

Sidnie Olson

From: MATT GROSZMANN [mgroszmann@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 12:00 PM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Balloon Tract CEQA Scoping Comments

Hello Senior Planner Olson,

I would like to submit my scoping comments on the City of Eureka General Plan Amendment and Rezoning that has been requested for the Big Box anchored retail development project being proposed for the Balloon Tract property.

As a proud citizen of Eureka, I am deeply concerned about the real impact of this proposed development that will no doubt be felt by all folks in the Eureka area, as well as Humboldt County as a whole. Not only do I have strong concerns about the contamination that exists on the site, but also the economic impact of this style of development on the community at large. Though I am not by any means an expert on these particular issues, I do realize that CEQA requires an Environmental Impact Report for this project. It cannot be stated strongly enough, how ultra important it is that this EIR consider these concerns that I mention, in great detail. Though I certainly do not speak for all citizens when it comes to this project, I have gotten a sense that most people agree that the EIR process for this proposed development needs to be as thorough and transparent as is possible.

As mentioned, clearly, I have substantial concerns about the current toxins on the site. I feel that the EIR must be very thorough when it comes to this. All citizens need to know what the impact of these toxins mean to all things living. That includes the property itself, as well as all surrounding water ways. And since the Balloon Tract is so close to Humboldt Bay, the effects on the ground water below is also paramount. Not only for current 2006, but also for the long term. From this point, I feel strongly that particular attention needs to be payed to what type of cleanup process is best for dealing with the contamination. I am not referring to only those processes that are the most economical, but whichever processes that clean up the site completely. So that there is only a very minimal chance of future health concerns from the contamination. Furthermore, if this means that it is in the best interest of the community to have the current owner facilitate a proper cleanup, then so be it. I have read plenty in the recent past about how the only feasible way to mitigate the current toxins, is to go with what is being proposed by the potential new owners of the property. quite frankly, I find that a little hard to believe in earnest. Though it may be the least costliest way of doing it, it does not mean that it is the most effective in doing a proper thorough cleanup. The EIR, quite simply, must explore all options regardless of the costs.

As far as the the type of development being considered for this property, the EIR has to provide for all feasible projects. We the citizenry, should not be given an "either or" scenario. As you probably know, there are some folks that are claiming that either we go with what is being proposed by the potential developers, or the property will sit "as is" indefinitely. I cannot imagine that these are the only options that are available for this property. Again, the EIR should address all potential uses, not just what is being presented currently by the interested developers.

As a former resident of the Bay Area of California, I have some personal experience with the type of Big Box development being proposed. In my previous hometown, I witnessed first hand the rise of large corporate stores in my area and the type of development that goes along with them. It had a

very dramatic impact on the immediate area as well as out lying communities in the vicinity. And I can tell you, most it was not positive in the long run. Whether it was a loss of retail choices and lowered wages due to big store domination or insane traffic gridlock to the area not to mention plenty of tax payer burden to pave the way for these big retailers, it changed the town forever. So, when I see the same type of development being proposed here in Eureka, I have some very real concerns. On the economical side of the issue, the EIR must do a very comprehensive study on the affects of Big Box retail when it comes to local communities. There appears to be no shortage of in depth studies done around the country on this very subject in the recent past that illustrate this very well. The impact of such things as traffic, utilities infrastructure upgrades/improvements, wage levels, retail revenue reallocation, currency circulation, etc. also need to be addressed. This should be done on the county as a whole, and not just the City of Eureka. Again, these various impacts need to be considered on a variety of potential developments for the Balloon Tract.

Personally, I am not in particular favor of a Big Box development on this site. I really feel that there are better uses of the property that could benefit all who live here, and not just a few. Evidently, a majority of folks in 1999 felt the same way.

Thank you for providing me an opportunity to comment on this subject. I eagerly await an Environmental Impact Report that lays the groundwork for a legitimate development plan for the Balloon Tract property. A plan that works best for the environment and the public as a whole.

Sincerely,

Matt Groszmann
2024 E Street
Eureka, Ca. 95501

Sidnie Olson

From: xandra grube [xandralydia@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 07, 2006 12:44 AM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Ballon Tract--Marina Center Plan Scoping for EIR

May 5, 2006

RE: Balloon Tract -- Marina Center EIR, scoping

Dear Sidnie,

The following lists impacts and alternatives that I believe should be included in the EIR on the Marina Center development of the Balloon Tract.

Impact #1. The loss of open space and public-zoned land to development, where there is a shortage of city parks for residents, should be analyzed. National and state standards for numbers of acres of neighborhood and community parks recommended per person should be compared to what exists in Eureka and what will exist after development of the Balloon Tract. Consider the use of rooftops for gardens and outdoor open space to mitigate this impact.

Impact #2. The construction of buildings on filled land poses a hazard during an earthquake and should be avoided or mitigated. Please include mitigation measures and explain the rationale for subjecting people to this hazard.

Impact #3. Impervious coverage on the site appears to be excessive, causing impacts in surface runoff and recharging of ground water. Including landscaped boulevard strips and a green plaza rather than concrete expanses would mitigate this impact.

Impact #4. Travel to and from the site has the potential to cause grave traffic congestion in an area already severely impacted. A secondary impact in the form of increased air pollution is also likely to occur. A transportation and transit center would be a great help in mitigation of this impact.

Impact #5. Wildlife currently using the open land and wetlands in the Balloon Tract will be deprived of most of the area they currently inhabit or use. The proposed 100-foot-wide buffer on either side of the slough may mitigate the impact of the loss of foraging and nesting areas for wildfowl and animals. Please discuss this impact and the method of restoring the slough proposed to mitigate the effects on waterfowl, birds, animals and benthic organisms.

Alternative A. Please discuss the alternative of restoring the portion of the Balloon Tract that was wetlands and actual bay in the 1850's to be contiguous to the bay and subject to tidal action.

Alternative B. Please also discuss an alternative for a development that does not rely on fossil fuels, i.e., gasoline and diesel fuels, for transportation and circulation. A plan that looks to the future should prepare for a fuel-constrained economy and alternative means of ingress and egress to the site than the automobile.

Thank you for allowing us to comment in advance of the preparation of the DRAFT EIR. This has the

potential to be a wonderful project if impacts are disclosed and adequate mitigations proposed so that the decision makers can make informed decisions.

Sincerely,

Xandra Manns
1255 C Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Get amazing travel prices for air and hotel in one click on [Yahoo! FareChase](#)

April 13, 2006
Department of Community Development
City of Eureka

Page 1

Subject: Marina Center CEQA/EIR Scoping Meeting

RECEIVED

Attention: Sidnie Olson, Senior Planner

APR 13 2006

DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To Whom it may concern ,

I have lived in Humboldt County for 34 years and worked in Eureka for 28 years. My questions regarding the development of the "Balloon Track" property are related to 2 issues, namely the cleanup of the site (and in particular, its geology) and the land use.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & SITE CLEANUP

1) If the Railroad (current owner) is not required to fully cleanup the site now, do successive land owners of the site have less responsibility to cleanup the site, should problems arise in the future from those toxic materials?

2) Do the Citizens of Eureka lose legal recourse against the Railroad (current owner) if the City of Eureka does not require a full cleanup of the site at this time, and problems with the toxic materials arise later?

3) What rights are the citizens of Eureka forfeiting and what financial costs are they incurring by not demanding a complete cleanup of the site at this time?

4) When deciding about the type of cleanup that is to be performed on this site, what long term costs are taken into account? If the zoning is restricted because complete cleanup is not conducted at this time, is this restriction on the property taken into account as a lost value over time (limiting the development potential of this property)?

5) Is the testing that has been done on this site adequate to fully determine the extent of the pollution? What are the tidal influences on the waste sites and the seepage of these toxic materials? How far has this material "migrated"? What is the rate of migration?

6) "Capping" has been suggested as a means to address the toxic materials on this site. The Department of Conservation Special Publication 115 (1995) on a Planning Scenario in Humboldt County for A "Great Earthquake" lists this site as an area with high liquefaction potential generally attributable to surface faulting and ground failure. Has this potential been taken into account when considering "capping" this site?

7) Has "capping" been done to sites in our area that have similar geology? Are they being monitored? Has the monitoring been adequate to determine how successful this would be as a treatment for this site, and for how long?

8) The success of "capping" relies on an impervious layer on the surface. How long will the "capping" last? With our rainfall, and the earthquake potential of our area, how long will the "capping" remain impervious? Who's responsibility is it to monitor the integrity of this cap? Who pays for that monitoring? What are the maintenance costs of a "capped" site versus a completely cleaned site?

9) If the "capping" fails, or the partially cleaned site shows later to be putting people or wildlife at risk, who will be responsible for cleanup or compensation at that time?

10) The drawings of the Marina Center show trees in the landscape. Tree roots potentially create channels for leaching of materials. How will "capping" affect the overall look of the project by restricting the use of trees and shrubs?

LAND USE OF THE BALLOON TRACK PROPERTY

1) If the railroad right of way should ever be utilized for local public transport, would the balloon tract be needed?

2) If the historic use of the property is not incorporated in the development of a design, what value is lost for Eureka?

3) Within the City of Eureka, the Balloon Tract property seems to be a keystone property in tying the "101 Corridor" visually and physically to the water front. What value does that have for Eureka and our tourist economy? Are there any other properties within the city limits that have that same potential?

3) Being promoted as a "Victorian Seaport", is retail shopping (as a main component of the Marina Center) the best use of the site?

4) Currently, Broadway is often overburdened with traffic during business hours. What additional burdens would be placed on traffic flow through Eureka with a project like the Marina Center? How would it be addressed?

5) With the price of gas going up, wouldn't another shopping center merely draw a large part of its income from the local area and thereby weakening existing businesses? How many businesses would be affected?

6) What decrease in local "multiplier effects" are likely due to the export profits from large national retailers?

7) What percent of failure is there of locally owned businesses when large national retailers move into an economic area that is small and isolated (similar to ours)?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,



David Hagemann
2020 Monument Road
Rio Dell, Ca. 95562

Sidnie Olson

From: harvey [harvey@asis.com]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 1:46 PM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: BALLOON TRACT

BALLOON TRACT

May 5, 2005

Sirs and Mesdames:

I have been a resident of Fieldbrook for eleven years. My wife and I raise Boer meat goats on the twenty acres spanning Lindsay Creek that we bought in 1981.

We are committed to good land use planning that will provide for a sustainable and decent society far into the future. For that reason, we participated in the development of the McKinleyville General Plan process and are now supporting a new plan for Fieldbrook. I attend as many meetings concerning the county's new General Plan as I can and often write letters and opinion pieces for the local papers on these subjects.

I am vitally concerned with plans for the Balloon Tract, particularly the bait-and-switch proposal the Arkley's have now advanced to make a Home Depot the centerpiece of their development plan. As everyone realizes, the Balloon Tract is the focus of Eureka's historic waterfront area. It is crucial for the economic and cultural future of the city and the entire Humboldt Bay region. To have it dominated by a warehouse-style structure, whatever its paste-on facade, and a vast, characterless parking lot, would be a travesty of wise public policy.

For this reason, I strongly believe that the wider public--which will clearly be affected by the kind of development that occurs on the Balloon Tract--must be involved in planning for it. It is entirely improper and a violation of public trust for the property simply to be handed over to a private developer, particularly one as politically influential and widely invested in the local economy as Rob Arkley is. The Balloon Tract must be subject to broader public policy in light of the entire community's long run vital interests.

Chuck Harvey
220 Buckman Trail Lane (Fieldbrook)
McKinleyville, CA 95519

(707-839-2249) harvey@asis.com

Sidnie Olson

From: Maggy & Charlie Herbelin [herbelin@tidepool.com]
nt: Friday, May 05, 2006 10:39 AM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Balloon Tract comments



Cover letter.doc
(32 KB)



Comments for
Notice of Prepara...



ATT50005.txt (64
B)

Sidnie,

Attached are my comments for consideration.
Thaks for all you do,
Maggy Herbelin

To: Sidnie Olson, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
531 "K" Street
Eureka, CA 95501

solson@ci.eureka.ca.gov

Subject: Balloon Tract CEQA Scoping Comments

Dear Senior Planner Olson,

Please accept my scoping comments on the City of Eureka Plan Amendment and the associated Rezoning request for the Big Box Mall project proposed for the Balloon Tract and adjacent areas.

The EIR must consider a full range of alternatives-not a simplistic two alternative analysis of the current proposal or a "No Action." Alternatives should consider levels of clean up and alternate ownership and use possibilities.

Thanks for your consideration of these comments. I look forward to seeing a development that will truly express the interests of our local citizens.

Sincerely,

Margaret Herbelin

Comments for Notice of Preparation EIR Marina Center Mixed Use Project

1. Would the project protect the Public Trust Doctrine underlying fee title of former tidelands? Courts have said the Trust lands will always be Trust lands and can not be overlaid.
2. Would the project meet the “highest and best use” of Coastal Dependant lands? Coastal Dependant zoning is meant to benefit the state as a whole. How would the project benefit the state as a whole?
3. Would the project meet the standards of the Water Quality Control Basin Plans?
The Stream and Wetlands System Protection Policy goals include:
 - To restore habitat and protect aquatic species and wildlife
 - To restore the associated recreational opportunities, green spaces and neighborhood amenities that water resources provideThe Policy recognizes that it is necessary to protect and restore the physical characteristics of stream and wetlands systems—stream channels, wetlands, riparian areas, and floodplains—including their connectivity and natural hydrologic regimes, to achieve water quality standards and protect beneficial uses.
4. Would the project demand Union Pacific to do a full clean up to the EPA standards? Union Pacific is doing this in several other locations through out the United States. Humboldt Bay is 303d listed for impairment. These properties have tidal influence allowing toxic substances contained in the soils to enter the bay.
5. Would the project do a full analysis of the economic impacts of additional Big Box retail on the existing local businesses? Especially addressing the removal of earnings from the community. Does the community have sufficient retail businesses currently? How much buying power does a community of our size have?
6. Would the project preserve open space for public use in perpetuity? Currently some of the parcels are zoned for public use, should these parcels be maintained for the public? These public parcels should provide access to Public Trust wetlands and sloughs for enjoyment and a healthy community .
7. Would the project protect the NRCA right of way? With increasing fuel prices, the future of public transportation should include rail.
8. Would the project meet the communities’ desires for development? These 30 acres are some of the few remaining within the city that can be used to draw people to come to enjoy our unique environment and fishing port. Would a Seafood Culinary Institute and Conference Center be good for the community?
9. Would the project need to develop all of the properties at one time? Would parcel by parcel development allow for more thoughtful uses to be considered?

10. Would the project provide housing at all income levels? Affordable housing and integrated neighborhoods provide for a healthy and safe community.
11. Would the project adversely affect the City of Eureka's tax revenue sources by having all the properties held in one corporate holding rather than in private ownership? Union Pacific, a large corporation, has kept the property from being a benefit to the community for many years because they could afford to allow the property to sit idle rather than being made available for local private or public use. Would this happen again if the property is held by a corporation as rentals rather than having several private owners? Private properties change ownership more frequently and maintain current tax base values.
12. Would the project protect the existing wetlands on the site? The US Army Corps of Engineers current policy calls for "no loss of wetlands," several areas of the project contain wetlands that need to be accurately identified, preserved, enhanced and protected.
13. Would the project create addition storm water runoff by adding large areas of paved surfaces, reducing riparian and other open space areas, and adding toxic substances to the runoff? The City of Eureka has not finished their storm water runoff disposal plan to meet state requirements. Humboldt Bay is a fisheries nursery and should be protected and enhanced for the economic benefits of fisheries. Studies are needed to understand the importance of the Bay for young of year fish. No further impacts should be permitted until the ecological needs of all species that depend on the bay habitat have been evaluated.

Sidnie Olson

From: Tom Hinz [tomhinz@starband.net]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 12:55 PM
To: solson@ci.eureka.ca.gov.
Subject: scoping comments

To: Sidnie L. Olson, Senior Planner
 Community Development Department
 531 "K" Street
 Eureka, CA 95501

Subject: Balloon Tract CEQA Scoping Comments

Dear Senior Planner Olson,

Please accept my scoping comments on the City of Eureka General Plan Amendment and rezoning requested for the Big Box Mall project proposed for the Balloon Tract and adjacent areas.

I am concerned that this project will have significant negative impacts on the people of Eureka and Humboldt County due to the toxic contamination situation, as well as the profound economic impacts on local communities as well as on small businesses and their employees. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) required for this project by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), should pay close attention to these issues in particular.

I am resolute in my determination that the toxic contamination be cleaned up to the fullest extent of technical feasibility and not be left for future generations to deal with. I am also adamant that the railroad not be "let off the hook" in their responsibility to clean up their mess.

The EIR must provide a comprehensive and current appraisal of the composition and distribution of the toxic materials on the site. There must be an explanation of the known and potential risks to human health associated with these toxic materials. There must be a state of the art consideration of the known and potential movement of these materials into ground water and/or the receiving waters of Humboldt Bay. All possible connections to all receiving waters must be considered for the site under current conditions, as well as over time across a long term time scale equivalent to the persistence of toxic effects from these materials.

All likely and potential impacts of toxic materials must be inventoried and assessed for all resource values, including but not limited to, water quality, sport and commercial fisheries and oyster mariculture, and other wildlife and plant resources. Cumulative impacts of this toxic waste site must be assessed as one among the many toxic waste sites in the watersheds of the Humboldt Bay. The cumulative impacts analysis must also be considered relative to the wide range of alternatives outlined below.

The EIR must consider a full range of alternatives- not a simplistic two alternative analysis of the current proposal or a "No Action". Alternatives should consider several levels of toxic contamination clean-up from full technical feasibility to the minimum levels proposed by the current project. The EIR should also

consider a wide range of land use alternatives including the current Big Box Mall proposal, a no retail option, a public facilities option, a waterfront dependent only option, a light industrial only option, and a wide variety of other mixes of uses.

The EIR must document and disclose the full range of project economic effects on the regional economy. These findings must be founded on a comprehensive survey of current studies of economic effects of big box retail on local economies, especially those that are similar to the economies Eureka and Humboldt County. Studies that reach conclusions counter to those providing the rationale for the current Big Box Mall proposal must be explained and substantial evidence provided for not applying such studies to the current proposal. Economic effects should be studied for potential changes to area wage levels, anticipated likely reallocation of retail spending, employment levels, loss of profits from the area, costs to local government for infrastructure and provision of services, indirect subsidies through increased public costs for medical and social services, and loss of local multiplier effects. Economic analysis must consider county-wide effects. The economic impacts analysis must also be considered relative to the wide range of alternatives outlined above.

Based on the vigorous political history surrounding this site, please analyze and demonstrate how a zoning change will not open the way to the Wal-Mart resoundingly rejected by voters in 1999? Thanks for your consideration of these comments. I look forward to accomplishing a development plan for this site that best protects the significant public interests at stake here.

Sincerely,

Tom Hinz
5928 Stover Road
Blue Lake, CA 95525
tomhinz@starband.net

Sidnie Olson

From: Paula Kant [paulak@saber.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2006 7:38 AM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: baloon comment..

Dear Sidnie,

I am new to the area. I have lived in many different areas, miami, san diego to name a couple and I am totally amazed that anyone would put a HOME DEPOT on PRIME waterfront property. I understand the blighted nature of the tract as it is, but a HOME DEPOT? omigosh-that is a hoot-with all the open space around on the east side you all are going to put a home depot there? you've got to be kidding...i just laugh-how foolish.. keep it zoned for public use, make the railroad people clean up their mess and use it for something that will make the most of it's water views in future...a home depot? that can go inland on another piece of land.

Sidnie Olson

From: Tracy Katelman [tracy@sohum.net]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 7:49 PM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Scoping Questions re Balloon Tract

Dear Sidnie,

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input into the Scoping for the Balloon Tract project. I am not opposed to development of this site. I am opposed to capping the site -- in place of a full toxic clean up - and placement of a big box store on the site. I believe strongly that both of these actions will provide long-term negative effects as defined by CEQA to Eureka--and the entire Count--for many years to come.

Below are some of the questions I want answered as part of this review process:

1. Which local businesses will be adversely affected by the development of new big box stores at the Marina Center, specifically Home Depot and Best Buy? How many existing jobs will be lost because of this development? What programs or plans does the City have in place to mitigate these job losses? What is the amount of sales tax that will be lost from these existing businesses closing down?
2. What regional economic documentation is there to support a Home Depot in Eureka if a Lowes or other home improvement store goes into Fortuna? What is the expected impact from both of these developments (cumulative impact) to existing home improvement businesses?
3. If UP and SN are successful in only capping the on-site toxins (as opposed to removing them), what will the City do to mitigate future pollution from the site? How much is this anticipated to cost? How will the City pay for this ongoing mitigation to the Bay?
4. How is this development appropriate for this valuable waterfront location?
5. Why is it necessary to have a huge parking lot located so close to the waterfront? What other options are available for parking for the development?
5. How will this development affect the already congested traffic flows of South Broadway?

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I look forward to receiving the answers to these questions.

Tracy Katelman
 Eureka Resident and Business Owner

Tracy Katelman
 ForEverGreen Forestry
 POB 1276, Eureka, CA 95502-1276
 207 G Street #115, Old Town Eureka
 707-443-2400
 707-443-5597 FAX
 707-845-8579 Mobile

tracy@sohum.net

Check out my new website: www.forevergreenforestry.com

Sidnie Olson

From: k lane [kristinlane2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 4:19 PM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Marina Center

Dear Senior Planner Olson,

Please accept my comments on the City of Eureka General Plan Amendment and rezoning requested for the Big Box Mall project proposed for the Balloon Tract and adjacent areas.

I am soon to be a home owner in Eureka, and am an expectant parent. As an expectant parent I would like to see positive change in Eureka. My family is concerned that Eureka has less open space for recreation (local community forest or marsh).

Further, I find the ideas of a balloon track development an example of our concerns- not an attractive potential for this land.

After reading the scope of the EIR and CEQA for the marina center, I was discouraged and outraged by the potential effects of rezoning this land, not to mention it ignores the clean up of this land for public u

The rezoning for commercial purposes will have significant negative impacts on the community rather than positive in the long term.

The long term effect of low paying jobs devastates the community economy, and will reduce the livelihood of many small businesses that have flourished

in Eureka. Let's not mimic the rest of America by continuing to add big box developm

Instead this land could be open to the public for use such as a park

for recreation, weddings, festivals, etc. (After the clean up was enforced.)

Eureka doesn't have a park on the waterfront for recreation and further this

land would be best preserved for wildlife. It would be a shame to have a mostly busi
make Eureka my home, if there were more open land for the community.

Think outside the box at alternatives to use of this land for the citizens of Eureka

Please assure the citizen of Eureka and Humboldt County that the railroad will be ac

Sincerely,

Kristin Lane

841 Bayside Dr. #3

Arcata, CA 9551

Sidnie Olson

From: kll1@humboldt.edu
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2006 4:22 PM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: Balloon Tract CE QA Scoping Comments

Sidnie L. Olson, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
531 "K" Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Dear Senior Planner Olson,

Please accept my scoping comments on the City of Eureka General Plan Amendment and rezoning requested for the Big Box Mall project proposed for the Balloon Tract and adjacent areas.

I am worried about the negative impacts that the toxic contamination of the site will have on the future of the city, Humboldt Bay, and the people that use the area. I believe that the only way to proceed with any project is to clean this area to the best of our ability, using all the techniques that available. We must not pave over the site and leave this cleaning to be finished by our children and grandchildren. We need to know what is there, where it goes and what will happen to it when it is disturbed by any construction that may be done there. Attention should also be focused on placing some responsibility for the mess on the railroad and how they might contribute to the cleanup.

I believe that serious consideration must be given to alternative uses for the property and the economic impacts of each. We must not focus only on the "big box" proposal. There are many cities in this country that have faced the problem of what to do with abandoned rail yards. What kinds of uses have them made of them.

I am especially worried about the effects of the proposed Big Box Mall on the local economies. What will be the effect, for instance, on our local businesses that are duplicated in the "big boxes"? Will money recycle in the community as it does now when we patronize our small businesses or will it simply leave the north coast?

The effects of rezoning are not clear to me. About 7 years ago, voters rejected a zoning change because it would have let Wal-Mart build there.

How will this zoning change be different and not overturn the will of the people?

Finally, we should not be in a rush to choose an alternative. We only have one Balloon Tract and once made the decision will affect the city and county for a long time.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Lang
2203 H Street
Eureka, CA 95501