

Comments: DEIR for the proposed Marina Center Project on Eureka's Balloon Tract

Name (print): Amy Pollock

Address: 329 Clark St. (home) + 322 F St. (shop)

E-mail: I oppose the Marina Center/Balloon Tract development project. As a resident I am apposed to increased traffic & urban decay. As a local artist, I value the cultural importance of locally produced goods shared with visitors to our area.

Do Tourists can go to Home Depot, etc. at their own homes. The unique, local businesses create our unique cultural environment. This project is not sustainable economically, environ-

Signed: Amy Pollock mentally, socially or culturally. Please

Or send e-mail comments to: DEIRComments@ci.eureka.ca.gov do not waste the resources of the people of this

131-1

Letter 131: Amy Pollock

- 131-1 The comment in opposition to the proposed project's potential impacts to urban decay and transportation is noted. The proposed project's potential impacts to transportation are discussed in Chapter IV.O, and the proposed project's potential impacts to urban decay are discussed in Chapter IV.P of the Draft EIR. Also please see Master Responses 1, 6, and 7.

Sidnie Olson

From: David Fix & Jude Power [foglark@att.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 10:19 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center

Dear Sidnie Olson,

I would like to share my opinion that the proposed Marina Center development would have a negative effect on Eureka and Humboldt County and I do not think it should proceed at this time. The construction of a Home Depot along with other new retail spaces in downtown Eureka would certainly cause many of our existing businesses to fail. An example is Pierson's, an exemplary locally-owned home improvement center, which could not compete with H.D. Humboldt County has a very small, economically depressed population, approximately 125,000, and we cannot support more retail stores than we already have. Why do you think Trader Joe's refused to come here? Because they knew our population was too small and too poor to support it. Home Depot itself has recently laid-off thousands of employees and is closing many of its centers. We have many empty store fronts as it is; it is irrational to consider building more. Local businesses are struggling (except the liquor stores?) and cannot take the blow of another big mall. Even Bayshore Mall is hurting - the two anchor stores are failing and spaces are vacant.

132-1

Another response I have to the proposed Marina Center is the aesthetic aspect. I was alarmed by the artist's rendition in the Times-Standard. It looked like a 1950's strip mall in the Central Valley. Isn't this supposed to be a Victorian Seaport? The architecture had no relevance to our culture or architectural heritage. It was really off-putting, although perhaps not as horrendous as the Italianesque County Jail facade on 5th Street. And I haven't even mentioned the traffic problems that will plague the 4th Street/Broadway area or the drug dealers and prostitutes who will flock to the new development. All in all, the Marina Center is a very bad idea in its present form.

132-2

132-3

Thank you for considering my input,
Jude Power
Eureka Shopper
Humboldt Co. resident since 1971

Letter 132: Jude Power and David Fix

- 132-1 The comment states that the proposed project would cause other businesses to fail and states that national chains avoids Eureka because the market is not strong enough to support them.

Please see Master Response 1, under “National Stores vs. Local Stores” and “Potential Local Store Closures.”

- 132-2 The opinion of the preliminary project renderings is 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.

- 132-3 The comment relates to site security and police protection. Please see response to comment 16-178. As stated there, by providing new development on the project site, including new residents, employment, economic activity, and public activity, the project may have a beneficial effect on safety of the area.

Also, the Police Department has indicated that one additional police office and one police service officer would be needed as a result of the proposed project, and the proposed project would contribute both sales tax and property tax revenues to the City, which would in turn increase the general fund. If the City Council determines through its annual budget review that additional police services are warranted, for either onsite services or off-site traffic enforcement, they would direct some of the increased general fund revenues to the Police Department.

Sidnie Olson

From: Christy Prescott [csprescott@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 5:27 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center DEIR Comments

Dear Sidnie Olson,

Please take my comments under consideration regarding the DEIR for the proposed Marina Center.

While I recognise the many benefits that may flow from the development of the Ballon Tract, I am concerned about the proposed big box development. While I support creating jobs in Humboldt, I believe these should be generated in a manner that does not compromise the sustainability of locally owned small businesses. I would like to see an analysis of the impacts of the big box development on local businesses.

133-1

My other concern with the DEIR is the lack of consideration and analysis used to support the General Plan land use designation amendment. Given that the development will require a site specific plan amendment to move forward, I would expect that the city would carefully consider the need for a big box development versus what the site is currently zoned for or other potential development types.

133-2

Consideration of the site's inherent qualities should be a fundament in the city's decision on approving any land use amendment to the plan. A big box development does not capitalize on the site's spectacular views or proximity to Old Town and Humboldt Bay. The DEIR needs to include a thoughtful and thorough analysis of the impacts associated with the proposed plan amendment direction. I find that the DEIR is currently lacking in this respect.

133-3

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope that you will take these comments under serious consideration in moving forward.

Sincerely,
/s/ Christy Prescott
2704 G Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Letter 133: Christy Prescott

- 133-1 The comment expresses concern that the proposed project would compromise the stability of locally owned businesses. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, under “Potential Local Store Closures.”
- 133-2 The comment expressing concern that the Draft EIR lacks consideration and analysis of the proposed General Plan amendment is noted.

The project entitlements and approvals are listed on pages III-17 and III-18. Chapter IV.I, Land Use and Planning, describes the existing land use and zoning designations and the proposed amendments. The potential environmental impacts of these entitlements and approvals are detailed throughout the Draft EIR. In addition, please see Master Response 4, which describes the existing and proposed zoning on the project site and permissible uses. Master Response 3 also discusses the Local Coastal Program’s Land Use Plan, which is an integral component of the General Plan.

- 133-3 The comment encouraging a thorough review of the proposed project’s entitlements and aesthetic impacts is noted.

The project entitlements and approvals are listed on pages III-17 and III-18. The proposed projects’ potential impacts to scenic vistas are discussed in Chapter IV.A, Aesthetics. The proposed project’s consistency with the Local Coastal Program is discussed in Chapter IV.I, Land Use and Planning, as well as in Master Response 3.

To: City of Eureka
Community Development Dept.
attn: Sidnie L. Olson, Principal Planner
531 R Street
Eureka, Ca. 95501-1165

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Comments on Marina Center DEIR: 1/31/09

I have lived in Humboldt Co. for 37 years. I have attended C/R, HSU, raised my family here and started my own family business. I'm a homeowner who built my passive solar home in 1981. I have lived in San Lake, Mendocino, Eureka, Ukiah, McKinleyville, Westhaven, Trinidad, Arcata and Eureka and had ample opportunity to witness both rural and urban development and historical decay as well as spoken over the years with fourth and fifth generation locals.

Where to begin about this ill-fated draft EIR is overwhelming to me. Lets go back to the early seventies when Old Town Eureka was a dilapidated waterfront fisherman's town in the glory days of Farbo's and abundant fish stocks. The Madaket, Old Town Bar and Grill and Fog's brought people to Old Town and all businesses boomed when the economy took a downturn. The funky but functional Eureka mall did the Downtown area took a permanent hit when the Bayshore Mall was built, after yet another very expensive Old Town Eureka revitalization project. But the brick Gagebo in. It couldn't sustain local businesses when even J.C. Penney's closed their Eureka store and moved to the mall. Down-

The loss of anchor stores at the Bayshore Mall, empty storefronts, declining sales, a deep recession beyond anything our grand parents have seen since the Great Depression should be enough to halt this grandiose bloated project. Even the Bear River revitalization project from 16 years ago still sits vacant with no local retailers, with the empty condos and retail space on F Street. The Marina Center is a bizarre hodge podge of big box commercial, regular commercial space, office, residential and light industry. "Shipping needs" just traffic and enhancement? Combining just traffic and shipping needs for this Center is totally incongruous and nonsensical. Spade gate existing traffic corridors on Broadway and side streets would bring commuting and peak traffic times to a gridlock standstill something we already "enjoy". Traffic Studies for Herrick Road, Elk River Road, Vaher Ave, Mayer Ave, intersection of F and Oak Street have not been addressed, let alone the traffic emission from 15,000 idling cars on the waterfront.

There are 2 Wjst historic sites within the project boundaries which have not been addressed. Wetlands mitigation, monitoring of non-native ice grass needs to be addressed. There are numerous known toxic contaminants in the soil: hydrocarbons, copper, lead, arsenic, and dioxins, seeping into the groundwater.

In the current recession, Home Depot announced last week they were closing hundreds of stores

134-1

134-2

134-3

134-4

134-5

134-6

5-732

We need to use the urban backfill/
 infrastructure that we have such as all
 that space we have already available on James
 Blvd's old warehousing sites. Letting Home Depot
 in would be a slap in the face to the
 few surviving local retailers like Ernie
 Pierson, where you get expertise and local
 service after the sale, unlike a national
 retail chain whose corporate headquarters
 are outsourced 3rd floors where public
 transit to the marina water, nonexistent.
 Safe bike trails and walkable space at
 the Marina Center? Good luck dodging
 the delivery trucks! The Eureka waterfront
 wetlands would be better served with a
 through channel and a Visitor-serving Recreation
 Use Center, an eco-tourist destination flagship
 along the lines of our global trend setting
 Arcata Marsh and Schatz Energy Center.
 Shopping destinations are quickly becoming
 dinosaurs of the Wall Street excess, and not
 wise or sustainable for our local economy. 40
 years of these revitalization bronztoggers
 should be history enough to cancel this
 ridiculous outdated mindset. Invest in
 our natural local sustainability and
 eco-tourism and green jobs instead
 I invite you all to take a walk today on our water
 front with open eyes. Take a deep breath,
 a fish rots from the head down. If it looks like
 a fish and smells like a fish, it indeed is a
 fish. Fitz Hill.

134-7

134-8

134-9

134-10

Thank you for your kind
 attention in this very important issues.

Sincerely,
 Leslie Quinn
 LESLIE QUINN
 1887 HAUSER CT.
 ARCATA, CA. 95521
 # 825-0209

Letter 134: Leslie Quinn

- 134-1 The comment lists vacant retail spaces, notes current economic conditions, and states that these reasons should be enough to disapprove the proposed project. The comment is noted.

Please see Master Response 1, under “New Recessionary Conditions,” as well as under “The Effect of the Bayshore Mall on Local Businesses.”

- 134-2 The comment states that the proposed project would bring traffic corridors on Broadway to a standstill.

To the contrary, the Draft EIR’s analysis shows that after implementation of the identified mitigation measures, all intersections on U.S. 101 in the project area would operate acceptably (i.e., without adverse congestion). All other intersections in the study area would similarly operate acceptably, except Koster Street and Wabash Avenue.

- 134-3 The comment lists several streets in the City of Eureka and claims that the traffic impact study did not address these streets and associated intersections. The comment also expresses concerns about emissions from project-generated vehicular trips.

The traffic consultant preparing the Draft EIR traffic analysis consulted with the City of Eureka, Caltrans District 1, and the EIR consultant ESA in developing the list of study intersections. Subsequently, the traffic consultant looked at potential impacts from project traffic on intersections beyond the study area including U.S. 101 and State Route 255 (Fourth and Fifth Streets at R Street), F Street south of Downtown, and Herrick Avenue at U.S. 101 and at Elk River Road. And it is found by the traffic consultant that the project’s impacts on these outlying intersections and roadways would be less than significant.

On vehicle emissions, it should be noted that all of the vehicle trips identified in the traffic analysis are not necessarily “new” trips. In fact, the air quality analysis was conducted both for project-generated vehicle trips in the URBEMIS2007 air emissions model, and also cumulative regional projections in population growth and vehicle emissions that would occur with or without the project. (Draft EIR, pages IV.C-14 and -15.) So those impacts are evaluated and addressed by the project to the extent feasible. Moreover, vehicles are not expected to idle on the project site as the comment suggests. Vehicle trips would begin or end at the project site. Except for some limited idling associated with delivery trucks, there is no evidence to suggest that vehicles would be left idling unnecessarily at the site. Finally, vehicle emissions arise from several factors which cannot be controlled by the project. For example, the project cannot control individual buying or driving habits, which would affect the fuel efficiency rates and whether individuals commute shorter or longer distances. In any event, the Marina Center is designed as a mixed-use project, with various land uses co-located so as to avoid unnecessary vehicle trips and thus reduce or minimize vehicle emissions.

- 134-4 The comment states that the potential Wiyot villages beneath the project site have not been addressed.

Implementation of a subsurface archaeological survey program would help determine whether significant archaeological sites exist in the project area. Please also see Master Response 9, which outlines revised Mitigation Measures E-2a and E-2b to implement the subsurface archaeological survey.

- 134-5 The comment states that there are numerous known toxic contaminants in the soil: hydrocarbons, copper, lead, arsenic, and dioxins, seeping into the groundwater.

Please see Master Response 4. The comment is correct that hydrocarbons, copper, lead, arsenic, and dioxins have each been detected at the project site, and that migration to groundwater may be a concern at other project sites. Petroleum hydrocarbons have been found in the “A” zone wells, but the area affected is limited, the amounts are decreasing from natural processes, and the hydrocarbons are not migrating. The impact to groundwater by arsenic, copper, and lead has also been minimal given the low concentrations and the tendency of these metals to bind to soil. Likewise, impacts to groundwater in the “B” zone have been minimal, indicating that the layer of densely compacted bay mud that separates the “A” zone from the “B” zone is an effective aquitard. Dioxins, on the other hand, are insoluble and therefore should not be present in groundwater. Dioxins were detected in ditches and Clark Slough. This, and the fact that dioxins are not associated with any of the past uses of the project site, suggest that these elevated levels of dioxin are attributable to offsite sources. In any event, the project proposes as Phase 1 to conduct site remediation and wetland restoration, which would together eliminate exposure pathways and reduce the risk to human health and the environment to a less-than-significant level.

- 134-6 The comment states that the Home Depot recently announced that it is closing stores. Please see Master Response 1, under “New Recessionary Conditions.”

- 134-7 The comment states that the City should use the urban backfill / infrastructure and states that Home Depot is a slap in the face to locally owned retailers. The comment is noted.

The project site is considered an urban infill site similar to the “urban backfill” sites suggested by the comment. Please see Master Response 1 regarding comments about national retail chains. Please also see Master Response 1, under “Potential Local Store Closures.”

- 134-8 The comment makes terse statements accusing the proposed project of lacking transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access. To the contrary, transit and bike routes that would serve the project are discussed in the Draft EIR under Impact O-7 on pages IV.O-45 to IV.O-48.

- 134-9 The comment suggesting alternative uses for the project site is noted. An analysis of alternatives to the proposed project is provided in Chapter VI of the Draft EIR. Please see

responses to comments 16-9, 16-239, and 16-242, which explain that the analysis has included a reasonable range of alternatives, as required by CEQA. 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, which are considered in Chapter VI of the Draft EIR.

- 134-10 The comment inappropriately confuses the demand for destination retail shopping centers with the fate of “Wall Street excess,” which is likely to mean the performance of banks and investment companies that took on too much risk during the past decade.

Destination retail shopping centers have existed for centuries. In addition, large-format destination retail, such as department stores, have existed for more than a century. These retail developments occurred more than one hundred years before the advent of credit default swaps and subprime mortgage-backed securities that played a large role in the crises in the financial banking sector from 2007 through 2009.

The demand for destination retail, while affected by the current economic conditions, is therefore not assumed to wane into extinction, as implied by the comment. Please also see Master Response 1, specifically under “New Recessionary Conditions.”

Sidnie Olson

From: howdix@earthlink.net
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 10:34 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center

To whom it may concern:

The Balloon tract has laid fallow far too long. I hope it will soon be turned into a better revenue source for the City of Eureka. I feel that the developers have far exceeded what they should have to just to try and satisfy everyone. They have satisfied me and at age 80 I hope I can live long enough to see the Marina Center completed.

135-1

Howard Rien, RDC, USN Ret.
howdix@earthlink.net
Eureka, CA

Letter 135: Howard Rein

135-1 The comment in support of the proposed project is noted.

Sidnie Olson

From: Jane Riggan [jriggan@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2009 2:27 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center EIR comments

Dear Sidnie:

I am particularly concerned about the human health effects of constructing the Marina Center on an old hazardous waste site and whether there have been any effects from the previous soil and hazardous waste material removal. My main concern is regarding the residential and museum use (especially in relation to children). Once I got a copy of Hazardous Materials Assessment in Appendix J, I was disturbed to see the brevity of the Health Risk Assessment (4.0).

Maybe this was only a summary, but there were still some disturbing aspects. Colleagues who have been familiar with other Union Pacific sites raised the issue of dioxins and PCBs and why they were not addressed. I am also concerned that Health Risk Assessment is based on one completed by Geomatrix in 1997 and an Addendum in 2000. That was nine years ago and it seems to me that the data would be considered outdated. It certainly seems that it would be prudent to get more recent data especially if your accepted version includes residences and the Discovery Museum.

136-1

Thank you for your careful consideration of these comments. Feel free to call me if you need clarification.

Jane Riggan
1721 J Street
Arcata, CA
825-6756

Letter 136: Janet Riggan

136-1 The comment requests further detail regarding the hazardous materials and radiation plan.

For further discussion regarding the Remedial Action Plan for the proposed project, please see Master Response 4 and Appendix S.

Sidnie Olson

From: nick robinson [swissforestryrobinson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 02, 2009 1:48 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center Public Comment

Hello

As a citizen and home owner in Eureka Ca, I wish to express my support of the Marina Center. I believe that this project will benefit the area tremendously. As long as I have lived in this city it has gradually improved, and the waterfront areas are particularly run down. As each new project is completed the aesthetics of our area improves, as does our quality of life. I also believe that the perceived impact of a big box store is grossly over stated. This area has a long history of supporting local businesses. People will not abandoned this notion just becuae a new store opens. Businesses such as Peirsons and Ace may experience a short term loss in business, but I believe that the local population will be loyal to their local stores. Competition will be good in the long run for everyone. I haven't seen anything close becuae of Target or COSCO.

137-1
137-2

The biggest potential impact from this project is the "No Project" scenario. The longer improvement and clean up proposals are delayed, the more expensive they become. How many assessments does it take to assess something? This area struggles enough as it is. We have always relied on a resource based economy, and being in such a remote location, inefficiency kills business. The bureaucracy of these projects may be necessary to some degree, but lets keep the layers as thin a practical and keep Eureka alive.

137-3

Nick Robinson
3378 L st
Eureka CA 95503

Letter 137: Nick Robinson

- 137-1 The comment's support of the proposed project is 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.
- 137-2 The comment states that local businesses may experience short-term losses due to the proposed project, but that the local population would be loyal to the local stores. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1 for further discussion.
- 137-3 The comment regarding the potential impacts of the No Project Alternative are noted. Please see response to comment 16-241, which further discusses the No Project Alternative.

Comment Letter 138

January 27, 2009

Sidnie Olson
Principle Planner
Eureka Community Development Department
531 K Street
Eureka, CA 95501

RECEIVED
JAN 29 2009
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Re: Marina Center Project

Dear Ms. Olson:

The Marina Center Project proposed for the Eureka waterfront will result in years of construction pollution, heavy equipment and trucks and accompanying diesel fumes, noise, ground vibrations, hazardous materials and dirt in the center of town for a project with serious environmental impacts and real potential for causing more business closures and urban decay in the area. Having "Home Depot" as an anchor store will bring large delivery trucks, constant auto traffic in and through the beautiful and fragile old town area and the increasingly congested Highway 101 corridor. Will studies be made to address, quantify, mitigate and publicize all these impacts? What cumulative impacts will be made on existing infrastructure and who will pay for necessary upgrades - other than unwilling taxpayers? What about earthquake protection? How will the tourist business be affected? The project effects will be severe and permanent.

138-1

I live in the Myrtle town area of Eureka which has been impacted by increasing growth and development, construction and truck traffic with inadequate traffic calming and danger from speeding and increased traffic flows diverted into the neighborhood to accommodate this growth. The diesel fumes, construction dust and dirt, trucks passing by, some days almost continuously, plus the noise, vibration damage and danger they pose to public health and safety cannot be overstated. I think the same could be stated about the Marina Center project. I am concerned that this project will add greatly to the negative impacts already evident locally. Such a loss for such a beautiful urban waterfront.

It is very important that environmental, health and safety, land use and traffic concerns are adequately addressed. The public must be involved, listened to, protected and informed since we will all pay the price for this development one way or another.

Sincerely yours,



Nola Roiz
P.O. Box 6309
Eureka, CA 95502

Letter 138: Nola Roiz

- 138-1 The comments questioning the proposed project's construction schedule, traffic, air quality, and hazardous materials impacts are noted.

The proposed project's construction timeline is described on page III-14. Please also see Chapter 2, which includes text changes to the Draft EIR explains that only the first phase of the proposed project would move forward presently.

The proposed project's potential impacts to traffic, including those from deliveries, are discussed in Chapter IV.O, Transportation. The proposed project's potential impacts to air quality, including impacts to air quality due to diesel fumes during construction, are discussed in Chapter IV.C, Air Quality. The proposed project's impact to noise and vibration are discussed in Chapter IV.K, Noise. The proposed project's potential impact to hazardous materials is discussed in Chapter IV.G, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The proposed project's impact to urban decay is discussed in Chapter IV.P, Urban Decay. The proposed project's potential impacts to infrastructure are discussed in Chapter IV.Q, Utilities and Services Systems and Chapter IV.O, Transportation. The proposed project's impacts related to earthquakes are discussed in Chapter IV.F, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. The proposed project's impacts to aesthetics of the urban waterfront are discussed in Chapter IV.A, Aesthetics. Cumulative Impacts are discussed in each chapter, as applicable.

The EIR is the primary document that analyzes these effects, often drawing on studies and documents prepared for specific impact categories. These references are cited at the end of each chapter, and those not previously publicly available are included as appendices in Volume II of the Draft EIR.

The proposed project would contribute sales and property taxes that would be directed into the City's general fund and would be available for distribution to the police or fire departments at the discretion of the City Council. Taxes would also be paid to state and federal revenue agencies for distribution at the discretion of decision-makers to various levels of government and utilities serving the project site. Please also see Master Response 1 regarding funding of police and fire services.

Comments: DEIR for the proposed Marina Center Project on Eureka's Balloon Tract

Name (print): Cindy Rosenfeld, DVM

Address: 38 Apple Valley Lane Eureka 95503

E-mail: cindrs@aol.com

What a wonderful idea to build a beautiful marina in Eureka. But there are serious issues you have not addressed. One of my interests is the impact of natural wildlife habitat. As a licensed veterinarian, I believe we have a responsibility to restore the tidal estuary we have destroyed. We must reverse the loss of natural wildlife habitat. Won't you please consider combining your project with this deeply moral issue which may also be part of the

Signed: Cindy Rosenfeld DVM

Coastal Act!

139-1

Or send e-mail comments to: DEIRComments@ci.eureka.ca.gov

Letter 139: Cindy Rosenfeld

139-1 The comment states that the project should include a component to restore the tidal estuary. Restoration of Clark Slough is an integral part of the proposed project. Please also see Master Response 4 and Appendix S, which discuss the remediation plan for the proposed project.

Sidnie Olson

From: Ruud [ruud@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 1:26 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina Center Comments

We are pleased to fully support the Marina Center Development and hope that the City of Eureka makes every effort to see this project completed.

We commend the Arkleys/Security National for wanting to invest in our community. Here we have people who have the vision, financial resources and experience to develop his type of project yet there is a resistance of the minority. We were born & raised her and are sick & tired of mostly the implants trying to block projects like this. There are many folks in this community that support this development.

140-1

Most of the waterfront area has been left to deteriorate for decades. This area cannot afford a "government funded project" as many of the "progressives" in this community would like to see. What part of 'private enterprise' don't these people get?

This mixed use development will become a tremendous asset to this community. The naysayers are wasting our best asset by attempting to block this project. We do have the Wharfinger & new docks then many blocks later the Adorni Center & Halverson Park and in the middle there's the boardwalk to nowhere. We have no restaurants on the waterfront; no hotels on the waterfront; empty and barren parcel after parcel along the waterfront ... what are we waiting for?

We recently had relatives from Norway visit who live on the southern coast along the North Sea. This was their 3rd trip to our northcoast. They cannot believe the lack of development around the waterfront & the bay. Their question was "why don't they do something to the waterfront area like build apartments, hotels, a fish market, restaurants, shops and places for people to go and enjoy the waterfront". We agreed wholeheartedly with them. We have visited their hometown in Kristiansand Norway which has done a tremendous job in developing their waterfront area. It has become a bustling hub of the city.

Note also that Norway is approximately the size of California and Baja combined and is one of the 'greenest' nations in the world. Also something that most people here are probably unaware of is that Norway is the 3rd largest oil exporter in the world behind only Saudi Arabia & Russia. They also really know how to do off-shore drilling cleanly.

The City of Kristiansand Norway is truly an example that the City of Eureka should follow.

Let's get this development approved and on the road to a reality.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion.

Michael & Lucy Ruud
5228 Meadow Court
Eureka CA 95503
ruud@suddenlink.net

Letter 140: Michael and Lucy Rudd

140-1 The comment in support of the proposed project is noted. As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, the proposed project requires several approvals from the City of Eureka and other public agencies. The EIR is a document used as a resource to aid in that decision-making.