

Delo Freitas

From: David Loya
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 1:17 PM
To: [REDACTED] Delo Freitas
Subject: RE: Displacement considerations in new City of Arcata policy

Thanks, Elizabeth. Please send correspondence on these topics directly to me and/or Delo.

David Loya (him)
Community Development Director
City of Arcata
p. 707-825-2045

I acknowledge my residence in Goudi'ni (Arcata), part of the ancestral territory of the Wiyot peoples. I offer my reconciliation and respect to their elders past and present.

<https://www.wiyot.us/162/Wiyot-Placename-Video>

To grow opportunity and build community equitably.

READ THE GATEWAY PLAN

Learn More About Public Meetings and Planning

Some services, such as water bills and police services, are available on-call. Please check our website www.cityofarcata.org for the latest information on accessing City services.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, February 7, 2023 8:11 AM
To: COM DEV <comdev@cityofarcata.org>
Subject: Re: Displacement considerations in new City of Arcata policy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi David and all,

Thanks for this information. I look forward to delving into it more as it is a relevant and important topic, surrounded by urban myths which likely contain some truths, but data is what we need.

Keep up the good work!

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Conner

On 2023-02-06 12:26, City of Arcata - Community Development Dept. wrote:

> View this in your browser [1]

>

> Dear Community,

>

> As we prepare for growth, we also need to be prepared to balance new
> development with appropriate measures to prevent displacement. I know
> that several of you have this on your mind as we discuss the potential
> for growth and change over the next 20 years.

>

> There is disagreement in the scholarship about the magnitude of
> displacement related to gentrification. But recent studies using new
> methods to tease apart the impact of new market rate housing on
> existing residents suggests the impacts may not be as significant as
> feared

> (<https://ccrl.stanford.edu/blog/housing-interventions-new-production>).

> Importantly, this study pointed to the positive outcomes of
> anti-displacement policy, such as 'for cause eviction'.

>

> The Gateway Plan already incorporates policy to offset the potential
> stresses that could lead to displacement. The plan includes relocation
> assistance for displaced individuals. It also incorporates
> inclusionary zoning, which will set a base percentage of affordable
> housing within new market rate buildings. There are incentives for
> going above the inclusionary zoning base for affordable housing. And
> the City can continue to prioritize policy that will help stabilize
> neighborhoods.

>

> I look forward to bringing the Community, Commission, and Council more
> information on the impact of different policy choices for a
> discussion. I encourage you to explore the various studies that
> Stanford's Changing Cities Research Lab, as well as other sources, to
> prime your thinking on this complex issue. As we work to meet the
> significant housing challenges we have now, and those we will have in
> the future, we will need to address the potential for gentrification
> caused displacement.

>

> Sincerely,

>

> David Loya (him)

>

> Community Development Director

>

> You are receiving this message because you are subscribed to
> Long-Range Planning & Community Visioning on

>

<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.cityofarcata.org&c=E,1,7ukG2WS8Yme5h8r4gngO147gu9i>

qe2lgLaPRQd5GGUMjYUECzJUFhA9ciTv5vTydKr_Fvqa8KmFCNmVh30HaNuiYyRlwBAJpzZTwnRjYMiqYryZK_YBZ&typo=1

To unsubscribe, click the following link:

> Unsubscribe [2]

>

> Links:

> -----

> [1]

> <https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.cityofarcata.o>

> rg%2flist.aspx%3fMID%3d262&c=E,1,nPcNrkHeDhKRXpjqBI71CBIVI79Ri7gSMQb2G

> 8tuJXFNYxdvlWB9b1hcjwoywDqTWbe9AkboW5wrDTL3_kkYRN3837V68V-UX_2laPpnLdV

> j9A,,&typo=1

> [2]

> <https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.cityofarcata.o>

> rg%2flist.aspx%3fmode%3dUnsubscribe%26Email%3deconner%40sonic.net%26CI

> D%3d281&c=E,1,5JEX356PpMPpcDC0SK8uqS6ANR0crMIXniGjOjhrTMHrCCULgJhRB9k6

> M74A6HzKWB0GwMaXrns9fC8huRmq2Khl0-bN0gxZpE4Wnkmu&typo=1

From Fred Weis February 14, 2023

Re: My comments on the Comments of Commissioner Judith Mayer
on Draft General Plan update & amendments: Land Use & Growth Management elements

This is NOT a summary. This is NOT a compilation.

These are some notes on items that Judith has brought up that attracted my attention.

I have copied just a sentence or two for each item – generally she has written more, which must be read for her full comment on the subject.

Page 1 – Page 78 in the packet

General: Vision: **The Commission has not yet addressed the Plan's over-arching Vision statement.**

Element order: **Let's discuss the Land Use element before the Growth Management element.**

Explicitly address drivers of land use change: **The draft plan should address the different drivers of land use change in terms of the types of change involved.**

Page 2 – Page 79 in the packet

Maps: **Not all of the maps that the text mentions appear to be included in the Draft element in locations that are easy to find and read.**

Very important:

Infill opportunity areas and streamlined / ministerial review: **Before adopting such a policy, the Planning Commission should discuss and figure out exactly what those streamlined review and ministerial pathways should involve, possibly together with the City Council, but definitely BEFORE we recommend such a policy TO the Council!** We haven't addressed or resolved this in the Gateway, let alone in any or all of the City's other "infill opportunity" areas!

Page 3 – Page 80 in the packet

Residential Zoning: : Recent state rules may increase the actual allowable dwelling densities
The Land Use element should explicitly address these new possibilities and their implications.

Very important:

Density designations: ... **in terms of both dwelling units (which state housing guideline use) and bedrooms (which more closely represent actual population).** A development of “single room occupancy” or efficiency apartments will impose different demands for services than a similar number of 3-bedroom “dwelling units.”

Planned Developments: The Planning Commission should consider separating policies for the Planned Development areas for which an actual Planned Development Permit has been issued, from those for which no actual Planned Development permit has ever been approved. **Staff had told the Planning Commission there are very few of these locations, yet two have come up within a couple of months.**

Agriculture and Natural Resource Lands (Policy LU-6): ... **consider regulating agricultural industries and processing with extensive or largescale structures separately from agricultural production that looks like, and imposes infrastructure demands more like “farming.”**

Page 4 – Page 81 in the packet

Industrial Land Uses & Public Facility Land Uses: (Typo Policy LU-4: 150 years rather than 50 years?) – [Page 51 in the packet]

Little Lakes (Draft policy LU-5): It may be time to rethink that, considering the need to remediate toxic site contamination, and the **serious risks to any permanent structure posed by sea level rise**, rising groundwater, earthquakes, and tsunami.

Presumably the LCP [Local Coastal Plan] element will also address this

More specific – Growth Management element draft:

However, the Growth Management element can go further in protecting the City’s greenbelt and **“bluebelt,” maintaining viewsheds**, etc. It can strengthen the City’s ability to do so **in the face of potential development pressure on and from the County.**

Page 5 – Page 82 in the packet

Very important:

County referrals to City: ... **Our General Plan should also strongly encourage the Community Development Department to refer those proposals to the Arcata Planning Commission for review and comment.** (Nothing prevents this now.) This could provide valuable public review and comment opportunities by Arcatans within our own public process.

Land-use designations within the Planning Area: ... **Growth Control element should also recommend that the County divide its ag land designations between those uses that would permit large-scale structures, and those that would not permit large-scale structures, disruptive lighting or noise, extensive groundwater draw-down, etc.**

Very important:

Annexation for conservation: ...

New Draft Policy GM-3c adds that the City may annex undeveloped land even beyond Arcata's Urban Services Boundary if the City owns that land for resource / habitat management or to fulfill the City's greenbelt policies.

However, I believe that the General Plan should go further, and should extend this language to reinforce the City's ability to annex land that the City does not own (or does not yet own), for conservation purposes.

A General Plan policy broadening opportunity for such conservation annexation would indicate to LAFCo and to state authorities that Arcata considers annexation an important conservation tool, rather than just as a means to expand urban development.

Delo Freitas

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2023 7:34 PM
To: Julie Vaissade-Elcock; Judith Mayer; Scott Davies; Christian Figueroa; Dan Tangney; Matthew Simmons; Peter Lehman; David Loya; Jennifer Dart; Delo Freitas
Subject: Using the AmeriGas block as a test site for developing a workable code

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Planning Commissioners, David, Delo, Jen
Subject: Using the AmeriGas block as a test site for developing a workable code

Hello. This is what I spoke about at the meeting on Tuesday (Feb 14).
This is not a transcription, but rather a document based on my notes.
I believe that to design building and massing for that one site would create valuable guidelines that Ben Noble could then utilize.
Thank you.
-- Fred Weis

Your form-based code study session on Saturday with Ben Noble.

A few comments. I like Ben. I think he's smart, and he can give us any Form-Based Code that you specify. But he's not an architect, and I don't regard him as a planner. **His orientation seems to be urban and modern.** Frankly, I don't think he's the right man for the job here.

[Added note: But he is what we have. My feeling is that he can create a code based upon the specifications that you provide to him, but left on his own there may be some severe issues. The sheer vertical wall -- no stepbacks, no setback, right up to the property line -- example that we saw is what I'm talking about. In a larger city, maybe. Here, it is not appropriate.]

The proposed code for form and massing, with height, setbacks, and setbacks was horrendous. By making stepbacks a percentage of ground floor area, it would allow a sheer vertical wall of whatever height you decide – 5, 6, or 7 stories – just 10 feet away from a single-family home parcel, or ZERO feet from any other parcel. This is not what we've been talking about here.

Here's a proposal. Pick one site. Have a discussion among yourselves about what kind of Form-Based Code it would take to satisfy what you want to see happen on that one site.

I propose the AmeriGas site – between 6th & 7th, between K and L. Here's why:

- **It is sure to be developed.**
- **It has a different kind of neighbor on each side.** On K Street, there's a major thoroughfare with likely bus routes. The other side of K Street are 1-story commercial buildings that will likely be re-developed. On 7th Street, there are historic one-story residences across the street. For purposes of the

exercise, assume that L Street will be a linear park. The heights would have to step down to that, for light and solar access. On 6th Street it's across from Bud's mini-storage – that's commercial.

- It's a full block.
- It could have an alley.
- It could have a Woonerf (pronounced: Vonerf) on 6th Street, as a walking street.

That one block has about every type of neighbor we're going to find in the Gateway Area. You'll need a bus pullout, deep sidewalks, some private-public areas. On 7th Street a big setback to avoid solar shading. Diagonally, there's the Montessori Garden and the Trailer Park.

When you come up with the elements of a Form-Based Code that would work for that site, you've gone a long way toward a final building and massing code.

Delo Freitas

From: D Duncan [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2023 9:59 AM
To: Peter Lehman; Scott Davies; Christian Figueroa; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Julie Vaissade-Elcock; Matthew Simmons; David Loya
Subject: objective standards

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners:

The California State law governing new construction allows “no personal or subjective judgment by a public official.”

It mandates “an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant and public official prior to submittal.”

.
The problem is, of course, to define that objective standard.

A direct approach might be the following:

Select five buildings in town generally liked that could represent what Arcata is looking for in design. Here is a sample list.

Plaza Point
A Slice of Humboldt Pie
The Plaza Shoe Shop
11th & I Office Building next to Los Bagels
Hensel Hardware

Describe the features of each building that stand out. From this list create the “objective standard.” Approached in this way, the city will be using its own buildings as examples instead of importing samples from elsewhere.

After all, the most objective thing in the world is an OBJECT, a building actually out there in the real world, not some concept in somebody’s head. Future Developers can visit each building and see for themselves the features the city wants to support.

Such a design program as this would achieve the goal of avoiding the “modern university” look that Cal Poly has chosen to pursue in the two new dorms.

It would also tend to attract better architects to a project as it would give them clear guidance and challenge them to a higher level of achievement than mere utility.

This is not to say that utility is inessential. Indeed creating housing NOW is quite urgent. The design standards should allow some flexibility for utilitarian structures that serve the immediate need of safe and affordable housing while insisting on a minimum of strong architectural detail.

Many Arcatans do not want to become a “modern” city. That decision was made when fast-food franchises were made illegal in the center of town, when stoplights were rejected as a means to manage traffic, when a four-story building height rule was put in place, and so forth. Let us continue in this tradition and not lose our identity as we move to meet the needs of the future.

Thank you for entertaining these ideas for building Arcata well.

Daniel Duncan

Delo Freitas

From: Cathy ChandlerKlein [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 9:34 PM
To: COM DEV; David Loya; Delo Freitas
Subject: gateway

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please forward to Planning Commission.

I am writing in support of the Gateway Project as an Arcata resident. I think this is a much needed and appropriate development for Arcata. It addresses our climate goals, our urgent housing needs, our transportation problems. I appreciate all the listening you have done to the whole community. It is time to move forward.

Thank you,

Cathy Chandler-Klein

Delo Freitas

From: Colin Fiske [REDACTED]
To: COM DEV; David Loya; Delo Freitas
Subject: Comments for 2/23 Form-Based Code Workshop

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi David and Delo,

CRTP would like to comment on the topics to be discussed at Thursday's form-based code workshop. Please provide these comments to the Planning Commission and City Council as well. Thanks!

First, we want to reiterate that we are strong supporters of the draft Gateway Area Plan, and we urge the city to finalize and adopt the plan and its form-based code quickly. This is a key strategy to address the housing crisis, the climate crisis, and the street safety crisis, and progress is urgently needed.

We have the following comments on parking and mobility standards, which we understand to be the main focus of Thursday's workshop:

- There should be no minimum parking mandates in the code. The parking ratios generally used to set these mandates have been thoroughly debunked, and there is no scientifically valid basis for requiring any particular number of parking spaces for a given development. Parking mandates have [a host of negative environmental and equity impacts](#), and more and more communities are [eliminating them](#). Arcata long ago eliminated parking mandates in the core downtown area, and it should extend this successful policy to the adjacent Gateway Area as well.
- We strongly support requiring developers to "unbundle" parking - i.e., to charge separately for residential/commercial rents and for parking spaces. This both discourages single-occupancy car use and avoids the unfair subsidy to non-drivers which is inherent when parking costs are "bundled."
- Extensive research shows that a connected network of physically separated bikeways is required to convince most people to bike for transportation on most streets. All streets within the Gateway Area should either (a) provide physically separated (Class IV or Class I) bikeways, wide enough for 2 bikes to pass each other, or (b) follow "woonerf" standards for mixing all modes of transportation at extremely slow speeds that allow for safety and comfort. Another way to approach this would be to require that all streets are designed to ensure they provide bicycle level of traffic stress 1 (LTS 1), the level required for people of all ages and abilities to feel comfortable riding a bike.
- Sidewalks - and associated frontage areas - should more or less follow the [NACTO guidance for design zones](#), including a clear path of 6 feet, surrounded by a frontage zone on one side and a street furniture/curb zone with buffers on the other side.
- Streets should be narrow and feature significant traffic calming. At Class I trail crossings, trail users should have the right-of-way.
- Street-facing building frontages should follow best practices for an active pedestrian environment, including a prohibition on street-facing garages.
- Key transportation demand management measures which should be incentivized in the plan include robust car-share and bike-share systems (including e-bikes), free bus passes for tenants and employees, and off-site bike, pedestrian, and transit stop upgrades in coordination with the relevant agencies.

Thanks for your consideration.

--

Colin Fiske (he/him)
Executive Director
Coalition for Responsible Transportation Priorities
www.transportationpriorities.org

Delo Freitas

From: Carisse Geronimo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2023 5:50 PM
To: COM DEV; David Loya; Delo Freitas
Subject: Form-Based Code Workshop Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Delo and David,

I'm reaching out to voice support for the Gateway Area Plan, and urge the city to finalize and adopt the plan and its form-based code quickly. This plan addresses issues related to critical housing and transportation needs as well as the climate crisis.

In particular, as a citizen of Arcata and avid cyclist, I want to highlight the need for a connected network of Class I or Class IV bikeways within the Gateway Area. These separated bikeways would promote ridership and usage of alternative modes of transportation, and also reduce the need for parking and vehicle infrastructure.

I'd also like to support the car-share and bike-share systems, which would support mobility for tenants and employees in the Gateway area, ensure they are well-connected to the surrounding area, and provide alternatives to driving personal vehicles.

These strategies would reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation, which unnecessarily make up a large proportion of emissions in our rural area.

Thanks for your consideration!

Best,
Carisse

This document was handed to the Transportation Safety Committee members at their meeting on February 21, 2023. What is here is modified from the original handout. Added is:

- Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element
Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound
- Paragraphs of text at the top of Page 5 added, about “fait accompli.”
- Other minor edits.

From the document:

“Other Considerations Gateway Draft 2-1-23 Posted”

This document is said to contain considerations from the public and from community members that are not in agreement with the Draft Gateway Plan.

Chapter 7: Mobility

L Street

Recommendation: Maintain current configuration; remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.

Source: TSC

Policy Implications / Staff Recommendation:

Direct conflict with plan as drafted. On PC list of concerns and alternatives will be presented with opportunity to discuss.

This is Fred Weis communicating to the Transportation Safety Committee:

I say that this statement, with regard to L Street, is not an accurate representation of what the TSC has very strongly voice.

Your recommendation is NOT: “Maintain current configuration”

Rather, it is: **Create an L Street Linear Park.**

Your recommendation is NOT: “remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.”

Your goal is not to remove the drawings that are in the plan. Your goal is to see one or more alternate plans for K Street. To replace what is in the Draft Plan with a working, viable street design for K Street.

From the Transportation Safety Committee meeting, January 17, 2023

The transcription is intended to be accurate, but may contain minor errors.

Fred Weis 55:52 on the audio track

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet -- I've been following you and what you're doing. It seems like you've been extremely clear on this. I don't know what is needed. As Patricia [Cambianica] mentioned, there's a second draft [of the Gateway Plan] that came out on [October] 1, but it only includes things that -- the word is "comport" -- with the original draft. So it doesn't include your findings about the L Street - K Street couplet. In this draft of the 2045 General Plan, I counted seven instances that referred to the L Street - K Street couplet. If it's helpful to any of you, I've got the page numbers. It can be in there, if it's worded in a different way. Worded as one of the considerations rather than stating it as a fact, as something that's done. This is a small item, but important: When you do your revisions and inserts, amendments is up to this, I would strongly request that you label, if you're going to have them as individuals, that use all three initials of your name, not just two initials, and then you do TSC, dash, ABC (the initials of your name). Because some of the Committees only use two initials, they don't identify the Committee. And it's difficult for the reader.

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet, if I can support you on that, please ask anything. You may know my website, Arcata1.com. There are about six articles about the L Street - K Street couplet. I have videos and transcriptions from meetings and quotes. As far as I know, you requested an alternative plan back in January [2022]. And then again, I think in May or June [2022]. No alternative has ever been offered. As Patricia mentioned, the depiction that exists does not provide adequate room for an emergency vehicle. Todd Tregenza of GHD gave a talk, a presentation during the [City Council / Planning Commission] joint study session. It was about 12 minutes long. His video and slides are on Arcata1.com along with my critique. I think that he's just flat out wrong in many many cases, including there being no room for emergency vehicles.

Otherwise, I just keep repeating what Jim and Patricia have said. That in an ideal world, this L Street - K Street couplet would be done [that is: A decision would be made] and complete before the General Plan, before any of this stuff was done. But that doesn't seem to be the case. The reason why it's important to me, aside from the thinking that it's an ideal location for a Linear Park, is that the codes for the Form-Based Code -- for the creation of building heights, building styles, building massing -- will be very different if L Street is a thoroughfare or if it's a

linear park, as linear park buildings will likely be two stories high next to it, so you get adequate sunlight. If it's a thoroughfare, they could be four or five or six stories, say four or five stories. So this is a very different situation. And I've been hammering on the Planning Commission and the City Council that this is a decision that needs to be made before other decisions. So now you're confronting it again with this General Plan update. So thanks again. And, again, my website is there, with maps. I made it to make things easier for everybody. If there's something that you can suggest that would make things easier for you, or for anything you think of, please contact me.

Wendy Ring 1:00:12 on the audio track

That's a question is sort of, I mean, along the same lines as -- **We took a position on the L Street couplet, and it doesn't seem to have made any difference.** So I am wondering, I mean, we could do a lot of work and try to rewrite this Circulation Element. Does it make any difference? How can someone educate me about the process? What happens to our input? How does the decision get made? I'm sorry, I don't know.

Dave Ryan 1:00:53 on the audio track

I'm going to surmise that, since all we can do is make recommendations to the City Council. And they're also getting input from a lot of other sources, whether it's the public or whether it's staff or whether it's their consultants, that, I guess they can take it or leave it based on their own personal positions and maybe weighing that other input in deciding what. So yeah, I hear you. I didn't know there was a second draft out, even though I'm kind of on the email list of when their meetings and things like that I have not seen the second draft of the gateway. Did you see that?

Wendy Ring 1:01:40 on the audio track

I guess I'm asking about this part of the General Plan that we're working on. And then my other question about it was if there hasn't been community input, because, you know, COVID changed a lot of things about that, if there hasn't really been kind of robust community input about the Transportation Element, is that something that our Committee could sponsor?

Dave Ryan 1:02:02 on the audio track

Some kind of a workshop? Yeah, maybe we can, we can recommend it to City Council that, you know, that this deserves something more than just us. **That maybe it's something that involves a representative or two from the TSC, along with creating an ad-hoc committee of public members, workshops, this thing.** So to me, if you're getting a sense, which I think is somewhat justifiable at this point, that they may just take what we say and "Ah, well, that's what they said" and we'll move on, then. Maybe we need something that suggests a separate committee. And that's a little bit what I was getting at when I kind of early on find out how much or you know -- this is important. It's not going to be done against supposedly, until 2045.

Twenty years ago, it seemed like it was heavy public involvement, and not just three minutes standing at a lecturn-involvement. It's like getting a chance to have big maps, and back and forth. And not following parliamentary procedures, et cetera. It's, you're doing the job. So I think that's a recommendation we could make to come out of this. I would certainly support that. That idea and concept.

From the minutes of the October 18, 2022 meeting:

Gateway Plan Update: Transportation and Circulation Element--L Street Couplet Discussion Staff Member David Caisse opened up the discussion asking the TSC Members if they wanted to further discuss the Gateway Project or if the TSC is satisfied with their original submitted recommendation. Dave Ryan commented that he attended the City Council meeting where the Council read the TSC recommendation on the Gateway Project. **He went on to say that he mentioned the time that the TSC has studied the project, the discussion that has taken place, and listening to public comment. He suggested to the Council that if they needed more information, they can view the YouTube videos of past TSC meetings.** Discussion followed with TSC Members agreeing to leave the TSC's recommendation to the Council as is.

From the minutes of the January 17, 2023 meeting:

A. For Discussion: 2045 Arcata General Plan Draft Circulation Element

Lots of discussion about the L street couplet with mention that the TSC Committee is not in favor of the L Street couplet.

Draft Circulation Element

Instances of the L Street – K Street Couplet

Request: REMOVE all instances of “L Street – K Street Couplet” from the Circulation Element

In theory, the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” could be in the Circulation Element – if it is worded as a design that’s under potential consideration, and if (hopefully) other designs under potential consideration are shown also.

To show this as a “fait accompli” is very poor.

(Fait accompli: a thing that has already happened or been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.)

Examples of the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” or references to it:

Page 21 in the packet Page 2-50 in the Draft Circulation Element

Additionally, implementation of the mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, including the “K” and “L” Streets couplets, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive to residents, workers, students, and visitors.

Page 22 Page 2-51 in the Draft Circulation Element

K Street & L Street One-Way Couplets Redesign “K” and “L” Streets to be one-way couplets south of 14th Street. Traffic Signal coordination at Samoa Boulevard....

Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element

Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound

(continued on next page)

Page 24 Page 2-53 in the Draft Circulation Element

As part of the Gateway Area Plan, the City is exploring mobility concepts and proposing circulation patterns to convert two-way streets into one-way couplets on K Street, L street, 8th Street and 9th Street (continuation west of I Street).

Changing K Street to a one-way couplet maintains a travel lane and parking but would then allow the street to be upgraded with a Class IV facility through implementation of the Gateway Area Plan.

Page 45 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes

The traffic model run also included the proposed circulation network improvements identified in the Gateway Area Plan, including conversion of "K" and "L" Streets to one-way couplets between Alliance and Samoa Boulevard.

Also: "Traffic Volumes" states: "The largest percent increases in daily traffic volumes is on Samoa Boulevard west of "K" Street are on Alliance Road, "K" Street, "L" Street, and 11th Street." **This is a false statement. There is no through traffic volume on L Street.** (The sentence also needs a grammatical correction.)

Page 49 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Table T-3

K St & 11th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 9th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 8th St (one-way couplet)

This document was handed to the Transportation Safety Committee members at their meeting on February 21, 2023. What is here is modified from the original handout. Added is:

- Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element
Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound
- Paragraphs of text at the top of Page 5 added, about “fait accompli.”
- Other minor edits.

From the document:

“Other Considerations Gateway Draft 2-1-23 Posted”

This document is said to contain considerations from the public and from community members that are not in agreement with the Draft Gateway Plan.

Chapter 7: Mobility

L Street

Recommendation: Maintain current configuration; remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.

Source: TSC

Policy Implications / Staff Recommendation:

Direct conflict with plan as drafted. On PC list of concerns and alternatives will be presented with opportunity to discuss.

This is Fred Weis communicating to the Transportation Safety Committee:

I say that this statement, with regard to L Street, is not an accurate representation of what the TSC has very strongly voice.

Your recommendation is NOT: “Maintain current configuration”

Rather, it is: **Create an L Street Linear Park.**

Your recommendation is NOT: “remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.”

Your goal is not to remove the drawings that are in the plan. Your goal is to see one or more alternate plans for K Street. To replace what is in the Draft Plan with a working, viable street design for K Street.

From the Transportation Safety Committee meeting, January 17, 2023

The transcription is intended to be accurate, but may contain minor errors.

Fred Weis 55:52 on the audio track

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet -- I've been following you and what you're doing. It seems like you've been extremely clear on this. I don't know what is needed. As Patricia [Cambianica] mentioned, there's a second draft [of the Gateway Plan] that came out on [October] 1, but it only includes things that -- the word is "comport" -- with the original draft. So it doesn't include your findings about the L Street - K Street couplet. In this draft of the 2045 General Plan, I counted seven instances that referred to the L Street - K Street couplet. If it's helpful to any of you, I've got the page numbers. It can be in there, if it's worded in a different way. Worded as one of the considerations rather than stating it as a fact, as something that's done. This is a small item, but important: When you do your revisions and inserts, amendments is up to this, I would strongly request that you label, if you're going to have them as individuals, that use all three initials of your name, not just two initials, and then you do TSC, dash, ABC (the initials of your name). Because some of the Committees only use two initials, they don't identify the Committee. And it's difficult for the reader.

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet, if I can support you on that, please ask anything. You may know my website, Arcata1.com. There are about six articles about the L Street - K Street couplet. I have videos and transcriptions from meetings and quotes. As far as I know, you requested an alternative plan back in January [2022]. And then again, I think in May or June [2022]. No alternative has ever been offered. As Patricia mentioned, the depiction that exists does not provide adequate room for an emergency vehicle. Todd Tregenza of GHD gave a talk, a presentation during the [City Council / Planning Commission] joint study session. It was about 12 minutes long. His video and slides are on Arcata1.com along with my critique. I think that he's just flat out wrong in many many cases, including there being no room for emergency vehicles.

Otherwise, I just keep repeating what Jim and Patricia have said. That in an ideal world, this L Street - K Street couplet would be done [that is: A decision would be made] and complete before the General Plan, before any of this stuff was done. But that doesn't seem to be the case. The reason why it's important to me, aside from the thinking that it's an ideal location for a Linear Park, is that the codes for the Form-Based Code -- for the creation of building heights, building styles, building massing -- will be very different if L Street is a thoroughfare or if it's a

linear park, as linear park buildings will likely be two stories high next to it, so you get adequate sunlight. If it's a thoroughfare, they could be four or five or six stories, say four or five stories. So this is a very different situation. And I've been hammering on the Planning Commission and the City Council that this is a decision that needs to be made before other decisions. So now you're confronting it again with this General Plan update. So thanks again. And, again, my website is there, with maps. I made it to make things easier for everybody. If there's something that you can suggest that would make things easier for you, or for anything you think of, please contact me.

Wendy Ring 1:00:12 on the audio track

That's a question is sort of, I mean, along the same lines as -- **We took a position on the L Street couplet, and it doesn't seem to have made any difference.** So I am wondering, I mean, we could do a lot of work and try to rewrite this Circulation Element. Does it make any difference? How can someone educate me about the process? What happens to our input? How does the decision get made? I'm sorry, I don't know.

Dave Ryan 1:00:53 on the audio track

I'm going to surmise that, since all we can do is make recommendations to the City Council. And they're also getting input from a lot of other sources, whether it's the public or whether it's staff or whether it's their consultants, that, I guess they can take it or leave it based on their own personal positions and maybe weighing that other input in deciding what. So yeah, I hear you. I didn't know there was a second draft out, even though I'm kind of on the email list of when their meetings and things like that I have not seen the second draft of the gateway. Did you see that?

Wendy Ring 1:01:40 on the audio track

I guess I'm asking about this part of the General Plan that we're working on. And then my other question about it was if there hasn't been community input, because, you know, COVID changed a lot of things about that, if there hasn't really been kind of robust community input about the Transportation Element, is that something that our Committee could sponsor?

Dave Ryan 1:02:02 on the audio track

Some kind of a workshop? Yeah, maybe we can, we can recommend it to City Council that, you know, that this deserves something more than just us. **That maybe it's something that involves a representative or two from the TSC, along with creating an ad-hoc committee of public members, workshops, this thing.** So to me, if you're getting a sense, which I think is somewhat justifiable at this point, that they may just take what we say and "Ah, well, that's what they said" and we'll move on, then. Maybe we need something that suggests a separate committee. And that's a little bit what I was getting at when I kind of early on find out how much or you know -- this is important. It's not going to be done against supposedly, until 2045.

Twenty years ago, it seemed like it was heavy public involvement, and not just three minutes standing at a lecturn-involvement. It's like getting a chance to have big maps, and back and forth. And not following parliamentary procedures, et cetera. It's, you're doing the job. So I think that's a recommendation we could make to come out of this. I would certainly support that. That idea and concept.

From the minutes of the October 18, 2022 meeting:

Gateway Plan Update: Transportation and Circulation Element--L Street Couplet Discussion Staff Member David Caisse opened up the discussion asking the TSC Members if they wanted to further discuss the Gateway Project or if the TSC is satisfied with their original submitted recommendation. Dave Ryan commented that he attended the City Council meeting where the Council read the TSC recommendation on the Gateway Project. **He went on to say that he mentioned the time that the TSC has studied the project, the discussion that has taken place, and listening to public comment. He suggested to the Council that if they needed more information, they can view the YouTube videos of past TSC meetings.** Discussion followed with TSC Members agreeing to leave the TSC's recommendation to the Council as is.

From the minutes of the January 17, 2023 meeting:

A. For Discussion: 2045 Arcata General Plan Draft Circulation Element

Lots of discussion about the L street couplet with mention that the TSC Committee is not in favor of the L Street couplet.

Draft Circulation Element

Instances of the L Street – K Street Couplet

Request: REMOVE all instances of “L Street – K Street Couplet” from the Circulation Element

In theory, the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” could be in the Circulation Element – if it is worded as a design that’s under potential consideration, and if (hopefully) other designs under potential consideration are shown also.

To show this as a “fait accompli” is very poor.

(Fait accompli: a thing that has already happened or been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.)

Examples of the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” or references to it:

Page 21 in the packet Page 2-50 in the Draft Circulation Element

Additionally, implementation of the mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, including the “K” and “L” Streets couplets, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive to residents, workers, students, and visitors.

Page 22 Page 2-51 in the Draft Circulation Element

K Street & L Street One-Way Couplets Redesign “K” and “L” Streets to be one-way couplets south of 14th Street. Traffic Signal coordination at Samoa Boulevard....

Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element

Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound

(continued on next page)

Page 24 Page 2-53 in the Draft Circulation Element

As part of the Gateway Area Plan, the City is exploring mobility concepts and proposing circulation patterns to convert two-way streets into one-way couplets on K Street, L street, 8th Street and 9th Street (continuation west of I Street).

Changing K Street to a one-way couplet maintains a travel lane and parking but would then allow the street to be upgraded with a Class IV facility through implementation of the Gateway Area Plan.

Page 45 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes

The traffic model run also included the proposed circulation network improvements identified in the Gateway Area Plan, including conversion of "K" and "L" Streets to one-way couplets between Alliance and Samoa Boulevard.

Also: "Traffic Volumes" states: "The largest percent increases in daily traffic volumes is on Samoa Boulevard west of "K" Street are on Alliance Road, "K" Street, "L" Street, and 11th Street." **This is a false statement. There is no through traffic volume on L Street.** (The sentence also needs a grammatical correction.)

Page 49 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Table T-3

K St & 11th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 9th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 8th St (one-way couplet)

This document was handed to the Transportation Safety Committee members at their meeting on February 21, 2023. What is here is modified from the original handout. Added is:

- Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element
Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound
- Paragraphs of text at the top of Page 5 added, about “fait accompli.”
- Other minor edits.

From the document:

“Other Considerations Gateway Draft 2-1-23 Posted”

This document is said to contain considerations from the public and from community members that are not in agreement with the Draft Gateway Plan.

Chapter 7: Mobility

L Street

Recommendation: Maintain current configuration; remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.

Source: TSC

Policy Implications / Staff Recommendation:

Direct conflict with plan as drafted. On PC list of concerns and alternatives will be presented with opportunity to discuss.

This is Fred Weis communicating to the Transportation Safety Committee:

I say that this statement, with regard to L Street, is not an accurate representation of what the TSC has very strongly voice.

Your recommendation is NOT: “Maintain current configuration”

Rather, it is: **Create an L Street Linear Park.**

Your recommendation is NOT: “remove concept of L Street as an arterial couplet with K Street from figures.”

Your goal is not to remove the drawings that are in the plan. Your goal is to see one or more alternate plans for K Street. To replace what is in the Draft Plan with a working, viable street design for K Street.

From the Transportation Safety Committee meeting, January 17, 2023

The transcription is intended to be accurate, but may contain minor errors.

Fred Weis 55:52 on the audio track

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet -- I've been following you and what you're doing. It seems like you've been extremely clear on this. I don't know what is needed. As Patricia [Cambianica] mentioned, there's a second draft [of the Gateway Plan] that came out on [October] 1, but it only includes things that -- the word is "comport" -- with the original draft. So it doesn't include your findings about the L Street - K Street couplet. In this draft of the 2045 General Plan, I counted seven instances that referred to the L Street - K Street couplet. If it's helpful to any of you, I've got the page numbers. It can be in there, if it's worded in a different way. Worded as one of the considerations rather than stating it as a fact, as something that's done. This is a small item, but important: When you do your revisions and inserts, amendments is up to this, I would strongly request that you label, if you're going to have them as individuals, that use all three initials of your name, not just two initials, and then you do TSC, dash, ABC (the initials of your name). Because some of the Committees only use two initials, they don't identify the Committee. And it's difficult for the reader.

In terms of the L Street - K Street couplet, if I can support you on that, please ask anything. You may know my website, Arcata1.com. There are about six articles about the L Street - K Street couplet. I have videos and transcriptions from meetings and quotes. As far as I know, you requested an alternative plan back in January [2022]. And then again, I think in May or June [2022]. No alternative has ever been offered. As Patricia mentioned, the depiction that exists does not provide adequate room for an emergency vehicle. Todd Tregenza of GHD gave a talk, a presentation during the [City Council / Planning Commission] joint study session. It was about 12 minutes long. His video and slides are on Arcata1.com along with my critique. I think that he's just flat out wrong in many many cases, including there being no room for emergency vehicles.

Otherwise, I just keep repeating what Jim and Patricia have said. That in an ideal world, this L Street - K Street couplet would be done [that is: A decision would be made] and complete before the General Plan, before any of this stuff was done. But that doesn't seem to be the case. The reason why it's important to me, aside from the thinking that it's an ideal location for a Linear Park, is that the codes for the Form-Based Code -- for the creation of building heights, building styles, building massing -- will be very different if L Street is a thoroughfare or if it's a

linear park, as linear park buildings will likely be two stories high next to it, so you get adequate sunlight. If it's a thoroughfare, they could be four or five or six stories, say four or five stories. So this is a very different situation. And I've been hammering on the Planning Commission and the City Council that this is a decision that needs to be made before other decisions. So now you're confronting it again with this General Plan update. So thanks again. And, again, my website is there, with maps. I made it to make things easier for everybody. If there's something that you can suggest that would make things easier for you, or for anything you think of, please contact me.

Wendy Ring 1:00:12 on the audio track

That's a question is sort of, I mean, along the same lines as -- **We took a position on the L Street couplet, and it doesn't seem to have made any difference.** So I am wondering, I mean, we could do a lot of work and try to rewrite this Circulation Element. Does it make any difference? How can someone educate me about the process? What happens to our input? How does the decision get made? I'm sorry, I don't know.

Dave Ryan 1:00:53 on the audio track

I'm going to surmise that, since all we can do is make recommendations to the City Council. And they're also getting input from a lot of other sources, whether it's the public or whether it's staff or whether it's their consultants, that, I guess they can take it or leave it based on their own personal positions and maybe weighing that other input in deciding what. So yeah, I hear you. I didn't know there was a second draft out, even though I'm kind of on the email list of when their meetings and things like that I have not seen the second draft of the gateway. Did you see that?

Wendy Ring 1:01:40 on the audio track

I guess I'm asking about this part of the General Plan that we're working on. And then my other question about it was if there hasn't been community input, because, you know, COVID changed a lot of things about that, if there hasn't really been kind of robust community input about the Transportation Element, is that something that our Committee could sponsor?

Dave Ryan 1:02:02 on the audio track

Some kind of a workshop? Yeah, maybe we can, we can recommend it to City Council that, you know, that this deserves something more than just us. **That maybe it's something that involves a representative or two from the TSC, along with creating an ad-hoc committee of public members, workshops, this thing.** So to me, if you're getting a sense, which I think is somewhat justifiable at this point, that they may just take what we say and "Ah, well, that's what they said" and we'll move on, then. Maybe we need something that suggests a separate committee. And that's a little bit what I was getting at when I kind of early on find out how much or you know -- this is important. It's not going to be done against supposedly, until 2045.

Twenty years ago, it seemed like it was heavy public involvement, and not just three minutes standing at a lecturn-involvement. It's like getting a chance to have big maps, and back and forth. And not following parliamentary procedures, et cetera. It's, you're doing the job. So I think that's a recommendation we could make to come out of this. I would certainly support that. That idea and concept.

From the minutes of the October 18, 2022 meeting:

Gateway Plan Update: Transportation and Circulation Element--L Street Couplet Discussion Staff Member David Caisse opened up the discussion asking the TSC Members if they wanted to further discuss the Gateway Project or if the TSC is satisfied with their original submitted recommendation. Dave Ryan commented that he attended the City Council meeting where the Council read the TSC recommendation on the Gateway Project. **He went on to say that he mentioned the time that the TSC has studied the project, the discussion that has taken place, and listening to public comment. He suggested to the Council that if they needed more information, they can view the YouTube videos of past TSC meetings.** Discussion followed with TSC Members agreeing to leave the TSC's recommendation to the Council as is.

From the minutes of the January 17, 2023 meeting:

A. For Discussion: 2045 Arcata General Plan Draft Circulation Element

Lots of discussion about the L street couplet with mention that the TSC Committee is not in favor of the L Street couplet.

Draft Circulation Element

Instances of the L Street – K Street Couplet

Request: REMOVE all instances of “L Street – K Street Couplet” from the Circulation Element

In theory, the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” could be in the Circulation Element – if it is worded as a design that’s under potential consideration, and if (hopefully) other designs under potential consideration are shown also.

To show this as a “fait accompli” is very poor.

(Fait accompli: a thing that has already happened or been decided before those affected hear about it, leaving them with no option but to accept it.)

Examples of the phrase “L Street – K Street Couplet” or references to it:

Page 21 in the packet Page 2-50 in the Draft Circulation Element

Additionally, implementation of the mobility improvements within the Gateway Area Plan, including the “K” and “L” Streets couplets, and the 8th and 9th Street couplets extension, will alleviate traffic congestion within the Gateway and will ensure all transportation modes remain comfortable, convenient, safe, and attractive to residents, workers, students, and visitors.

Page 22 Page 2-51 in the Draft Circulation Element

K Street & L Street One-Way Couplets Redesign “K” and “L” Streets to be one-way couplets south of 14th Street. Traffic Signal coordination at Samoa Boulevard....

Page 23 Page 2-52 in the Draft Circulation Element

Figure T-k “General Plan Vehicular Circulation” shows L Street as the one-way southbound

(continued on next page)

Page 24 Page 2-53 in the Draft Circulation Element

As part of the Gateway Area Plan, the City is exploring mobility concepts and proposing circulation patterns to convert two-way streets into one-way couplets on K Street, L street, 8th Street and 9th Street (continuation west of I Street).

Changing K Street to a one-way couplet maintains a travel lane and parking but would then allow the street to be upgraded with a Class IV facility through implementation of the Gateway Area Plan.

Page 45 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes

The traffic model run also included the proposed circulation network improvements identified in the Gateway Area Plan, including conversion of "K" and "L" Streets to one-way couplets between Alliance and Samoa Boulevard.

Also: "Traffic Volumes" states: "The largest percent increases in daily traffic volumes is on Samoa Boulevard west of "K" Street are on Alliance Road, "K" Street, "L" Street, and 11th Street." **This is a false statement. There is no through traffic volume on L Street.** (The sentence also needs a grammatical correction.)

Page 49 Appendix T-A in the Draft Circulation Element Table T-3

K St & 11th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 9th St (one-way couplet)
K St & 8th St (one-way couplet)

Delo Freitas

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 9:24 AM
To: Julie Vaissade-Elcock; Scott Davies; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Peter Lehman; Matthew Simmons; David Loya; Christian Figueroa; Delo Freitas; Jennifer Dart
Subject: February 11 Form-Based Code study session recording is on-line

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Planning Commission Chair Vaissade-Elcock, Vice-Chair Davies, Commissioners Mayer, Tangney, Figueroa, Lehman, Simmons
Community Development Department Director Loya, CDD staff Dart, Freitas

From: Fred Weis
Re: **February 11 Form-Based Code study session recording is on-line**

- The Planning Commission [study session of February 11](#) is on [Arcata1.com here](#). **This was the first in-person meeting with our Form-Based Code consultant, Ben Noble.** Because the Councilmembers were requested to not be present, and for members of the public who were not able to be there for four hours on a Saturday morning -- also so that you could see it and review it -- a couple of members of the community and I hired the videographer Eric Black to record video of the event, and I recorded audio. The video is a bit crude (Eric supplied just the raw footage), but very useful. All the slides and course materials from the workshop are included in the articles.
- There will be two more Planning Commission 4-hour study sessions with Ben Noble. These meetings are scheduled for March 18 and April 22.
I would like to provide recordings of these meetings as well.
- The cost of hiring Eric Black was \$175. I've requested reimbursement for this expense and allocation of \$350 for the two future meetings. I feel it's an important part of public engagement. Asking people with jobs and families to sit for four hours on a Saturday morning, and not providing a recorded alternative, is not right, in my view.
- The Form-Based Code presentation page on [Arcata1.com is here](#). Other Form-Based Code material can be found [here](#).
David Loya's Building and Massing presentation videos from August 12, 2022 with commentary are there, and Ben Noble's June 29 and August 12 workshops are there. The June 29 article has a full transcription of the talk and a complete table of contents, so you can read or skim it.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or suggestions, or if there are any maps, recordings, transcriptions, or other data that would be useful to you.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis

Please include this with the letters.

Delo Freitas

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2023 8:57 AM
To: Sarah Schaefer; Meredith Matthews; Alex Stillman; Stacy Atkins-Salazar; Karen Diemer; Kimberley White; David Loya; Jennifer Dart; Delo Freitas; Julie Vaissade-Elcock
Subject: Council meeting with Committee Chairs is on-line / Request for Form-Based Code recording reimbursement

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please include this with the letters.

To: Honorable Mayor Schaefer, Councilmembers Matthews, Stillman, Atkins-Salazar, and White
Planning Commission Chair Vaissade-Elcock
City Manager Diemer, Community Development Department Director Loya, CDD staff Dart, Freitas

From: Fred Weis
Re: **Council meeting with Committee Chairs is on-line**
Request for Form-Based Code stud session recording reimbursement

Honorable Mayor et al:

- Audio recordings of the Council meeting with Committee Chairs from last night (Feb 21) are on-line on Arcata1.com.
They can be seen under "[What's New](#)" or via the newest articles on the Council's portal page at arcata1.com/council.
- **Councilmember Kimberley White had requested this**, as she was unable to attend the meeting because of illness.
Please forward this information to the Chairs and other participants.
I would like to include photos of the notes that Karen Diemer and Emily Sinkhorn were taking. Please let me know how I could obtain photos. (Easiest would be for someone to take the photos and send them to me, or I could stop by and take photos.)
The article on the Coastal Commission approval of the wastewater treatment facilities that Gregory Daggett had mentioned is there also.
- As a point of curiosity, we can note (without substantial significance, we hope):
The current **Arcata City Council is composed entirely of female**-gender-oriented persons.
Chairs of the nine Committees are entirely male-gender-oriented persons.
(The Chair of the Planning Commission is Julie Vaissade-Elcock.)
- The Planning Commission [study session of February 11](#) is on Arcata1.com also. **This was the first in-person meeting with our Form-Based Code consultant, Ben Noble**. Because the Councilmembers were requested to not be present, and for members of the public who were not able to be there for four hours on a Saturday morning, a couple of members of the community and I hired the videographer Eric Black to record video of the event, and I recorded audio. The video is a bit crude (Eric supplied just the raw footage), but very useful. All the slides and course materials from the workshop are included in the articles.

- There will be two more Planning Commission 4-hour study sessions with Ben Noble. These meetings are scheduled for March 18 and April 22.
- **The cost of hiring Eric was \$175.** There was a bit of software required for the video transfer, \$19. **Total \$194.** The two future recordings of the study sessions would have direct costs \$175 each. My time in putting together the material was about ten hours -- no direct cost on that, of course.
- **We request that a reimbursement for this \$194 expense and and allocation of \$350 for the two future study session events.** If there are going to be other in-person meetings with Ben Noble, I'd like to see them recorded also, either by me or by the City.
- **I consider the decision to not create even audio recordings of this Planning Commission study session to be evidence of poor management.** Part of the \$118,000 that the Council allocated for Form-Based Code development is intended for public outreach and engagement. The public workshops and accompanying public surveys have not been adequately promoted. (The e-mail announcements of the public workshops and the Mad River Union press releases **have not mentioned the surveys.**) I am aware that the Community Development staff is overworked, but these are decisions, not time-consuming activities.
- I would be glad to discuss what I regard as lack of real community engagement separately. Despite all the very many meetings and outreach, clearly something is wrong. The outreach has not produced results -- and for simple reasons, I think.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or suggestions.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis

Delo Freitas

From: Fred [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2023 4:09 PM
To: Julie Vaissade-Elcock; Scott Davies; Judith Mayer; Dan Tangney; Christian Figueroa; Peter Lehman; Matthew Simmons; David Loya; Jennifer Dart; Delo Freitas
Subject: from Fred Weis: Possible information to be added to the minutes for the February 14 Planning Commission meeting.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Planning Commission Chair Vaissade-Elcock, Vice-Chair Davies, Commissioners Mayer, Tangney, Figueroa, Lehman, Simmons.
Community Development Department Director Loya, CDD staff Dart, Freitas

From: Fred Weis
Date: Thursday, February 23, 2023
Re: **Possible information to be added to the minutes for the February 14 Planning Commission meeting.**

- **What is below is what could be added to the minutes.** This took me about 8 minutes to assemble. It would be less time next time, if I utilize the same format. I use an online transcription service to transcribe the meetings, and this supplies the times on the video where the speakers talk, the names of the speakers (if known), where the agenda items start, etc.
- If it would be helpful to the Commission, I can supply this information on a regular basis. Normally I could have it within a few days after a meeting.
(If I do not have the name of the speaker, I can just say "unknown speaker.")
- We will note that **there is no attempt to provide a summary** of what the members of the public said.
I understand that providing a summary of what a speaker said can be problematic.
- Listing the times when the public did speak **may be an "in-between" compromise** that accomplishes the aim of having public comment be accessible via the video. Without knowledge of the time, searching through a video for one speaker is cumbersome.
- From my point of view, **to only have action minutes -- while acceptable by law -- is very unsatisfactory from the public's perspective.** In terms of ranking, from less desirable to more desirable, we have:
 1. Action minutes only. "Public comment was taken."
 2. Action minutes with the number of speakers. "Public comment was taken. There were 4 speakers."
 3. Action minutes with the names. " Public comment was taken. There were 5 speakers: Jim Becker, Patricia Cambianica, Fred Weis, Gregory Daggett, one online speaker - name unknown."
 4. Action minutes with names and time on the video, as shown below.

- **If this is outside of what the Commission and Staff want to do, I understand.** I had mentioned at the February 14th meeting that I could do this. What is below is an example.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis

[From the February

=====

Planning Commission meeting: **February 14, 2023**

Public Comment speakers

Times may not be exact. The times are based on the video for that date that can be accessed through the City of Arcata "Meeting Calendar" page.

<https://arcataca.iqm2.com/Citizens/calendar.aspx>

CITY OF ARCATA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Council Chamber

February 14, 2023 Tuesday, 6:00 p.m

AGENDA

II. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS 6:01

Members of the public who provided comment: 4

Jim Becker 6:39

Gregory Daggett 8:07

Patricia Cambianica 11:16. Ceded time to Fred Weis

Fred Weis 11:29

No on-line comment.

VI. BUSINESS ITEMS. 19:26

[This was moved to be taken up prior to discussion of the General Plan Land Use and Growth Management Element Updates]

1. Consider Planning Commission Minutes Format and Level of Detail

Members of the public who provided comment: 4

Jim Becker 45:08

Patricia Cambianica 46:39

Fred Weis 48:30

Gregory Daggett 51:16

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS. 57:50

A. Discuss the General Plan Update with Emphasis on the Land Use and Growth Management Element Updates
Members of the public who provided comment: 3

Fred Weis 2:01:31

Gregory Daggett 2:03:34

Lisa Brown (online) 2:07:18

=====

Delo Freitas

From: Patrick Carr <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2023 10:35 AM
To: Delo Freitas; David Loya; COM DEV
Subject: Gateway workshop input

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I'm unable to attend this evening's workshop but if you could accept this input and convey it to the City Council and Planning Commission members I'd appreciate it.

I support the Gateway proposed project and do so because I strongly support having high density development in Arcata that allows for alternate transportation (by bike, transit, and foot) and enables individuals and families to live affordably in this city. I think this is more important than having extensive total areas devoted to parking, and vastly greater than developing extensive swaths of nearby land for single family homes few will ever be able to afford.

Thank you,
Patrick Carr, Arcata resident since 1995

Delo Freitas

From: Joan Edwards [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2023 5:38 PM
To: COM DEV
Cc: Delo Freitas
Subject: Gateway project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello! I am a resident of Arcata and live in the Westwood area. My greatest concerns about this project are:

- 1) Parking
- 2) Housing
- 3) Building heights

1) Parking. I agree that we need to distance ourselves from cars but even those who bike to work every day, usually own a car to go visit grandma, or go shopping for larger items, or out of town. They will need a place to park that car. It might be feasible to have a car for several families to be shared but even that can create problems given maintenance and insurance. Cars are part of the reality in this area where the public transportation options are still limited. And the need to be parked when not in use. And they are a source of housing for those without other options. Anyone biking to work these past few days?

2). Housing. There is a lot of talk about this plan creating housing but without incentives for folks to adopt section 8 options for the development or other ways to provide housing to the low income residents, this housing boon will be a boon to the developers pocketbooks and not to the housing market for the less wealthy. I live near 2575 Alliance, a large low income apartment complex, that houses MANY people and while it is not perfect, it is pretty darn great! It is well run, clean, well maintained, with open parks and playgrounds, adequate parking and reasonable rents for those residents. It should be a model for future growth of housing for low income citizens.

3) Building Heights. It seems counterintuitive that the planners would disregard the recommendations by the Fire Department to limit the building heights given the potential for disaster. It strikes me that the height should be predominantly 3 story with a possible setback 4th floor that had easy access from the 3rd floor and a space up there for gardens and community use (ie: barbecues, gatherings). That is if the access to the top floor was easily constructed to allow for safe access by emergency personnel.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Joan Edwards