



December 12, 2007

Ms. Bonnie Neely, Chair  
Board of Supervisors  
Humboldt County  
825 Fifth Street  
Eureka, California 95501

Subject: Winzler & Kelly Infrastructure Report

Dear Chairperson Neely and Members of the Board:

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity to provide input to your Board and the Planning Commission regarding the Infrastructure Report prepared by Winzler & Kelly. Clearly there has been a massive amount of effort go into the 420-page document dated November 2007.

With the limited amount of time made available to review the report, we have at this point only cursory comments and several questions:

- 6-1 1 The growth areas identified on page xviii of the Executive Summary are as follows:
  - > Humboldt Hill
  - > Ridgewood
  - > Cutten
  - > Myrtle town
  - > McKinleyville CSD areas
  - > Fieldbrook Glendale CSD area
- 6-2 2 On page xxxvii of the Executive Summary, it indicates there are six (6) communities where the cost to provide wastewater is unknown...including two of the major growth areas -- Humboldt Hill and Myrtle town.
- 6-3 3 With the City of Eureka's treatment system currently being evaluated and the results not anticipated until next year, how does one anticipate the impact on the Humboldt CSD's ability to provide sewer hookups? Reference page xxv of the Executive Summary.
- 6-4 4 On page xxvii of the Executive Summary, it states the Humboldt CSD "is currently operating at approximately 60% of contracted flows." Do we know how many hook ups Humboldt CSD currently has available? If not, why not?
- 6-5 5 Is it realistic to assume the rough estimate to provide new and improved infrastructure for the entire County is approximately \$250 million when the cost is unknown for 6 of the communities?
- 6-6 6 What population growth rate assumptions were used?
- 6-7 7 On page xviii of the Executive Summary there are references to Sketch Plan 3 being used to model 2030 traffic volume estimates. Sketch Plans 1, 2 and 3 were being used during earlier years of the General Plan work. However those Sketch Plans were replaced a couple of years ago by Sketch Plans A, B, and C. How are those differences reconciled?
- 6-8 8 Are the Urban Study Areas the most logical growth areas? If they had not been pre-determined by County Planning, where should growth occur over the next 20 years based on existing physical and economic conditions?

We commend all those who have contributed so diligently to this work. HELP especially appreciates the leadership of County Planner Mr. John Miller and Winzler & Kelly's Managing Principal Mr. Neal Carnum, P.E., as well as all those at the special districts who have devoted numerous hours providing input.

It has been our opinion from the beginning that Winzler & Kelly was not provided adequate time to complete the monumental tasks assigned to them on February 15, 2007.

- Task A1: Distribution and Capacity of existing infrastructure
- Task A2: Distribution and Development of Alternative Growth Scenarios
- Task A3: Distribution and Capacity of new infrastructure needed to meet projected growth under alternative growth scenarios (Sketch Plans A, B and C)
- Task A4: Capital Improvements/Public Facilities Technical Report
- Task A5: Draft Development Policy Options (General Plan Element)
- Task B1: Water Supply and Demand
- Task B2: Water Quality
- Task B3: Wastewater Treatment and Disposal
- Task B4: Watershed Features and Processes
- Task B5: Flood Management
- Task B6: Stormwater Management
- Task B7: Water Resources Technical Report
- Task B8: Draft Development Policy Options

Infrastructure is the backbone of the entire General Plan. It affects each and every one of the General Plan elements. We urge the County to extend the Winzler & Kelly contract to allow sufficient time to satisfy the requirements of their contract scope of work.

We agree with those who believe you cannot plan for the future until you know where you are today. It is imperative that the General Plan update process be delayed until such time as the many questions regarding infrastructure can be answered so that each element will be consistent, as required by State law.

Sincerely,

Kay Backer, representing  
Members of HELP

cc: Supervisor Jimmy Smith, District 1  
Supervisor Roger Rodoni, District 2  
Supervisor John Woolley, District 3  
Supervisor Jill Geist, District 5  
Commissioner Bruce Emad  
Commissioner Mary Gearheart  
Commissioner Richard Hansis  
Commissioner Thomas Herman, Chair  
Commissioner Scott Kelly  
Commissioner Sef Murguia  
Commissioner Jeff Smith  
Loretta Nickolaus, CAO  
Kirk Girard, Community Development Services Director  
Kathy Hayes, Clerk of the Board  
Sharon Lodes, Planning Commission Clerk  
Neal Carnum, Winzler & Kelly Managing Principal

helpcountyneely7