

Sidnie Olson

From: Donnie Hubbard [dhubbard@omindustries.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 11:22 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: marina center eir

City of Eureka Community development dept
Att Sidnie Olson
531 K st Eureka Ca 95501

Re Marina Center draft EIR

I have reviewed the draft EIR on the marina center project. I have found the document to be complete. I support the EIR and the project wholeheartedly..] 91-1

*Don Hubbard
Project Manager
O&M Industries
Ph. (707) 822-8800
fax (707) 822-8995
dhubbard@omindustries.com*

Letter 91: Donnie Hubbard

91-1 The comment supporting the Draft EIR and the proposed project is noted.

Sidnie Olson

From: Nancy Ihara [nancyihara@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2009 2:28 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Cc: nancy ihara
Subject: Urban Decay

To: Sidnie L. Olson, Principal Planner, City of Eureka

What "urban decay" means in a setting like Eureka is difficult to discern. For me, and I suspect many others (as evidenced by photos of urban decay on Wikipedia), urban decay congers up images of blocks and blocks of abandoned, run down buildings, deserted apartments and closed stores. In the last 50 years Old Town before redevelopment probably came closest to this picture. Even at its most rundown, however, Old Town contained viable businesses - a fabric store, several restaurants, a small grocery store, and more. Urban decay for Eureka, then, I believe is something smaller scaled than normally envisioned. Downtown Eureka after the opening of the Bayshore mall is, I believe, another example of an Eureka -sized urban decay phenomenon. Many of us experienced that phenomenon: dozen of store closings, vacant buildings, streets that were virtually empty except for 101.

The construction of the Marina Center will have, I believe, a similar deleterious effect on the downtown and on other Eureka "centers", such as possibly Henderson Center and the Bayshore Mall. For this reason I do not support the Marina Center development as it is presently proposed. It makes no sense to allow this large scaled development which will assuredly have a harmful and unhealthy effect on other Eureka "center" locations.

92-1

Additionally, I would like to comment on the assertion that the balloon track itself represents an example of urban decay. The track is unsightly but does not represent the deterioration of an urban center. It is a deserted railroad facility. The claim that present day Old Town is impacted given the distance between the two is not believable.

92-2

Nancy R. Ihara
231 Dean St.
Manila, CA 95521
nancyihara@yahoo.com

Letter 92: Nancy Ihara

- 92-1 The comment expresses concern regarding the potential effects of the proposed project on existing retail businesses. Please see Master Response 1, under “Potential Local Store Closures.”
- 92-2 The comment states that the project site is vacant but not blighted. The comment is noted. The condition of the project site, however, meets the definition of urban blight (see, e.g., Cal. Health & Safety Code, Section 33031(b)). It is a brownfield site with environmental contamination, primarily vacant buildings, and debris piles. The comment also states that the vacant condition of the site does not affect Old Town. That comment is also noted.

Sidnie Olson

From: jak3488@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2008 11:13 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center Comments

City of Eureka, I want to offer my wholehearted support for the Marina Center. The area where this project will be located is in need of a comprehensive diversified project such as this. It will increase the tax base for Eureka substantially with a rather small footprint. If instead of fighting this project some of your councilmembers would get behind this. In a short period of time during an economic downturn (Which will add jobs) this project could be completed and returning much needed tax dollars. It would also provide alternatives for shopping when I come to Eureka to spend money. The present site is a complete eyesore for all the Eureka BayFront and the alternatives will not provide the kind of tax base increase the city needs. I can't understand the motives some of the councilmembers have concerning this project unless they are "getting something" from the areas old guard. Make the right choice and back this plan to completion. Sincerely, Jeff Jacobsen P.O. Box 489 Hydesville, California 95547

93-1
93-2

Letter 93: Jeff Jacobson

- 93-1 The comment supporting the proposed project is noted.
- 93-2 The comment states that the proposed project would add jobs and revenue for the city. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, specifically under “Fiscal Impacts to the City of Eureka and Other Jurisdictions” and “Jobs / Wages Impacts.”

Sidnie Olson

From: Alec Johnson [hedgerowteacher@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 7:11 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Leakonomics

To Whom It May Concern:

I am responding to the DEIR under consideration for the balloon tract area. I understand the centerpiece will be a Home Depot or something similar. I feel the DEIR gravely overlooks the effect this project will have augmenting Urban Decay in the Eureka area. It turns out that where we spend our money has a big effect on our local economies and, by extension, ourselves. We do ourselves a much bigger favor, for example, by renting DVDs from local vendors than from a national chain. The money spent locally circulates three to four times more, stimulating economic development all along the way. Not paying attention to business ownership is to fail to notice economic leaks. "Leakonomics" is another term used for this kind of bad policy.

94-1

Make no mistake, Home Depot (HD) isn't coming to Eureka to create jobs. It's coming here to destroy some and shift the others to lower paying ones. While we might be able to purchase hardware products for less, our family and friends will be earning less. And every penny we spend "saving" money flies right out of our economy instantly, poof, leaving little economic stimulus in its wake.

94-2

Let me also draw your attention to the recent news regarding HD as it underscores our communities vulnerability, should we allow that corporation in our town. HD announced this week that it is laying off 7,000 people! If HD comes to Eureka it's an honest question to ask "will they stay?" It's easy to imagine them coming in, wiping out their competitors, then shutting their doors the next time the Global economy goes belly up. Then we'd have to drive to Arcata or Fortuna if we wanted a hammer. Assuming we could still afford the trip, or the hammer, after losing our job at Home Depot.

94-3

I also wish to object to the notion of capping the site as a reasonable solution to the toxic waste present. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to notice that the proposed area is adjacent to the bay and therefore actively leaching toxins into the bay. A thorough solution that disposes of the toxic waste completely must be a fundamental element of the final plan.

94-4

These are but a few of the many reasons I feel that all pertinent authorities should refuse to grant permission for this development, as specified, to proceed.

Most sincerely,
Alec Johnson
P.O. Box 5840
Eureka, CA 95502

Letter 94: Alec Johnson

- 94-1 The comment states that national chain stores have deleterious effects on communities. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, under “National Stores vs. Local Stores.”
- 94-2 The comment states that jobs would be lost and economic damage would result from the proposed project. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, under “Jobs / Wages Impacts” and “National Stores vs. Local Stores.”
- 94-3 The comment asks whether an anchor tenant would stay in the proposed project. No tenant can be forced to remain open in a leased space beyond the terms of the lease. Please see response to comment 40-4, which states that the large anchor tenant retail space could be released after vacation.
- 94-4 The comment states that placement of clean cover material over the project site the project site is not a reasonable method of remediation. The comment is noted. For further discussion regarding the Remedial Action Plan for the proposed project, including site placement of clean cover material over the project site, please see Master Response 4. Note that the soil at contaminated hot spots at the project site would be excavated and removed prior to placement of clean cover material over the site.

Sidnie Olson

From: Jeanette Jungers [sparrowmomma@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 5:44 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: MARINA CENTER

1-3-09
From: Jeanette Jungers
771 Azalea Lane,
Eureka, CA 95503
707-443-3420

To: City of Eureka Community Development Department
Sidnie Olson, Principal

I would like to address my concerns regarding the DEIR for the Marina Center. The city and residents of Eureka have a desire to see our Bay and our community develop in a wise manner and I have a number of concerns related to the DEIR and this proposed project.

Pollution: Health Risk assessment data is out of date.
Toxicity values have been updated by the EPA for a number of chemicals of concern at this site.
Dioxins and furans were not evaluated.
HRA based on exposure pathways for a vacant lot.
No assessment made for the proposed uses, including residential.
No analysis of ecological risk (to wildlife).
The DEIR dose not include information on the levels of any contaminants found onsite.

95-1
95-2
95-3
95-4
95-5
95-6
95-7

Transportation:
Diesel pollution from additional deisel truck traffic during construction phase and by deliveries to the businesses on site.
Traffic impacts to residents of Eureka.
Congestion on Broadway.
Dangers to bicylists/pedestrians with the additional vehicular traffic.
No Public transit within the project area.
Diversion of traffic into neighborhoods east and south of the project have not been addressed.

95-8
95-9
95-10
95-11
95-12
95-13

Land Use.
Land use and zoning designations should be consistent with Eureka's General Plan, this project does not meet this designation.
LCP ammendments require approval of the California Coastal Commission.
Coastal dependent developments should have priority over other developments.
Visitor serving commercial recreational facilities shall have priority over private residential, general industrial or general commercial development.
This piece of property could be a county gem and clean up should not be dependent on the development of this parcel.

95-14
95-15
95-16
95-17
95-18

Urban Decay:
As we have seen recently the nation is in the grip of a deepening recession. If we allow Big Box development on this site we will see our local businesses suffer, closure of stores at the Mall, Piersons, Myrtle Ave Lumber, Schafers etc. What this will do to Old Town revitalization and to our downtown core will be devastating. Big Box stores may provide cheap goods, but they don't provide for their workers and the bulk of their profits will go out of town to corporate coffers.

95-19

Leaving us with a dead and dying down town.

Cultural Resources:
This proposed project will negatively impact the cultural resources that are no doubt within the boundries of this project.
The Wiyot tribe had villages around the Bay, and although evidence is not evident on the surface there are no doubt historical artifacts which need to be identified and protected.

95-20

The citizens of Eureka and Humboldt County have a desire to see our Bay restored. Other projects could be developed which would have a positive outcome for our city. No tourist has ever come to Humboldt County with the desire to go to a Big Box store. Some alternate uses could be: A Boardwalk with small craft stores selling and demonstrating their craft, potters, blacksmiths, jewelers, local artists, local food store, bakery, seafood restaurant, a Conference center, an Aquarium an ocean research center. I could probably list a dozen other uses which would be more appropriate to our area, but I'm sure you get the idea.

95-21

I hope that the city denies this applicant and instead looks to developing our bay in a way which would be consistent with our desire for a clean, healthy bay.

I hope you will give some consideration to my suggestions. Yours Sincerely Jeanette Jungers

Hotmail@ goes where you go. On a PC, on the Web, on your phone. See how.

5616

Letter 95: Jeanette Jungers

- 95-1 The comment states that the Health Risk Assessments of 1996 and 2000 are out of date. For further discussion regarding the site investigations, please see Master Response 4.
- 95-2 The comment states that the toxicity values for chemicals have been updated by the EPA since the Health Risk Assessments. For further discussion regarding the site investigations, please see Master Response 4.
- 95-3 The comment incorrectly states that dioxins and furans are not evaluated.

For further discussion regarding the health risk assessment for the proposed project, and more detailed information about contamination on the property, please see Master Response 4.
- 95-4 The comment states that the previous Health Risk Assessments were prepared for a vacant lot and not the proposed project. For further discussion regarding the investigation of contaminants at the project site, please see Master Response 4.
- 95-5 The comment states, “No assessment was made of the proposed uses.” Although the Draft EIR includes Chapter IV.I, Land Use and Planning, which discusses the proposed uses and related policies, this comment is included among others related to hazardous materials onsite. Impacts related to hazardous materials, including impacts related to proposed uses on the site, are discussed under Impacts G-1 and G-2, on pages IV.G-19 through IV.G-23 of the Draft EIR. See also Master Response 2 regarding the adequacy of the air quality assessment.
- 95-6 The comment states that the Draft EIR does not include an assessment of risk to wildlife. Please see response to comment 52-33, which addresses risks to wildlife. Please note that the Draft EIR includes Section IV.D, which discusses potential biological impact. In addition, note that the contamination on the project site is an existing condition, and the proposed project would remediate contamination at the project site.
- 95-7 The comment incorrectly states that the Draft EIR does not include the levels of contaminants at the project site. Please see Chapter IV.G. For further discussion regarding the Remedial Action Plan for the proposed project, and more detailed information about the levels and locations of contaminant on the property, please see Master Response 4 and Appendix S.
- 95-8 The comment states that diesel pollution from traffic during construction and deliveries would exist. The health risk assessment summarized in Appendix E evaluates the incremental health risk associated with construction equipment, diesel delivery truck emissions, parking lot traffic emissions, and emissions from traffic on U.S. 101 in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Please also see Master Response 2.

- 95-9 The comment simply states “traffic impacts to the residents of Eureka.” Please see the responses to comments 31-1, 32-9, 38-4, 40-2, and 41-1 regarding traffic impacts. Response to comment 31-1 reiterates that cumulative growth in traffic on Broadway would be 33 percent with or without the proposed project. The other comments discuss potential impacts to other city corridors or alternate routes.
- 95-10 The comment simply states “Congestion on Broadway.” Please see responses to comments 31-1 and 49-1, as well as Master Response 6, which address congestion on Broadway.
- 95-11 The comment states that there would be danger to bicyclists and pedestrians. Please see the responses to comments 33-3 and 75-1 regarding bicyclist and pedestrian safety.
- 95-12 The comment states, “No public transit in the project area.” The existing public transit system would be expected expanded to serve the project as needed as demand expands.
- 95-13 The comment expresses concern regarding diversion of traffic into other neighborhoods. Please see the responses to comments 32-9 and 38-4, as well as Master Response 7, which address trip distribution and traffic on alternate routes.
- 95-14 The comment states that the land use and zoning designations should be consistent with the General Plan.

As stated in Chapter III, Project Description, the proposed project would require rezoning and other approvals. The Draft EIR therefore acknowledges that land use designation changes would be required.

- 95-15 The comment states that LCP amendments require Coastal Commission approval. As stated in Chapter III, Project Description, the proposed project would require rezoning and other approvals. The Local Coastal Program Amendment would require certification from the California Coastal Commission.
- 95-16 The comment regarding coastal-dependent uses is noted. Please see Master Responses 3 and 5 regarding land use issues and priorities in the coastal zone. As stated in Master Response 3, it is questionable whether any coastal-dependent uses could be developed on the project site, given that it does not abut the Bay.
- 95-17 The comment regarding priority uses is noted. Please see Master Responses 3 and 5 regarding land use issues and priorities in the coastal zone.
- 95-18 The comment states that the property should be cleaned up independent of the proposed project.

The Draft EIR does not state that remediation of contamination is dependent on the proposed project. In June 2009, after the City circulated the Draft EIR for public review, Environmental Resources Management (ERM) prepared a Supplemental Interim

Remedial Action Plan (SIRAP), which is added to the Marina Center EIR as Appendix S (please also see Master Response 4). The SIRAP is intended to address existing site contamination concerns of the Project Applicant and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and it is designed to be implemented with or without the build-out of the buildings and related improvements and infrastructure proposed in the project. The Project Applicant has proposed to implement the SIRAP in conjunction with onsite wetland restoration as Phase 1 of the proposed project and incorporating pertinent mitigation measures in the EIR, which are already described in the Chapters III and IV.G of the Draft EIR. Therefore, while this EIR addresses both this initial phase of the project as well as subsequent phases, the SIRAP has independent utility and can proceed on its own in advance of the City's approval of any entitlements necessary for the proposed project itself. Regulatory agencies cannot approve the Final Remedial Action Plan without first knowing the intensity of and types of uses that are planned to take place at the project site.

- 95-19 The comment states that economic conditions are not favorable and that the proposed project would exacerbate them. Please see Master Response 1, under "National Stores vs. Local Stores," "New Recessionary Conditions," and "Potential Local Store Closures."
- 95-20 The comment relates to archaeological investigations. Implementation of a subsurface archaeological survey program would help determine whether significant archaeological sites exist in the project area. Please see Master Response 9.
- 95-21 The comments regarding tourism and other uses for the project site are noted. Please see responses to comments 16-9, 16-239, and 16-242, which explain that the Draft EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives. An alternative containing uses similar to those described could be the Tourism Use Alternative, which is considered in Chapter V of the Draft EIR.

Sidnie Olson

From: melaniek@humboldt1.com
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 7:30 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center

Comment: Here are my thoughts about the Marina Center proposal:
Can this community really support MORE retail stores and restaurants?

96-1

There are so many businesses leaving the Mall - doesn't anyone notice these things? What I anticipate will happen is that restaurants and businesses currently in Old Town might relocate and Old Town will become the new or should I say re-new blighted area. So much energy and money has been spent on making Old Town the wonderful place it is now, it would be a shame to see all that deteriorate because of an unwise choice of development of the balloon track.

We have a thriving oyster culture business here in Humboldt. Why not expand that, or go with more of the innovative suggestions that have been made related to developing ecotourism in Eureka rather than retail stores.

96-2

Also, I think the traffic issue will be significant. Big box stores, if they are built should be located in an easy access right off a freeway - like in Fortuna at the old mill site, rather than in the center of an already too congested downtown city area.

96-3

Name: Melanie Kasek

Address: 2615 Copenhagen Rd.

City: Loleta

Zip: 95551

E-mail: melaniek@humboldt1.com

Letter 96: Malanie Kasek

- 96-1 The comment expresses concern that the local retail and restaurant market is saturated. Please see Master Response 1, under “Potential Local Store Closures.”
- 96-2 The comment suggesting another use for the project site is noted. Please see responses to comments 16-239, and 16-242, which explain that the Draft EIR contains a reasonable range of alternatives. Alternatives containing uses similar to those described could be the College of the Redwoods Alternative, the Tourism Use Alternative, the Horticultural Gardens Alternative, or the Wetland Restoration and Public Park Alternative.
- 96-3 The comment states that traffic would be significant. As stated in response to comment 31-1, there would be a 33 percent increase in cumulative traffic on Broadway with or without the proposed project by the year 2025. Implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce almost all impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Sidnie Olson

From: Tim keefe [t_keefe@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2009 3:02 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center DEIR Comments

I have had an opportunity to review the DEIR for the proposed Marina Center and here are my initial comments. As a professional archaeologist who works on both State and Federally funded projects I am appalled at the level of cultural resource identification efforts that have occurred as well as the proposed mitigation efforts. The DEIR notes that there are potentially two significant ethnographic villages within the area of direct project impacts and it also states that there could be buried historic and prehistoric sites present but it clearly is shown that no effort has been made to adequately identify or characterize what these may be.

97-1

"Given the known and recorded sites in the area and its waterfront location, the project site is highly sensitive for prehistoric occupation, and there remains a possibility that previously unknown significant deposits may be encountered during development especially at depths below approximately 5 to 8 feet. Such unrecorded resources could be damaged or destroyed during project construction, including any subsurface, ground-disturbing activities."

The DEIR also notes that since there is Federal involvement on this project, the 106 process must be followed. Although recognized, this apparently hasn't been done. When and where has the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) been involved as required under Section 106? I don't see any and if I did I imagine that a Finding of Effect for the project has been determined, produced and concurred with by the SHPO (which would lead to a the development of a Memorandum of Agreement and Treatment Plan - ph III data recovery or some other fitting mitigation, and likely in this case also a Late Discovery Treatment Plan). Sems like there is more work to be accomplished here.

97-2

It appears to me that no effects statement can as of yet be made since identification efforts have not been completed (if you don't know what will turn up when the earth is turned then identification hasn't been completed). I also want to add that in regards to the present "Plan" for dealing with potentially significant sites in construction, this is flawed logic at its worse. Just exposing a buried site would be considered an adverse effect to a site if you haven't determined how your actions would impact the located site. On this same issue, the idea that a project would be redesigned in the middle of construction based on a late discovery is ludicrous at best. As an example of the potential problems and risks I point to a recent project conducted in Port Angeles, WA (<http://www.achp.gov/casearchive/caseswin05WA.html>).

97-3

The lack of adequate identification efforts resulted in the loss of millions of dollars, the desecration of a truly significant archaeological site, and the demise of a project. I think Eureka would be wise to heed past precedents before accepting such a flawed plan.

Please complete the cultural resource/archaeological identification efforts for this project! Clumsily digging around during construction and hoping nothing pops out of the ground is not acceptable at such a sensitive location.

Timothy Keefe
4310 Walnut Drive
Eureka, CA 95503
(707) 441-2022
(FAX (707) 441-5775

Letter 97: Tim Keefe

- 97-1 The comment relates to archaeological investigations. A subsurface archaeological investigation described in revised Mitigation Measure E-2a would help determine the presence of cultural resources in the project area. Please see Master Response 9 and responses to comments 69-1, 69-6, 69-7, and 69-10. This investigation would commence when engineering plans and soil remediation plans are finalized but prior to project construction.
- 97-2 The comment that Section 106 consultation between the City of Eureka, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the State Historic Preservation Officer has not yet begun are noted. The results of the subsurface investigation would help guide the Section 106 consultation process. Please also see responses to comments 69-19 and 69-20.
- 97-3 The comment states that archaeological investigations must proceed prior to construction. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 9 for revised Mitigation Measures E-2a and E-2b, as well as responses to comments 97-1 and 97-2, and the responses referenced therein.

The comment also references the challenges faced by the Hood Canal Bridge Replacement project in Washington State. This project, led by Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), included the construction of graving dock facilities at Port Angeles, WA (Wilma 2005). The archaeological survey prepared for the Port Angeles site determined that Tse-whit-zen, a large Klallam village, had been located near the site, and that the village cemetery was in the general vicinity. Soon after beginning excavation in August 2003, construction workers found human remains and other artifacts. WSDOT suspended construction and required further archaeological studies. By December 2004, 355 complete skeletons had been located and removed. Lower Elwha Klallam leaders, who at first wanted all burials removed so they would not be left underneath the graving dock, began urging the state to reconsider the project location altogether. In December, the tribe officially asked WSDOT to cancel plans for the graving yard. The State agreed, and eventually found a new site for the graving dock.

The proposed Marina Center project includes mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to archaeological resources. Please see Mitigation Measure E-2c, which states that if human remains are found on the project site, and if the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, a qualified archaeologist shall be summoned within 48 hours to conduct an independent review to evaluate whether the remains belong to a single individual or multiple individuals. If the latter, and if there are six or more Native American burials on the site, the site shall be identified as a Native American cemetery and all work on the site within 100 feet of any burial site must cease until recovery or reburial arrangements are made with the descendants of the deceased or, if there are no descendants of the deceased, with the NAHC.

As stated in Master Response 9, monitoring is not the sole mitigation strategy for the proposed project. Mitigation Measure E-2a, dictates a number of steps that the Project Applicant must follow if archaeological materials are found, including ceasing construction activities, conducting an independent review of the find by a qualified archaeologist, and then implementing one or a combination measures (e.g., “removing the object or feature, planning the construction around the object or feature, capping the object or feature with a layer of soil sufficient to protect the integrity of the feature or object, and/or deeding the site as a permanent conservation easement.”). (Draft EIR, pages IV.E-17 and -18.) Given the possibility that no archaeologically significant materials will be found during project construction or monitoring, as well as the fact that any materials found would be protected through the treatment measures required under Mitigation Measures E-2a and E-2b, no further mitigation is required and the project is expected to have a less-than-significant impact on archaeological resources.

RECEIVED
JAN 26 2009
JAN 27 2009
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Re: Proposed Marina Center:

I am completely against the Arkly/ Security National Marina Center plan. It's sickening to see big money buying its way through Humboldt County. This is a bad location and usage. We need to envision the area open to the public and visitors. An RV park would place visitors in the heart of Eureka. How about a water park-heated

98-1

The marina center plan is too big for Eureka and out of scale. We can't keep businesses in Eureka open even now. Having a big Home Depot would cheapen the area. They basically sell cheap merchandise when must be replaced more frequently and the money doesn't stay here.

98-2

98-3

Restoring wetlands should be paramount in this area. It has been proven wetlands help protect existing areas from flooding and adds to the beauty of the area. Katrina showed the damage done when wetlands had been bulldozed over and developments built. We already have the mall built over wetlands. In this time of worry over global warming haun, wetlands may help protect this area.

98-4

Sincerely
Lina Kent



Ms Lina Kent
1815 Caroline Ave
McKinleyville, CA 95519

Letter 98: Lina Kent

- 98-1 The comment states that this is a bad use and location for the proposed project, and suggests alternative uses. The comment is noted. The potential environmental impacts of the proposed project are discussed throughout the Draft EIR. Alternatives to the proposed project are discussed in Chapter VI.
- 98-2 The comment's opinion of the preliminary project renderings are noted. As stated in the outline on page III-18 of the Draft EIR, under *F. Project Entitlements and Approvals*, and reiterated on page IV.A-6 under Impact A-3, the proposed project would be subject to site plan review and architectural review by the City of Eureka. Design features specific to the site plan and buildings would be established at that time. The Design Review Committee will review the site plans and designs to ensure that EMC Section 156.054 (D) goals are met.
- 98-3 The comment states that money paid to national chain stores does not stay in the community. Please see Master Response 1, under "National Stores vs. Local Stores."
- 98-4 The comment states that wetland restoration of project site should be paramount, especially considering worry over global warming. The Marina Center project includes the creation of contiguous estuarine wetlands at the south end of the project site at an acreage exceeding the extent of the existing combined scattered, degraded seasonal and estuarine wetlands (mitigation ratio of 1.05:1). These restored wetlands are anticipated to be of much higher quality and biological value than those currently onsite. Please also see response to comment 8-6 regarding global warming and sea-level rise.

Starr Kilian

From: Starr Kilian [starrkilian@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, December 06, 2008 1:01 PM
To: 'DEIRcomment@ci.eureka.ca.gov' &
Subject: Draft EIR comment

*Please note
address given in the
Times Standard was
"undeliverable".*

To Whom It May Concern:

After reading the article in the Times Standard on Saturday, December 06, 2008, regarding the Marina Center, I felt compelled to comment on three items:

1. The artist's renderings were absolutely ugly. They remind me of old malls which have been and are being torn down all over the country. The Humboldt County Library, Wharfinger Building, and HSU's Aquatic Center are all attractive. Why would you want to lower the standard with this proposed architecture?

99-1

2. The statement regarding mall vacancy rate, stability "and the ability to re-tenant smaller vacancies as they occur " appears to be glaringly outdated in light of current local, national and international economic events. I believe this aspect must be reevaluated.

99-2

3. In regards to the article's reference about "big box stores", competition is good but a Home depot will certainly affect the many smaller lumber yards and hardware stores. Stores like Almquist Lumber may survive just because they offer some higher quality products, not available elsewhere in the county.

99-3

I am happy to see clean up of the balloon tract and commend all those involved in their efforts to rid the area of "urban blight" and improve the local economy, but I do feel the areas mentioned above need to be reevaluated.

Respectfully,
Esther Kilian
Fieldbrook

RECEIVED
DEC 09 2008
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

12/6/2008

Letter 99: Esther Kilian

- 99-1 The comment's opinion of the preliminary project renderings are noted. As stated in the outline on page III-18 of the Draft EIR, under F. Project Entitlements and Approvals, and reiterated on page IV.A-6 under Impact A-3, the proposed project would be subject to site plan review and architectural review by the City of Eureka. Design features specific to the site plan and buildings would be established at that time. The Design Review Committee will review the site plans and designs to ensure that EMC Section 156.054 (D) goals are met.
- 99-2 The comment states that the vacancy study appears outdated. Please see Master Response 1, under "Vacancy in the City of Eureka."
- 99-3 The comment states that the proposed project would cause local stores to close. Please see Master Response 1, under "Potential Local Store Closures."

Comment Letter 100

Comment Letter 100

Sidnie Olson

From: jhking [samonely@quik.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 10:04 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center Draft EIR Comments
Attachments: Marina comment JK 1-09.doc

Sincerely yours,

Joyce H. King
685 School Road
McKinleyville, CA 95519

City of Eureka Community Development Department
Sidnie L. Olson, Principal Planner
531 K Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Re: Marina Center Draft EIR Comments

Dear Ms. Olson:

Does the EIR evaluate the short and long term cumulative impacts to the environment, infrastructure, and economy of this project in combination with all past, present, and foreseeable future projects, especially with regard to the following:

- 1. potential increases in greenhouse gas emissions from the preparations, building, transportation, and use of this project? [100-1]
2. impacts on waste treatment and storm water capacity and compliance with Water Quality Control Board requirements? [100-2]
3. impact on costs and operation of roads, and other county infrastructure? [100-3]
4. impact on costs and operation of police, fire, public health, environmental health, natural resource agencies, and other governmental services for protection, monitoring and enforcement? [100-4]
5. increases in point source and non-point source pollution to air, water, soil? [100-5]
6. impacts on existing or recovering native aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems? [100-6]
7. impacts on natural drainage, storage and other hydrologic functioning? [100-7]
8. impact of Big Box stores on local businesses, wages, and quantity and quality of jobs? [100-8]
Does the EIR require mitigation methods that have been thoroughly tested and shown to be successful for at least 10 years? [100-9]
Will all mitigations be funded, monitored, and maintained for at least 10 years at a level which ensures their success?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important matter. I look forward to your answers to these questions.

5-629

Letter 100: Joyce King

- 100-1 The comment asks if the Draft EIR discloses cumulative impacts associated with greenhouse gases (GHGs). Please see Draft EIR pages IV.C-19 through IV.C-22 for a discussion of the cumulative impacts related to GHGs associated with the project. Please also see response to comment 9-9, which discusses thresholds for cumulative impacts and the merits of infill development in reducing GHG emissions. Please also see response to comment 9-10, which states that the proposed project would reduce emissions associated with travel to Crescent City. Finally, please see responses to comments 16-22 and 22-4, which explain that the Draft EIR does include an analysis of GHG emissions associated with the proposed project, including emissions associated with energy use and deliveries.
- 100-2 The comment asks if waste treatment and stormwater capacity would be in compliance with WQCB requirements. Cumulative waste water impacts are discussed on Draft EIR page IV.Q-10 under Impact Q-8.
- 100-3 The comment states that the proposed project could have impacts on the costs and operations of roads. The comment is noted. According to the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*, pavements are engineered to carry the truck traffic loads expected during the pavement design life. Truck traffic, which includes buses, trucks and truck-trailers, is the primary factor affecting pavement design life and its serviceability. Passenger cars and pickups are considered to have negligible effect when determining traffic loads. The proposed project would predominantly generate trips in passenger cars and pickups, and therefore would not have an impact on the long-term wear and tear of City streets.
- 100-4 The comment expresses concern about the costs of public services to support the proposed project. The proposed project would contribute taxes and fees toward local, state, and national government funds. These funds are allocated to specific agencies at the discretion of the Eureka City Council, the California State legislature, and the federal Congress through annual budget reviews.
- 100-5 The comment asks if the Draft EIR discloses cumulative impacts associated with point source and non-point source air pollution. Please see Draft EIR pages IV.C-15 and IV.C-16 for a discussion of the cumulative impacts related to criteria air pollutants.
- 100-6 The comment asks whether there would be impacts to recovering aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Please see responses to comments 13-4, 88-9, and 88-10, which discuss potential impacts to wildlife.
- 100-7 The comment questions the effects of the project on hydrologic functioning and natural drainage. For further discussion regarding the cumulative effects on drainage, please see responses to comments 87-5 and 88-6.

100-8 The comment expresses concern regarding the proposed project's impacts on existing retail businesses and jobs and wages. Please see Master Response 1, under "Jobs / Wages Impacts" and "Potential Local Store Closures."

100-9 The comment questions whether the Draft EIR requires mitigation measures to be in place for 10 years.

The Draft EIR does not make any requirements regarding mitigation measures. Pursuant to CEQA, the EIR is required to identify mitigation measures for the proposed project. The City Council would require the implementation of mitigation measures and a monitoring program for a period of time that it determines appropriate.