

Sidnie Olson

From: Sidnie Olson
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2009 11:06 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment Form

-----Original Message-----

From: jtimmons88@gmail.com [mailto:jtimmons88@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 10:16 AM
To: Pam Powell
Subject: Citizen Comment Form

This was recieved from the Citizen Comment Form

Comment: The City is already glutted with empty retail space and I cannot think of a more inappropriate location for a shopping mall than right on our waterfront. Better to leave it natural than to go forward with this ill-thought out Marina Center. Thank you. 161-1

Name: Julie timmons

Address: box 378

City: cutten

Zip: 95534

Phone: 707 4442670

Fax: 707 4442670

E-mail: jtimmons88@gmail.com

Letter 161: Julie Timmons

161-1 The comment expresses concern that the retail space market is already oversaturated in the City of Eureka. The comment is noted. Please see Master Response 1, under “Vacancy in the City of Eureka.”

Sidnie Olson

From: k.t. [k.travers@att.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 3:28 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: marina center deir

Hello

The future is green, been a very long time coming! A change of attitude is required. We (Humboldt Co.) are so perfectly poised to lead.....

These are my concerns (some) about the Marina Center development:

ENVIRONMENT HEALTH AND SAFETY

- 1) lack of information on levels of contaminants on site.
 - 2) source for dioxin and furans on site not identified
 - 3) dioxins and furans not evaluated for health risk assessment.
 - 4) DEIR recognizes impacts and hazards posed by remediation of the property and after remediation, potential for contamination to remain on site.
 - 5) mitigation measures defer identification of actions to be employed to a future date
- Complete clean up and accountability only acceptable approach.

162-1

TRAFFIC

- 1) 15,669 new vehicle trips per week.
- 2) 14 and 74 seconds of increased travel time according to National Security brochure.
- 3) no bike or pedestrian accident projections
- 4) compatibility with ongoing traffic studies not addressed
- 5) no public transit within area
- 6) no mention of mitigation to reduce traffic
- 7) diversion of traffic not addressed

162-2

The 101 safety corridor has an approximate 5 min. increase in travel time that some commuters do not tolerate....they take short cuts (old arcata rd. and samoa blvd.). There is/was a proposal for a paved road through bird/wildlife sanctuary to Waterfront Dr., this will definately become a "short cut" should this project come to fruition. Not Good!

LAND USE AND CULTURE

- 1) zone changing: Local Coastal Program amendment for a project that is not a proper fit. The Arkleys got a change in planning once before downtown with Starbucks, will this become the norm?
- 2) destruction of Wiyot historic villages/native history

162-3

3) more retail when more coastal industrial/visitor- serving/agriculture would be economically enhancing
Regarding the Wiyot, after full investigation of the site for historical evidence of their villages/heritage, a museum and educational (memorial) could be erected. We have a huge Indian history but little of it to share outside of the Clark Museum. Maybe something to recognize the other cultures that have contributed to the area as well such as the Chinese. This has been neglected. Recognition could bring a more cohesive community. All this would be harmonious with the Discovery Museum, should it move there.

The EcoHostel is still a viable enterprise although in a different location these could all tie in.

The horse and buggy tourist transport planned for old town would also tie in nicely. Maybe some other kind of transport depot could be maintained on site i.e. bike rentals, human powered rickshaw-like taxies, kinetic-like covered rentals, etc. More could be done in the aquaculture business perhaps, boat building, an extention of Blue Ox? And this may be far reaching, but what about farming/manufacture of hops and hemp products?

URBAN DECAY

Not alot I should have to say here!!!!

- 1) old town/down town was devastated by Bayshore Mall (it was something some were convinced had to happen, I mean just think of all the jobs that will be created---short sightedness, please NOT AGAIN!)
- 2) change to the social fabric and ambience of Eureka and all of Humboldt Co. It won't end here once that pandora's box is cracked open.

162-4

We have a special, beautiful, wonderful home, not a generic big box shoppers destination!

Think out, way out of the box!

Very Sincerely Yours
Kathy Travers
1726 Sunny Ave. Eureka 95501

Letter 162: KT Travers

- 162-1 The comment states dissatisfaction with several aspects of the hazardous materials analysis, charging that the Draft EIR does not include information regarding the levels of contaminants at the project site, does not identify the source of contaminants, does not evaluate the risk of some contaminants, and deference of preparation of a Remedial Action Plan until a later date.

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

- 162-2 The comment lists a series of general concerns about the amount of new vehicle trips, increased travel time, lack of accident projections for pedestrians and bicycles, compatibility with ongoing traffic studies, no public transit within the area, no mention of mitigation to reduce traffic, diversion of traffic not addressed, and concerns about Waterfront Drive which could be extended south through a bird sanctuary becoming a “short cut” for travelers along U.S. 101.

New Vehicle Trips – An estimated 15,669 new vehicle trips per day are expected to be attracted to and from Marina Center. However, even without Marina Center, this level of new trips is expected due to regional growth in retail and commercial activities, so Marina Center acts to locate the origins and destinations of these new trips. The project itself does not increase economic growth through 2025, but rather is a part of the expected growth.

Added Travel Time – The mitigation done on U.S. 101 in conjunction with successive phases of the project serve to reduce overall travel times from what would be expected without the project while traffic continues to increase at 1.5 percent per year on average. Therefore, with a 33 percent growth in overall traffic levels during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, travel time increases are limited to the 14 to 74 second increase overall in the corridor. Without mitigation, travel times would be far longer in 2025.

No Forecasts of Pedestrian or Bicycle Accidents – There are no generally accepted analytical methods for forecasting bicycle and pedestrian accidents. However, the identified mitigation measures are consistent with the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices in terms of provision for vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle operations along streets and at signalized and unsignalized intersections. The mitigation proposed for Marina Center is expected to result in a reduction in accident rates. This reduction in accident rates is likely to include a reduction in pedestrian and bicycle accidents, but there is no way to estimate whether this is the case.

Compatibility with Ongoing Traffic Studies – Extensive use is made of prior traffic impact studies conducted in the area. However, at the time the traffic study was completed, there were no pertinent traffic studies other than those mentioned in the

References. Subsequent to the publishing of the Draft EIR, the Ridgewood Village project traffic analysis was begun. However, that study is not yet completed. To the extent that information is available from that study, information is provided within the Final EIR for Marina Center.

No Public Transit in Area – Current transit operators have discretion on the provision of transit services near Marina Center including whether to provide direct service to Marina Center. As explained on page O.IV-46 of the Draft EIR, the increased demand for public transit service at the project site can be accommodated and would remain within reasonable walking distance from the Marina Center. Again, the project’s impacts on public transit service would remain less than significant, and no further mitigation is needed.

No Mitigation to Reduce Traffic – Marina Center is proposed as a mixed-use project, and as such, “captures” trips that would remain onsite that would otherwise use public streets. An estimated 1,776 daily trips would be kept off U.S. 101 and city streets because of the mixed-use aspect of Marina Center (based upon Table III in the Traffic Impact Study (Appendix P of the Draft EIR). The “captured trips” shown in that table are those that are expected to be completed entirely onsite due to the mixed-use character of the proposed land uses. So the project design itself partially mitigates potential traffic impacts through trip reduction. Enhanced pedestrian and bicycle paths along and around the proposed project should also aid in reducing vehicle trips.

Diversion to Waterfront Drive/Extension of Waterfront Drive through a Bird Sanctuary – It is unclear if the comment concerns Palco Marsh or the wetland reserve proposed as part of the project. To the extent that the comment is related to Palco Marsh this project would no impact because the extension of Waterfront Drive is not part of this project.

To the extent that the comment is about the wetland reserve, for diversion of traffic issues see response to comment 32-9. According to the traffic modeling, Waterfront Drive is not expected to receive any significant number of additional diverted trips along U.S. 101. In fact, the improvements provided as part of the project’s mitigations should help reduce the propensity for drivers along U.S. 101 to take alternate routes. Moreover, the area proposed to be a wetland reserve is not, at the moment, a bird sanctuary. Instead, it is a vacant brownfield site that must still undergo some site remediation. The project, as proposed, would not increase traffic on Waterfront Drive dramatically, and would also make the project site much more inhabitable for birds.

162-3 The comment disagreeing with the proposed land use approvals is noted. As stated on Draft EIR pages III-17 to III-18, the proposed project would require a Local Coastal Program amendment, which would rezone the project site.

The comment suggesting alternatives to the proposed project is noted. Pursuant to CEQA, alternatives to the proposed project are discussed in Chapter VI of the Draft EIR. Please

also see responses to comments 16-239 and 16-242, which explain that the Draft EIR includes a reasonable range of alternatives.

The comment related to Wiyot villages is noted. Please see Master Response 9, which includes revised mitigation measures to implement a subsurface archaeological investigation.

- 162-4 The comment expresses concerns that the proposed project would cause urban decay and states that the opening of the Bayshore Mall increased retail space vacancies. Please see Master Response 1, under “The Effect of the Bayshore Mall on Local Businesses.”

Sidnie Olson

From: Sara Turner [smtturner7@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2009 12:55 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Marina center comments

I write in SUPPORT of the Marina Center proposal for several reasons as follows:

After decades of having a totally useless wasteland in central Eureka, the plan for development developed by Security National would create an attractive, busy hub of businesses, homes and offices and recreational opportunities. It's construction would begin immediately. I am 82 years old and I would like to see this happen while I am still alive and might enjoy it.

163-1

What governmental or non profit entities have anything to propose ready to go now, with plans or funding? Where would we get the millions of dollars to repay Security National for what they have already legally invested?

163-2

Has anyone calculated the amount of tax income that the Marina Center would generate? We can be sure there would be increased traffic. In addition to the street modifications in the current plan, a shuttle service would enable people like me to park nearby and get a low cost (or free) ride to my destination in Old Town, not just to the Center. I have often noted how parking scarcity makes shopping in Old Town difficult for anyone—not just oldsters like me. It is my belief that having the Marina Center will increase business in the entire downtown Eureka area.

163-3

Finally, there are those who object to a "big box" retail store, mostly, it seems, for the harm that it might do to small, local businesses. I find it somewhat hypocritical that those who object often shop at Costco (truly a big box) and lesser chains such as Target, Staples, etc. Over the forty plus years that I have lived in Humboldt county I have tried to shop at virtually all of the building supply stores in the Eureka-Arcata environs and, while personnel are friendly, display of and access to merchandise is not easy. Nor does the store actually see your proposed project to completion. They hand out business cards of contractors and it is up to the individual to negotiate any agreement for completion of the work. For some of us who know little about what should be done, this can be a major problem. Such is not the policy of Home Depot, as experienced by a family member who lives in another state. Her counter installation was overseen by the local store where she bought the material and saw it completed to her satisfaction.

163-4

I have no comment regarding air quality or toxic materials but since it looks as if the pulp mills may be permanently closed, we should be safe from that issue.

163-5

Sara M. Turner
1506 J Street
Arcata, CA 95521
707-822-0235

Letter 163: Sara Turner

- 163-1 The comments in support of the proposed project are noted. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the construction timeline.
- 163-2 The comment supporting the proposed project is noted.
- 163-3 The comment supports the project and suggests that it would attract new business to the entire Downtown Eureka area. The comment also inquires whether the project's tax income effects have been estimated. The comment is noted. Please see Appendix K: Eureka Balloon Track Retail Development Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis, CBRE Consulting Group, November 2006 which estimates net new tax income of approximately \$0.95 million and net new business sales of \$91.8 million to the City of Eureka. Please also see Master Response 1, under "Fiscal Impacts to the City of Eureka and Other Jurisdictions."
- 163-4 The comment notes the different business practices of large and small hardware stores, suggesting that the customer service, extent of services, and display and access of merchandise is superior at the large hardware chain store. The comment is noted.
- 163-5 The comment states that air quality would not be an issue. The comment is noted.

Sidnie Olson

From: Glen Twombly [gatwombly@suddenlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2008 11:27 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: Sea level

I do not see any reference to the effects of the widely predicted rise in sea level due to global warming. Has it been considered? What is the altitude of the project above current maximum high tide? 164-1

Thanks,

Glen A. Twombly
2066 Mustang Lane,
Arcata, CA 95521

(707)826-7506

Letter 164: Glen Twombly

164-1 For further discussion regarding the sea level rise, please see response to comment 3-15, which states that direction on sea level rise to coastal permit Project Applicants is in flux, and an upper planning limit has not been established.

RECEIVED

FEB 02 2009

DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

1-29-09

City of Eureka
Community Development Dept.
Attention: Sidnie L. Olson
AICP, Principal Planner
531 K. Street
Eureka, CA 95501

I wish the people of Eureka could open their eyes and appreciate what Mr & Mrs Rob Arkley have done and want to do in the future for Eureka.

The Sequoia Zoo and the Arkley Center should first come to mind - however they reworked the kitchen of the Christ Episcopal Church - which they quietly remodeled and purchased beautiful blue sitting's for several hundred.

I'm sure there are many other projects that they have done that anyone has every known about.

We need say business in our area that we can get to employees so many that need work. We could go against the employment & Home Dept could add. I wish the Arkley's lived in Fortuna! Don Patton Vallentin
1070 Fernwood Dr. Fortuna

725-5117

165-1

Letter 165: Anne Patton Vellutini

165-1 The comment in support of the proposed project is noted.

Comment Letter 166

Comment Letter 166

Diane R. Venturini
175 Dana Lane
Eureka, CA 95503
(707)442-5524
Jan. 11, 2009

City Of Eureka
Community Development Dept.
Attn: Sidnie L. Olson
AICP Principal Planner
531 K. St.
Eureka, CA 95501

RECEIVED
JAN 13 2009
DEPARTMENT OF
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Dear Sidnie Olson,
After reviewing the Marina Center Draft EIR, I have a few concerns & reservations about the project.

1. Hazardous Waste Cleanup

I want a total & thorough cleanup of the site before any development begins & throughout construction of the project. Of course, they are required to meet federal & state requirements. In addition, previously unidentified contaminants may be present on or below the ground surface. Ongoing monitoring is a must!!

166-1

2. Smart Growth

A: I want smart growth for our county. I do want to see the site developed, but what is built HAS to be what is best for Eureka & Humboldt Co. as a whole.

Why is there NO mention of using any "green building" technology? Any new construction (especially on this scale) should be making some effort to build environmentally friendly structures. This is good for our health & is good for this community. The Marina project should be building this way.

This Draft EIR may not be the place where this is discussed, but to me it is a very important part of the project.

There's talk of a "green team" forming in the county with the help of the RCEA leading the way. That's smart growth.

166-2

B: Are any of the housing/residential units geared for low income/ elderly or disabled residents?? Our very own HACOG's regional Housing Needs Plan outlines the "fair share allocation" for Hum. Co. A portion of low income housing needs to be included in this project.

Also, who is going to rent these units? Surely you have seen, the 3rd coming of the extinct "Ferry Bldg." at 1st & F St.? It lays nearly vacant, years after completion!!

166-3

C: These parcels are a few of the remaining picturesque Humboldt Bay scenic vistas. I DO NOT want to see a 5 story office building and a 4 story parking garage on this site.

166-4

D: And last but not least, I DO NOT want a "Big Box" entity in this location. We the voters spoke our mind when WalMart tried to buy into Eureka. Listen to us!! Take the necessary time to make informed decisions about what growth this city needs. Do NOT cave into the pressures of corporate greed.

166-5

In summary, what I want to see developed in the "Old Balloon Tract" site, is a multi-use project. It should have an equal mix of recreation & parkland with some retail, (not a Big Box), residential units, (including some for low income/elderly), office space, (not 5 stories high) & some light industrial.

This project is too big for this community!! It is not a good fit for the current & future needs of Eureka.

Please DO NOT approve this Draft EIR!!

Thank you for listening,
Sincerely,

[Handwritten signature]

Diane R. Venturini

Cc: City Council Member Larry Glass
Board of Supervisor Mark Lovelace

5-813

Letter 166: Diane Venturini

- 166-1 The comment requesting a “total and thorough” cleanup of the project site is noted. For further discussion regarding the Remedial Action Plan for the proposed project, please see Master Response 4 and new Appendix S.
- 166-2 The comment requesting green building is noted. The building materials and methods of construction have not yet been determined for the proposed project. These materials and methods would be determined during the detailed design stage. At that time, green materials and technologies may be considered.
- 166-3 The comment inquires whether any of the project’s housing is low income and raises concerns that the project’s units would be unrented. All of the new housing is planned for sale at market rates to meet the project’s key objective to “develop an economically viable mixed use project.”
- 166-4 The comment’s concern on the height of the proposed buildings 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.
- 166-5 The comment states that voters already made their decision regarding big box retailers in relation to a previous proposal for a Wal-Mart. The comment also states that the proposed project is caving into corporate greed pressures. Neither statement addresses the environmental impacts of the proposed project, the Draft EIR, nor CEQA. The comment is noted.

Sidnie Olson

From: Abigail's Elegant Victorian Mansion - Eureka, California [evm@humboldt1.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2009 11:15 AM
To: DEIRcomments
Cc: DEIRcomments
Subject: Arkley's First National - and the Ballon Track

Let us stop all this Bull Shit and get this project going. Damn it, everybody knows it is needed - from a variety of reasons - all good. Let's keep the momentum going on turning this dying mill town / fishing town around. Get off your ass and push with VIGOR* to get back Eureka's former luster. How many courageous fools to you think are going to come along? Let's grab this opportunity before the guy (Arkley) has a chance to rethink the issue and just throw in the towel - like so many other prospective projects in the past. Eureka needs him much more than he needs us.

* I don't mean passive acceptance - I mean MAJOR contributing help - to get this MARINA CENTER going !

Doug Vieyra, Curator / InnKeeper

Abigail's Elegant Victorian Mansion ~ Historic Lodging Accommodations
1406 C Street, Eureka, California 95501 * PH: (707) 444-3144
www.Eureka-California.com * E-Mail: Info@Eureka-California.com

167-1

Letter 167: Doug Vieyra

167-1 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.

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

Name (print): Greg Wellish

RECEIVED

Address: PO Box 979 Trinidad CA 95570

FEB 02 2009

E-mail: Gregwellish@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF

This DEIR fails to realistically address major concerns. No testing
for Dioxins and Furans known to be on site. Traffic impacts are
not dealt with honestly. Broadway is Hwy 101 and already over used
at peak times. The traffic mitigations are not sufficient.
The effects on old town/downtown by urban blight are understated.
Right now businesses are closing and the commercial properties are
un-rentable. History (the Bayshore Mall project) says we can expect many
more empty storefronts if this is built. Project in no way meets zoning or
Coastal Zone requirements. I recommend the NO BUILD alternative,

168-1
 168-2
 168-3
 168-4
 168-5

Signed: Greg Wellish

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

Letter 168: Greg Wellish

- 168-1 The comment states that the Draft EIR fails to address major concerns, such as testing for dioxins and furans on the project site. The comment is noted.

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

- 168-2 The comment expresses concerns about increased traffic and states that impacts are not dealt with honestly. The comment is noted.

Please see response to comment 31-1, which states that the 33 percent increase in traffic on Broadway by the year 2025 would occur with or without the proposed project, and the mitigation measures identified reduce almost all traffic impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- 168-3 The comment states that the urban decay analysis is understand regarding the potential effects to existing businesses. Please see Master Response 1, under “Vacancy in the City of Eureka.”

- 168-4 The comment states that the opening of the Bayshore Mall prompted increase retail vacancy rates. Please see Master Response 1, under “The Effect of the Bayshore Mall on Local Businesses.”

- 168-5 The comment recommending the No Build Alternative is noted. Please see response to comment 16-241, which clarifies the No Build Alternative and potential remediation efforts that could be undertaken.

Comment Letter 169

Comment Letter 169

Sidnie Olson

From: Sidnie Olson
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 10:16 AM
To: DEIRComments
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment Form

I doubt it matters what those who would actually use the area think- but please reconsider.

Name: Elizabeth Welton

Address: 929 Koster

City: Eureka

Zip: 95501

Phone: 707-268-3425

E-mail: gampagampa2@aol.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Pam Powell
Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2008 8:51 AM
To: Sidnie Olson
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment Form

Sidnie,

I forwarded this comment received from the public to council. David has asked me to forward all marina related comments to you and to not continue to forward to council.

Pam Powell
Assistant to the City Manager

-----Original Message-----

From: Pam Powell
Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2008 8:40 AM
To: Chris Kerrigan (coachk11@yahoo.com); Council Members; Larry Glass (lglass@foggy.net); Mike Jones (mike-jones@leavitt.com); Polly Ender (pendert@sbcglobal.net); Virginia Bass-Jackson (vbjcra@aol.com)
Subject: FW: Citizen Comment Form

5819

FYI
Pam Powell
Assistant to the City Manager

-----Original Message-----

From: gampagampa2@aol.com [mailto:gampagampa2@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, December 06, 2008 8:53 AM
To: Pam Powell
Subject: Citizen Comment Form

This was recieved from the Citizen Comment Form

Comment: Never before have I seen such ugly buildings built on purpose!! The waterfront is now a place where I take guests to show them how unigue it is- what a nice place to walk and talk.

If you actually build the way its planned now I will avoid it like the plague- it would be embarrassing. The architecture you are reason would have been first rate in 1950- but its just ugly now.

I work in a building with some 300 people and we discussed this on Monday when the first drawings were on the front page- we all agreed- bad- really bad.

Please don't do this- When we drive by Dr. Berg office quests comment on how well he has kept that place- when I say its a new building- they can't believe anyone would have spend the money.

Thanks to the Starbucks building the look of downtown has been improved. It it looked like that (although not my first choice) at least it would be intriguing.

169-1

Letter 169: Elizabeth Welton

169-1 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.

Comment Letter 170

Comment Letter 170

Sidnie Olson

From: Pat Wenger [Pat.Wenger@humboldt.edu]
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2009 2:00 PM
To: DEIRcomments
Subject: draft EIR comments

From: Pat Wenger
2340 17th St
Eureka CA 95501
Friday, January 30, 2009

To: City of Eureka
Community Development Department
Attn: Sidnie L. Olson, AICP, Principal Planner
531 K St.
Eureka, CA 95501
DEIRcomments@ci.eureka.ca.gov

As a document, the draft EIR is very consistent with the contemporary American document standard of hiding information behind an abundance of nonsense and pseudo-scientific sounding filler, hoping readers will just go away. As a nation, we urgently need some succinctness and clarity standards. I encourage our City Government to avoid thinking that this EIR says much of value. It does, however, describe a project which is clearly a poor choice for healthy Eureka development: this so-called development will damage our business and public communities in many ways, and the current version of the EIR is carefully constructed to hide those issues. I will mention some of the issues I find particularly significant in this brief response to the request for public comment on the Marina Center draft EIR.

The "large anchor store" (Anchor 1) is one of the most problematic elements of the proposal. It is fortunately inconsistent with the zoning of the site, but Eureka is certainly a part of the current American culture in which politicians are 'bought' in a variety of ways, so it is highly possible that the zoning will be changed with no attendant investigation of the favors (\$) which have changed hands in the decision-making process. The issue of the zoning changes should be left to the people of Eureka, and unless they are supportive of changes in zoning, then no changes should take place.

The draft EIR, as posted at the City of Eureka WEB site (http://www.ci.eureka.ca.gov/), contains lots of valuable information, but it is carefully hidden in the onerous nature of the report. As a citizen of Eureka, I find the traffic delays unacceptable as a planned mistake, the extra waste of gas and all the associated negative environmental effects unacceptable as a planned mistake, and certainly the misplacement of a new mega-store (Anchor 1) in a location appropriately not zoned for such placement unacceptable as a planned mistake.

A mega-store specializing in building and home-improvement materials will have a tremendous detrimental effect on the Humboldt economy and will cause local money to flow out of our county with a much lower recirculation rate than money spent as smaller and businesses with a much higher 'local ownership and management' configuration (many carefully-researched studies document this, but large-store proponents continue to argue the lie of positive economic development when bringing these stores to new locations - see "Big=Box Swindle" by Stacy Mitchell, 2006, for extensive documentation of this issue). Even is our community does not wish to work toward the maximum economic benefit of Humboldt County residents, it is still an exceptionally poor idea to propose putting a mega-store in the downtown and near-waterfront location of the parcels considered in the Marina Center proposal. If our area is to suffer the economic loss which WILL accompany the arrival of such a mega-store, then at least our supervisors can have the foresight to plan a

location for such development which will not have the enormous negative traffic and wasted-burning-fuel and wasted time issues the proposal would bring to our downtown. If our City Council and zoning authorities are readers of these responses, I very much hope that they hear my request that the best interests of all Eurekaans - health, time usage, clean-air, and the possibility of a zone-appropriate usage of the parcels under consideration - is given priority over a current active pressure to allow this clearly-thought-out big development a green light. I understand the attractiveness of this already-planned big development project, but as a Eureka resident I can also see that the draft EIR for this project, as posted on the City of Eureka WEB site, works to downplay and even hide the many negative effects of this proposed development. At this point in time it will be relatively painless for Eureka leaders to make the right choice: protect our environment, protect our central Eureka from a clogging and inappropriately placed development, protect our air and related living conditions such as overall noise, and imagine that at some time in the future the parcels under consideration WILL BE put to appropriate, clean, low traffic uses which will enhance our City. Let us, as a community, encourage our developers to situate development proposals with the interests of the community more clearly in mind.

The EIR is certainly misleading in the way it handles many issues. For example, in the section "xx", states:

"In fact, the project site's proximity to a major transportation corridor through the North Coast (U.S. 101) and its location in Eureka, Humboldt County's largest city, could result in less impact on regional transportation systems and air quality than would comparable development in a more outlying area, or an area with a lower concentration of population within the county."

The language "could result in less impact" is so telling - nothing is promised, nothing is established, but the reader is expected to follow this nonsense to the conclusion that the proposal is actually O.K. When someone who wants something hires writers to prepare an EIR which supports what they want, this is exactly what it will sound like if it is hiding reality from the readers. Many of the important conclusions of the document are of this logical character - the only thing they really tell us is that the writers want the City of Eureka to approve the project. I am really quite disgusted at arguments such as that about the intersections being of poor quality already, and I hope most readers see this stuff for the smoke-screen it is intended to be.

I encourage City of Eureka leaders in the strongest possible way, please help the developers of the proposed Marina Center find some outlet for their energy and investment potential which will not pose such long-term damage to our community.

Pat Wenger
2340 17th St
Eureka CA 95501

5821

170-1

170-2

170-3

170-3 cont.

170-4

Letter 170: Pat Wenger

170-1 The comment stating that the proposed project is not consistent with current land use controls on the project site is noted. As stated on Draft EIR pages III-17 to III-18, the proposed project would require a Local Coastal Program amendment, which would rezone the project site.

170-2 The comment expresses concerns regarding increased traffic at and around the project site. Please see the response to comment 31-1, which states that the 33 percent increase in traffic on Broadway by 2025 would occur with or without the proposed project. Please also see response to comment 32-9, which discusses traffic diversion into other neighborhoods.

The comment also states that placement of a “mega-store” at the project site would be a mistake and inconsistent with zoning. As stated on Draft EIR pages III-17 to III-18, the proposed project would require a Local Coastal Program amendment, which would rezone the project site.

170-3 The comment expresses general opposition to the proposed project and its associated environmental effects. The comment is noted.

The comment also expresses opposition to big box retail stores. Please see Master Response 1, under “National Stores vs. Local Stores.”

170-4 The comment questions the use of the phrase “less-than-significant impact.” The comment also states that the Draft EIR does not represent the professional judgment of the City of Eureka, but rather written by the Project Applicant.

The City of Eureka, as Lead Agency pursuant to CEQA, must analyze potential impacts of the proposed project. The City ultimately decides what studies and data are to be included in the Environmental Impact Report.

The Marina Center Mixed Use Development Project Environmental Impact Report was prepared by Environmental Science Associates, in consultation with other consultants and the City of Eureka. As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, the City of Eureka is the Lead Agency for the proposed project, and as required by CEQA, the completed document represents the judgment of city staff.

As stated in Chapter I, Introduction, the conclusions reached in the EIR reflect the determinations of the City of Eureka, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines. The EIR is a factual informational document, prepared in conformance with CEQA, and written for the purpose of making the public and decision-makers aware of the potential environmental consequences of the Marina Center project.

The City of Eureka sent the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to 56 governmental agencies and organizations and persons interested in the project in April, 2006, and the City held two public scoping meetings in April 2006 to obtain public comments on the scope of the EIR. As detailed in the appendices, numerous consultant reports were prepared, analyzed, and summarized. The document underwent several rounds of intensive review by city staff and by the consultants. It represents two-and-a-half years of investigation and effort by these parties.