

**SPEECH given for General Plan Update Groups 3 and 4 Draft Documents
at the 5/17/07 Planning Commission**

Because the Commission is accepting comments tonight on the first of the mandatory elements for the General Plan Update, we wish to speak to the discussion of ‘alternatives’ within mandatory draft General Plan update documents:

Within the General Plan update draft documents and on the County’s plan update website, mention is made of the Sketch Plan Alternatives, and the Sketch Plan Alternatives Report. When viewed, the report provides a level of information about the concepts initially behind the differing alternatives, labeled numerically. The report, however, falls short of matching up with the current discussions and input by the Commission or by the general public, adding to the angst and confusion of this process.

We did some investigation to gain some clarification because I was not present from the beginnings of this discussion. The Board report (wherein the ‘alternatives’ were labeled alphabetically), is shorter and provides less detail or information from which to determine the differences, or the similarities, of the new “alternatives”; or even to be able to identify one from the other. The alternatives that were given to the public in the original Sketch Plan Alternatives Report and those that were given a vote of confidence as a preferred alternative by the Board of Supervisors are apparently not related; the Board was going from a different Sketch Plan Alternatives report than what the public was presented.

So what alternatives are we looking at in these draft documents as a basis for the General Plan Update?

Alternative D is easy to identify: it’s the existing General Plan. We would like to see the existing General Plan and analysis compared in this update in each and every document. Identifiable details about alternative A, alternative B and alternative C are at this time not clearly distinguishable; they may be in concept form only and not contain comparable text and narrative for which to compare in the draft documents.

We understand the process is in flux, and staff has to accommodate input as much as possible – the problem with the modifications to the “alternatives” is that the current ‘alternatives’ do not accurately reflect the spirit of the original intent, do not accurately reflect the spirit or the intent of the public input received in the many workshops and meetings held over the past few years. The input cannot be accurately related to the current set of “alternatives” at all.

The NCHB appreciates all of the time and efforts that staff has put in to creating these draft documents, trying to reflect ideas and concepts they think will be good planning for our future. Having said that, the NCHB finds itself respectfully asking that staff be directed that if any one alternative is discussed within a draft document, that ALL four of the alternatives should be discussed, in order, together, and with enough detail to provide for clarification and easy

comparison by the reader; whether the reader is a member of the public or a member of the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors.

With respect to the Safety element under review this evening we offer the following:

1. We anticipated discussion with respect to Circulation matters for emergency ingress and egress for residents as well as service providers and see none. This worries us.
2. We also anticipated seeing discussion on water supply with respect to available supply for both domestic water and fire fighting needs during the particular season and time of day when domestic water demand on a water system is at its peak.
3. We do not support the inclusion of detailed discussion in regard to drainage in this document. We support those standards as they exist and are implemented by other agencies more equipped to manage their implementation: The County Land Use Division, Water Quality Control Board, Fish and Game etc. This discussion is duplicative of other codes and ordinances, and if they are to be added anywhere in the General Plan, the discussions would be more appropriate in the Water, Biologic or Conservation /Open Space Elements.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

For the NCHB,

Julie Williams, Advocate
P.O. Box 254
Eureka, CA 95502
445-5799
E-mail: nchb@northcoast.com