

Hegler, Suzanne

From: Humboldt Association of Realtors <ida@harealtors.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 4:04 PM
To: Fennell, Estelle; Lovelace, Mark; Bohn, Rex; Sundberg, Ryan; Bass, Virginia
Cc: Planning Clerk
Subject: Traffic Impact Fee
Attachments: 4-4-16 Traffic Impact Letter.pdf

Dear County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission,
Please see the attached letter from Humboldt Association of Realtors® addressing the proposed Martin Slough
Interceptor Traffic Impact Fee.

~ Ida

Ida Heinen, Executive Officer
Humboldt Association of Realtors
707-442-2978/Phone, 707-442-7985/Fax
CELL – 707-362-9511



April 4, 2016

Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
Mark Lovelace, Chair
825 5th Street
Eureka, CA 95501

RE: Proposed Traffic Impact Fee

Dear Mr. Lovelace and Board,

The Humboldt Association of Realtors® shares the concerns of the Humboldt Community Services District and those of the Greater Eureka Area Municipal Advisory Committee with regard to the draft interim traffic impact fee report presented by City and County staff at the GEAMAC meeting on March 8, 2016.

The Association is not disputing the necessity of the traffic mitigation fee but is concerned with the current proposal as it relates to the boundaries identified in the current plan, which exceed those originally presented for the Martin Slough Interceptor Project. HAR would like to express our support of the attached letters from HCSD and GEAMAC and request that the boundaries of the Martin Slough Interceptor Project be confined to those in the original proposal.

Sincerely,


Brenda Lockhart
Board President


Jeff Ragan
Government Relations - Chair

cc: Robert Morris, Humboldt County Planning Commission

- PRESIDENT**
Brenda Lockhart
- PRESIDENT-ELECT**
Kristi Machado
- SECRETARY/TREASURER**
Elizabeth Campbell
- PAST PRESIDENT**
Jeremy Stanfield
- DIRECTORS**
Kevin Dreyer
Marci Ebert
Victoria Foersterling
Kyra O'Rourke
Joe Matteoli
Andy Parker
Marci Pigg
Kim Quintal
Robin Ronay-MLS
Michelle Voyles
Dean Wilson
Joyce West
- AFFILIATE LIAISON**
Kim Preston
- EXECUTIVE OFFICER**
Ida Heinen



March 9, 2016

**Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
Mark Lovlace, Chairman
825 5th Street
Eureka, Ca 95501**

Ref: Proposed Interim Traffic Mitigation Fee Proposal

Chairman Lovelace and members of the Board:

At the March 8th meeting of the Greater Eureka Area Municipal Advisory Committee, County Public Works Staff, City of Eureka Staff and their third party consultant presented a revised draft of a proposed Interim Traffic Mitigation Fee.

Following the staff presentation and more than two hours of public comment the committee determined that they could not support the current proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) The review of alternatives required in the fee foundational documents has never been undertaken.**
- 2) There is concern that the fee boundary as proposed is inconsistent with the provisions of the Martin Slough EIR.**
- 3) At the revised growth levels, the fee would have difficulty funding even a small portion of the proposed projects.**

Sincerely,

**Glenn Ziemer
Chair- GEAMAC**

Humboldt Community Services District

Dedicated to providing high quality, cost effective water and sewer service for our customers

March 24, 2016

Robert Morris, Chair
Humboldt County Planning Commission
825 Fifth Street
Eureka, CA 95501

Subject: Humboldt County Traffic Impact Fee

Dear Commissioner Morris:

The Humboldt Community Services District (HCSD) Board of Directors have great concerns with regard to the current process County and City of Eureka (City) staff have followed to draft the current Traffic Impact Fee which we understand will be presented to the respective Board of Supervisors and City Council in the very near future. As such we feel it critical that we bring the matter to the Humboldt County Planning Commission's attention as the Traffic Impact Fee affects land use issues.

The reason the County is looking at a traffic mitigation fee study is because the Martin Slough Interceptor (MSI) Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Mitigation Measure 11-3.1 requires such. It is unfortunate that this fee process was not performed years ago as dictated by the Martin Slough EIR adopted in 2004. Now the County and City find themselves in an emergency situation to push through the process.

After presenting their draft interim traffic impact fee report at two Greater Eureka Area Municipal Advisory Committee (GEAMAC) meetings, the recommendations were passionately contested by the public as well as HCSD. Attached please find a copy of our February 26, 2016 letter detailing specific concerns and requests to be included in the Traffic Interim Fee. However, it now appears that the County and City staff, along with their consultant, is proceeding with their plan as they initially envisioned it.

It is our understanding that there must be a direct nexus between an impact fee imposed for development and the use of such funds collected. We are concerned that the County and City staff are getting away from the intent of the MSI Project traffic impact fee. We understand the city would like to address inadequacies of their traffic system in other parts of the city. From this District's perspective, it is not the responsibility of the MSI to mitigate issues not associated with the Martin Slough basin nor is it prudent to have areas that have nothing to do with the Martin Slough basin, such as development in Freshwater or Humboldt Hill, associated with this Martin Slough traffic mitigation measure. Therefore we feel if the County and City want to address these issues they should set them up as separate areas (basins). Thus money collected from a specific basin would address mitigation measures in that specific basin.

Robert Morris, Chair
Humboldt County Planning Commission
March 24, 2016
Page Two

The HCSD Board feels it is imperative that the Martin Slough basin is treated as a standalone mitigation area. We took on 64% of the approximate \$30 Million MSI Project burden based upon assurances that any development within the Martin Slough basin would drive a mitigation fund to deal with necessary traffic improvements within the Martin Slough basin. This concept is supported by the required nexus that the money collected must be used in direct relation to the area in which the monies were collected.

It appears that the County and City are trying to expand the scope of the boundary that will be included in the traffic mitigation fee to address long standing traffic issues. Let it be clear that HCSD is not against the idea of a larger traffic study area. However, we do feel that all fees collected from development within the Martin Slough basin must be utilized within the ms basin to mitigate potential traffic impacts. Further, this is the approach that both HCSD and the City presented to the public when garnering support for the Martin Slough Interceptor project.

In conclusion, we are not contesting the necessity for a traffic mitigation fee. We are concerned about the proposed plan as presented. We feel the funds generated within the Martin Slough basin need to be used to mitigate the impacts of growth in the Martin Slough basin. As mentioned previously we believe a simple solution is to create different basins for the study area. Thus, fees collected within each basin can then easily provide the nexus requirement that there is a direct relationship to the property developed.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this matter for your review and consideration. Should you have any question or require additional information, please feel free to call upon the HCSD staff or any of its Board members.

Sincerely,

HUMBOLDT CSD

David Hull,
General Manager

c: HCSD Board of Directors