

## **M. Public Services**

### **Environmental Setting**

#### **Fire Protection and Emergency Services**

The Eureka Fire Department (EFD) provides fire protection services and emergency medical response in the City of Eureka and would provide those services to the project site. There are three active fire stations in the City, with one additional unstaffed station currently being used for storage (Fire Station 6). The EFD is headquartered at 533 C Street, and this fire station, which is closest to the project site, is about one half mile east of the project site. The Fire Department maintains three engine companies and a single truck company, as well as two reserve engines, one reserve truck and one hazardous material response vehicle (Gillespie, 2008). The EFD is staffed with 41 personnel including one chief, two assistant chiefs, five captain IIs, nine captains, 12 engineers, nine firefighters, one part-time fire inspector, and two office staff. The EFD also has ten volunteer firefighters.

The EFD also has an automatic aid agreement with Humboldt Fire District and Arcata Fire Protections District, each of which borders the EFD's response areas. EFD is additionally a signatory department to the Humboldt County Fire Chiefs Mutual Aid Agreement and utilizes this agreement as the foundation of its Multi-Alarm Mutual Aid Response Plan.

In 2007, the EFD responded to about 3,287 calls for service. Of these calls, approximately 60 percent were calls for medical aid and rescue, 4 percent were for fires, and the remaining calls were related to calls for automatic/mutual aid, hazardous materials, good intent calls, etc. The EFD generally maintains an average driving time of about 3.5 minutes.

In addition to fire protection services, the EFD provides first response in a medical emergency, with City Ambulance of Eureka providing paramedical services and patient transport to St. Joseph's Hospital at 2700 Dolbeer Street, which is about 3.5 miles southeast of the project site. All of the EFD's sworn personnel are trained to the Emergency Technician I level with defibrillator and intubation certification and two career staff are paramedics (Gillespie, 2008).

All members of the Eureka Fire Department are trained and State certified to the First Responder Operational and Decontamination for Hazardous Materials. Twelve of the City's firefighter personnel are hazardous material specialists certified by the State of California. These personnel comprise the Eureka Fire Department Regional Hazardous Material Response Team, which provides services to the City and greater Humboldt and Del Norte Counties. An Emergency Operations Center also operates out of the City of Eureka Fire Department for coordinating responses to natural or man-made disasters (Eureka Fire Department, 2006a; Eureka Fire Department, 2006b).

## Police Protection Services

The Eureka Police Department (EPD) provides police protection services in Eureka and would serve the project site. The EPD is headquartered at 604 C Street, which is about one half mile east of the project site. The EPD also maintains three police annexes, one in Old Town at Third and E Streets (approximately 1 mile northeast of the project site), and a second at 735 Everding Street (approximately 2 miles southeast of the project site). A third police annex is located at the Bayshore Mall at 3300 Broadway (approximately one-and-a-half miles south of the project site).

The EPD is allocated 49 sworn officers, and has a current staff of 47 officers. Existing facilities could accommodate the allocation of 49 officers. The EPD also employs seven police services officers who perform similar duties to police (i.e., take reports, respond to non-injury traffic collisions, etc.) but do not enforce the law or make arrests.

The City of Eureka has three patrol beats, and the project site would be located within Beat 1. There is one officer assigned to Beat 1 per shift, although on some days, staffing allows for an officer to patrol throughout the city. According to CBRE Consulting's urban decay analysis, crime and drug use have made the project site dangerous (CBRE, 2006). Because of this, the Police Department must currently devote extra resources to the area.

The Police Department received a total of 41,085 calls for service in 2005 and 15,633 of these calls were in Beat 1. Although individual response times vary depending upon patrol car location, the emergency response time average to any point in the city is 4 minutes. The response time to the project site is 2 minutes (Eureka Police Department, 2006).

## Schools

The project site is within the Eureka City Unified School District, which operates four elementary schools, two middle schools, one high school, and four alternative schools. Although school enrollment projections frequently shift, Eureka City Unified School District schools have experienced a steady decline in enrollment. There were about 5,936 students enrolled during the 1998/1999 academic year and there was a student enrollment of about 4,725 students in the 2005/2006 academic year (California Department of Education, 2006). This represents a decrease of roughly 1,200 students. During this same period, the citywide population increased by about 253, or about 1 percent (California Department of Finance, 2005).

The Eureka City Schools that would serve the project include Alice Birney Elementary School at 717 South Avenue. The project site also is served by Zane Middle School at 2155 S Street with an approximate capacity of 700 students and Eureka High School at 1915 J Street with an approximate capacity of 2,200 students. Records for the 2005/2006 academic year show Zane Middle School and Eureka High School enrollment at 80 and 76 percent capacity, respectively (Davis, 2006b).

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, or Senate Bill 50 (SB 50), restricts the ability of local agencies such as the City of Eureka to deny land use approvals on the basis that public

school facilities are inadequate. SB 50 establishes the base amount of allowable developer fees at \$2.24 per square foot of residential construction and \$0.36 per square foot of commercial construction.<sup>1</sup> These fees are intended to address local school facility needs resulting from new development. Public school districts can, however, impose higher fees provided they meet the conditions outlined in the act. Private schools are not eligible for fees collected pursuant to SB 50. The Eureka City Schools District has not established developer fees (Davis, 2006a).

## Parks

The City of Eureka is located along California's north coast and is close to several national and state parks. These parks include Redwood National Park, Six Rivers National Forest, Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Patrick's Point State Park, and Humboldt Redwoods State Park. Together, these parks provide tens of thousands of acres of public recreation land. The City of Eureka General Plan characterizes these national and state parks as regional parks, or parks that serve populations that can reach the facility within 1 hour of driving time (City of Eureka, 2008).

Within the City of Eureka there are approximately 148 acres of neighborhood and community parks, as well as other recreational facilities, such as golf courses, the Adorni Recreation Center, the Sequoia Park and Zoo, youth centers, the Elk River Wildlife Area, the Del Norte Street Pier, the Woodley Island Marina boat ramps, marshes, and plazas.

According to the General Plan, a neighborhood park is designed to serve a population of between 3,000 and 8,000, and is intended to serve the needs of residents living within one-half to three-quarters of a mile from the park. A neighborhood park is generally between 1 and 5 acres in size, and typically includes tot lots, children's play structures, and unlighted sports fields and/or courts. A community park generally serves the needs of residents residing within three-quarters to 2 miles of the park, and is intended to serve a population of between 8,000 and 20,000. Community parks typically range from 30 to 50 acres in size, and include large landscaped areas, restrooms, lighted sports fields, and specialized equipment and resources not found in neighborhood parks. They may also include community centers and swimming pools. According to the General Plan, the City has a goal of a neighborhood park ratio of 1 acre per 1,000 residents, and a community park ratio of 3 acres per 1,000 residents. Based on an existing population of about 26,381, the ratio of community and neighborhood park space to residents is approximately 5.6 acres per 1,000 residents (City of Eureka, 2008; California Department of Finance, 2005).

---

<sup>1</sup> These are current base fees adopted by State Allocation Board (SAB), which is the policy-level body for the programs administered by the Office of Public School Construction within the State Department of General Services. The SAB is authorized by Government Code Section 65995(b)(3) to increase the base fee every 2 years. In order to levy the fees, school districts must prepare a "nexus" analysis demonstrating why the fees are required and how they will be used.

## Environmental Analysis

### Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, implementation of the proposed project would have a significant effect on public services if, based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, it would:

1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - a. Fire protection
  - b. Police protection
  - c. Schools
  - d. Parks
  - e. Other public facilities

### Regulatory Framework

The following standards and regulations govern public services and are used to measure impacts.

#### ***General Plan and Local Coastal Program***

The City of Eureka's adopted General Plan and adopted Local Coastal Program together formalize a long-term vision for the physical evolution of Eureka and they outline the policies, standards, and programs that guide day-to-day decisions concerning Eureka's development in the coastal zone. The Policy Consistency Analysis, found in Section IV.I, *Land Use and Planning*, provides an evaluation of the Marina Center project's conformity with the policies of the adopted General Plan and Land Use Plan portion of the adopted Local Coastal Program.

#### ***Coastal Zoning Regulations***

The Coastal Zoning regulations, which implement the policies of the Land Use Plan portion of the adopted Local Coastal Program, are codified in Chapter 156 of the Eureka Municipal Code (EMC), and are also referenced as Article 29, Part 1, Section 10-5.29 et. seq. of the zoning regulations of the City for the coastal zone.

#### ***Zoning Regulations***

The Zoning Regulations of the City of Eureka are found in Chapter 155 of the EMC and are adopted pursuant to the City Charter to protect the public health, safety, peace, comfort, convenience, prosperity and general welfare.

## Project Impacts

### **Impact M-1: Would the Marina Center project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?**

The proposed project would increase the number of on-site buildings and increase the on-site population. This would increase the demand for fire protection services and emergency response services within the City of Eureka. The project site would be served by the EFD headquarters Station 1, located at 533 C Street, which is approximately one half mile east of the project site. The proposed project would increase the demand for services (both medical and fire) and would impact the existing staffing, but would not require the construction of any new or physically altered facilities. The EFD has indicated that the proposed project would not affect EFD's average driving time from Station 1 of about 3.5 minutes. (Smith, Gillespie, 2008).

In 2007, the Eureka City Council received and filed a Standards of Response Coverage Study (SORC) for the greater Eureka Area, including the area contained within Humboldt Fire District #1 (Citygate Assoc, 2007). One of the primary findings contained within the study was *“that the City Fire Department’s fire, rescue, and emergency medical services (EMS) are currently only sufficient for small building fires and singular, not simultaneous, building fires at once”* and that *“even mutual aid from neighboring fire departments will not provide a full and adequate response force to “major” fires”*.

The SORC Study further stated that *“this creates the need for good fire prevention and community-wide understanding that there is zero tolerance for unwanted fires. This is because a department with the capabilities of a mid-sized city does not exist in the region to help control fires. What regional mutual aid may do is to arrive in time to prevent the spread of a fire beyond the building of origin or sufficiently slow a vegetation fire so that it will not grow to catastrophic proportions”*.

The Study makes a number of recommendations that apply to the City's jurisdiction including the maintenance of response time goals, joint, increased fire truck / fire engine staffing, and proactive fire prevention measures such as a zero-square foot residential fire sprinkler requirement.

Because of staffing concerns and the recommendations of the SORC study, the EFD recommends proactive mitigation to reduce impacts to fire staffing levels by requiring that all building be fully sprinkled. The installation of fire sprinklers would be an immediate response to a fire emergency and is proven to reduce the spread for fire.

In addition to proactive mitigation, the project would contribute to both sales taxes and property taxes, which would in turn increase the city's general fund through increased tax revenues. During the annual budget review and adoption the City Council would determine where the increased revenue would be directed (i.e., whether to fund new fire positions or equipment).

The proposed shipping area to the rear of the Anchor 1 store would adjoin the rear property line of the existing industrial buildings located on Washington Street and would provide much needed emergency fire response accessibility to the rear of those existing industrial properties. Therefore, the project would increase the EFD's ability to provide emergency fire response service to the existing industrial properties located on Washington Street.

The proposed project may include 'traffic calming' measures such as speed bumps or other devices within the parking areas or along the private streets. In some cases traffic calming measures such as speed bumps can hinder or prevent fire apparatus passage. In order to assure that these devices do not result in unintended impacts to fire apparatus, a mitigation measure has been added requiring that all traffic calming measures be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department prior to installation.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the California Building Code and California Fire Code, based on the 2006 International Building Code and 2006 International Fire Code, to assure installation of adequate fire protection measures in new building plans that are designed to reduce the impact of fires, including fire sprinklers, firewall protection, fire hydrants, smoke detectors and other requirements. The EFD has indicated that the water supplies and pressures around the perimeter of the project site are adequate (Gillespie, 2008). As part of the project, new on-site infrastructure would be constructed to serve the project site, but no new facilities would be required off-site. The EFD would be involved in the review of project plans, and the project applicant would be required to incorporate the EFD's conditions into the final project designs, as well as provide special equipment should it be required to serve the proposed project.

The project proposes the construction of a five-story office building, which for Eureka is a tall building. The City of Eureka Fire Department currently has fire trucks capable of accessing and fighting fires on the fifth floor of a building. The fire trucks require an 18 foot wide clear area to deploy the stabilizers and the site plan shows that the proposed five-story building would have limited fire apparatus access as it has the proposed plaza to the west, another building adjacent to the north and the parking structure to the east. The only clear access is to the south along the proposed Fourth Street Extension - this area should be signed as a no parking zone. Fire apparatus would not be able to access the building from the north or east because of the adjacent buildings, but with mitigation requiring the plaza be designed to handle the weight of the apparatus and with an eighteen foot clear area to deploy the stabilizers, access would be available from the plaza. The EFD has indicated that having access from two sides of the proposed five-story building, and with the fire sprinklers, emergency fire suppression would be adequate.

The proposed traffic Mitigation Measure O1-b requires the closure of northbound Fairfield Street at its intersection with Wabash/Broadway. Northbound Fairfield to Broadway is currently an emergency response route for Fire Station 3. Closure of the emergency access route could impact emergency fire response. However, the installation of an emergency preemption system (e.g., Opticon or equivalent) on all new traffic signals and existing signals on Broadway between Harris and Fourth Street will improve emergency response by shifting the red light to opposing traffic and thus opening the Broadway corridor for fire apparatus access.

## Mitigation

**Mitigation Measure M-1a:** All buildings shall be fully sprinkled.

**Mitigation Measure M-1b:** The applicant shall install fire hydrants and fire water mains as required by the Eureka Fire Department. The location, size and flow of all hydrants and fire mains shall be shown on the building construction plans.

**Mitigation Measure M-1c:** All traffic calming measures proposed for installation within the parking lots or along internal roadways shall be reviewed and approved by the City Fire Department prior to installation.

**Mitigation Measure M-1d:** In order to assure that fire apparatus have adequate width to deploy stabilizers, both sides of the Fourth Street extension adjacent to the five-story office building shall be signed as “No Parking.”

**Mitigation Measure M-1e:** The proposed plaza in front of the five-story office building shall be designed to provide fire emergency apparatus access, this shall include the ability for fire apparatus to drive across the plaza and an eighteen foot wide area to deploy the truck stabilizers. The design of the plaza shall be shown on the building plans and shall be approved by the City Fire Department.

**Mitigation Measure M-1f:** The applicant shall cause to be installed on all new traffic signals and all existing traffic signals on Broadway between and including Harris Street and Fourth Street an Opticom emergency traffic prompting device, coded to Eureka Fire Department transmitters. Installation shall be coordinated with City of Eureka Engineering Department and Caltrans.

## Finding of Significance

The recommended mitigation measures would avoid or minimize the potential for the Marina Center project to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

---

**Impact M-2: Would the Marina Center project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?**

The proposed project would increase the daytime and nighttime population at the project site and could potentially result in an increase in the demand for police services. Although increases in the demand for police services could lead to an increase in response times, the Police Department has indicated that the proposed project would not substantially affect the Police Department’s emergency response time average of 2 minutes to the project site and 4 minutes citywide.

Additionally, the Police Department does not anticipate the need for any new or expanded facilities as a result of the proposed project (Eureka Police Department, 2006).

The Police Department indicates that one additional police officer and one police service officer would be needed as a result of the project. The project would contribute to both sales taxes and property taxes, which would in turn increase the city's general fund through increased tax revenues. During the annual budget review and adoption the City Council would determine where the increased revenue would be directed (i.e., whether to fund new police positions). While the project could incrementally contribute to demand for police services, it would not cause, or substantially contribute to the Police Department's existing staffing deficiency. As stated above, the Police Department is already devoting extra resources to the project site because of the current problem with crime and drug use.

A proactive mitigation to address concerns of police staffing is requiring an on-site security patrol to handle routine situations that do not require Eureka Police Department response.

Furthermore, by providing for new development on the site, including new residents, employment, economic activity, and public activity, the project may have a beneficial effect on the safety of the area. Existing underused areas of the site that have low daytime and nighttime population and that are often difficult to police would be replaced with daytime and nighttime activities that would introduce activity and reduce vacant spaces on the site.

Additionally, to ensure that the project would not adversely affect the ability of the Police Department to deliver adequate services to the project site, as part of standard development practices, the City may require that project plans be reviewed by the Police Department. The project applicant would be required to incorporate the Police Department's recommendations into the final project design as part of the City's conditions of approval to the project.

The project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities and the impact would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation**

**Mitigation Measure M-2a:** The Marina Center development shall have an on-site security patrol to handle routine situations that do not require emergency response from the Eureka Police Department.

### **Finding of Significance**

The recommended mitigation measures would avoid or minimize potential for the Marina Center project to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

**Impact M-3: Would the Marina Center project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?**

The proposed project would include construction of 54 dwelling units, residents of which could include new students. Using the student generation rate developed by the California State Department of Education,<sup>2</sup> the proposed 54 dwelling units could result in approximately 27 elementary or middle school students and 11 high school students on the project site. Students could attend nearby schools, including Alice Birney Elementary School, Zane Middle School, or Eureka High School. Existing enrollment projections for elementary schools predict an approximate 6 percent decline district-wide between the 2005/2006 and the 2007/2008 academic years. Assuming a similar decline for Zane Middle School and Eureka High School, the new students that could be generated by the project would result in an approximate 2 percent increase in enrollment at elementary and middle schools serving the project site and a 1 percent increase at the Eureka High School.

The estimated 1,246 new jobs that could be generated by the project would not directly generate new student enrollment in the Eureka City Unified School District (or other school districts). It is possible that people could relocate to the City of Eureka or other nearby cities as a result of employment opportunities provided by the proposed project, and their children would attend public schools. New housing construction would be subject to the City's planning process, where secondary effects, such as increased school enrollment, would be addressed.

Based on the foregoing, the increase in student enrollment as a result of the project would be considered negligible and would not require new or physically altered facilities. Additionally, the Eureka City Unified School District schools have been experiencing consistent declines in student enrollment in recent years, and currently the School District schools have adequate capacity. Pursuant to the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, the project applicant would be required to contribute its fair share in student impact fees in accordance with City of Eureka School District requirements. Therefore, the potential impact on schools would be less than significant.

**Mitigation**

None recommended.

**Finding of Significance**

The potential for the Marina Center project to result substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new

---

<sup>2</sup> The California State Department of Education estimates that one dwelling unit could generate an average of 0.7 students, consisting of 0.5 elementary or middle school students and 0.2 high school students. The State's student generation rates are a result of statewide sampling that incorporates widely varying dwelling unit types, households, and other demographic characteristics across the state and, therefore, may not reflect the actual characteristics of the local area.

or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

---

**Impact M-4: Would the Marina Center project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?**

The proposed project would increase the permanent on-site population, thus increasing the demand for parks and recreation facilities. The proposed project would result in an on-site resident population of about 122 persons and generate about 1,246 new jobs. As discussed in Chapter III, *Project Description*, the proposed project would construct bicycle and pedestrian paths, and landscaping on the site. The bicycle and pedestrian paths would complement and interface with existing public access to the Eureka Public Marina and waterfront walkways. No existing parks or open spaces would be removed by the proposed project.

As discussed in the setting section, there are ample parks and open space in Eureka and the surrounding area. This is due to the City's proximity to thousands of acres of state and national parks as well as the provision of local parks and recreation facilities. With an existing population of 26,381 and approximately 148 acres of neighborhood and community parks, the City currently provides approximately 5.6 acres of park space per 1,000 residents, exceeding the City standards identified in the General Plan.

While the new resident population resulting from the proposed project would increase use of City parks and recreation facilities, the proposed project would not affect the existing ratio of park space per 1,000 residents or result in the need to construct new facilities or expand existing recreation facilities. Additionally, the proposed project would provide a pedestrian and bicycle path adjacent to Waterfront Drive that would serve the on-site population as well as the larger community. This amenity would enhance the pedestrian environment adjacent to the waterfront. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on parks and recreation facilities would be considered less than significant.

**Mitigation**

None recommended.

**Finding of Significance**

The potential for the Marina Center project to result substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant

environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

---

**Impact M-5: Would the Marina Center project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities?**

No additional public services have been identified that would be affected by the development of the Marina Center project.

**Mitigation**

None recommended.

**Finding of Significance**

The potential for the Marina Center project to result substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities would be a *less-than-significant* impact.

---

**Cumulative Impacts**

**Impact M-6: Would the Marina Center project, when combined with other foreseeable development in the vicinity, result in adverse cumulative impacts on the provision of public services?**

The proposed project, in conjunction with reasonably foreseeable future projects, could result in a cumulative increase in the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services, police protection, schools, parks and recreational facilities. The project site is located in an area already served by local public services providers that meet their response time goals and standards for the project site area. The development of the project and other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity would be incremental and would not by itself trigger the need for the expansion of public services facilities or directly and adversely affect response times for police, fire and emergency medical services. Furthermore, the project and other reasonably foreseeable future projects would be required to comply with all fire code standards, incorporate police department recommendations after project review, contribute a fair-share payment for student impact fees, and provide publicly accessible open spaces. The project is likely to have a cumulatively beneficial effect on the provision of public services because the project is expected to generate net revenues of \$781,318 to fund city services (CBRE 2006). Therefore, the effect of the

proposed project on public services provisions, in combination with other foreseeable projects, would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation**

None recommended.

### **Finding of Significance**

The project would have a *less-than-significant* impact on public services and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative public services impacts.

---

## **References – Public Services**

- Bennett, Rick, Eureka Fire Department, personal communications, April 10, 2006 and June 16, 2006.
- California Department of Education, Data Quest, [www.cde.ca.gov/ds](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds), accessed April 24, 2006.
- CBRE Consulting, Inc., *Eureka Balloon Track Retail Development Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis, Eureka, California*, November 2006.
- City of Eureka, *City of Eureka General Plan*, adopted February 1997, amended through April 2008.
- City of Eureka, *Eureka Redevelopment Final Program EIR*, prepared by Environmental Science Associates (ESA), January 10, 2005.
- City of Eureka, *Eureka Municipal Code*, adopted May 1966, amended through April 2008.
- Davis, Margaret, Eureka City Schools, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent, personal communication, April 7, 2006a.
- Davis, Margaret, Eureka City Schools, Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent. Personal communication, June 19, 2006b.
- Eureka Fire Department, *Regional Hazardous Materials Response Team website*, [www.ci.eureka.ca.gov/depts/fire/default.asp](http://www.ci.eureka.ca.gov/depts/fire/default.asp), accessed April 24, 2006a.
- Eureka Fire Department. *City of Eureka Emergency Operations Center website*, [www.ci.eureka.ca.gov/depts/fire/disaster/default.asp](http://www.ci.eureka.ca.gov/depts/fire/disaster/default.asp), accessed June 19, 2006b.
- Eureka Police Department, Personal communication, received June 29, 2006.
- Gillespie, Bill, Eureka Fire Department, Fire Marshal. Personal communications, May 2, 2008
- State of California, Department of Finance, *E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2005, with 2000 DRU Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2005.