

This chapter presents implementation measures including potential scenarios for waste-water treatment, utilization of the design guidelines, and funding sources.

A. Waste-Water Treatment Planning Process

The shape, size, and walkability of Laytonville will be governed by which waste-water treatment option the community chooses. Currently, low-density land-use prevails in the downtown area because large portions of parcels must be set aside for septic systems and alternate leach lines, thus maintaining large distances between destinations. Infill development and increasing the density and mix of uses in the Town Center will be important for developing more sustainable land-use patterns and for the community to realize its vision.

Laytonville has several options. Like Goldilocks who sampled three bowls of porridge and three chairs to determine which one was “just right”, so too must residents of Laytonville choose which waste-water treatment option is “just right” to support the community’s vision, goals, and development needs.

Over three decades of work has been conducted through the Laytonville County Water District, LAMAC, various consultant teams, and multiple citizen-based waste-water treatment committees to begin to address these needs. A November 2001 study conducted by Oscar Larson and Associates for the LAMAC recommended a combination pond/storage/wetland treatment system, and a combination Ten Mile Creek/Irrigation disposal system.

A public entity will be necessary to manage the waste-water treatment system within the boundaries of the Laytonville County Water District. Two options exist: 1) expand the Laytonville County Water District’s powers to include sewer, or 2) form a new district such as a septic management district, sewer district or Community Services District. Potential treatment systems

and management options are discussed below.

1. Papa Bear

A centralized waste-water treatment (sewer) facility would be the most expensive and growth-supporting option for Laytonville. Sewer would allow for greater densities, amenities and business expansion in the Town Center, multi-family housing opportunities, a public restroom, and infill development within the district boundaries. During this planning process, residents expressed concern that a central sewer system may allow for a level of growth that is not consistent with the small-town, rural character of Laytonville. Since the majority of centralized systems rely on surface discharge, there are also community concerns about the impact of effluent on Ten Mile Creek, however, this can be mitigated through tertiary treatment.

2. Mama Bear

Decentralized waste-water treatment facilities offer an incremental approach to development by providing increased treatment options for a cluster of homes or a commercial cluster. They offer cost-effective, aesthetic solutions for water treatment because central-

ized underground infrastructure is not required. Such management systems would allow for more compact development in the Town Center for specific neighborhoods or clusters of buildings. A variety of decentralized treatment options can be utilized.

- a) Constructed Wetland systems provide a simple, low-maintenance alternative to conventional treatment systems. They can be integrated into a complete system including pre-treatment, disinfection, and re-use. Compared to other decentralized methods, they reduce sludge production and energy consumption. Constructed wetlands have been effectively integrated into waste water treatment systems in many locations including Arcata, CA and Berea, KY.
- b) Forest Evapo-transpiration Systems are a secondary treatment component of a complete waste water system. Pre-treated wastewater is passed through pipes into the trees' rootzones. Redwood trees are known to be particularly effective at pumping water from the ground; studies suggest that a mature Redwood tree can utilize up to 500 gallons/day. Additional benefits resulting from forest growth are carbon seques-

tration and the production of valuable lumber. Water-consuming grasses, including Reed Canary Grass, may also be appropriate to facilitate evapo-transpiration. Such systems have been effectively used in Massachusetts, Vermont, and California.

- c) Clustered Septic systems are an alternative to individual septic systems. They usually involve individual septic tanks that are gravity-fed or pumped to a shared leach line. In a neighborhood, the shared leach line provides an opportunity for a community park and open space. This type of system requires a septic management district to maintain tanks and leach lines. The use of these systems is widespread in the United States.

3. Baby Bear

Whether Laytonville chooses to stay with individual septic systems, or a to create a septic management district for purposes of managing individual systems, growth and development opportunities will remain limited. Vacant lots will be required for waste water treatment in the Town Center, pushing desired com-

munity amenities and facilities into other areas of the community. While individual septic remains the “default” for property-owners, serious consideration should be given to the long-term implications of this choice. This management option is not consistent with the community’s vision as outlined in previous chapters.

It is recommended that the Laytonville County Water District, LAMAC, County of Mendocino, and interested developers work collaboratively to address wastewater treatment needs in Laytonville.

B. Purpose of Design Guidelines

The Design Guidelines in Chapter 7 provide guidance for design and construction of the built environment within Laytonville’s Town Center. The purpose of the guidelines is to help achieve the community’s vision for a safer, pedestrian-oriented Town Center that achieves a distinctive identity.

These guidelines are developed for use by the LAMAC as a framework for evaluating projects within the Town

Center for consistency with desired community form. The Mendocino County Department of Planning and Building Services (DPBS) currently refers all zoning changes within the LAMAC boundaries to the LAMAC for review and comment. Similarly, all applications for building permits should be referred by DPBS to the LAMAC for review under these guidelines.

C. Potential Funding Sources and Economic Development Opportunities

1. Low-cost Implementation Measures

Perhaps the most sensible and timely improvements to the Town Center can be made by local residents, business-owners, students, and artists. Laytonville has a strong tradition of public artwork, including mosaic benches, tiles, and kiosks built by High School Students. Community members are encouraged to keep these traditions alive. Local grant sources that may aid in these efforts include:

a) Arts for the Future Grant.(AF)

This grant program is offered through the Community Foundation of Mendocino County and is designed to establish mutually beneficial,

long-standing relationships between successful arts organizations, artists, and/or artist cooperatives and the businesses and/or non-arts organizations in the communities in which they reside. They hope to inspire innovative programming that enriches the quality of the arts in the County and increases the earned income of local artists/arts organizations and their community partners.

b) Community Enrichment Grant (CE)

This grant is offered through the Community Foundation of Mendocino County and is available to any non-profit organization that is based in Mendocino County; or any organization with a project that has specific benefit to Mendocino County residents. This program has previously funded equipment purchase and the Laytonville Community Garden in previous grant cycles. Up to \$5,000 is allowed per project.

c) Local Fundraising Campaigns (local)

Historically, local fundraising campaigns have been very effective at supporting community organizations, projects, and individuals in need

in Laytonville. While care should be taken to not place too-heavy a reliance on donations from local businesses, soliciting donations from landowners offers promise. The potential for fundraising events such as bake-sales, barbeques, and entertainment events should continue to be explored.

2. Major Funding Sources

As an unincorporated community, Laytonville must partner with a fiscal sponsor and/or public agency to be eligible for most funds. There are multiple funding sources available through Mendocino County and the Mendocino Council of Governments through which Laytonville could benefit. Some of these funding sources are controlled directly by MCOG – State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Transportation Enhancement (TE) program, while most remaining programs are awarded and then administered by either State or Federal agencies.

Private foundations also offer funding for facilities desired by the community.

a) Local Transportation Fund (LTF)

LTF funds are administered by MCOG for regional transportation planning, public transit,

bicycle and pedestrian projects. Funds are derived from a ¼ cent regional sales tax.

b) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

STIP provides funding on a formula basis to Mendocino County. All funding from the STIP (other than a small percentage used for Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) activities) must be used for capital improvement projects. Categories for potential projects include highways/street/roads, bicycle and pedestrian, transit and rail.

c) Transportation Enhancements (TE)

The TE program is Federally-funded on a six-year cycle, consistent with the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill. The program develops projects that creatively and sensitively integrate surface transportation enhancements into the surrounding community. Projects must be over and above required mitigation of normal transportation projects. Projects must fall into one of twelve categories including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, landscaping and beautification, and his-toric rehabilitation. Gateways are also eligible for TE funds. Regional TE funds These funds are administered through MCOG,

and State TE funds are administered through Caltrans.

d) Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) Grants

These State Highway Funds-sourced funds are allocated through Caltrans annually to assist communities with integrated transportation and land use planning. Once funded, applicants are eligible for a second round of funds for further studies. Up to \$300,000 is allowed per project, and a 20% local match is required.

e) Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning (EJ)

These Caltrans grant funds are available to promote community involvement in planning to improve mobility and safety while promoting economic opportunity, equity, environmental protection and affordable housing. Maximum grant amount is \$250,000, and a 10% local match is required.

f) Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)

This statewide competitive program provides state funding for city and county capital projects that will improve safety and convenience for bi-

cycle commuters. Commuter trips include trips made primarily for work, school, or shopping, and does not include trips made primarily for recreation. From 2006/07 and forward, there is expected to be \$5 million available annually in this grant program. Applicants may request no more than ¼ of the annual available total funding. A 10% local match is required. See website at www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta.

g) Safe Routes to School (SR2S)

This competitive program makes grants available to local government agencies, including school districts, for construction of safer routes to school. Competitive applications will enlist the assistance of other participants including school boards, school districts, elected officials, community groups, students, and other agencies.

h) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

This Federally-funded and State-administered program provides funds for safety improvements on any public road, any public surface transportation facility, any publicly-owned bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail, and for

any traffic calming measure. These funds serve to eliminate or reduce the number and severity of traffic accidents at locations selected for improvement. Projects are eligible based on calculated Safety Index. With County sponsorship, Laytonville could be eligible for these funds. See website at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.htm>

i) Sustainable Communities Grant and Loan Program (SCGL)

The California Pollution Control Financing Authority has implemented the Sustainable Communities Grant and Loan Program to assist cities and counties to develop and implement sustainable development growth policies, programs and projects. It is unknown whether this grant program will extend beyond the 2007 cycle. See website at www.treasurer.ca.gov/CP-CFA for more information.

j) USDA-Rural Business Enterprise Grants (RBEG)

These grants are available to cities and non-profits. The primary criterion is the creation of jobs and economic development, with an emphasis on small businesses. They can be used for training, technical assistance, capital expenditures,

parking, façade improvements and other uses. They typically range from \$100,000 to \$200,000. See website at www.rurdev.usda.gov/rbs/busp/rbeg.htm.

k) Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

CDBG monies are available for unincorporated rural communities through state-allocated CDBG funds accessible through County Government. Eligible activities include:

- construction or reconstruction of streets, water and sewer facilities, neighborhood centers, recreation facilities, and other public works;
- demolition;
- rehabilitation of public and private buildings;
- public services; and
- planning activities.

l) Energy Partnership Program (EPP)

The California Energy Commission offers energy audits and low-interest financing to public schools, special districts, public and non-profit hospitals, and public care institutions to help re-

duce energy consumption and install renewable energy systems. Loans totaling \$3 million are available to public institutions at a 3.95% interest rate. The CEC provide the following free assistance:

- Conducting energy audits and prepare feasibility studies
- Reviewing existing proposals and designs
- Developing equipment performance specifications
- Reviewing equipment bid specifications
- Assisting with contractor selection
- Assisting with commissioning

Applications can be downloaded at:

www.energy.ca.gov/efficiency/partnership/index.html

m) Tony Hawk Foundation (Hawk)

This foundation's goal is to promote high-quality public skate parks in low-income areas throughout the United States. A maximum \$25,000 may be requested. Applications may be downloaded at:

http://www.tonyhawkfoundation.org/grant_application.asp

n) Prop 1C Funding (1C)

Proposition 1C was passed by the voters in November 2006. Among the housing grant and loan programs to be initiated in 2008 are the Housing on School sites program that provides affordable housing for teachers and school employees, and the Infill Incentive Grant program that provides funding for public infrastructure (sewer, water, parks, site cleanup) to facilitate infill housing development. Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) will be available in January 2008. See website at <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/>.

o) Proposition 42 Funds

The passage of Proposition 42 in 2002 created a new source of funding (from the sales tax on gasoline) for improvements to streets and roads. The funds are distributed on a formula basis to counties and cities.

p) Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

These are federal funds which are exchanged for State funds (for easier administration). The state distributes these funds on a formula basis direct-

ly to counties and regional transportation planning agencies. MCOG distributes its regional share to the County and cities on a formula basis, and retains a share for regional projects. These funds may be used for streets and roads capital projects.

q) Proposition 1B Transportation Bond

A total of \$2 billion was approved by California voters in November 2006, for local street and roads capital projects. These funds will be distributed from the state to counties and cities on a formula basis beginning in FY 2007/08.

r) Recreational Trails Program (RT)

Investigate the RT Program thru the California State Parks system, to possibly fund trail improvements identified. See web site for more details: http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=24324

