

Notes from Ag Center (south Eureka) Meeting on the Draft Land Use Maps
September 25, 2007

| |
|--|
| <p>What do you mean when you describe the methodology for urban study analysis?</p> |
| <p>I understand why you want to plan on a watershed level, are you going to be proposing new standards that try to deal with water quality?</p> <p>Response: The Total Mean Daily Load analysis coming from the Regional Water Quality Control Board will be used to guide the County's decision making.</p> <p>Are they mandated? I've heard there are serious problems in all the watersheds, and I'm concerned that the new standards will shut down all new development. Sometimes when the new rules come into play, they take on a life on their own.</p> <p>Response: there is a need for the County to address the new requirements from the State and federal agencies on a county wide rather than a project specific basis.</p> |
| <p>Are the maps available? Response: the maps will be posted to our website tomorrow.</p> |
| <p>The table top area you're looking at designating for development under alternative C, shouldn't you be looking at the entire parcel, and not just the top part of the parcel. The property line goes all the way to the watercourse, and if you're doing watershed planning, it seems you would want to draw the line differently. Also, if you leave the remainder as TPZ, the new development is going to seriously inhibit future timber operations.</p> <p>Response: that's a good point, and one we will have to discuss in the EIR.</p> |
| <p>Are you setting aside any of the outlying areas for urban reserve? If we have a problem with getting sewer in the Eureka, are there going to be other areas that will be made available for residential use?</p> <p>Response: the general plans are the guiding documents that give the reason for water and sewer capacity. Unless you identify it in the Plan, no one is going to serve it in the future. General plans include areas for development that will be served by future extensions of infrastructure. That's the standard approach.</p> |
| <p>Did the traffic model results incorporate the new extension of a road from the McKay Tract to Harris and Hubbard? Response: no.</p> |
| <p>700 units maximum for the Forster Gill in the existing plan would go to what?</p> <p>Response: the 940 allowed under the current Plan would go to 1,400 units.</p> |
| <p>At the City Council meeting in Eureka they said they don't want the outlet for Forster-Gill to go out Lumbar Drive. How are you going to deal with that?</p> <p>Response: there is an environmental assessment being done for the project that will look at alternatives.</p> |
| <p>How is the County coordinating with the City?</p> <p>Response: the County is doing a lot of coordination with the City on roads issues. We have jointly developed a traffic model to assess the impacts of each alternative on traffic in both the City and the County. We are also coordinating with them on drainage, water and sewer issues. We recognize there are different opinions about what should happen. That's why we look at alternatives.</p> |
| <p>Do you do any studies looking at soil? One of those areas you're looking at development has really good soils for growing timber, and if you lose that to residential development, that will be lost forever for timber production.</p> <p>Response: I'm sure the flats that we're looking at are on very good soils for timber production. This issue was looked at in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Eureka Community Plan, and will be a big issue for the General Plan Update.</p> |