

Attn: Martha Spencer
Humboldt County Planning Department
Community Development Services
3015 "H" St
Eureka CA 95501

Re: Chapter Group 3 - Public Health and Safety - Chapters 20-22

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I am submitting these comments regarding the *Public Safety Element* of the *Humboldt County General Plan Update*. If this address is not correct, please forward these comments to the individual Planning Commissioners and Staff. Your schedule at <http://www.planupdate.org/gp/gpdemo/pc-bos-hearings-schedule-demo.htm> indicates this is the appropriate month for feedback on this subject. I hope this letter can be included in the comments relating to the April Workshop on the subject.

In general, I noticed that the draft plan update fails to consider the considerable potential impact of global warming on the coastal high water levels in the area. While storm surges and tsunamis are discussed a bit, there is nothing stated about a more permanent loss of surface area due to ongoing rising sea levels. Since this is now a foreseeable event, at the very least over the next 25 year period and perhaps earlier, it requires analysis in this document.

If there may be a permanent change in coastline, the earlier such planning takes place, the better. "No time like the present" would be a good motto for this planning cycle.

1) I had a look at your flood maps for 100 and 500 year floods at <http://www.planupdate.org/gp/PrelimHearingDraft/Group3/Maps/base2flood.pdf> and noted with alarm that a) 101 would be submerged north and south of the Eureka/Arcata area - where the lion's share of the Humboldt population resides - and that b) 299 to Redding would also be cut off. This is an unacceptable scenario, and requires immediate attention with regard to future planning. The population center of the County must have access to other areas in the event of a major, lasting flood event. Such events are predicted to be major in the coming years, as a result of climate change.

2) Additionally, since we have been made aware by peer reviewed scientific studies that sea levels may rise in the next decades, these flood maps must reflect storm events predicated upon higher "normal" sea levels. It was unclear if these maps take this into account. The alternatives must address the concerns raised.

3) A possibly *abrupt* rise in sea level, should the ice masses in Greenland and Antarctica slip off the land base underneath, must also be considered in this document, along with how the alternatives would address such an emergency. The alternatives must address the concerns raised.

Should the County plan housing/transportation needs differently in view of these projected changes in sea level? At what time would it be most advantageous and cost effective for the planning for such changes to take place?

The element must evaluate the impact of rising sea levels on planning in the Humboldt GPU in order to conform with CEQA. I look forward to seeing a more thorough discussion of rising sea levels in your final document, which in turn are considered in the formulation of the alternatives and selection of the preferred alternative in the Final EIR.

Thank you for all your hard work and for taking these considerations into account in your planning.

Sincerely,

Margaret Draper

Margaret Draper
Attorney at Law
POB 176
Bayside, CA 95524