



Dear Planning Commissioners:

This letter concerns the North McKay Ranch project, Item F.1 on your January 6, 2022 agenda.

We the undersigned request that you a) specify that the final EIR in the McKay tract development is inadequate and b) that you reject the proposed development.

Briefly:

- CEQA does a great job of bringing to light problems. It has done so in the case of the McKay proposal. However, it also offers huge opportunities for obfuscation by Planning Department staff and administrators. In this case, the Planning Department appears to be using “motivated reasoning” to reject the statements of problems submitted by RCEA, HCACOG and Caltrans. Environmental organizations and neighbors also submitted excellent comments that were brushed off. Please read these letters with an open mind and see if you think the tortured logic of the staff in rebuttal is anything other than a highly trained defense of the developer’s castle.
- There are, despite all the contortions (especially with regard to transportation impacts), two significant environmental effects that could not be wished away: a) greenhouse gases and b) wildfire protection. Please look closely at what is proposed for mitigation. In the case of greenhouse gases it is “offsets.” It has now been amply demonstrated that most offsets are less than they purport to be and many are scams. Even when they are allowed, under cap and trade, for example, they are required to be limited (in California to 4% of emissions reductions as of now).

In this case, the “mitigation” of excess greenhouse gases by purchasing offsets from the Arcata Community Forest falls short. The Arcata Community Forest periodically harvests some of the biggest redwoods, an overall continual reduction in photosynthetic capacity and increase in greenhouse gases – not a sink. In fact, this so-called mitigation is a fraud because it is limited to 30 years, the putative life of the project. The Planning Department promotes a fiction that major projects like this, Terra Gen, and the Nordic Aquafarm only last for 30 years. So the mitigation only lasts for 30 years. Is there anyone except the king in his new clothes who believes the greenhouse gases from this 1950s style suburban development will be limited to 30 years?

- This is another example of planning processes being unfairly biased toward those who want to be wealthy now versus our children and their children and their children who



will live with the consequences of climate disasters. Planning commissioners must be Stakeholders for the Future!

- The bias of this whole process is seen very clearly in the response to the CEQA requirement that project alternatives be considered. The real alternative to this project is infill and building up, not more single family homes with automobiles, drive-to shopping centers, and woodstoves. The proposed “environmentally superior” alternative did the exact opposite, reducing density! We believe the only choice left you is to vote “no project.”

The climate crisis is real. In Humboldt County we still have no idea how we will manage sea level rise, or if it is even possible. This is not the time to signal that business as usual with a few EV chargers is just fine. Our attempts to mitigate climate change are decades behind. The Climate Action Plan asks only that we cut emissions 40% by 2030; that would have been a good goal for 2000. Sonoma County has adopted a CAP that will reduce emissions by 80% by 2030. We have to do better in order to have a chance at preserving major elements of the world that we grew up enjoying. Is the McKay subdivision what we want to bequeath to the next generations and what we want as a monument to our better selves in a time of crisis?

350 Humboldt Steering Committee

Daniel Chandler, Ph.D.

Diane Ryerson, M.A.

Laura Simpson

Signed also by the following community members.

Michael	Tomczyszyn	94132	Joyce	Heyn	92064
Peter	Lee	94118	Carol	Mone	95570
Jerry	Martien	95503	Rebecca	Stauffer	95524
Laura	Simpson	95519	Jo Ann	Huffman	95501
Dennis	Allen	93101	Christine	Doyka	95542
Sunnie	Noellert	95519	Marijane	Poulton	95570
Diane	Ryerson	95521	Sue	Mossman	95518
Rush	Rehm	94062	Irith	Shalmony	95521
George	Clark	95503	Kay	Schaser	95501



### Grassroots Climate Action

Carol	Lee	95503	Judith	Foster	95521
Tamara	Voyles	95472	Gail	Coonen	95503
Dana	Utman	95524	Kathleen	Kolodny	95521
Rudy	Ramp	95521	Joanna	Welch	95501
Gina	Ness	95501	Katherine	Bettis	95503
Peter	Malelu	95521	Ann	Kilby	95519
Cathy	Chandler- Klein	95521	Barbara	Barratt	95521
Nancy	Ihara	95521	Linda	Alm	95521
Betina	Garsen	95501	Laura	Guldin	95521
Myra	Toth	93023	Fhyre	Phoenix	95519
Lee	Dedini	95524	Utkarsh	Nath	94555
sue	hilton	95521	Daniel	Chandler	95570
Archie	Mossman	95518	Henry	Millstein	95501
Beth	Herrmann	95501	Jenifer	Pace	95521
Charles	Chamberlin	95521	Kenzie	Mullen	95501
Margaret	Emerson	95521	Caroline	Isaacs	95503

**From:** [Kimberly Tays](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 9:40:16 AM

---

To the Planning Commission:

I am writing to voice my OPPOSITION to yet another terrible project for Humboldt County. This proposed subdivision will cause more traffic problems and exacerbate climate change because people will have to drive everywhere, due of a lack of alternative transportation options. We have to stop developing this way!

When will the County start promoting projects that enhance our communities? Everything I see proposed/approved makes me cringe because of a lack of good planning, unimaginative designs and the destruction that comes with these developments that destroy habitat and forest lands.

Please deny this project. Let's build something that we can be proud of instead of these soul crushing, cookie cutter developments that are so harmful to the environment.

Kim Tays  
Humboldt County resident

**From:** [Chris and Luis](#)  
**To:** [Planning Clerk](#)  
**Cc:** [colin@transportationpriorities.org](mailto:colin@transportationpriorities.org); [Scott Ellsmore](#); [Susan Seaman](#); [Bass, Virginia](#); [Wilson, Mike](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 3:16:35 PM

---

Greetings,

We have concerns about the proposed North McKay Ranch Project as currently designed.

We are Eureka residents and homeowners at 3341 H St, Eureka, CA 95503.

We agree with the Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities that the project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.

The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and provide for safe transit for pedestrian traffic.

As residents of H Street we witness daily the speed of commuters traveling our residential streets and the number of accidents and near misses. Added to this is the unacceptable traffic noise.

The city recently put a crosswalk and bulb-outs on the corner of H Street and Hodgeson. It has done little to slow down traffic as seen in the attached photo.

More needs to be done on our existing residential streets to calm traffic before approving another development that will surely add to our problems. We've repeatedly written to our City staff asking for help, such as stop signs and lower speed limits. We're still waiting, as are many of our neighbors.

Yes, we need housing and jobs, but there is a better way to build and more planning that needs to factor in community needs for safe and liveable communities.

Sincerely,

Luis Chabolla and Chris Luna

 [IMG\\_1285.jpg](#)

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** C.D. Hoyle <chasdoyle@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:20 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

As a Eureka resident, I would like to comment on the North McKay Ranch Project and oppose it in its current form because:

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Nancy Ihara <nancyihara@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2022 5:49 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** North McKay Ranch, Record Number PLN-9902-GPA

Commissioners,

There is much that I am distressed about regarding the McKay tract development. I would like, however, to focus on one element.

It is my understanding that wood burning stoves will be allowed as long as they have catalytic converters. The following is from an EPA site, "Frequent Questions about Wood-Burning Appliances" that addresses catalytic converter wood burning stoves:

"Note that a catalyst stove burns more cleanly at lower burn rates. At high burn rates the particulate matter passes through the catalyst more quickly, with less retention time, resulting in *higher emissions*." (Italics added.)

Particulate matter, health professionals inform us, is very unhealthy. There is no way to control how hot residents might choose to have their fires in their stoves.

The site continues:

"Catalytic stoves are typically more expensive long term than non-catalytic models because the catalyst honeycomb eventually breaks down and needs to be replaced. Modern catalysts can last up to 10 years with proper maintenance and use."

Again, there is no way to insure that residents will maintain the catalysts in their stoves. In 10 years time any environmental benefit from these stoves could be lost.

I would like to suggest that at the very least that the Commission select to recommend that the applicant make amendments to the project not currently considered in the EIR. I would suggest that wood burning stoves not be allowed.

Nancy Ihara

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** C.D. Hoyle <chasdoyle@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:20 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

As a Eureka resident, I would like to comment on the North McKay Ranch Project and oppose it in its current form because:

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.



## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** C F <cfjr3@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:32 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I am **opposed** to the current North McKay Ranch Project as it currently is propose .

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project must include a safe bicycle route.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.

Claudio Freixas Jr.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Colin Fiske <colin.fiske@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2022 11:19 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Cc:** Wilson, Mike  
**Subject:** North McKay Ranch Project, 1/6/22 Agenda Item F.1

Planning Commissioners,

I am writing with very serious concerns about the North McKay Ranch project, Item F.1 on your agenda this week. As we have detailed in several letters included in the project record, this project as currently proposed will clearly result in significant increases in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and consequently is inconsistent with the County's own General Plan. The staff report's claim that this project is "infill" which will result in a "self-sustainable walkable neighborhood" is frankly a bit absurd.

And you don't have to take our word for it. Comment letters from HCAOG and from RCEA (both agencies on which a County Supervisor sits as a Director), as well as from Caltrans, say substantially the same, and explicitly lay out the need for increased density and meaningful pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements in order to meet the requirements of CEQA as well as state and County goals and policies for transportation and climate mitigation. Unfortunately, County staff have chosen to dismiss all of these comments largely on technical grounds, ignoring the expertise of these key planning agencies (along with stakeholders like CRTP), claiming for themselves the sole right to interpret the General Plan and describing standard complete streets features as "infeasible."

The Final EIR also claims that they cannot reduce GHG emissions enough through transportation measures to avoid a significant impact, and therefore that mitigation measures should not be required. In fact, CEQA requires the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures when an impact is significant, and this requirement is not conditioned on those measures being able to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

The Final EIR further claims that many transportation mitigation measures would require cooperation with the City of Eureka, and therefore are infeasible. In fact, it is standard practice under CEQA to require a project proponent to receive approvals or permits from other agencies, and the County should do so here.

We take particular issue with the straw-man argument presented by staff that the Environmentally Superior Alternative is a reduced density project which will result in fewer housing units. In fact, as CRTP and other environmental advocates, along with expert agencies, have repeatedly said, one of the key steps needed to make a project in this location environmentally superior is to *increase* the density of housing and mixture of uses. As it currently stands, the project will likely not be dense enough to support any additional transit service, and included commercial uses will not be sufficient to substantially reduce trip generation rates.

Please listen to HCAOG, RCEA, and the community, and require the project to increase density, implement active transportation and transit improvements, and demonstrate that it will reduce VMT and GHGs in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (and thus in the General Plan). If these actions are truly infeasible, then the project should be denied.

Thank you.

--

Colin Fiske (he/him)

Executive Director  
Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities  
[www.transportationpriorities.org](http://www.transportationpriorities.org)

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Emily Siegel LCSW <emilysiegellcsw@sonic.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 02, 2022 7:51 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** McKay Ranch Subdivision case number #9902 hearing date 1-6-22

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Addressing only issues within the CEQA process for the McKay Ranch subdivision hides the fact that the Planning Commission is making a political decision and ignoring the many valid issues that need to be addressed. The Planning Commission is a political body that is supposed to deal with the concerns of the people of our county. There are still valid concerns for many people about major problems with fire danger, wood smoke from wood stoves, greenhouse gas and neighborhood traffic concerns. These are human caused problems, as are all climate crisis problems. It is possible to truly limit the effects of human-caused climate change and restore the environment and we humans really can do that. But purchasing mitigation offsets for only 30 years is simply not enough to address these issues that will continue for much, much longer than 30 years. The climate crisis demands that we do everything we can to solve these problems. Pretending that the CEQA process is enough does not take care of the valid issues people have raised about this project. The Planning Commission needs to take action to truly alleviate these problems. — Emily Siegel LCSW, home address: 65 Cod St., Eureka 95503/ business address: 539 G St, Suite 107., Eureka 95501/ 707-845-2405

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Eugene Perricelli <ceperr@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:46 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

- In deference to our climate disruption/disaster, now unfolding, and our need for meaningful reform, we should NOT be continuing to approve old fashioned car centric suburbs. The least we should do is mandate the following suggestions if McKay is to be built.
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.

Thank you for your attention to the needs of future generations. Claire Perricelli, Eureka, 95501

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** mark\_schaffner@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 3:26 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Commissioners:

I do not support further development of Cutten without addressing the larger issue of transportation corridors and decreasing the reliance on cars for personal transportation.

Thank you,

*Mark*

*For a prompt reply please call me, then text me. Due to reception and connectivity, mails may not be checked daily. Thank you.*

Mark Schaffner 707-616-8895

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Meg Stofsky <mstofsky87@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 10:47 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

My name is Margaret (Meg) Stofsky and I live on Manzanita Ave, which is a cul-de-sac and would be affected by this very ill thought out plan. Please do not go forward with the McKay forest development plan. Cal Fire indicated that it would substantially increase fire risk

CRTP has indicated that the lack of a meaningful traffic analysis has grossly underestimated the impact on traffic, therefore emissions and quality of life as far as walking in the Sequoia Park & Zoo area. We don't need any more houses in the \$500000 range! This is the wrong plan at the wrong time. Please submit my comment for the public record.

Thank you. Margaret Stofsky

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Mike Turek <turek\_mike@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 9:52 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I live at Foxwood Estates an over 55 years of age development. It is already difficult to turn onto Walnut Drive due to traffic and it will only get much worse if this North McKay Ranch Project is allowed under its current plan. Below are recommendations for making the project more appropriate.

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.
- 
- Sincerely, Michael F. Turek 2015 Foxwood Drive, Eureka, CA 95503



## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Patricia-Anne WinterSun <p-aws@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 7:10 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Cc:** colin@transportationpriorities.org  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.

If we do not follow our own rules who will?

--

Yours in least waste,  
Patricia-Anne WinterSun  
Myrtle town

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Paula Rhude <isrhude@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 5:32 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

In my opinion the Planning Commission should take into account the comments and suggestions of CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.

No more business and building as we have always done it!

Eureka needs to step up and do it's part to decrease global warming . Eureka needs to stick to it's own planning guidelines.

Thank you,

Paula Rhude, 234 Clark Street, Eureka

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Robert Eckart <villagekeepers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2022 7:08 PM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Dear Humboldt County Supervisors:

I am a Humboldt County resident that frequents this area.

Please consider that we need standard traffic-calming, bike and pedestrian facilities to keep people safe, as well as to comply with State requirements.

Please do not allow this subdivision development without these needs met.

We expect this of you. Please.

Sincerely,

Robert Eckart

## McClenagan, Laura

---

**From:** Holly Quinn <g.holly.cq@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 07, 2022 9:53 AM  
**To:** Planning Clerk  
**Subject:** Comment on North McKay Ranch Project, Agenda Item F.1

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

To whom it concerns,

I have copied directly from CRTP, as they cover all my concerns about this proposal. We live in a place that deserves the very best for its residents, and the very best for our precious Earth. While it may not be easier, because not as much of it has been done so it is less familiar, setting a high standard for the weight new housing and transportation costs really should be done. People deserve to live in a good environment, in all ways, one that does not further strain the environment of those around.

- The project must include meaningful active transportation and transit improvements, such as those suggested by CRTP, HCAOG, and RCEA.
- The project should have increased residential density and more commercial uses in order to shorten trip distances, reduce car trips, and make new bus service more feasible.
- The County must be able to demonstrate that the project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and climate-harming emissions in line with the targets established in the Regional Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Action Plan for Energy (RePower Humboldt), and the General Plan. Specifically, they must show that the project will help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 25% and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions by 65%
- If the project can't meet these standards, then it should be denied. The County can and must meet its housing needs with modern, walkable developments - not old-fashioned, car-oriented subdivisions.

Please think carefully, and think for the long-term, not the short-term benefits.

Regards,  
Holly Quin