

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

For Planning Commission Agenda of:
September 3, 2020

<input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative Agenda Item	}
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continued Hearing Item	}
<input type="checkbox"/>	New Hearing Item	}
<input type="checkbox"/>	Old Business Item	}
<input type="checkbox"/>	New Business Item	}

Subject: VMT Screening Criteria and Thresholds of Significance

Record Number: PLN-2020-16529

Attached for the Planning Commission's record and review are the following supplementary information items:

1. Request for Continuance to an Unspecified Future Date – Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds of Significance Item.
The Planning Commission received a substantial amount of correspondence expressing opposition to the proposed Vehicle Miles Traveled Thresholds of Significance. To enable staff more time to work with commenters and other stakeholders to craft recommended thresholds and alternatives that better reflect their views, staff is recommending this item be continued to an unspecified future date.
2. Public comments

From: [diane ryerson](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Cc: [diane ryerson](#); [Walter Paniak](#)
Subject: Meeting State planning requirements for VMT
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 9:19:35 AM

Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisors:

As a resident of Humboldt County and City of Arcata, I urge you to support and implement actions recommended in comments submitted in a letter from CRTP, EPIC, Humboldt Baykeeper, NEC, and 350 Humboldt. I strongly support the use of more realistic thresholds for VMT and revision of the maps to show that development outside of existing cities will increase VMT.

Thank you for giving serious consideration to these comments.

Diane Ryerson
1659 I St, Arcata, CA 95521
707-826-7750

From: [Walter Paniak](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: VMT standards
Date: Thursday, August 27, 2020 9:46:26 AM

The recommendations and comments submitted by CRTP ,EPIC HBK, NEC and 350 Humboldt are logical and realistic in determining actual VMT. Without local services and shopping VMT has to be greater.

Thank you for considering their comment which I support.

Walt Paniak
Arcata

--

Walt Paniak

From: [Lee Dedini](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Fix the VMT Plan!
Date: Thursday, August 20, 2020 8:55:22 AM

Planning Commision,

Revise the maps and treat the VTM Plan as the serious issue it is: driving is the single largest source of Greenhouse emissions.

Lee Dedini
1539 Irene St.
Bayside, Ca.

From: [Valerie Rose](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Planning Commission considering VMT
Date: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 9:56:32 AM

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Please send the VMT plan back to the drawing board. It has "screened out" most of the parts of the county that could be developed, and their contribution to Greenhouse gases from increased driving is thus not even considered. We need to put a high priority on acting on climate change, and this is one way to start doing it! Please improve the plan to include these areas.

Valerie Gizinski
Arcata

From: [Ali O Lee](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Please Fix the VMT Plan
Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 2:19:42 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for inviting public comment on the proposed Transportation Analysis Process for implementing new CEQA Guidelines based on Senate Bill (SB) 743.

Measuring transportation impacts in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than vehicular congestion or level of service (LOS), makes more sense for public safety and non-motorized traffic.

In rural areas, such as ours, in Humboldt, pedestrians, recreational cyclists, commuter bicyclists, school children, skaters, berry pickers, people accessing their mailboxes, use the roads, but current LOS calculations primarily take into account motorized vehicles' use of our roads.

VMT assessment for the county as a whole—without exempt areas—will help combat the crisis of traffic injuries and deaths in our communities.

Unfortunately, the proposed VMT screening criteria and thresholds will be neither effective nor defensible without substantial revisions.

Trips and Miles Are Not Interchangeable

The screening criteria based on a specific number of projected trips per day—for “small projects” both inside and outside of Urban Services Areas—are not appropriate since development density has extreme variability in trip lengths—in Humboldt.

Smaller stores can generate long trips, in Humboldt—especially when the smaller store is the only store for many miles, as in the case of the stores under 50,000 square feet in Orick, Shelter Cove, Redcrest, and in Orleans. Humboldt has many food deserts, so people travel for many miles to access essentials.

One-size-fits-all approaches tend not to fit Humboldt's rural variability. Weott and Shelter Cove road use by the community are as different from each other as Big Lagoon is from McKinleyville.

In other words, VMT cannot be taken out of context from the denser urban areas and the more geographically isolated areas of Humboldt.

As both a cyclist and a commuter to provide social services to individuals in remote areas, I ask that you do not exclude more rural areas from VMT calculations when analyzing transportation in Humboldt.

Thank you.

Ali

Ali O. Lee
aliolee@icloud.com
707-502-6011

From: [Sue Y Lee](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: Screen out and VMT miles
Date: Monday, August 31, 2020 2:05:38 PM

Driving is Humboldt County's #1 contributor to carbon emissions and climate change.

Using "screen out" in rural Humboldt County for the most developable parts of the county as a criterion for VMT is a poor way to predict how many miles will be traveled due to development in the screened out areas. Even stores that are small by state standards can bring a lot of new traffic in Humboldt County.

Sincerely,
sue lee mossman
PO Box 223
Arcata, CA 95518
7076773669

From: [Gail Coonen](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: VMT
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 12:20:40 PM

Dear clerk,

I am a member of 350 Humboldt and a concerned citizen. The Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) proposal

needs to be closely looked out. We are a far flung county and people often need to travel many miles round trip

to take care of business. Since the largest contributor to green house gases(GHG) is travel in Humboldt, every land

planning decision needs to take VMT into account. For instance housing developments and large cannabis grows, such as,

the proposed Adesa project, with workers traveling to work and back. The long term goals needs to be lowering our

GHG contributions and increasing our quality of life, not making wealthy investors wealthier.

Thank you,

Gail Coonen

From: [Kate McClain](#)
To: [Planning Clerk](#)
Subject: For HC Planning Commissioners" 9/3 meeting regarding VTM
Date: Wednesday, September 2, 2020 8:08:52 PM

Dear Humboldt County Planning Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Transportation Analysis Process for implementing new CEQA Guidelines based on Senate Bill (SB) 743.

I urge you to carefully study the well crafted perspective presented to you by a respected environmentally conscious leader in our community, Colin Fisk, Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities (CRTP). You would be wise to educate yourselves in the important details of this issue. For example, we all know that most cars in Humboldt County are fossil fuel dependent and that the use of cars is our #1 contributor to the climate crisis. Even stores that are small by California standards can bring a lot of additional traffic in our county. It seems ridiculous to "screen out" the most developable parts of the county from consideration.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Kate McClain
McKinleyville