bluff and Tehama County)	\$ 3,000,000	2020+
ATP-County14	Mineral	Restriping and crosswalks at SR 36 and SR 172	TBD	2020+
			<b>\$ 7,500,000</b>	
<b>Caltrans</b>				
ATP-Caltrans01	State Route 36	Multi-use path parallel to SR 36 from Battlecreek Campground to SR 36	\$ -	2020+
			<b>\$ -</b>	



## 6. Recommended Programs

There is an urgent need for bicycle and pedestrian education in Tehama County. Public outreach efforts indicate that residents hesitate to engage in active transportation due to a lack of infrastructure, lack of knowledge of existing facilities, and safety concerns. In addition to the infrastructure improvements outlined in this plan, Tehama County residents must have the necessary skills to be safe and confident bicyclists and pedestrians.

### 6.1. Education and Encouragement

Education programs enhance safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists by educating motorists and non-motorists on safety standards, safety hazards, and desired behaviors and practices. With increased education and awareness, community members will become more confident biking and walking in high traffic areas. Educating both motorists and non-motorists on safety practices, laws, and general cycling skills will draw awareness to bicycle and pedestrian safety.

Encouragement programs motivate residents to use existing bicycle and pedestrian networks for both transportation and recreation. The programs will inform bicyclists and pedestrians of the locations of high visibility, low traffic roads connecting to major destinations. Active transportation users can use this information to safely reach and use various recreation areas in Tehama County. The County's investment in encouraging active transportation will further promote a successful citywide bicycling and walking culture. The community will enhance public health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by using active transportation facilities more frequently and driving less. Implementing a countywide encouragement program will minimize safety concerns and encourage more residents to utilize the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities for daily travel.

Schoolchildren with no previous knowledge of safe pedestrian and bicycle practices are currently discouraged from engaging in active transportation. The lack of bicycle and pedestrian education and encouragement programs poses a threat to schoolchildren's safety as they walk or bike in school zones.

Education programs can include organized community bike rides, bike rodeos, bicycle repair and maintenance training programs, and bicycle and helmet donation programs. Biking events will teach residents bicycle handling and traffic skills while increasing familiarity and comfort. Bike rodeos are safety clinics where schoolchildren engage in fun activities to practice their riding skills and learn the rules of the road. Bicycle repair and maintenance training programs provide hands-on activities. Schoolchildren learn how to pump a flat tire, realign bike chains, adjust seats, tighten loose bolts, and remove and change a flat tire. Providing models of desired behaviors and safety practices will foster a safe environment for knowledgeable and confident active transportation users.

Funding for educational and encouragement programs can be acquired through the Active Transportation program (ATP) and through the state Safe Routes to School program (SR2S) and the federal Safe Routes to School program (SRTS). Safe Routes to School is an international movement with the goal of increasing the number of children who walk or bike to school. Safe Routes programs encourage walking and biking in schoolchildren by removing the barriers that prevent them from walking, including non-infrastructure improvements such as increased familiarization with traffic laws and training in bicycle safety and repair.

The Tehama County Bikeways Plan recommends working with the California Highway Patrol, City of Red Bluff Police Department, and Red Bluff Elementary School District to organize bicycle and pedestrian education programs. Elementary school administration will work with the California Highway Patrol and Tehama County Police Departments to request bicycle safety presentations and bike rodeos.



### 6.1.1. California Highway Patrol

The California Highway Patrol organizes bike rodeos for schools and community groups as requested. These bicycle education programs cater to bicyclists 14 years and younger. The bike rodeos typically have 6 to 10 skill stations where riders can test their handling skills. Law enforcement representatives guide the children through the course, teaching them in-traffic-riding behavior.

### 6.1.2. City of Red Bluff Police Department

The School Resource Officer from the City of Red Bluff Police Department gives presentations on bicycle safety at Red Bluff schools. Bicycle safety pamphlets are also made available. The police department offers a two hour long Bicycle Violators Program on Saturdays. The program educates bicyclists 14 years and younger on proper biking etiquette and rules of the road.

### 6.1.3. Red Bluff Elementary School District

The Red Bluff Elementary School District works in conjunction with the Red Bluff Police Department to provide students with bicycle safety educational programs. Teachers educate schoolchildren on the importance of helmets and proper bicycle handling skills. Teachers also encourage children to use bicycles on field trips when possible.

## 6.2. Enforcement

Tehama County experiences many pedestrian and bicyclist involved collisions, most commonly in the City of Red Bluff. Major roads in Red Bluff with high collision rates include Antelope Boulevard, Main Street, and Jackson Street. A higher presence of California Highway Patrol cars at intersections with high collision frequency

will help enforce stricter speed limits. Red Bluff can explore installing traffic calming measures along these major roadways. These could include speed feedback signs, curb extensions, speed bumps, raised pedestrian crossings, and rapid flashing beacons at crosswalks.

The City of Red Bluff strictly enforces the mandatory bicycle helmet law. Violators are issued citations, verbal warnings, or issuance to the Bicycle Violators Program.

## 6.3. Evaluation

Achieving long-lasting success requires that safety programs occur consistently and are beneficial to participants. Frequency of events, number of attendees, and student/parent opinions regarding the programs will help track effectiveness.

Tehama County school districts and police departments will lead the programs and evaluate their effectiveness. School administrators will be tasked with collecting data including number of students walking and biking to school and attendance of bike rodeos and other programs. Bicycle and pedestrian counts should be performed before and after programs take place to see if the number of students walking and biking increases. Classroom or parent surveys should be given after program participation, posing questions such as “Did the Bike Rodeo help you or your child feel more confident riding a bike?”

Collision data on major roadways near schools should be analyzed before and after implementing education, encouragement, and enforcement programs, as well as infrastructure improvements. Due to Tehama County’s rural geography and low population it will be difficult to determine trends in pedestrian and bicycle collisions. However, data collected over several years may indicate a decrease in pedestrian and bicyclist involved collisions within school zones, suggesting the programs are highly effective at training confident and knowledgeable pedestrians and bicyclists.



## 7. Funding

Funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects is typically carried out through the competitive grant programs. However, some regions utilize regular formula funding to construct or supplement active transportation projects. Projects that receive funding typically have well developed foundations, have robust community support and are priority projects in the region.

### 7.1. Federal

Most Federal funding sources are administered through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Many of these programs allocate funds to state level agencies for regional and local distribution. The Federal Transit Administration and various non-profit organizations also provide funding and technical assistance for non-motorized facilities and programs.

#### 7.1.1. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program is an FHWA-administered program that provides funding for projects that will contribute to the attainment or maintenance of national air quality standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. Although primarily used for transit and alternative fuels projects, Tehama County receives a small amount of CMAQ funding annually for active transportation projects. Tehama County's annual CMAQ funding amount is not enough to fund significant projects, and the County forfeits any CMAQ funding not used within 3 years. In order to preserve funding, Tehama County has entered into a trade agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay area. The MTC is able to use Tehama County's

CMAQ funding before the County loses it, and in return Tehama County is able to withdraw the accumulated funding amount from the MTC at any time.

### 7.2. State

State funding sources are administered by the various State of California departments, including Caltrans. State non-motorized monies sources include taxes, bonds and allocation of federal monies.

#### 7.2.1. Active Transportation Program (ATP)

California received an average of \$123 million a year over the five-year period from 2013-2018 for ATP projects. Due to the passage of SB 1 by California legislature in spring of 2017, funding for Cycle 4 in 2019 and funding expectations for future cycles increased significantly. SB 1 increased the gas tax and directs an additional \$100 million dollars a year to the Active Transportation Program, or about \$223 million annually. The distribution of funds is highly competitive and is managed with the guidance of the ATP Program Guidelines developed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Funds are distributed using a percentage basis and eligible recipients submit applications to Caltrans based on the following categories:

- Urban Regions (MPO administered) – 40% for urban areas with populations greater than 200,000.
- Small Urban and Rural Regions (State administered) – 10% to small/rural counties with populations of 200,000 or less.
- Statewide Competition (State administered) – 50% to any applicant based on a statewide competitive basis.



Tehama County is a rural county, and therefore eligible for the 60% of ATP funds available for small urban/rural and statewide projects. Despite the highly-competitive nature of this grant program, Tehama County has successfully procured ATP funding for two projects: the Olive View School Connectivity Project and the West Street School Connectivity Project, both in Corning, were awarded in the small urban/rural category of Cycle 4 (2019).

### *7.2.2. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program*

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a five-year capital improvement program for transportation projects funded with revenues from the Transportation Investment Fund and other sources. The STIP is updated and adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) every two years. The STIP programming cycle begins with the release of a fund estimate in July of odd-numbered years and adoption typically occurs in August. The fund estimate identifies the amount of new funds available for the programming of transportation projects. After the fund estimate is adopted, regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) prepare a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for 75% of the statewide funding and submit it to the CTC.



Appendices for the  
2019 Tehama County  
Active Transportation Plan

June 2019



Blank Page

## Appendix A

### Public Outreach Materials



## Overview

Community outreach was conducted in various forms to provide the Tehama County Community with an opportunity to express their needs and suggest improvements regarding active transportation. The outreach campaign included a SurveyMonkey online questionnaire, social media, public meeting in Red Bluff, and pop-up outreach at community events and central locations in small communities.

## Stakeholders

Stakeholders including regional agencies, businesses, and advocates related to active transportation were invited to provide input in the planning process. Stakeholders were invited to community meetings and provided with the opportunity to review the Draft Active Transportation Plan.

## Project Website

A project specific website, [tehamawalkbikeandride.com](http://tehamawalkbikeandride.com), was developed to inform the community about the Tehama Active Transportation Plan and to solicit input regarding the Plan. The website was utilized to invite the community to public outreach events held during the duration of the Plan development process as well as to promote a questionnaire developed to gauge the communities' active transportation needs and desires. Flyers for public meetings, a link to the questionnaire hosted on SurveyMonkey, a direct feedback form, and other materials related to the Plan were available on the website. The draft Active Transportation Plan was posted on the project website for the public to review and comment on. Over the course of the Plan development process, the website had 99 unique visitors, 137 visits, and 310 pageviews.

## Questionnaire

A 15-question questionnaire ("survey") was developed to gauge the community's active transportation behaviors, needs, and desires. Questions asked the respondents how often and where they bike or walk in Tehama County for utility or recreation, what they like and dislike about walking or biking in the County, and what could be done to encourage them to walk or bike more frequently. The survey was developed using the SurveyMonkey platform and was distributed in both digital and hard-copies. A link to the digital survey was provided on the project website and was promoted on social media sites including Facebook and Instagram. Physical copies of the survey were available at public outreach events and were later entered into SurveyMonkey to utilize the analysis functions of the platform and for consistency.

Over the course of the Plan development process, the survey was completed by 37 respondents.

## Social Media Campaign

### Facebook

A Facebook page was developed for the Active Transportation Plan under the name *Active Tehama County*. Posts advertised upcoming meetings and community outreach events. Tehama County residents were given Active Transportation Plan updates via links to Red Bluff Daily News and the project website. County businesses, non-profits, clubs, schools, government agencies were followed and "liked." These pages and groups were strategically chosen due to their common interests, community influence, and large follower engagement. Facebook pages were directly messaged and asked to promote and advertise upcoming community meetings.



### *Instagram*

An Instagram account was created for this Active Transportation Plan as a part of the social media campaign under the name *Tehama Walk Bike Ride*. Photos related to the development of the Plan were posted, as well as the link to the SurveyMonkey questionnaire. Meeting flyers, photos of existing conditions of the Tehama County active transportation network, and photos of community outreach events were shared on the project Instagram page. Stakeholders and community groups were tagged in photos, including Caltrans District 2 and the City of Red Bluff. A link to the project website was also promoted on the project Instagram page.

### *Twitter*

A twitter account under the name *Tehama Walk Bike* was created and used as a networking platform to keep updated on local agencies, schools, and businesses in Tehama County. These included Caltrans District 2, Red Bluff High, Red Bluff Parks & Recreation, Los Molinos Chamber, Tehama District Fair, Red Bluff FFA, Tehama County Information, and Tehama County Economic Development. Posts included polls, links to surveys, project updates, active transportation information, and local news retweets.

## *Public Outreach Events*

### *Tehama County Fair*

The Tehama County Transportation Commission held an outreach booth at the Tehama County Fair from Friday, July 20 to Sunday, July 22, 2018. The booth was located in the Tyler-Jelly Building and provided interactive exercises to engage, inform, and solicit input from the community. The booth was staffed by the TCTC and members of the consultant team, who were available to discuss the

ATP with community members and record input provided. A sign-in sheet was used to track visitors to the booth, a large-scale table map was available for the community to write comments directly on, and hard-copy questionnaires were available for the community to complete and return to the booth.

During this meeting, many members of the community were engaged. Four hard-copy questionnaires were completed and returned, and comments were recorded on the large-scale map highlighting areas of concern for residents, as well as desired facilities.

### *Paynes Creek*

Project team members tabled at the Paynes Creek Store on September 19, 2018 to reach the population of this rural community. Few customers visited, and all either stated they do not walk in Paynes Creek or were not interested in talking. After tabling at the Store, staff visited Plum Valley Elementary in Paynes Creek to speak with administrative staff about walking and biking near the school. School enrollment is very small, with most students being driven or bussed to school. One child walks with a grandparent from down the street.

Paynes Creek is a small community located just off Highway 36 northeast of Red Bluff. Several homes and a building containing the store, tavern, and post office are clustered along a few streets in the center of the town. Two of these streets, Inskip Valley Road and Madden Road, are unpaved. All roads lack paved shoulders. A one-lane bridge connects the residences with the store and highway. A small elementary school serves students living in Paynes Creek as well as nearby areas including Manton. Due to remote location and limited resources, residents are vehicle-dependent. Walking and biking are uncommon, and residents may prefer to preserve the rural



feel as opposed to paving roads and constructing shoulders and sidewalks.

### *Manton*

Project team members tabled at Manton Corners, a store and saloon, on September 19, 2018 to reach the population of this rural community. Few customers visited, and most either said they do not walk in Manton or were not interested in talking. A woman in Manton stated that she walks frequently. The owner of the business stated that many people bike through the area, and many community members walk. Wild animals are a factor that prevents some people from walking.

Manton is larger and more spread out than Paynes Creek, with a few businesses including store, bar, and post office located at the junction of Manton Road, Forward Road, and Rock Creek Road. Residences, vineyards, and ranches are located in the surrounding region. The part of Manton located north of North Fork Battle Creek is in Shasta County.

### *Dairyville Orchard Festival*

Project team members tabled at the Dairyville Orchard Festival at Lassen View School on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Dairyville is an unincorporated agricultural community located along SR 99 between Red Bluff and Los Molinos. Visitors provided comments through the maps, comment cards, and surveys provided.

### *Proberta & Los Molinos*

On November 7<sup>th</sup> project team members tabled at Nu-Way Market in Los Molinos and Harvey's Market in Proberta. Residents of these small communities provided comments through the comment cards, maps, and surveys.

### *Red Bluff*

The Tehama County Transportation Commission held a public outreach meeting at the Red Bluff Community Center on Thursday, October 25, 2018. The meeting was held in the conference room from 4:00 – 6:00 p.m. 9 community members attended the meeting. Jeff Schwein, the project consultant, led a presentation on the benefits of walking and biking, existing conditions and barriers to mobility, and solutions for improving walking and biking trips throughout the County. After the presentation, community members were asked to identify faulty pedestrian and bicyclist facilities and potential project areas on large-scale maps. The identified roads lacked bicycle lanes, sidewalks, wide shoulders, and/or connections. Streets included Main Street, Antelope Boulevard, South Jackson Street, Paskenta Road, and Adobe Road. Community members stated that the existing bike trails are poorly maintained and often have goat head thorns lining the path.

Community members wanted to see more connections between existing infrastructures. For example, connections to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam, from Adobe Road to River Park, and from the Tehama County Library to Shasta College. Some community members desired a class I shared-use path along the Sacramento River from Red Bluff to Bend.

Four hard copy surveys were completed during the community meeting. Survey results showed that community members value Tehama County's wildlife and natural landscape. When asked to prioritize future pedestrian and bicycle projects, community members stated that the most attractive trails would be those constructed adjacent to Reeds Creek and Sacramento River. Scenic Tehama County has many natural assets that would be accentuated with the construction of future bicycle and pedestrian projects.

## Appendix B

### Stakeholder List



Stakeholder List - Tehama County ATP 2019

Affiliation	Contact	Title	Phone	Email	Address
<b>Government</b>					
Tehama County	Bill Goodwin	Chief Administrator	(530) 527-4655	bgoodwin@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Tim McSorley	Public Works Director	(530) 385-1462	timmsorley@tcpw.ca.gov	9380 San Benito Ave, Gerber, CA 96035
	Jessica Riske Gomez	Interim Transportation Manager	(530) 385-1462	jriskegomez@tcpw.ca.gov	9380 San Benito Ave, Gerber, CA 96035
	Kristen Maze	Planning Director	(530) 527-2200	kmaze@co.tehama.ca.us	444 Oak Street - Room 1 Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Steve Chamblin	District 1 Supervisor	(530) 527-4655 Ext. 3015	schamblin@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Candy Carlson	District 2 Supervisor	(530) 527-4655 Ext. 3014	ccarlson@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Dennis Garton	District 3 Supervisor	(530) 527-4655 Ext. 3017	dgarton@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Bob Williams	District 4 Supervisor	(530) 527-4655 Ext. 3018	bwilliams@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Burt Bundy	District 5 Supervisor	(530) 527-4655 Ext. 3016	bbundy@co.tehama.ca.us	727 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Ryan Teubert	Flood Control and Water Conservation District Manager	(530) 385-1462	rteubert@tcpw.ca.gov	9380 San Benito Ave, Gerber, CA 96035
	Vicky Dawley	Resource Conservation District Manager	(530) 737-5178	vicky@tehamacountyrcd.org	2 Sutter St # D, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Red Bluff-Tehama County Chamber of Commerce	Lisa Hansen	Chair	(530) 527-0727	lisa.hansen@expresspros.com	100 Main St, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Los Molinos Chamber of Commerce	Bryan Fox	President	(530) 384-2251	LMCOC2012@gmail.com	8066 CA-99 E Los Molinos, CA 96055
Corning Chamber of Commerce	Laura Fierce	President	(530) 824-5550	info@corninchamber.org	1110 Solano St, Corning, CA 96021
Caltrans Local Assistance	Ian Howat	Coordinator for Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity Counties	(530) 225-3484	ian.howat@dot.ca.gov	1657 Riverside Dr., Redding, CA 96001
City of Red Bluff	Robin Kampmann	Public Works Director	(530) 527-2605 Ext. 3055	rkampmann@cityofredbluff.org	555 Washington St. Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Scott Friend	Planning Director	(530) 527-2605 Ext. 3059	friend@cityofredbluff.org	555 Washington St. Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Anita Rice	Deputy City Clerk	(530) 527-2605 Ext. 3057	arice@cityofredbluff.org	555 Washington St. Red Bluff, CA 96080
City of Corning	Robin Kampmann	Public Works Director	(530) 824-7029	rkampmann@corning.org	794 Third Street Corning, CA 96021
	Lisa Linnet	City Clerk	(530) 824-7033	linnet@corning.org	794 Third Street Corning, CA 96021
City of Tehama	Carolyn Steffan	City Administrator	(530) 384-1501	cdsteffan@sbcglobal.net	250 Cavalier Dr Tehama, CA 96090
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency	Dan Little	Executive Director	(530) 262-6190	dittle@srta.ca.gov	1255 East Street Suite 202 Redding, CA 96001
Tehama County Sheriff's Office	Phil Johnston	Assistant Sheriff	(530) 529-7900	pjohnston@tehamaso.org	22840 Antelope Boulevard Red Bluff, CA 96080
Red Bluff Police Department	Kyle Sanders	Chief of Police	(530) 527-8282	questions@rbpd.org	555 Washington Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Corning Police Department	Jeremiah Fears	Chief of Police	(530) 824-7000	jfears@corningpd.org	774 Third Street Corning, CA 96021
Tehama Farm Bureau	Kari Dodd	Executive Director	(530) 527-7882	kari@tehamacountyfarmbureau.org	275 Sale Lane Red Bluff, CA 96080-2938
Tehama County Health Services Agency	Valerie Lucero	Executive Director	(530) 527-9491	818 Main Street Red Bluff, CA 96080	818 Main Street Red Bluff, CA 96080
<b>Schools</b>					
Antelope Elementary School District	Jim Weber	Superintendent	(530) 527-1272	jweber@antelopeschools.org	22630 Antelope Blvd., Red Bluff, CA 96080
Corning Elementary School District	Richard Fitzpatrick	Superintendent	(530) 824-7701 Ext. 1256	rfitzpatrick@cuesd.net	1590 South Street Corning, CA 96021
Elkins Elementary School	Marla Katzler	Superintendent	(530) 833-5582	mkatzler@elkinschoolca.org	2960 Elkins Ln, Paskenta, CA 96074
Evergreen Union School District	Brad Mendenhall	Superintendent	(530) 347-3411	bmendenhall@evergreenusd.org	19500 Learning Way Cottonwood, CA 96022
Flournoy Elementary School	Lane Bates	Superintendent	(530) 833-5331	lbates@flournoyschool.org	15850 Paskenta Rd, Flournoy, CA 96029
Gerber Elementary School	Jenny Montoya	Superintendent	(530) 385-1041	jmontoya@gerberschool.org	23014 Chard Avenue, Gerber, CA 96035
Kirkwood Elementary School	Dane Hansen	Superintendent	(530)824-7773	dhansen@kirkwoodschoolca.org	2049 Kirkwood Rd., Corning, CA 96021
Lassen View Elementary School	Jerry Walker	Superintendent	(530)527-5162	jwalker@lassenview.org	10818 Hwy. 99E, Los Molinos, CA 96055
Los Molinos Unified School District	Joey Adame	Superintendent	(530) 384-7826	jadame@lmusd.net	7851 Highway 99E, Los Molinos, CA 96055
Red Bluff Union Elementary School District	Cliff Curry	Superintendent	(530) 527-7200 Ext. 104	c Curry@rbuesd.org	1755 Airport Blvd., Administration Bldg, Red Bluff, CA 96080-4514
Reeds Creek Elementary School	Cindy Hasse	Superintendent	(530) 527-6006 Ext. 111	chaase@reeds creek.org	18335 Johnson Road Red Bluff, CA 96080
Richfield Elementary School District	Jeff Scheele	Superintendent	(530) 824-3354	jscheele@richfieldschool.org	23875 River Rd. Corning, CA 96021-9771
Lincoln Street School	Michelle Barbard	Superintendent	(530) 527-5811	mbarnard@tehamaschools.org	1135 Lincoln St, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Tehama County Department of Education	Rich Duvarney	County Superintendent	(530) 527-5811 Ext. 323	rdvarney@tehamaschools.org	1135 Lincoln St. Red Bluff, CA 96080-0689
	Karla Stroman	Safe Education and Recreation for Rural Families Program Administrator	(530) 528-7392	kstroman@tehamaschools.org	1135 Lincoln Street Red Bluff, CA 96080
<b>Parks and Recreation</b>					
Red Bluff Parks and Recreation	Karen Shaffer	Director	(530) 527-8177	kshaffer@cityofredbluff.org	1500 S Jackson St, Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Mike Skelton	Supervisor	(530) 527-4300	mskelton@cityofredbluff.org	1500 S Jackson St, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Tehama County Parks Department			(530) 528-1111		757 Oak Street, Red Bluff, CA 96080
Corning City Parks Department			(530) 824-7029	corningrecprogram@corning.org	794 3rd St, Corning, CA 96021
<b>Non-Profit</b>					
North Valley Services	Allen Skaggs	Director	(530) 527-0407	alnvs@att.net	11799 Highway 99W Red Bluff, CA 96080
Back to School Project, Inc.			(530) 529-4074	btskids@bactoschoolproject.com	P.O. Box 292 Red Bluff, CA 96080
Bikes for Kids Redding	Ted Blankenheim	Organizer	(530) 917-5806	skippy7777@gmail.com	Redding, CA
PATH Tehama County Coalition	E.C. Ross	President	(530) 527-5448	info@redbluffpath.org	P.O. Box 315, Red Bluff CA 96080
Tehama County CattleWomen	Jeanne Smith	President	(530) 527-4793	mnswebdesigns@yahoo.com	PO Box 457 Red Bluff, CA 96080
Tehama County Drug-Free Community Coalition	Ulanda Hinkston	Coalition Director	(530) 528-7356	uhinkston@tehamaschools.org	1135 Lincoln St. Red Bluff, California
<b>Tribal Partners</b>					
Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians	Latisha Miller	Rolling Hills Casino Owner	(530) 528-3500	lmiller@paskenta.org	2655 Everett Freeman Way Corning, CA 96021
<b>Local Businesses</b>					
Tehama District Fair	Mandy Staley	CEO	(530) 527-5920	info@tehamadistrictfair.com	650 Antelope Blvd. Red Bluff, CA 96080
	Shanna Long	President			
Bell-Carter Olive Co	Jud Carter	President	(530) 824-2901	contactus@bellcarter.com	1012 2nd St Corning, CA 96021-3248
Red Bluff Round-Up Association	John Trede	President	(530) 527-1000	info@redbluffroundup.com	670 Antelope Blvd. Suite #1 Red Bluff, CA 96080
<b>Bicycle Groups</b>					
Shasta Wheelmen	John Crowe	President	(530) 246-2563	info@shastawheelmen.org	P.O. Box 994292 Redding, CA 96099
Ride Redding	Carson Blume	Co-Director		info@rideredding.com	Redding, CA
Redding Trail Alliance	Nathan Knudsen	Executive Director			624 1/2 State Street, Redding, CA 96001
Red Bluff Cycling	Richard Cherveny	Admin	(530) 366-7954	rcherveny@mercy-high.org	Red Bluff, CA 96080
Chico Stage Race - Paskenta Hills Road Race	Jeff Galland	Race Director	(916) 612-0811	info@chicostagerace.com	Paskenta Hills, Paskenta, CA 96074
<b>Walking Groups</b>					
Shasta Sundial Strollers	Cynthia Turbin	President	(530) 246-4130	shastasundialstrollers@yahoo.com	215 Lake Blvd #524 Redding, CA 96003

## Appendix C

### Survey Results Summary Pages




Tehama County Active Transportation Survey

SurveyMonkey

Q1 Where do you live as your primary residence?

Answered: 35 Skipped: 2




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Red Bluff	42.86%	15
Corning	0.00%	0
Lake California	31.43%	11
Los Molinos	2.86%	1
Tehama	11.43%	4
I live somewhere else in the County	11.43%	4
I live outside the County	2.86%	1
Total Respondents: 35		

Tehama County Active Transportation Survey

SurveyMonkey

Q2 How often do you walk, hike, jog and/or run (for recreation, exercise or utilitarian)?

Answered: 36 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Almost every day	36.11%	13
A few times a week	41.67%	15
Once a week	0.00%	0
A few times a month	13.89%	5
A few times a year	0.00%	0
Never	8.33%	3
TOTAL		36




Tehama County Active Transportation Survey

SurveyMonkey

Q6 Below are some challenges associated with walking. In your opinion, which ones discourage you and others in your area from walking? (check all that apply)

Answered: 36 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Uncomfortable weather	27.78% 10
Missing sidewalks/ lack of shoulders	50.00% 18
Missing crosswalks/ Unsafe intersections	25.00% 9
Speeding	63.89% 23
Aggressive Driving	36.11% 13
Distracted Driving	41.67% 15

6 / 18

Tehama County Active Transportation Survey

SurveyMonkey


Poor night-time lighting	25.00%	9
Lack of shade	25.00%	9
Generally feeling uncomfortable walking	11.11%	4
Unable to access nearby trails	13.89%	5
Lack of nearby trails	50.00%	18
Lack of access to water	13.89%	5
Total Respondents: 36		

7 / 18



Q7 How often do you ride a bicycle (for recreation, exercise or utilitarian)?


Answered: 37 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Almost every day	5.41%	2
A few times a week	24.32%	9
Once a week	10.81%	4
A few times a month	16.22%	6
A few times a year	13.51%	5
Never	29.73%	11
TOTAL		37

Q11 Below are some challenges associated with bicycling. In your opinion, which ones discourage you and others in your area from biking? (check all that apply)

Answered: 24 Skipped: 13



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Uncomfortable weather	25.00%	6
Missing bike lanes/ lack of shoulders	58.33%	14
Unsafe crossings and intersections	33.33%	8
Speeding	54.17%	13
Aggressive Driving	54.17%	13
Distracted Driving	62.50%	15
Poor night-time lighting	16.67%	4
Lack of shade	12.50%	3



Tehama County Active Transportation Survey


SurveyMonkey

Generally feeling uncomfortable bicycling	4.17%	1
Unable to access nearby trails	29.17%	7
Lack of nearby trails to ride on	54.17%	13
Total Respondents: 24		

Tehama County Active Transportation Survey

SurveyMonkey

Q12 I would consider riding my bike more if.... (pick all that apply)



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
there were wider shoulders on roads	58.33%	14
there were bike lanes on roads	66.67%	16
there was a separation between me and the vehicles	45.83%	11
there were more paved trails	54.17%	13
there were more dirt trails	33.33%	8
there were more bike racks at my destination	25.00%	6



Tehama County Active Transportation Survey	SurveyMonkey	
there were more bike racks at trailheads	20.83%	5
there were showers at work	12.50%	3
there was better signage/wayfinding	29.17%	7
there were "Bikes May Use Full Lane" signage where needed	8.33%	2
if I could get mechanical help with my bike	4.17%	1
if I felt more comfortable riding around cars	25.00%	6
I would not ride a bicycle, for any reason	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 24		

## Appendix D

### School Outreach Summary



## OVERVIEW

The project team conducted phone interviews with administration of rural Tehama County schools to determine unmet active transportation needs in rural communities. Interviews took place in November and December of 2018 and were casual and generally very brief, intended to determine whether students walk and bike to the school and if they are safe doing so. Some schools could not be reached via phone or email during the interview process, but most administrators reached were excited about the possibility of improving safety at their schools.

### *Bend Elementary*

Spoke with Principal or Assistant Supervisor Nancy. She said they are at the point of writing a Safe Routes to School grant. It would be less extensive than the project recently built at Evergreen Middle School. Driscolls is located next to the school, will donate property for the project, and will set their fence back 12 feet for a multi-use trail on the North side of Bend Ferry Rd. The project will be located on the North side of Bend Ferry Rd from either the West side of Driscolls or from Ash Lane to Via Pasado.

Vehicles currently travel at 60 mph or more on Bend Ferry Rd, posing a threat to students who walk along the road.

A parent survey is conducted every year at Bend Elementary. The average score for the question “My child is safe going to and from school” has decreased.

### *Elkins Elementary, Paskenta*

An administrator of Elkins Elementary was interviewed. She stated that students walk and bike to school as there is no bus. However, there are no shoulders along roadways, posing a danger to students. The busiest and most dangerous times are drop-off (8 –

8:15 am) and pickup (2:30 – 3pm). A safe path for students to walk between Elkins Elementary and the community center (Paskenta Community Hall) would be “a godsend” according to the interviewee. The path would follow the north side of Toomes Camp Rd between Wannatoddy Ln and Crane Mill Rd.

### *Gerber Elementary, Gerber*

Conducted an interview with Jenny Montayo, Superintendent. She said that although few or even no students walk to school due to the rural nature of the school, improvements are needed to properly and safely accommodate student traffic during arrival and dismissal time.

Gerber Elementary is situated along Chard Ave., which is a narrow roadway connecting State Hwy 99W and Rawson Road. Vehicles speed down this roadway destined for Red Bluff, Las Flores, Gerber, or Proberta. Superintendent Montayo said Chard need sidewalks, as well as speed bumps and speed feedback signs to slow vehicle traffic down and give pedestrians a separate area to walk.

Superintendent Montayo also noted safety issues pertaining to inadequate parking. Currently, there is one small parking lot used for staff and faculty parking, and the same lot is used for buses and parents during arrival/dismissal times. She recommended that the bus yard to the west of the current parking lot be utilized for faculty parking to increase safety during arrival/dismissal peak traffic.

### *Kirkwood Elementary, Corning*

Contacted Kim Varner, Secretary. She stated that the school’s main issue is lack of visibility. Kirkwood Road is narrow and lacks adequate infrastructure including crosswalks, sidewalks, and paved shoulders. An estimated 9 schoolchildren walk to school while 0 bike. Secretary Kim Varner stated that the school has contacted the



city multiple times within the last year in an effort to have crosswalks and sidewalks installed.

She also emphasized that staff have witnessed drivers speeding on Kirkwood Road, specifically around the S turn northwest of Kirkwood Elementary. She recommended installing crosswalks with rapid flashing beacons to alert drivers of students walking and biking in the area. She also suggested wide sidewalks and speedbumps to reduce traffic speeds.

Varner stated that drop off and pick up hours are highly congested. This is due to the lack of parking on the small property and on-street. Parents must park on the dirt shoulders off the main road and have their children walk across Kirkwood Road without crosswalks.

*Lassen View Elementary, Los Molinos*

Contacted Dave Hague, Director of Maintenance. He stated that they currently do not allow students to bike or walk to school due to heavy traffic and frequent accidents along State Highway 99. The school has petitioned to the state several times in an effort to upgrade visibility. There is currently only one yellow school sign along State Highway 99 indicating that there is a school in the area. The school zone lacks speed reduction signs.

Pick-up and drop-off hours are very congested. School officials have witnessed several parents getting into accidents as they merge onto the highway. The area has experienced a high rate of pedestrian collisions. Ultimately discouraging community members and students from walking or biking.

*Los Molinos High School, Los Molinos*

Called December 27-28. Could not contact, but Los Molinos High School already has bicycle lanes and sidewalks from a recent Safe Routes project.

*Los Molinos Elementary, Los Molinos*

Conducted an interview with Cari Novo, Secretary. She stated that students are discouraged from walking and biking to school due to a lack of infrastructure along Stanford Avenue. She noted that the sidewalks on the northeast side of Stanford Avenue are not ADA compliant. The crosswalk on the intersection of South Center Street and Stanford Road lacks a curb ramp making mobility difficult. Novo also noted the absence of sidewalks and paved shoulders on the northwest side of Stanford Avenue.

She also stated that Los Molinos Elementary has taken matters into their own hands to combat increased congestion during drop off and pick up hours. Staff members and buses are only able to park and load in the back parking lot. She believes this has only slightly reduced the amount of on-street parking and increased visibility of students.

*Vina Elementary, Vina*

Contacted Graciela Resendiz, Secretary. She stated that Vina Road lacks sidewalks, crosswalks, and paved shoulders. D Street also lacks sidewalks and crosswalks. The scarcity of infrastructure around Vina Elementary puts schoolchildren at risk when engaging in active transportation.

*Reeds Creek Elementary, Red Bluff*

Contacted Karen Deveraux, Office Secretary. She stated that all schoolchildren rely on school buses or their parents to get to and from school. Although no students currently walk or bike to school,



the infrastructure is inadequate. There is an absence of sidewalks, crosswalks, paved shoulders, and lighting along Johnson Road.

*Richfield Elementary, Corning*

River Road lacks high visibility crosswalks and crossing beacons.

*Flournoy Elementary, Flournoy*

Conducted an interview with Erin Murphy, Instructional Aid. She stated that she is unsure of how many of the 35 students walk or bike to school. A majority of the students travel to school via bus or their parents. Osborn Road lacks sidewalks, crosswalks, paved shoulders, and lighting. Ultimately posing a threat to schoolchildren safety and discouraging them from walking or biking to school.

*Capay Joint Union Elementary, Orland*

Cutting Avenue lacks ADA compliant sidewalks, paved shoulders, crosswalks.

The crosswalks at the intersection of Cutting Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is are not ADA compliant.

There is an absence of sidewalks on the northwest portion of 4<sup>th</sup> avenue. The crosswalks on the northeast side lack curb ramps.

## Appendix E

### Detailed Community Comments



## Tehama ATP Map Comments Summary

### Tehama & Los Molinos

*Mixed use trail and crossing over Sacramento River on old railroad bridge*

*More lights in Mill Creek Park*

*Blind corners along Tehama Vina Road*

*Connectivity needed along Tehama Vina Road*

*Bike path option: adjacent to the railroad from the intersection of CA-99 and Armayo way to the intersection of B Street and 5th Street*

*Bike path option: along Tehama Vina Road*

### Lake California

*Bike/walking path on one side of Lake California Drive*

### Red Bluff

*Bike path option: class IV bike route along CA-36*

*Need lighting along Chestnut Avenue*

*Schools need connections to parks*

*Need walking path connections along Aloha Street*

*Need creek connection from El Cerrito Drive to Carl Court*

*Gap in the bike lane along S Jackson Street between Crosby Lane and Spyglass Drive needs re-striping*

*Lack speed controls at intersections bounded by Main Street and Lincoln Street from Breckenridge Street to Walnut Street*

*I-5 bridges are scary for biking and walking*

*Shasta College needs a pedestrian/bicyclist path connection*

*Kimball Road and Montgomery stop sign*

*Pedestrian bridge crossing Sacramento River*

*Round about or flashing crosswalks at intersection of Antelope Blvd and 36: dangerous for pedestrians/bikes*

*Trail from fair grounds to Hogsback Road*

*Wider shoulders along Trinity Avenue and Saint Marys Avenue*

### Tehama County

*Connect Gerber, Tehama, & Los Molinos by trail*

*Need bike/ped connection on Wilcox Gold Road overpass*

*North Hess Road ends and forces bikers/pedestrians onto the freeway*

*River trail along Sacramento River in Bend*



## Fair Outreach, July 20 - 22

### Map Comments Summary

*Connect the park (Red Bluff Recreational Area) to the college (Shasta College - Tehama Campus); Utilize the existing diversion dam path to create a loop*

*Lake California Drive is very dangerous, with blind curves*

*3rd Street in Red Bluff needs improvement*

*Walnut Street from Scoops (Lincoln Street) and west needs bicycle improvements*

*The right side of the train tracks, by Raley's, needs improvement*

*The bridge over Aloha Street near east of Jackson needs improvement - people hang out under the bridge and there is no safe space*

## Red Bluff Meeting, October 25

### Paper Comments Summary

*Aloha/Willow & Train*

*Tree roots - throughout town on Walnut*

*Access to West side of river / Diamond Ave. Fish*

## Proberta & Los Molinos Meeting, November 7

### Paper Comments Summary

*Bus to Corning from Gerber is challenging - more outreach on route schedules*

*Needs more safe pedestrian crossings, other than Antelope*

*Trails - more, health benefits: Red Bluff, Diversion Dam, river trails, hiking trails needed*

*Walgreens/Luther Rd and South Main St - bad intersection*

*Fix our roads:*

*- Hospital to freeway section is dangerous*

*- Not in support of rail services*

*- Kimball - South Jackson St: the school area needs work, may be a good project for kids*

*- Need to improve rural bus routes, they are not cost effective*

*Special needs family member:*

*- Horseback rider who is ADA, lives in Gerber, places to ride twice a week, he needs separate pathway*

*- Need a safe walking path through Gerber: there is zero connectivity, prevents mobility, 99W is not safe to walk on*

*Kimball Road needs work/safety improvements*

*Needs a stop sign at Montgomery, safety hazard at the clinic, perhaps a bulbout*

*Metteer Elementary School: children walk through the intersection and it's scary*

*Horseback trails would help for mobility, right now we have to trailer them*

*Jackson Heights Trail would be nice as a multi use path*



*Bike lanes, trails, transit needed for the elderly*

*Rural roads need more lighting*

*Transit from homes - elderly to the main lines*

*Lots of pedestrians in Los Molinos: don't feel safe walking, impaired drivers are not separate from walking areas*

*Tehama Vina Road is a shortcut for drivers, the striping isn't visible so drivers take up the whole paved area, there needs to be more reflective areas, the curves are blind, there is no lighting, it's dangerous for drivers and walking*

*Recommend a traffic count on the road*

*Los Molinos: flower planters are a hazard and in the way of the flow of traffic and bike paths*

*Lighting issues along 99 West, in Mill Creek Park, and on west side of Tehama Vina Rd*

*Bridge from Tehama-Los Molinos good but road needs work*

*Tehama needs sidewalks, bike paths, and crosswalks*

*Los Molinos crosswalks are good and get people to slow down, lighted crosswalks help*

*Everday maintenance and the shoulders need improvements*

*Red Bluff 99 and Main St: move and add a middle turn lane so people aren't driving in the shoulder where pedestrians are walking*

*Josephine St need road work: due to health issues, I haven't been active, but I plan on riding my bike, but not at night because there is very low visibility*

*Lighting issues from elementary school to high school on Sandord Ave*

*Biking to town for kids is not a very good situation so they are sent down Roosevelt to avoid 99*

*Farmers also take Roosevelt competing with pedestrians*

*Avoid the high traffic times like mornings or evenings*

*If the bus went down a little further South of Los Molinos, it would help*

*Need a trail connection to Butte College from Los Molinos through Vina*

*Access to public lands is difficult on the river and is problematic, you need a boat to get to many places*

*The planting areas and lights on Main St in Los Molinos are an issue, bike racks would be a nice addition to future projects*

*Los Molinos: river trail from Woodson Bridge at the park for equestrian use has become dilapidated and unused, there is an old network that isn't maintained any more*

*Flower boxes are unnecessary improvements as barrier for bike lanes, it has stopped/slowed traffic because people can't park*

*99 and Los Molinos need to have shoulders swept*

*Walnut and South Main St need to be reworked in Red Bluff*

*Need more public transportation, the routes need to cover more areas, light rail for rural areas*



**SurveyMonkey Responses to Open-Ended Questions and "Other" Options**

**Where (if at all) do you walk, hike, jog and/or run for recreation or transportation?**

All over Tehama City streets.
On the streets of the City of Tehama
On my own property.Well at le act it's
I walk or ride my bike in Los Molinos on the streets or bike path when there is one.
Tehama, often down & around Durro's cornfield & then back to the north end of town. Sometimes to the bridge to watch the river and the birds.
SRDC, Chico!
River Park - Diversion Dam Neighborhood
Down Sale by river
Wilcox Golf Road
Downtown Red Bluff, Diversion Dam Area
In & near Tehama
Every where if my bikes flat
Tehama County Roads, Red Bluff City Streets, Mendocino Forest, Lassen Park
RB Rec Area, RB River Park, Jellys Ferry trails, Bend Area trails
For work, not exercise. Loop on Kimball to airport to vista S Jackson and back to Kimball streets
In the Mineral area. Recreation
Red Bluff, and vicinity.
During the week, I stick to neighborhood streets and unofficial trails. On the weekends, I will drive to either local BLM trail systems or city of Redding trail systems
Lake California streets
Lake California river trail
Diversion Damn trail, Hogs Lake and Iron Canyon, around town
Open Space
Lake Ca
Usually I hike in a wooded area north of here. I would love it if the trail would open up in lake California so I could walk and run closer to home We walk around the neighborhood. Gym
Around Lake Cali and River Trail in Redding
Neighborhood
In Lake Ca...the hills, etc
bike streets don't know where else
City streets and sidewalks Mendocino Rec. Area



pharmacy
Gurnuey Ave and street where I live
bus
L.C.
In my house
<b>What do you like MOST about walking/hiking/running there?</b>
Mostly quiet, serene & peaceful. Nice neighbors to greet & converse with.
It is usually quiet, with little traffic and some wild life
Well, at least it's close to home and I won't get run over.
I enjoy the scenery and meeting people.
The size of the city, seeing the clouds & mountains by Durro's, the river, and most of the town (except 5th & C streets) have little or no traffic most of the time
Trees, open space
Beautiful, safe
Free
Scenery & exercise
Pretty Area
Close to home
Nothing
Lite traffic, wildlife
access natural landscape
Conveniently close to home
something to do, our town small we should be able to walk all of it and feel safe
being in the outdoors
Light traffic, well most of the time, good weather.
Neighborhood - ease of access BLM and city of Redding - diverse terrain, connect with nature, variety of options for easy/hard and short/long hikes and rides
Quiet
Safe
paved trails and easily accessible
Solitude
Not much traffic
Safe Clean Easily accessible
Lake California—safe and beautiful River Trail. That I can take it to Shasta dam



Convenient
Views, hills, quiet
unsafe, need no cars
semi-paved
keeps my knees active
endorphins
walking breaks
quiet
N/A
What do you like LEAST about walking/hiking/running there?
Nothing - Tehama is a great place to live & walk.
Loose dogs and fast non courteous drivers. Some preschool drivers picking up or bringing their children drive fast and won't give a walker an inch. It gets boring. But if I step foot off my property I am subjected to cars going 50 to 70 mph on a narrow road with little to no shoulder. Kids, deer, rattlesnakes,bikeriders,joggers and walkers still brave this road. It's beautiful and where else are they going to go. I've had to many close calls. Can't something be done about the speed limit? Like a rural recreation designation of 30 to 40 mph?
I don't always feel safe when walking or riding due to the unsafe areas where autos also are traveling. Blind spots where bikes or pedestrians cannot be seen.
Dogs if they're loose. When Pacific Farms spreads their waste products in nearby orchards - smells toxic & strong
People who litter, Biking not safe
Sometimes sketchy people
Dogs
worrying about cars
It's fine, I'm just happy to walk :)
The occasional problem dog or problem driver
Everything
Lack of room on roads
Lack of trail maintenance
Isolated, poor lighting at night/dusk, the corner of airport turning into vista is better if you cut through parking lot of corner business - too dangerous
Winter
Roads are falling apart, and poor drivers.
Neighborhood - Traffic and lack of variety BLM and City of Redding - takes 30-45 minites to get to a trailhead
Dogs running loose
Cars
crowded at times



Lack of trails, shoulders on roads
To far from home
Lake California. Nothing Redding. I would rather exercise more closer to my home and support local businesses in tehama county
No bike paths to speak of!!!
people speeding and not obeying stop signs
car, even if they're parked could open the door and hit me
few bike lanes sidewalks uneven or missing
I start hurting
Hot weather. need shade and water.
running
heat
All of it
Below are some challenges associated with walking. In your opinion, which ones discourage you and others in your area from walking? (check all that apply)
Speeding - If on 5th Street mainly
If you must leave the road the shoulders are sloping, uneven and have debris
Smoke from fires. Sometimes it is too hot (for afternoon / early evening)! Also, when Pacific Farms spreads whatever they spread on their orchards (smells like chemical waste products) it becomes too bad smelling & hurts my eyes.
Hot!
Heat, dogs
Uncontrolled dogs - being chased, snapped at, etc
These questions aren't relevant for the purpose of this survey.
We need more trails for walkers and runners in lake California
I would bike more often if I had safe place The streets are not safe
too heavy
Where (if at all) do you ride a bicycle for recreation or transportation?
On city streets.
Trail ride - parks, Sac River Trail
Around my neighborhood
In & around Tehama
Between Gerber to Tehama, Los Molinos & around town. Gerber Road I go between RR trax & orchard to Tehama Avenue. Thankfully if I don't stop to long & I don't bother the orchard workers or get up on traxs nobody has got mad i cut thru
Roads only thing we have, very unsafe
only on my street



have bike, don't ride - not sure where trails are - can we make a map of bike and walking trails in Tehama County?
roads
In the Mineral area
Red Bluff, and outskirts.
See answer to question 3
Lake California streets
LC
Lake California
Lake ca
Neighborhood
Redding. River Trail or wiskeytown
Neighborhood
Same
Redding
I go out Red Bank or that way, I ride to town
City streets
to restaurant
LC
<b>What do you like MOST about bicycling there?</b>
The scenery.
No traffic
I'm close to home
Good cardio & endurance training
Everything that isn't gonna get me hit by cars on that stretch between Gerber & Tehama.
Getting to one place to another
Lacks heavy car usage and it's near river riparian area
Being outdoors
Good weather, somewhat lite traffic.
See answer to question 4
Quiet and beautiful scene
Safer than most
Bike Lanes
Not much traffic
Close to home Lake California is not out of the way so not like to have to drive so far just to enjoy a day hike



Accessible to shasta dam and mountain biking in national parks
Convenient
Same
trail
not as many cars
only place close to home
get places faster
quiet
What do you like LEAST about bicycling there?
Too much aggressive traffic
The safety issues.
I can only pick places that are safe & easy
Nothing
Problem dogs & drivers
That the bus schedule to Corning via Gerber is fucked cause the new orland connection. Really, again this is NOT the questions I feel will resolve this issue.
unsafe
I rode my bike to work and to ruin errands in all other communities I have lived in. All except this one, very disappointing. Lack of shade and safe riding lanes and routes to commute / connected routes.
not all our roads have bike lanes
Our roads are falling apart, repairs are poor at best.
See answer to question 5. And I would add that the road surfaces are not the best for road biking and there are few options for mountain biking in and around lake california
Traffic
Speeders
Poor intersections
It's fine
The transient population in Redding
Goatheads causing flats
Same
homeless tweekers
roads are narrow and rough
Lack of bike lanes No bike-hike trails
putting in effort



heat
Below are some challenges associated with bicycling. In your opinion, which ones discourage you and others in your area from walking? (check all that apply)
Poor road pavement conditions. ie: potholes.
Dogs chasing me, puncture vine
Nothing I like biking, but not from Gerber to Proberta just to get to Dollar General or bus to Corning.
Would more often if had a safe place
I would consider riding my bike or riding more if.... (pick all that apply)
Can no longer ride my bike due to back injury.
If there were better lighting at night.
I'm more interested in walking
I ride more if it was safer in our area. Need to know places to ride.
Speeders & dogs here dealt with
Again, my give me about riding a bike in my feelings about Transportation are not even relevant because with or without the transportation changes I still enjoy the ride my bike there for this question is stupid
Please make bike trails so families and old people (me) can get out safe
Where (if any) do there need to be safer street or highway crossings for people, walking, running, hiking, biking or cross country skiing?
Corner of C & 2nd Streets in Tehama & by Post Office. Traffic often doesn't stop of even slow down in spite of speed limit or pedestrian crossing signs.
Great idea
Tehama Vina Rd. And Mill Creek Park.
More places
All along main roads
More crosswalks in Tehama & enforcement of failure to yield to pedestrians.
Between River and Tehama, Aramayo Way, Solana Street to South Avenue,
Most county road seem to not be wide and could use at least wide shoulder
All major intersections, school crossings
Main & Pine, Washington & Oak, Antelope by freeway on & off ramps
Walnut St
Many lights do not change for bicycle riders without a car at intersection. Main-Adobe road for example.
LC
along both major highways that run through towns and communities throughout the County
The intersection of Lake California Drive and Bowman Road
Lake California Drive, Bowman, Gas Point, Jelly's Ferry



We need a good trail to get bikes and walking off the streets
Walnut & Paskenta Rd, intersections Main St Luther on north side
all over
Where (if any) do there need to be wider shoulders and bike lanes for people, walking, running, hiking, biking?
Everywhere - The shoulder should be distinct and CLEAN
Great idea
All over the west end k of Red Bluff.
Tehama Vina Rd and Mill Creek Park.
The shoulders are pretty accurate for walking & I like that there is a sidewalk on the bridge
Wilcox
NA
look I got very very high interest in the subject matter and I've also contacted Google regarding some of the subjects related to the busing in this County and I'd be more than happy to give you some data because these questions are not even relevant to the solution that you're trying to achieve because these questions are not even relevant to the solution that you're trying to achieve
Tehama County
Yes Main St N > S through HWY 99 to NVS or at least hospital.
Paskenta Rd, Baker Road
The community of Mineral had filed a petition with Caltrans for a pave bike/walking trail from about 2 years ago. The pave bike/walking trail would start at the Mineral store and go west about 1.5 miles to the Battle Creek camp ground area. In the summer months the camp ground gets about 3500 visitors and the Mt. Lassen Assembly of God Camp gets about 750 visitors. A great deal of these visitors walk or ride their bikes from the camp grounds to the Mineral store and restaurant. A cross the street from the Mineral Caltrans station is a LNP baseball field that the visitors from the camp grounds and the people of Mineral use this public baseball facilities. At the present time there is a dirt path that they are using. The local resident uses this path also for exercise. The state right away is 70 feet and 100 feet in this area. I believe this path would encourage exercise and improve the quality of life for the local community.
Main street, Walnut st. Rawson Rd, Antelope Blvd. Adobe Rd.
Lake california drive!
Most streets
Highways
Lake California Drive
All roads mentioned above
Along reed creek would be a nice trail or river We have one at dam but we need one of this side of river
Most country roads Rawson Old 99
Highway 99 E
LC and LC Drive is very dangerous



Where (if any) do there need to be sidewalks for people walking and those with limited mobility?
Sidewalks won't solve the problem as they are uneven and usually have curbs which make it more uneven. Clean up the shoulders for people walking and bicycling and enforce leashes on dogs.
Great idea
Tehama Vina Rd
All areas of recreation
The entire County you might as well just start you might as well just level the county and start over.
City streets have some buckling issues, broken and missing parts
Walnut St
I realize the county isnt responsible for roads within lake california, but a separate walking path on the hill down to the lake club would be much safer way for walkers and bikers to get up and down the hill
All our streets
Red Bluff
Approach to Shasta College Red Bluff Campus
Unknown
Paskenta Rd - Luther We have kids walking to school with no sidewalks
Paskenta Rd in Red Bluff end of Aloha, Walnut & Paskenta intersection Luther - beyond airport
all over
to get around