Issue	True /False	Response
Wetlands		
Significant departure from Wetlands conservation policies of the McKinleyville Community Plan.		**The Town Center Ordinance is not a departure from the Wetlands conservation policies of the Community Plan.** The community plan does not prohibit the relocation of wetlands. Even now without the Town Center Ordinance the wetlands behind the McKinleyville shopping center can be relocated. The Town Center Ordinance proposed wetland mitigation to require higher value wetlands be established in an area for this purpose that will also be available to the public. The Mckinleyville community plan polices state: *14. On existing parcels, **development within Wetland Areas shall be permitted** where the least environmentally damaging alternative of development techniques is employed and where mitigation measures have been provided to fully offset any adverse effects. Mitigation measures for development within Wetland Areas shall, at a minimum, include those prescribed by the administration of the Open Space & Grading ordinance* *15. No land use or development shall be permitted in Wetland Areas which degrade the wetland or detract from the natural resource value on newly created parcels.* There are 6 parcels that could be affected by these policies. • 4 of them are unchanged since adoption of Community Plan • Southern LPH parcel has been slightly reconfigured. Existing parcels clearly allow Development within Wetland Areas – least environmentally damaging alternative: • Definition of Development in Community plan comes from California Government Code Section 65927 – Broad definition. • Acceptable practice to relocate wetlands where the wetlands can be relocated, and result is improved wetland environment.

Issue	True /False	Response
		The LPH parcel is in substantially the same configuration, but technically it has been modified since adoption of the community plan. Life Plan is proposing to relocate and enhance wetlands on site.
MCP affirms that McKinleyville will maintain its rural character within Urban Areas by protecting streams, riparian corridors, greenbelts, wetlands, open spaces and parks. (2602(1)).		The Town Center Ordinance is consistent with this policy. • At least 14 acres is set aside for wetland preservation/recreation/ enhancement • 2Xs the size of Pierson Park (Library, Azalea Hall, Sheriff's station) • There are no riparian corridors or greenbelts which extend out of any parcel in the town center to adjoining parcels. • A drainage ditch is proposed to become a riparian wetland • The area where wetland preservation and mitigation is proposed will become a natural public open space with trails and public access
Allowing fill of Single Parameter Wetlands		When this process started it was not clear how many single parameter wetlands existed in the area. There was thought that single parameter wetlands dominated the site. Studies show this is not true. The Town Center Ordinance does propose to use the 3 parameter standard. This is consistent with: • County General Plan • US Army Corps of Engineers The only agency with wetland jurisdiction that uses the 1 parameter standard is the Coastal Commission. The Town Center is not in the Coastal Zone. Wetland studies show there is limited area of single parameter wetlands. • .64 acres (27,878.4 sf) of single parameter wetlands • Policy discussion whether to not amend Community Plan on this point. • An option is to not ament the Community Plan

Issue	True /False	Response
Allowing fill of up to 5.4 acres of Wetlands		The context of the comments is that the wetlands are being lost. This is not true. Consistent with the policy direction above the Town Center Ordinance includes provisions that all wetlands proposed to be filled would need to be replaced on at least a 1.5:1 basis. • Net result is higher value wetlands that the public can enjoy. Western end of the property chosen because that is where the higher value wetlands are located and where the best opportunity for recreation exists. • The public and MMAC had a guided field trip with Biologist and CDFW Scientist to go out and evaluate wetlands and proposal.
Open Space		
Parcel behind Safeway should be a civic park		It is not legal to take all property rights away from a property without compensating the owner for lost value. In this case This property has land use and zoning. • R-3-Q-D-N-WR;C-2-N-W • As part of the 2011 Housing element the western portion of this property was guaranteed 115 units. • The C-2 zone allows development without a discretionary permit. It would become discretionary if impacting wetlands Converting this to a civic park would require purchasing of the property from the property owner. This whole process is about finding balance between achieving the stated community goals and not making it impossible to develop what the community would like to see.
No Spaces for People to Gather		This is not true. 1. Pierson Park is an existing component of the Town Center – including the Community Center, Library, Azalea Hall, and the park itself. 2. Ordinance creates 14 acres of passive open space

Issue	True /False	Response
		3. The circulation is designed around pedestrian and bicycle circulation. These allow human scale encounters, and are likely to become the central backbones of development further expanding the opportunity for people to meet. 4. Town Center ordinance also requires "open space areas where the public can gather, vendors can display goods and provide opportunities for other public enjoyment. A minimum of three percent of the developable but undeveloped area of the Town Center shall be devoted to this open space. A minimum of 20,000 square feet of this shall be provided in a common open space area. This shall be outside of other required components of the site design and may be centralized at one location. Provisions shall be made to demonstrate how this provision will be addressed either at the time of subdivision or when the first new development is proposed.
Transportation		
Concern with phasing with street improvements		Hiller, Mckinleyville Ave, and Railroad build out will be conditioned as part of the subdivision or as development occurs. Life Plan Humboldt will be making frontage improvements. Central will need to be accomplished through grant funding
Opposition to lane reduction on Central Avenue		It is important to understand why the discussion about Central. The Community Plan sees Central Avenue as a significant divide in the Town Center and an impediment for pedestrians and bicyclists. The objective is to narrow the width of the street section pedestrians would need to cross and slow traffic. There is documentation from many communities that doing this increases business and provides for a better environment along the street. This is about creating a place that people want to be. There are many complications, so the current idea that has been discussed is to have 3 lanes (north, south, and center turn.) Other options exist 1. Mckinleyville Multi-modal Connections project 2. No Project (Does not achieve Community Plan Policies)

Issue	True /False	Response
Density		
EIR Quantified 25 Units Per Acre.		The EIR needed to evaluate the maximum impact, so a conservative number was chosen, that would represent a number unlikely to be exceeded. • Current C-2 zoning allows more development than the Town Center Proposes • 75'height limit (first floor commercial, then up to 5 stories of residential.) • Normal Medium Density Residential allows up to 30 units per acre, the analysis stepped back from that. • Context is 4 story buildings, with commercial on the ground floor and residential above that. On site parking is also not required which creates more space for development. Purpose of EIR is to disclose and then mitigate. Need to target development potential that is high enough to reflect potential development.
36% populations increase in Mckinleyville		If growth occurs, Mckinleyville will expand. The question becomes where should the growth occur. This has the potential to provide housing types not currently available. (Condominiums which are owner occupied, more affordable housing that includes amenities, workforce housing.)
Design Review		
MMAC as Design Review Committee		The MMAC is the appropriate body to facilitate development of the Town Center Ordinance and serve as the design review committee. It is the role of the MMAC to gather information from the Community and provide recommendations. That is what has been done with the Town Center. The MCP does not identify how the Design Review Committee will be formed. From the MMAC Rules: *The McKinleyville Municipal Advisory Committee (MMAC) is tasked with gathering input from the community and providing advice on matters which relate to services which are*

Issue	True /False	Response
		or may be provided to the McKinleyville Community Planning Area by the County or other local governmental agencies. The advice to be provided by the MMAC includes but is not limited to advice on matters of public health, safety, welfare, public works, public financing and proposed annexation that may affect the local area covered by the MMAC A second responsibility of the MMAC is to review, comment, and provide advisory recommendations to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on proposed zoning amendments, and General Plan petitions and amendments located within the McKinleyville Planning Area. MMAC is to evaluate the proposed amendments and petitions for conformance with the McKinleyville Community Plan. It should also be noted that the MMAC did not exist at the time of the 2002 McKinleyville Community Plan.
Design Review Eliminated -- Why		Design Review Committee has not been eliminated. The MCP says: *Design review standards shall be adopted for the Town Center area as identified on the Plan's land use maps. A Design Review Committee shall be formed to develop those standards within the Town Center area. No Special Permit shall be required as part of the process.* The MMAC has served as the Design Review Committee for
MCP Town Center		
Intent of Town Center not evaluated in DEIR.		The EIR identifies project objectives. Those objectives were taken directly from the policies of the McKinleyville community plan. The analysis within the EIR uses the applicable General Plan or Community Plan policies to determine the significance of impacts.