

FINAL REPORT

Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Visioning Forum April 28, 2004

Conducted By ISADR: The Institute for Study of Alternative Dispute Resolution

Report Completed By ISADR Staff:
Elizabeth Watson, Ph.D., Co-Director
Karen Nelson, Assistant Director
Neil Peacock
Marco Rotting

To:
The Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory
Committee

From:
The Institute for Study of Alternative Dispute Resolution

June 2004

PROCESS DESIGN FOR:

Commercial/Industrial Water Front Visioning Process

Goals

This process will serve to accomplish several goals identified by members of the Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory Committee.

- 1.) To establish educational outreach in order to inform the public as to the history and purpose of the Harbor Revitalization Plan, including the geographic area of the Revitalization Plan, the recommendations of past technical studies, and the conservation measures currently in place.
- 2.) To initiate a community dialog and visioning process that will engage the public in attempting to identify and prioritize acceptable industrial/commercial uses for this portion of Humboldt Bay.
- 3.) To explore the possibility of environmentally innovative and economically viable uses or projects, which are compatible with revitalization and conservation priorities.

Methods

The Institute for Study of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ISADR) worked with the Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory Committee (HBHRAC) to design this community visioning and collaborative dialog process. Given the public response to Calpine's proposed LNG project, the question becomes "What do we want in our harbor?" This question was asked in the forum for a specific part of Humboldt Harbor, the mid region zoned "industrial and commercial."

This focused question about approximately one-third of the harbor had obvious advantages from the perspective of those charged with its planning. However, the "focus" on only part of one part of a larger body of water presents a "red flag" to a considerable segment of the community. Both perspectives are valid:

- a) need to focus on planning for an area of the bay that is zoned industrial/commercial;
- b) the insistence of looking at the bay as a whole, as a biologically sensitive body of water.

The design of the public forum was made with the intent of honoring both perspectives. This was not difficult as they are not mutually exclusive perspectives. The following were included in the forum format:

1. As preparation for this process, ISADR and Harbor staff initiated outreach with potential stakeholders and Bay related interest groups with an invitation to participate in this forum.

2. David Hull, from the HBHRAC, provided an informational presentation to the participants regarding the History and purpose of the Revitalization Plan, the geographic scope of the Revitalization Plan, and the existing Project Approval Criteria. This presentation included technical reports, economic analysis, land use maps, and other educational material used to explain topics such as the various environmental quality requirements presently in operation.

3. The forum provided a means of input from participants that allowed a focus on one part of the bay while allowing for recognition of the interdependence of all parts of the Bay. Three forms of recording input were used. From the conversations held at each table, ideas and concerns were recorded on large flipcharts. These sheets of paper were taped to the wall near the end of the meeting so that participants could use their three dots to indicate the priority of the ideas recorded. The bright yellow sheets of paper on each table were to record concerns that fell outside the focus area. These yellow sheets of paper provided input into areas outside the area in discussion such as the whole bay or the portions not zoned "industrial/commercial". Many participants noted that the scope of the plan was too narrow and did not involve the community's input. Overall this information should help assist the "Revitalization Plan" and the "Humboldt Bay Management Plan". The white pads of paper were to encourage the input of reasons in more detail behind positions taken.

Over one hundred and forty participants attended this visioning meeting in which they were asked to comment on the "industrial/commercially zoned" area. Although this is true, as noted, many participants commented on other areas and this information is included in the report.

4. Given the existence of a great diversity of thinking and emotion surrounding the future of the Bay, ground rules were developed, posted and honored by participants.

GROUND RULES

WE:

will turn off cell phones

will share a commitment to listen carefully and to speak respectfully.

will recognize the legitimacy of other's views.

will respect the rights of others to full, uninterrupted expression of opinion.

will give the same priority to solving concerns of others as we would like them to give to our concerns

will respect the purpose of this meeting by providing input that is relevant

will post "off topic" input that IS relevant to planning for the Harbor on yellow paper found at each table

Conclusion

First and foremost it should be noted that ISADR collected "raw soft data" from participants. Soft data is data that was not based in research or methodological views. The data was collected with the intention of questioning the public about what they would like to see in their bay. The idea for the visioning began in our minds, not with a research basis and from this only so many generalizations and insights can be extrapolated from the data. In research terms, the data collected from the visioning is not "clean", but in the same terminology; it is not "dirty". The data is not viewed as clean because we only created and designed the visioning process and the forum to conduct this process, not the results or the information shared. Participants were allowed to "vote" at the end of the visioning to express their views and ideas about what development and industries should be in the bay. As noted, we allowed each participant to vote with three dots during the visioning process. These dots were then tallied and organized into themes. These results are reported in this document.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	Page 5
Introduction	Page 6
Purpose of this Report	Page 6
Visioning Process	Page 6
Report Methods	Pages 6-7
Sections: 1-6	Pages 7-22
1. Easel Pad Individual Group Analyses with Themes	Pages 7-12
2. Easel Pad Group Comparison Analysis with Themes	Pages 12-13
3. Dot Analysis and Specific Ideas Analysis	Pages 13-16
4. White Note Pad Analysis	Pages 16-18
5. Yellow Sheet Summary Analysis	Pages 18-21
6. Conclusion	Pages 21-23
Appendices: 1-7	Pages 24-52
1. Visioning forum agenda	Page 24
2. Easel pad suggestions, comments or ideas	Pages 25-36
3. White note pad ideas	Pages 37-39
4. Yellow Paper ideas	Pages 40-42
5. Dot ideas per Group	Pages 43-45
6. Specific Ideas per Group	Pages 46-48
7. Contact List	Pages 49-53

Introduction:

The Harbor Commission was contacted by ISADR to hold a public participation meeting in which the community would provide input into the process thus far and to provide their ideas, suggestions and concerns regarding the Harbor Commission Plan and their future actions. The basic question for the public was: What do you want for our harbor in the industrial/commercial zoned area? This report is a direct result of the contract between the Harbor Commission and ISADR, in which we were to hold the visioning forum and to provide a report with a summary of the process and the generated ideas that developed from the visioning process.

Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is two-fold, to provide the commission and its committee with a report containing participant's ideas, suggestions and concerns, as well as an analysis of the data collected. This report has a variety of sections that cover specific angles of the visioning process and will provide the harbor body feedback into this process and future processes with the community.

The Visioning Process:

The visioning process was conducted to provide insight and information from the participant's viewpoints and worldviews. The visioning process was intended for participants to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments for the Harbor Commission's Report and plans. It was designed in a way that was conducive to discussion of opinions and positions held by individuals.

ISADR conducted this activity by dividing the participants into nine groups with a facilitator and a recorder in each group. Participants had one hour to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments which were recorded on easel pads of paper. This allows all participants to visually read and see the ideas and to intellectually and socially discuss, educate and explore the topics and issues. After this process was complete we asked all participants to walk around the meeting room and view all of the ideas, suggestions and comments from all nine groups. This gave participants a chance to see the results of the conversations at other tables. It provided a non-hostile setting to openly discuss and brainstorm ideas, suggestions and concerns. Overall ISADR thinks the process went very smoothly and produced many meaningful results.

Methods Used to Create the Report:

All of the data collected from the visioning exercise was used to create this report. This includes, the easel pad ideas, the dot ideas and

specific ideas noted by participants, yellow sheets of paper used for off topic ideas, white legal pad ideas and a contact list of information. After this process was transcribed, ISADR staff used standard data analysis methods and operations to interpret the data. The specifics of the data collection processes are noted in each section of this report. Overall ISADR made every effort to be as unbiased and objective as possible in producing this report. It is the hope of ISADR staff that this report will be used and found helpful in making further decisions regarding Harbor development and collaboration with the community.

Sections: 1-7

Section: 1

Easel Pad Individual Group Analysis with Themes

The visioning process was intended for participants to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments for the Harbor Commission's Report and plans. ISADR conducted this activity by dividing the participants into nine groups with a facilitator and a recorder in each group. Participants had one hour to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments which were recorded on easel pads of paper. This allows all participants to visually read and see the ideas on paper and to intellectually and socially discuss, educate and explore the topics and issues.

Although a data analysis was conducted on the information from the visioning process, we have included the raw data from the easel pads individually, and collectively compare the groups. During the brainstorming portion of the exercise groups were isolated from each other at individual tables and each group had its own form of cognitive/critical/thought process, direction and understanding. It would be invalid and unreliable to report the comparisons without the raw data from each individual group. Thus ISADR has drawn from these raw data five themes for all groups and will use these five themes to discuss each group individually and to analyze the similarities and differences between all groups. Overall we feel this information will provide more opportunities for the committee to review the participant's input and to have a firm grounding in their thought process and rationales.

Again ISADR staff made no changes, comments or interpretations of the information with the exception of categorizing the comments by five themes to compare and contrast the groups. For your convenience the original raw data has been included as well as the group raw data with themes.

In analyzing the information ISADR determined five main themes that ran throughout all of the groups: economic development, environmental concerns, collaborative development and decision making process (es), infrastructure and zoning/scaling. These five main themes also have many sub themes and topics that run through them. It will be productive for the committee to consider these five themes and the sub themes within them to get a complete understanding of the participants visioning exercise ideas, suggestions and comments. The data analysis follows.

Common Themes for the Nine Individual Groups

Group 1

Economic development was noted four times with a variety of sub themes such as residential development, fishery industry interests, tourism and recreation, public access and a museum/bus/train station/research/rail system center or complex.

Environmental concerns were noted three times with a range of sub themes such as: concerns for wetlands, erosion and the effects of dredging, safety, eelgrass, conservation and sustainability. Some other sub themes included concerns with economic development, pollution and aquaculture industries. Aesthetics was also another important sub theme.

The process was noted three times with two sub themes; participants want to be involved in the process and want to be able to develop ideas and projects.

Infrastructure was noted once and the main sub theme was local funding and infrastructure for local businesses and industries.

Zoning/scaling was noted once, in which one core sub theme emerged; rezoning parcel four.

Group 2

Economic development was noted seven times with numerous sub themes. Local industry was noted as being very important as well as marine culture and/or industry. Some additional sub themes included: funding, marketing, real estate concerns, recreation, cruise ship industry, a holistic approach with environmental concerns, Balloon track development, educational uses and having development with multiple uses.

Environmental concerns received two notations in which participants' wanted/needed clean water and were opposed to dredging the channel.

The process was noted four times and mainly participants wanted to be involved in the process and to be involved in the regulation and restriction decision making processes.

Infrastructure was noted two times and three focal sub themes emerged, such as: transportation development, community/public involvement and supporting the HD Report with their existing infrastructure.

Zoning/scaling was also noted with two marks in which three key sub themes materialized such as examining parcels, rescaling industries and the best use of the space available.

Group 3

Economic development was noted six times with six key sub themes. Tourism and local development were noted as very important by group three. Some other main sub themes included energy development, a pulp industry, a science center and noting the difference between growth and development.

Environmental concerns were noted five times with six main sub themes including: developmental impacts, pollution, standards and marketing, aesthetics, energy and recycling and sustainable bay practices.

The process was noted seven times with three core sub themes. The first sub theme involved more community participation and the other two themes were revising the outdated plan and creating a new plan for the bay.

Infrastructure was noted two times and the two key sub themes were funding and transportation.

Finally, zoning/scaling was noted three times with a main sub theme of using available land efficiently and properly.

Group 4

Economic development was noted seven times with seven main sub themes. Two main sub themes included local development and energy development, and were noted as very important. Recreation, access and tourism were also delineated as important sub themes. Other sub themes included marketing, multiple use and big industry competition.

Environmental concerns were noted three times and involved the following sub themes: overall concern, pollution, dredging, erosion, ecosystems, wildlife, environmental character and the concern of industry. This group mainly focused on affects and side effects on the environment and the bay as a whole ecosystem.

Infrastructure was noted one time with concerns with the impacts of industry and the opposition of supplying public funds for new infrastructure.

The process was noted two times by this group with two key sub themes such as: involvement in the policies, priorities, regulations and parameters of development and having solutions at a variety of levels such as immediate, intermediate and ultimate solutions.

Zoning/scaling was noted six times and involved two core sub themes. One sub theme involved not rezoning, rescaling or resizing the industrial areas. Participants do not want more development. The other main sub theme involved policies and priorities for zoning and scaling and public involvement in these processes.

Group 5

Economic development was noted seven times with eight main sub themes. Three main sub themes included local development, local jobs and economy and sustainable development. Other sub themes included marketing, recreation, break bulk industry, tourism and developing docks.

Environmental concerns were noted twice with the following sub themes: pollution, sustainability, large industry concerns and overall environmental concerns

Infrastructure was noted once with one sub theme of no new infrastructure.

The process was noted five times with similar sub themes of objectives, power and authority, regulations, community involvement, a policy constitution and a claimed ship biased/privilege to the process.

Zoning/scaling was noted five times with no specific sub themes.

Group 6

Economic development was noted eleven times by group six. Four main sub themes were noted such as: local development, energy needs assessment, linking the water industry with development and utilizing recycled paper industry as an option. Other sub themes included energy development, tourism, access and recreation and small industry research. Overall group six felt very strong about economic development.

Environmental concerns were noted four times with three key sub themes including preservation, sustainability and pollution concerns.

Infrastructure was noted two times with a sub theme of no new infrastructure.

The process was also noted once in which local tribes should be consulted and considered.

Zoning/scaling was noted seven times in which there were three main sub themes such as small scaling with community character kept intact and one comment of wanting larger scaling.

Group 7

Economic development was noted three times with many sub themes such as: manufacturing, maritime industry, international marketing and local industry. Some sub themes were quite specific such as diversifying the development, keeping the development local and using

other cities as examples for us to model. Others included science and educational based development as well as recreation, tourism and environmentally sound industries.

Environmental concerns were noted four times with many sub themes such as: sustainability, value based ideals, community concerns, ecosystem protection, shipping industry concerns, pollution and no natural resource extraction. Overall environmental concerns are an issue and must be considered.

Infrastructure was noted five times with three key sub themes such as: using existing assets, matching economic development to existing resources and assisting in the permitting process.

The process was noted eleven times, again, one of the highest tallies for all groups, with four main sub themes such as: community character and public involvement in the process of development and decisions, and value based processes to support our local community.

Finally, zoning/scaling was noted six times with three key sub themes such as community character, appropriate scaling and flexibility in scaling and zoning.

Group 8

Economic development was very important to group eight with it being noted seventeen times, the highest tally thus far. Four main sub themes emerged from this data such as: local development, maritime and fishing industry development, using non-local exports and having a research educational facility be the main focus of development. Some other main themes were: development compatible with zoning, finding a unique niche for Humboldt County, marketing, light industry, mixed use or multiple uses of development, tourism and recreation, energy and value added development.

Environmental concerns were noted four times with five key sub themes. These themes included safety, sustainability, aesthetics, protecting ecosystems and no more concerns like LNG Calpine.

Infrastructure was noted three times with two main sub themes, transportation and developing the rail system.

The process was noted two times with one main sub theme, the concern of deep water dredging and if this is a major consideration of the processes in motion as of now.

Lastly, zoning/scaling was noted one time with no sub themes or commentary.

Group 9

Economic development was noted six times with many sub themes. Some main sub themes included local development, value added industries, maritime and aquaculture development and a research center

with an educational component involving HSU and CR. Other sub themes included: sustainable development, resource based exports, gravel industry, recycling old docks, boat building, cruise ship industries, tourism, marketing, small industry, the international market, seasonal industries and dredging the bay with a certain tonnage to keep the channel open including large industry.

Environmental concerns were noted once and included sub themes such as clean industry, sustainability and protecting ecosystems.

Infrastructure was noted two times, in which three main sub themes emerged. One main sub theme was the permitting process, in which the process needs to be streamlined, reorganized, reviewed with time and money constraints and that the Harbor Commission should assist in this process. Transportation and energy infrastructure were also noted as being very important.

The process was noted once in which group nine felt the plan was “hasty” and ill planned without community input.

Finally zoning/scaling was noted without any sub themes or comments.

In conclusion, all nine groups provided a variety of input within the five main themes extrapolated from ISADR’s analysis. The committee will have a variety of options to review and consider from this process.

Section: 2

Easel Pad Group Comparison Analysis with Themes

Upon reviewing the theme analysis from all nine tables, there appears to be no need to compare groups. We think it would be valuable for the committee to brainstorm off of these five themes from the groups and to conduct their own analysis/discussion of the five themes and sub themes to note where the committee agrees and disagrees with the participant’s views and ideas.

Thus no further analysis has been conducted for this process. The five main themes, again, are:

- economic development
- environmental concerns
- infrastructure
- the process
- zoning/scaling

ISADR staff hopes that the theme analysis will help the commission and the committee in making decisions in the future and that it indicates the value of involving the larger community in its harbor planning process.

Section: 3

Dot Analysis and Specific Ideas Analysis

The visioning process was intended for participants to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments for the Harbor Commission's Report and plans. ISADR conducted this activity by dividing the participants into nine groups with a facilitator and a recorder in each group. Participants had one hour to brainstorm ideas, suggestions and comments which were recorded on easel pads of paper. This allows all participants in a group to visually read and see the ideas on paper and to intellectually and socially discuss, educate and explore the topics and issues. After this process was complete we asked all participants to walk around the building and view all of the ideas, suggestions and comments from all nine groups. We then asked participants to place dots next to their top three choices of ideas, suggestions and comments.

The analysis for the dots was based on the frequency in which they occurred, thus the number of dots is counted and tallied to note the most common occurrence. ISADR staff has made no changes, comments or interpretations of participant's comments with the exception of counting the number of occurrences through dots in a thematic form to ensure clarity and reliability. We did not include frequencies below three because of reliability and validity problems. We distributed three dots for each participant, and because of this procedure we decided not to count any of the results below three dots. We did not note half dots or otherwise defaced dots, and just counted them along with the "regular dots." We referred to this as the "hanging dots" rule.

Many of the comments, suggestions and ideas were just that, thus not specific ideas. We thought it would be useful for the committee to view and consider these specific ideas as well. Again, ISADR made no changes or interpretations of participant's ideas with the exception of counting the number of duplicate specific ideas. Again these will be noted by the most common occurrence in descending order including a total of fourteen specific ideas including subtopics. Overall twenty-nine major dot counts were noted from the data and are summarized as follows. The counts will be listed in the order of frequency, thus the most commonly mentioned themes will appear first and then in descending order. In the

case in which the dots have the same frequency (number of dots), the data will be listed in ascending group order.

Visioning Exercise Dot Analysis

The most common occurrence of dots was thirteen, based on the idea that deep water industry is essential and that it must be conducted safely. The next most common dot occurrence included eleven dots, in which reorganizing the permitting process is a need.

Ten dots were noted for many ideas, such as: no waterfront road that would block local access or views, that there is a distinction between growth and development, and participants want local growth and development. Two other dot counts reached a total of ten, including a national research estuary with a tourism element and finally that participants like the PB Port's ideas and suggestions.

Nine dots were noted for developing the Balloon Track with a museum complex that contains a tourism element. Seven dots were noted for needing appropriate scaling for industry and development.

Six dots were noted for a few ideas including: a science related educational facility with connections with HSU and CR, and the idea of maintaining and growing the public access areas and open vistas.

Five dots also produced many results such as: rezoning the area surrounding Eureka airport to include smaller businesses, more public involvement in the process, environmentally, sustainable development with local control and exploring renewable energy sources and industries.

Four dots produced a variety of ideas as well, including: clean, sustainable industries, participants having environmental concerns and community concerns regarding jobs and the local economy, developing the fishing industries, a marine research facility with an aquarium and finally sustainable research based exports.

Three dots produced the following ideas: developed dock with infrastructure for a cruise ship industry, Balloon track development, participants wanting local jobs and a stable economy, Balloon track industry, a marine science center, value added resource industry, piling mitigation banks to recycle old docks, creating a value based industry with community character, proper scaling and no LNG types of industry and

finally some participants reflect there is no alternative for no a project option and think there should be a non-industrial focus for development.

These are the main ideas, suggestions and comments the participants have to offer the Harbor Commission to consider and reflect upon while making local decisions that affect everyone.

Specific Ideas Analysis From Groups 1-9

The most common specific idea included a **research facility** with a total of ten similar marked ideas. This included three marks for a marine laboratory, four marks for an educational facility and one for an interpretive center or facility. One mark was also noted for an engineering and geological study to be done at the research facility and one mark for a national estuary facility. Overall participants like the idea of a research facility and this is compatible with natural and environmental concerns.

The second most common occurrence included two specific ideas, **tourism and aquaculture**. Tourism had six marks with one specifically targeting ecotourism and one involving a tourism ferry. Aquaculture has six marks with two marks for maritime industry, two marks for fishing and two marks for oysters. Overall participants are interested in tourism ideas and aquaculture industries although aquaculture does bear some environmental concerns.

The third most common occurrence with four marks involved **recreational development**, in which participants would like to see kayaking, canoeing, boating, fishing, hiking, biking and other recreation activities. Recreation development would also have low impacts on change and environmental concerns while satisfying public access interests as well.

The fourth most common occurrences involved three marks and involved **many specific ideas such as:** a bus /train/transit station in which a rail station received two marks and transportation noted two marks. These ideas may involve environmental concerns in the form of pollution. Another idea that received three marks was a cruise ship industry although this involves dredging and environmental concerns. Shipbuilding and ship repairing were another idea which received three marks, in which shipbuilding received two marks and ship repair received one mark. Lastly, small and light industry was noted with three marks and carries some environmental concerns.

The fifth most common occurrence involved two marks and three ideas: **an aquarium, a recycling paper plant** which carried some environmental concerns and a **museum complex** which could involve a

naval ship museum, an exposition, a marine science museum or a fine arts museum. These ideas also coordinate with tourism and possibly recreation.

Finally, the sixth most common occurrence involved one mark and three ideas such as: **exploring tax free ports and foreign trade zones, natural resource and raw material industries and valued added industries.**

In conclusion, these are some specific ideas that have been noted from all of the groups. ISADR urges the committee to consider these ideas when making their assessments and decisions.

Section: 4

White Note Pad Analysis

All nine groups in the visioning forum were given notepads at each table for note taking, ideas generation and miscellaneous reasons. Our intent was to provide an avenue for more detail, if such was desired. From these circumstances, we are unsure of the origins and meanings of these comments, but felt it would be valuable to include all comments generated from the process. This source produced over eight specific themes with related issues and ideas. To ensure accuracy and validity of this report, we included these comments with no changes or interpretations of community comments with the exception of formalizing themes for clarity. For your convenience the original raw data has been included in the appendices.

The first main idea was the **overall process**. Many participants had concerns with how the process was being conducted, who was included and excluded, and what the parameters for the process were. Other specific process ideas were public trust values, such as access to land areas and to have a voice in the process. One participant suggested a constitution for the bay. Another participant commented on tax subsidies, in which tax subsidies should not be provided for development or industry.

The next main theme was **environmental concerns**. Many participants had concerns regarding pollution, sustainability and clean industry. Participants are concerned about what types of industry enter the bay and how they operate. Others were solely concerned about development pollution and pollution effects on public space and access. Participants don't want the industrialization of the bay to be radically transformed and to endanger the environment in the process. Many participants were also worried about conservation, thus they want development to consider conservation efforts in development plans. Other participants were interested in energy, in which waste energy is not being

utilized. People would also like to see new forms of energy production and conservation to include environmental concerns. Last people are concerned about ecosystems and wildlife such as fisheries. Participants do not want the development to affect the fragile ecosystems in the bay.

Economic development was another major concern in which revitalization should involve local input into the process. One main idea, which was reiterated, was keeping local businesses and expanding local businesses in Humboldt County. People are opposed to outsourcing businesses and bringing them to Humboldt County. Participants are also interested in economic development that is sustainable and environmentally sound. This includes businesses that are clean; consider the local environment and surroundings as well as energy uses and pollution. Some were even concerned about the effects of development on housing prices and real estate. Some participants want development but not development that disturbs the community or the environment.

Participants are also interested in **how development is being marketed, to** whom and why, as well as how this avenue may be broadened and expanded. Participants have considered developing a trade show business in which businesses can come for short periods of time for trade shows and functions, having the business opportunity for the harbor to be an exposition. The idea of incorporating city plans into economic development was also suggested, such as the Samoa town plan or the Eureka town plan and how this connects and fits with economic development.

Recreation and tourism were another focus for participants. People still want to be able to use the bay for recreation and feel that these could be sources for tourism development. Public access was noted as being very important to participants and some community members present. Some participants even feel that recreation and tourism can be combined with industrial uses of the bay. Overall the concern of public access and recreation are important aspects of the community's input to the development plan. Some specific ideas were cruise ships and a marine museum for recreation and tourism development.

Some other major ideas brought forward were the uses of industry and what that may involve. **Zoning issues** and the idea of rezoning were addressed by participants as well as the possible value of **light industry** and break bulk cargo. Still others noted the importance of collaboration with HSU and CR to fuel industry and research within the bay. This idea is very broad and open ended with no specific suggestions.

Lastly people are concerned with **dredging** the harbor. Some participants are highly opposed to this process while others are highly supportive of the idea. Dredging the harbor allows for certain industries to come while others note this factor as a negative aspect and point to site pollution and the energy intensive practices of dredging. Overall the idea of dredging needs to be further explored as it is in other sections of this report.

Finally participants noted the significance of **infrastructure** and how economic development should not disrupt or negatively impact the existing infrastructures. Participants noted how economic development should use the existing infrastructure and should only be developed if local businesses are part of the economic development.

Section: 5

Yellow Sheet Summary Analysis

The yellow sheets of paper were provided for participants to record the ideas, comments, concerns, and suggestions that were not associated with the specific geographic area or industrial/commercial scope of the Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Plan.

While these comments fall outside the specific focus of the Revitalization Committee's intention for the visioning forum, ISADR specifically provided these yellow sheets of paper to validate and include participant's input so that this information can be included as a resource for discussion within the broader visioning process. The input included areas outside of the zoning area, ideas, suggestions and comments regarding the whole bay and revitalization process as well as overall concerns relating to the bay including the process of planning and development. We felt it was necessary to confirm and recognize these comments by reporting them to the Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory Committee in a manner that noted this distinction. ISADR made no changes, comments or interpretations of community comments with the exception of formalizing themes for clarity and reliability.

For your convenience the original raw data has been included in an appendix. Overall seven major themes were extrapolated from the data and are summarized as follows. The themes will be listed in the order of importance by participants, thus, themes will be discussed by the frequency in which the comments, ideas and suggestions were made. The

most commonly mentioned theme thus will be mentioned first and then in a descending order.

The most common theme regarding bay development was the **overarching process**. Participants were highly concerned with the way in which the planning and development of the bay was being conducted and wanted more consistent, proactive community and stakeholder involvement within the process. Participants feel that decisions are being made without public input, for example, the LNG, Calpine proposal. Participants also feel that community character is not being expressed or considered in the process of planning and development. People want their voices to be heard in the process and community members are more likely to expect and enjoy the planning and development if they feel like their concerns, ideas, suggestions and comments have been considered and evaluated in the process. Some community members also feel that regulations, restrictions and planning objectives need to be revised or reworked. Participants stated they feel this is needed because of the Calpine proposal. Overall participants want to be a part of the process as well as help develop a new development plan or to revise the harbor plan. Many participants claim the Harbor Commission has acted without community support and want to be actively involved in this process.

The process was also “dotted” by one participant in the “dotting” portion of the visioning process. This means that one participant thought this was one of their top three priorities, issues, concerns or suggestions. Specifically the dot was associated with the comment that the “process up to now has been closed and flawed, the process must allow consideration and concerns about the planning process”. Overall this idea was echoed throughout the theme of process and highly noted for its importance.

The next most common theme regarding the Harbor Plan was **environmental concerns**. This theme included a variety of sub themes such as sustainability, ecosystems, wildlife preservation, conservation, pollution, erosion, water quality, energy uses, waste, environmental health of the bay and the protection of aquaculture. Overall participants are concerned about developmental effects on the natural environment and how this will impact the environment, public land use and access. It was also noted by participants that an environmental survey and a geological survey should be conducted by an outside source because many participants feel the surveys and reports already conducted are flawed and biased.

Environmental concerns were also “dotted” by two participants in the “dotting” portion of the visioning process. This means that one participant thought this was one of their top three priorities, issues, concerns or suggestions. Specifically the dots were associated with the

comment that “the entire bay must be considered for its natural values” and that the report “should be tossed and should start over with the public”. These comments reiterate the importance of community involvement in the process of planning and development and how this relates, interacts and is connected with environmental concerns. Overall this idea was visible in the environmental concerns theme and was predominately noted in the results.

The third most predominate theme was **zoning and scaling**. Many participants were concerned about zoning, what type of industry it would include or exclude as well as the possibility of rezoning. Some participants connected the possible problems of environmental impacts from present zoning and others noted the environmental concerns of rezoning to include larger industries. Overall most participants only had non-supportive zoning and scaling comments, in which they did not want the zoning expanded or revised, or to harm the environment. Participants would like the Harbor Commission to look into the possibility of rezoning and scaling and if it is possible for community members to have input into this process.

The fourth most common theme was **infrastructure**. Many participants are concerned with the existing infrastructure and if it can support new incoming businesses or industries. Many participants also commented on investing in infrastructure such as transportation, more specifically the rail system in Humboldt County. Many people feel this is a resource not being utilized and would like the Harbor Commission to explore their infrastructure options. Other participants feel that existing infrastructure should support local businesses and new local businesses or industries. Many participants only want local development and thus only local infrastructure for local businesses.

The **economic development of Humboldt Bay** was also a major theme noted by participants. Many participants were interested in large industries and commercial involvement while many others were solely interested in local economic development. A few participants were also interested in how economic development would affect residential growth and property values. Although this is a common idea surrounding economic development, Humboldt County and more specifically Eureka is a small, rural town in a rural county. Many participants are concerned how economic development will effect or change the community environment, character and involvement.

Some other sub themes within economic development were **tourism and aquaculture**. Both of these ideas are specific suggestions for the Harbor Commission to consider in their developmental plan. Many

participants feel both of these ideas have not been well reviewed or evaluated. Some other participants were concerned. A final sub theme within economic development was marketing, specifically to whom and why is the Harbor Commission marketing to and having the Harbor Commission exploring the international economy/marketing. Many participants feel there are viable options that have not been explored, thus the Harbor Commission should keep its options open for planning and development.

The final two themes included **dredging and interpretative sites**. The dredging comments were positive, in which some participants want the bay dredged because it would bring in larger industries and “would promote boat traffic”. Although this comment was made, it was a minority comment; in which most participants feel dredging is environmentally damaging and/or destructive. Overall most participants are not in support of dredging the bay.

Other participants are interested in only an interpretative site, in which this site would be the only source of planning and development. Others would like to see an interpretative site in conjunction with other industries or development. Overall the participants do not have a specific site in mind although there are some suggestions, such as: estuaries, marshes, reserves, research centers and community cultural sites. This recommendation has been left open ended and participants are open to suggestions and ideas, although the idea is very important.

Section: 6

Summary Conclusion

A further analysis utilizing the seven major categories put forth by the PB ports consultant team and cross tabulating these results with the dot analysis was conducted. It should be noted that a majority of the ideas presented by participants do fall within these seven categories and should provide much insight into the development of the bay for the commission and the advisory group. ISADR hopes that these analyses help bring the public involvement process one step closer to actualization. In regards to the seven categories put forth by the PB port consultant team, all of the ideas have relevance in relation to the dots. These ideas are as follows:

1. Marine dependent industrial opportunities
2. Niche dry and liquid bulk cargoes
3. Coastal feeder barge service (rail)

4. Marine science and tourism
5. Aquaculture and commercial fishing
6. Boat building
7. Forest products cargo handling

Many of the participants' ideas directly matched these seven categories or were loosely and indirectly related to the categories. Many of the categories are open ended as well, leaving room for interpretation and changes. The dot analysis in conjunction with these seven categories is as follows:

The most common dot occurrence was thirteen, which included deep water industry conducted safely and environmentally. This idea matches the marine dependent suggestion put forth by the PB Port team. This idea is open-ended and may be altered to meet the needs of the community and the harbor.

The second most common dot occurrence involved reorganizing the permitting process. This included "the process" and community involvement. This idea does not correlate with the PB Port team's ideas. Participants want to be involved in the process of development and industry and would like assistance with the permitting process.

The third most common dot occurrence included many ideas including: local access to the waterfront, the distinctions between growth and development and the desire to have local growth and development. Other dot counts also reached ten, which included a national estuary with a research component and that many participants liked the PB Ports ideas and suggestions. Many of these ideas did not correlate with the ideas of PB, except the national research estuary, which falls into the marine science and tourism idea. Overall again participants want to be involved in the process and to have a say or vote in the development and industry choices for our bay.

Nine dots were recorded for developing the "balloon track" which would contain a museum complex and a tourism element. This idea directly correlates with the marine science and tourism idea as well as the rail barge service idea. Overall this idea was noted many times through the dot analysis and matches the PB Ports ideas well.

Seven dots were noted for having appropriate scaling for development and industries to be developed in the bay. This idea does not correlate with the PB ideas. Again participants want to be involved in the process and would like to provide input to the commission and the advisory committee.

Six dots were noted for a research facility with collaboration with HSU and CR as well as keeping public access and open vistas a priority or tourism. Again these ideas directly correlate with the PB Ports ideas and suggestions, such as the marine science and tourism ideas.

The dots that produced four and five dots included the same ideas already noted, such as a research science facility and having open access to the water. The only new idea presented in the four dots was further developing the fishing industry, in which this idea matches the marine dependent industrial opportunity idea from PB Port.

In conclusion the three main ideas that match the PB Port ideas and suggestions are:

1. Marine science center and tourism with coastal access
2. Marine dependent industrial opportunities
3. Aquaculture and commercial fishing

All of these ideas are well supported by the participants and the community. To include to this list are the following:

1. More community involvement in the development process
2. More access and assistance from the commission and other agencies in receiving permits and dealing with the permitting process.
3. Keeping development and industries local with local control
4. Keeping the bay as natural as possible and keeping environmental standards and ideals in mind when considering development.

Overall ISADR feels the commission and the advisory committee have many options and ideas to work from. We feel if this advice is taken, the community will support and approve of these development and industry ideas and suggestions.

Appendix: 1

HUMBOLDT BAY HARBOR REVITALIZATION VISIONING FORUM AGENDA

- I.) Introduction: 7:00
- A. Introduction of Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory Committee
 - B. Establish Purpose of the Forum
 - C. Review and Discussion of Agenda
 - D. Review of Ground Rules
- II.) Setting the Context: Presentation of what has been done: 7:10
(Given by David Hull, Humboldt Bay Harbor Revitalization Advisory Committee)
- A. History and Purpose of Harbor Revitalization Plan
 - B. Geographic Scope of Harbor Revitalization Plan
 - C. Existing Project Approval Criteria
 1. Avoid/minimize/mitigate environmental impacts
 2. Avoid/minimize/mitigate navigation impacts
 3. Comply with existing zoning/land use regulations
 4. Meet Coastal Zone requirements
 5. Meet existing air quality requirements
 6. Meet existing water quality requirements
- III.) Visioning Exercise 7:50
(Lead by Facilitator and ISADR staff)
- A. Purpose of Visioning Exercise
 - B. Review Ground Rules for Visioning Participation
 - C. Contexts for discussion;
 1. Review list compiled by PB Ports and Marine
 2. Community-Generated and supported
 3. Environmentally Sensitive
 4. Economically viable
 - D. Group Discussion 8:00
- IV.) Reconvene/Post Recommendations 9:00
- A. Refreshments
 - B. Place your DOTS
- V.) Conclude 9:15
- A. Check posted comments to see where the dots end up

Appendix: 2

Easel Pad Ideas, Suggestions and Questions

Group 1:

1. Safety for citizens, low risk projects
2. Museum complex and intermodal bus and train station at 2nd& commercial tourist train running to it. Plan: Marine Science/Tourism Cluster says, "Put museums, etc. in Balloon Track site", Major part of Balloon Track will probably be commercial/industrial. Museum complex would be transition from tourist area to commercial. "Front of House" faces Old Town; "Back of house" faces industrial. Historic turntable in Balloon Track needed to turn steam, locomotive around for train. **Dot = 9**
3. Protect existing wetlands
4. More public involvement at early stages of development/planning
5. No smoke stacks
6. Rezoning-parcel 4
7. No more smell/stink
8. Investigate possibility of public access at industrial sites. Possibility for tourist access to view commercial operations
9. Major concern of erosion of the beaches because of dredging and vessel prop. wash
10. Aesthetics
11. No public money spent to develop public commercial infrastructure. **Dot = 1**
12. Careful use of public funding to leverage private projects
13. Would it be possible to have a countywide vote for the major projects and set some criteria for major projects? **Dot = 1**
14. Harbor District to take more proactive role in conservation and recreation
15. Harbor District should take a more proactive role in eel grass and aquaculture management
16. Fishing industry gets priority to developing waterfront
17. No negative impact to property values
18. Research facility. **Dot = 2**
19. Support fishing industry. **Dot = 1**
20. Coney Island types of development
21. Barge rail cars can be transported from Fields Landing until railway is repaired. Develop railway network around bay, example particleboard is trucked to Redding from Arcata to be put on the rail system for export.

22. Would like to see clean manufacturing that pays good wages, has long term sustainability with co-generation **Dot = 4**
23. Focus on expanding the recreational niche
24. Establish site for marine lab on clean water, closest to mouth of Jetty to establish NEER or NEP. **Dot = 2**

Group 2:

1. We want to preserve the environment and its beauty here while creating jobs and helping the economy. **Dot = 4**
2. Year round jobs
3. Maintain the parcels zoned industrial
4. Provide financial aid for public and private partnerships
5. Good marketing-the internet
6. Keep control of collaborative post planning
7. People friendly industry such as growing of seaweed culture. **Dot = 2**
8. Transportation in and out of county is challenging. Industrial park idea also allows us to get started now on development without waiting for transportation to develop.
9. Larger emphasis on recreation, education. (Bay is a natural gift; this is why many people moved here). **Dot = 1**
10. Consider the impact of industry and residential/real-estate. Fit these together.
11. Totally developed dock able to handle cruise ships and navy. Consider infrastructure as well. (sewer) **Dot = 3**
12. Not have something that overwhelms bay and bay activities.
- 13.** Against deeper dredging.
- 14.** Balloon track is ideal for industrial development. **Dot = 3**
15. Proactively be eco-friendly in this process; just don't rely on CEQA and regulatory bodies.
16. Promote Humboldt's clean water in bay.
17. Learn fro the past: Calpine and liquid gas effects on community, identify conflicts and to augment PB recommendations
18. Need to develop marketing plan to streamline development.
19. PB ports and marine's ideas are appropriate, have value and should be pursued, any of their nine ideas. **Dot =10**
20. Like idea of marine industrial park but questions of size, prefer medium to small
21. Need an economically viable project, this was considered by PB ports and marine
22. Within a site only a percentage of land is useable. Keep this in mind when looking at size

23. Missing link between marine and marine related projects, examples: bus service to tourist clusters. Infrastructure to support the projects (to support recreation/tourism and more).
24. Have coastal associated industries, not take up coastal/dependent space, (example: does X business have to be on the water or not, an aquarium?) **Dot = 1**
25. Support appropriate ideas/projects. Put out a friendly message to attract businesses.
26. Encourage home-grown cottage industries.
27. Multiple little things site, potter that makes ceramic whales, hand dried seaweed, sail making and wooden boats
28. Have parameters of what's acceptable not lists. X might not be on the list but be a good idea.
29. Encourage multiple uses
30. Harbor district should live up to its whole name, conservation, harbor, and recreation.

Group 3:

1. All activity taking place in the industrial portion of the bay will impact the entire bay.
2. Developments in the industrial portion of the bay that have potential irreversible impacts on the whole bay should be prohibited.
3. Concerns will liquid bulk cargo, examples: chlorine and sulfuric acid.
4. Why does the Harbor Management Plan have to be combined with the Harbor Revitalization Plan? These should stay separate.
5. Harbor Revitalization Plan should be abolished. * **Dot = 2**
6. Hastily organized Harbor Revitalization Plan
7. Plan dominated by historical focus on previous rather than future industrial options
8. Top down plan
9. Sphere of the plan is not large enough-should consider relevant watersheds.
10. How much land is available that isn't currently in use by a business.
11. Concerns about beach access, maintenance of litter, tourism impact on beach, parking inadequacies. Promote beach tourism, trail building, patrols, and signs. Including bay access-wildlife viewing. **Dot = 2**
12. Would like to promote interpretive centers
13. Should be sustainable environmentally
14. All business coming in should be a model of environmental standards.

15. Distinction between growth and development, focus on development from within rather than growth from outside companies. * **Dot = 10**
16. Support locally owned businesses
17. Maximize resource use of waste products particularly wasted energy.
18. No public funds/subsidies
19. Non-renewable fossil fuels will be more expensive over time- we need to look for a solution (example: dredging of Harbor)
20. Process should be transparent to the public-not confidential
***** **Dot = 1**
21. Less reliance on fossil fuels
22. Concerns about limited access out of the county for containers (narrow roads)
23. Emphasis on science related development linked to HSU which could lead to high paying jobs. **Dot = 6**
24. Create jobs for HSU graduates locally. **Dot = 1**
25. Recognize beauty and potential we already have in Humboldt
26. Science base could lead to tourism, on par with the Scripps Institute in San Diego. **Dot = 2**
27. Small scale specialized paper producer-since pulp is readily available.
28. Look for industry that can use pulp for manufacturing as well as locally available products.
29. Refer to prosperity plan. **Dot = 1**
30. Emphasize local business development and entrepreneurial/ships?
31. How will vision wish list be implemented?
32. Naval ships as a museum for education and tourism and reunion-permanently here. **Dot = 1**
33. Film/TV industry building
34. Balloon track as train station for local transportation and tourists.
35. Remove airport site from the Revitalization Plan.

Group 4:

1. Questions about infrastructure impacts of shipping increases such as railroads, highways, local streets, airports and bridges
2. Need marine engineering study of the bay? **Dot = 1**
3. Who are we marketing to?
4. Energy generation not tied to fossil fuels should be explored. **Dot = 2**
5. State the limits of port growth, capacity and overall parameters
6. Reduce pollution, concerns about water, air quality and industry

7. Concerns about access trails, small boats pier and shoreline fishing, public access. **Dot = 2**
8. Appropriate scale including the size of the industry. **Dot = 7**
9. Preserve the recreational and environmental aspects and characteristics. **Dot = 1**
10. Focus on local existing businesses rather than looking outside the community. Growing existing businesses or developing local businesses here. **Dot = 1**
11. Invest in local business development. **Dot = 2**
12. Balance between local and larger, outside businesses and offsets will merge, give priority to local businesses
13. Industry has to be big enough to compete
14. Is best use of money revitalizing harbor, or are other developments more "best use"?
15. What do we have for recreation?
16. Need land access for public to use the bay.
17. Pilot projects of other energy sources and industries. **Dot = 1**
18. Can large industrial areas be rezoned to include smaller businesses? Example: Eureka airport. Can we revisit zoning? **Dot = 5**
19. How would industry affect Samoa/Manila/Fairhaven town plans?
20. Concerns about environmental affects on local wildlife and their quality of life.
21. What is our bottom-line? What are we unwilling to accept? Consider toxins, landscape, views, access and types of projects to accept.
22. Geological surveys and their importance
23. What is the appropriate size? How is this determined?
24. Mixed use to promote wider base of stewardship
25. Bottom line: no more deepening of the channel. **Dot = 1**
26. Erosion caused by deepening
27. Explore other energy-based industries. **Dot = 1**
28. Explore intermediate solutions such as a transfer station or barge feeder
29. Industries need to be independent of public subsidies, taxes and money as well as docks, planning and dredging
30. Industry in zone should not affect the outside areas such as eel grass, HBWR or the Arcata Bay
31. No hazards to the community will be created. **Dot = 1**
32. Work within existing physical parameters of bay, width and depth. **Dot = 2**

Group 5:

1. Marine science museum
2. Need jobs and stable living wages. **Dot = 3**
3. Balloon tract/ industrial. **Dot = 3**
4. Too windy for pool development
5. Don't use Dock B for light industrial development
6. Make EPIC statement the basis for development which includes small scale locally based industry. **Dot = 1**
7. Raw material industry to end manufacturing
8. Are marine dependent industrial locations under consideration available? Deep restrictions limits interest
9. Investigate break-bulk (non-containerized cargo) which bring high paying jobs. Focus on Samoa side such as unwanted large ports
10. Cargoes-we want non-toxic versus toxic
11. Upgrade dock facilities to handle break-bulk
12. How does the port market their available land, and is it appropriately zoned? ** **Dot = 2**
13. Like constitutional approach and clear framework. We need a list of objectives of what we want and don't want. Examples such as clean and responsible industry, best available practices and technology, no negative effects on our community or others, and compatible with Humboldt County geology. Include this list when dealing with marketing **Dot = 2**
14. More public involvement and participation in the process. ** **Dot = 5**
15. Distinguish between shipping definitions and non-shipping definitions such as light manufacturing and marine science. There needs to be a division of powers.
16. Harbor District concerns are shipping related?
17. Cruise ship terminal possible
18. Find out about jobs from ship building
19. Development should be sustainable, locally based, culturally relevant, utilizes local natural resources and that we use value-added commodities
20. Make the fundamental premise of the Revitalization Plan require that all development must meet the principles of bioregionalism, sustainability and local control. **Dot = 5**
21. Concerned about the impact of large scale industrial development and its affects on local conservation efforts, land and areas. **Dot = 1**
22. Potential uses: Aquaculture, local manufacturing, ship building, maritime oriented, enhance foreign trade zone, tax free port
23. Naval ship museum **Dot = 2**

24. Manufacturing, storage and repair of containers
25. Glass arts and small consumer products
26. Humboldt Bay and Watershed interpretive and science complex. **Dot = 1**
27. Expo. **Dot = 2**
28. Minimize the need for incoming industries and additional utility infrastructure
29. Consideration of public access plan
30. Don't want waterfront road which obstructs access and view. **Dot = 10**
31. Jobs for local kids

Group 6:

1. Recycled products that has potential for the Pacific Rim market
2. Focus on projects where we are starting-ending point, not a pass through.
3. Concern of potential pollutant by-products of industrial development.
4. Maintaining community character-appropriate scale
5. Concern with long term community sustainability-what will be here for my children?
6. Small to medium scale marine port facilities to reduce local traffic impacts.
7. Renewable/sustainable energy, does this fit? **Dot = 5**
8. Support projects/industries that do not require major public investment, expansion of infrastructure
9. Concern: gentrification of area if only tourist based industry.
10. Support existing commercial fishing industry. **Dot = 4**
11. Preserving landscape that we have
12. No project alternative or non-industrial focus. **Dot = 3**
-Leave un-built sites un-built. **Dot = 1**
13. Large scale parcels may encourage development-look at down town zoning option.
14. Promote industries that compliment our resources and current infrastructure capabilities. **Dot = 1**
15. Dry dock, syncro-lift feasibility
16. Co-locate pulp mill to look at paper production, recycled paper? Possibility, keep it clean. **Dot = 2**
17. Identify and encourage industries that use water
18. Are dredge materials useable?
19. Encourage open vistas and public access. **Dot = 6**
20. Evaluate potentials of Samoa. What role can it play in Harbor Revitalization?

21. Viability of smaller parcels to support smaller scale industrial development. Would smaller scale competition be viable, help harbor?
22. As proposed, marine research facility/aquarium-located on the most contaminated site-relocate with access to high quality water. **Dot = 4**
23. Importance of Mari culture, keep it in the bay, clean and other land uses need to be compatible. **Dot = 1**
24. Boat building facility requires supportive infrastructure and supplies. **Dot = 2**
25. Address energy needs for future industry.
26. Producing local energy rather than importing it
27. Historical and cultural preservation of Harbor, thus smaller scale developments.
28. New industries are needed to sustain economic viability of area and we need to create our own independent community future.
29. Hydrogen power viability?
30. Look at smaller scale economic options and not just one big solution.
31. Locally homegrown industries
32. Utilize local resources, local resources not raw materials, value added. **Dot = 2**
33. Sand/gravel export market-integrate with watershed restoration efforts.
34. Ship via barge not truck.
35. Solicit and incorporate input from local tribes
36. Marine education and tourism facility examples are aquarium, education and research

Group 7:

1. Focus on manufacturing and existing assets. **Dot = 1**
2. Need jobs and to diversify manufacturing
3. Brownfield reclamation-existing industrial reuse
4. Build on existing assets
5. Consider infrastructure/facilities available-water, roads, land, docks, and airport
6. Science based options
7. Educational opportunities
8. Look to examples elsewhere
9. Utilize recycling/environmentally responsible industry. **Dot = 1**
10. Rethink shipping
11. Utilize existing resources
12. Bird Sanctuary

13. Projects such as the oil platform or LNG should not be permitted because of the scale and community character. We should use value based principles. **Dot = 3**
14. Development must not spoil environment or community. **Dot = 1**
15. Why do we assume we need development? And at what cost? **Dot = 9**
16. What is development?
17. Recreation and coastal access-ecotourism and recreation. **Dot = 1**
18. Marine science. **Dot = 3**
19. Value based approach
20. Identify problem areas and growth potential areas
21. Zero pollution and food grade industry
22. Light manufacturing with high run off standards and point source pollution
23. No pulp mill, water exports or gravel extraction and shipping
24. Environmental health for non-humans-retain or improve
25. Environmental sustainability review
26. Industry and manufacturing in deep water areas
27. Site appropriate growth/project location
28. Expansion of marine sciences to include HSU and CR, noting Harbor District site 7A. **Dot = 1**
29. Coastal dependent industrial zoning, need for flexibility that still recognizes coastal appropriate use
30. Parcel history appropriate to zoning designation
31. Site appropriate use location
32. Identify other marine compatible uses that are site specific with assessment of quality and needs, these need to be balanced
33. Looking at community change and current compatible uses and future commercial drawl?
34. Community change/zoning general plan, changes with community values. **Dot = 1**
35. Business opportunities identified, target marketing-global, national economy drives growth needs. **Dot = 1**
36. Conflict between community values and recent industrial business proposals
37. Coordinate business type and infrastructure. Depends on who/what wants to come. **Dot = 1**
38. Recruiting desirable businesses with pre-permitted uses
39. Listing of desirable growth. **Dot = 1**

Group 8:

1. Locally based kind of economy

2. Inventory what is needed here in our community-create here to be used here. Example: Mari culture-fishing, not shipping for export.
Dot = 1
3. Deep water uses: industry essential-safety. * **Dots = 13**
4. Focus on educational resources-graduate students
5. Light industry-computers and technology. ** **Dot = 2**
6. No LNG
7. Diversify land use-be careful about where to place industry for compatibility *
8. Take advantage of what the other harbors (LA, Portland, Seattle), don't accommodate
9. Barge traffic-can't get STAA rated trucks. Rail more feasible. Requires truck transport that is oversized. Is containerized cargo feasible here?
10. STAA-length of truck rating, with longer truck, we're competing with the rail.
11. We need to look at resource based commodities from the valley, etc.
12. Exporting aggregate-not gravel, not hard rock. **Dot = 1**
13. We are constrained by starting at this point...we need to assess what we need and develop local business
14. If we put our energy into attracting multinationals, not local we won't develop community. How can we enjoy the local based produce?
15. Reevaluate whether a deep-water port is appropriate. **Dot = 1.**
16. Concerned about restoring fisheries-if we go for cargo we limit fishing.
17. Bring fuel in by barge and then send local cargo out, barge shuttle.
18. Large boat building won't work, small crafts would. **Dot = 1**
19. Spill over port for importing cars
20. There is no rail system
21. Free trade zone would provide for not paying duty/taxes.
22. Restoration, tourism, fishing and Mari culture; go for sustainability, do not close out options by large operations
23. How can we create jobs in the local community?
24. Environmental concerns-we want families to stay here, we need businesses that are environmentally friendly. Businesses and environment can be compatible, lets chose the way. **Dot = 1**
25. Harness the knowledge of the colleges and lets go for what is workable here.
26. We need outside income to survive, examples: engage outside and bring money in

27. We are on the Pacific Rim-use this as a commercial value
28. National estuary research center could be global. Aquamarine scope-culture. Could help develop here and outside as well and can bring in tourism. **Dot = 10**
29. Use our unique beauty as an attractant
30. Cruise ships
31. Look at ways to create our own power. * Work towards self-reliance/diversified. More research on wave generated power.
32. Oyster growers cater to local markets, not enough market here to sustain them, process them here.
33. We should revive and focus on local markets for fishing and other raw resources for value added products. * **Dot = 1**
34. Processing plant (fish _ may not be feasible here, but lets put it on the table.
35. Value added resources, based SHOTTS Lab etc. *****, **Dot = 3**
36. Develop wastewater into fuel cell technology. **Dot = 2**
37. Recreation/tourism. Examples: kayaking, water craft, local guide services, festivals, hiking, ecotourism and movie industry. * **Dot = 1**
38. Fine arts center or facility, tap into the growing art community here.

Group 9:

1. Why is the industrial/commercial area being addressed before a comprehensive Humboldt Bay Management Plan is established? **Dot = 1**
2. How does the Schneider dock fit within the plan?
3. Develop sustainable resource based exports **Dot = 4**
4. Small businesses have difficulties with the permitting process, need help. **Dot = 1**
5. Develop value-added and finished product exports (shipping)
6. Reorganize the permitting process. **Dot = 11**
7. Partnering between businesses and Harbor District in the permitting process.
8. If permitting process for aquaculture was streamlined the industry would explode
9. Develop woolery, high-end carpets. **Dot = 1**
10. Mills closing
11. Railroad and gravel hauling with port: competition and linking. **Dot = 2**
12. Gravel permitting problems
13. Cruise ships

14. Gravel industry
15. Aquaculture development near Bay Shore Mall and development of infrastructure
16. Aquaculture by Fields Landing. **Dot = 2**
17. Education/Marine Center (Fields Landing) that will partner will HSU. **Dot = 1**
18. Aquaculture/educational center with partners of College of the redwoods and HSU.
19. Can we establish a piling (Mitigation) Bank? (Recycling old docks). **Dot = 3**
20. Boat building facility connected to Harbor District and on the industrial sites
21. Educational facility linking boat building to College of the Redwoods
22. Tourist Ferry
23. Who/what types of business are we currently marketing to?
24. Loss of community based economy
25. Aquaculture/value-added industry
26. Need aquaculture permitting process streamlined-time constraints and money are issues.
27. Harbor District should assist with permitting process
28. Clean Industry
29. Only three clusters in prosperity plan have identified the port in their plan.
30. Small light industry should be explored
31. Connection of light industry and the necessity of dredging the bay
32. Power availability is an issue
33. Need heavy industry to have a certain tonnage to keep dredging and to keep the channel open. **Dot = 1**
34. Competitiveness of operating in the global market-shipping international
35. Seasonal market fluctuations
36. Timber and dredging
37. Dredging and loss of eel grass

Appendix: 3

Small Group Note-pad Comments and Concerns

1.) More shipping

- Generate small businesses
- No smoke stacks
- Rezoning
- Less secrecy

2.) New development should;

Not negatively impact public trust values, including public access, water quality, recreation and other coastal-dependent public trust values

Not require tax subsidies

Not impact existing infrastructure to the point that we need to build more highways, etc.

Not affect the conservation values that are highly valued by so many residents (and attract tourists and future residents)

Prioritize local businesses over large multinational, out-of-area businesses

Not be in conflict with existing restoration efforts, conservation, and public access to coastal areas

Not negatively impact fisheries in any way

Should take into consideration the Samoa town Plan

Not bring toxics or pollution along with industrial development

3.) Light industrial park, STAA- rated trucks (48 foot trucks)

One of our best resources we have is the college and the University
-Most grads leave

Along with that, our property prices are relatively low for the State of California.

It's definitely a beautiful area that we all love, and it's worth protecting. What we need is a less controversial project

4.) The Humboldt Bay needs a "Constitution" for Bay Development with a list of what we do and don't want;

- Relevant industries related to local resources, manufacturing, and culture
- Self-sustaining industry that builds ability for the region to take care of itself
- Clean, responsible industry that employs best available practices and technology
- Public access is provided around most of the Bay, along, and to the bay shore
- Industrial development that contributes to and is compatible with public access

5.) Marine industrial park

Break bulk cargo (non-containerized)

Tourism related projects

- cruise ship facilities
- marine museum

Market properties to developers

Attend port trade shows

6.) The plan is weakest in its total lack of exploration of the issue of the rising cost of (fossil fuel) energy recovery during this century. Dredging is energy intensive, for example. Humboldt Bay is geographically isolated. What will happen if a development plan based on energy intensive industry is actualized and around 2020 – 2040 sufficient energy at a usable price doesn't exist? Have we built a bridge half way over a void? What is the future time perspective of the plan?

7.) The term "sustainable" should appear over and over and over within all of the Harbor District's, County's, and City's language with respect to any and all development around the Bay

Natural Capitalism= sustainable economic development

- We need to maximize opportunities to utilize resources that are not necessarily considered as such (convert all waste streams to value added productivity)

Specifically, we have two large power production plants that reject 100% of their waste heat (King Salmon and Fairhaven), and one that utilizes most of theirs (Stockton Pacific). We should seek projects that utilize that

waste heat, which represents 2/3 of the energy value of the fuel consumed. A variety of agricultural and/or industrial processes could fit in here. The heat from Fairhaven could be pumped to the near by Simpson pulp mill.

Appendix: 4

Yellow Sheets of Paper

1. Water born projects and inland project link across the marine zone being considered tonight, as an example:
 - a. a cluster of interpretative sites-Arcata Marsh-new site in Eureka-Fish and Wildlife Reserve, in county Bay-make an interesting tour-as would Victorian houses, as would tribal sites, but an infrastructure is lacking to handle all these
 - b. Development of new aquaculture, activity in eastern/central bay, needs a site on land and transportation out of the area but we aren't to discuss the water projects tonight
 - c. Increased residential growth requires a resident friendly ambiance. Projects need to consider there.

2. It would be more useful if we could see what we produced, condensed, with duplicates eliminated, then use sticky dots for prioritizing, perhaps a second step process or homework.

3. Don't forget larger industry, can typically afford living wages and benefits.

Maintain present zoning and utilize present wharfage without extension. Don't fear investing in transportation infrastructure.

4. Dredge channel to Arcata and promote boat traffic
5. The revitalization plan of 2003 should be withdrawn and the process begun anew. The public was not given the opportunity to participate in its formation. But, based on our solid rejection of water exports and Calpine, its clear we need to be sensitive to the waters ability to sustain development and to land and public needs/desires.
6. Because the Harbor District has been so ineffectual, why not eliminate it all together? The city and county can handle the harbor with their own harbor commissioners.
7. Exclude industrial impacts that affect the entire bay, especially irreversible impacts concerns with liquid bulk cargo, chlorine, sulfuric acid, etc.

Bay issues are deeply connected to watershed issues sphere of influence is larger than recognized "sphere of influence".

Let Arcata do what they want with the revitalization plan since they are in the "sphere of influence."

8. Community character and existing scale need to be primary considerations in relation to the areas outside the designated zone, (Samoa Bridge to Fields Landing) which include Arcata, Fickle Hill, Kneeland, Eureka, Loleta and Table Bluff.

9. Harbor District should take a more proactive role in managing the aquaculture industry and protecting the eel grass meadows under the protective agency's laws, that are in the state's and federal agency's jurisdictions. The district must leave all tideland aquaculture by yearly fee and bid on selected approved environmental areas approved by Fish and Game and Fish and Wildlife Services and NOAA. Leases shall be on a five year basis with sovereign clauses.

Harbor district must establish a plan to support the restoration industry in the marine estuaries by seeking grants and providing jobs in the restoration industry.

Establish a national marine estuary reserve. Establish a national estuary preserve on Humboldt Bay.

10. International marketing of locally designed and/or built apparatus-materials.

Suggest international need-an energy producing apparatus based on a energy source outside of fossil fuels, examples are oil, coal etc..

And most of all the correct scientific application of physical and chemical laws and the teaching of such

Need detailed marine engineer of total Humboldt Bay and entrance and total potential protection.

Loss of rail transportation

11. Tourism industry.

Beach and coastal forest area need to be developed; access, patrols, parking, trash pick-up, information signs, trails, etc.

This includes bay and marsh areas from Table Bluff to Arcata but primarily the Pacific beaches on the north spit.

12. Who are you selling to?

What is your out of bay markets?

Van Duzen rail route option?

What is land of water use and is its affect on the water of the Bay?

13. Go prosperity? Clean Industry

Food grade development-zero pollution?

Bay must function as a nursery for non-human species-sardines, crabs, halibut, salmonoids, bird life and fish.
Light to heavy manufacturing with high run-off standards.
No pulp mills, no huge gravel exporting and no water exporting.

14. Bay shoreline integrity and erosion

I have looked at the aerial photos of the bay from 1941 and 2000. There is noticeable loss of shoreline, particularly in the area of King Salmon, across from the entrance and along the inside of the North Jetty between BLM land, south of the coast guard base to Fairhaven.

15. Full geological evaluation of the physical area of concern

Eureka aquifer sandstone underlying area-where does it go?

16. Dismantling of all former industrial sites and clean up, etc.

17. Why do we need to revitalize industry on the Harbor?

18. Do not define/refer to central bay only as "port" or "harbor". The entire Bay must be considered for its natural values.

Consultant's study is unreliable and inappropriate (PB is a mega engineering firm; not appropriate for our bay). Toss the report, start over with the public. **Dot, dot**

Process up to now has been closed and flawed. Must allow consideration and concerns about process. **Dot**

19. I would like to see a committee set up to evaluate proposals but forth by community members concerning the development of economic opportunities and manufacturing in this specific region of the bay. Priorities should be given to proposals designed to minimize energy consumption while renewable energy sources and drawn from locally available products otherwise considered "waste". Priority should also be given to proposals that preserve and/or improve upon the environmental health of the bay. Priority should be given to locally owned, closed system businesses, thus maximizing local control. This will provide jobs for HSU graduates with backgrounds in engineering, environmental science and the natural sciences as well as businesses.

Appendix : 5

Dots from Groups 1-9

Group 1

- 9 dots: Balloon track museum complex with tourism element
- 4 dots: Clean, sustainable industry
- 2 dots: Research facility
- 2 dots: Marine laboratory
- 1 dot: No public money for commercial development from local infrastructure
- 1 dot: Community members get to vote on possible projects
- 1 dot: Fishing industry

Group 2

- 10 dots: PB ports have appropriate ideas
- 4 dots: Environmental concerns with concerns for local economy and jobs
- 3 dots: Developed dock with infrastructure for cruise ship industry
- 3 dots: Balloon track development
- 2 dots: People friendly industry
- 1 dot: Recreation and education industry
- 1 dot: Coastal industry: make good use of the water

Group 3

- 10 dots: Distinction between growth and development; want local
- 6 dots: Science related educational facility with HSU and CR
- 2 dots: Science based tourism
- 2 dots: Throw out the Harbor Plan and start over
- 2 dots: Access/recreation and tourism
- 1 dot: Public involvement with the process
- 1 dot: Jobs for HSU graduates
- 1 dot: The Prosperity Plan
- 1 dot: Naval ship museum with educational and tourism component

Group 4

- 7 dots: Appropriate scaling for industry and development
- 5 dots: Rezone areas such as the Eureka airport to include smaller businesses
- 2 dots: New energy ideas
- 2 dots: Access and recreational concerns
- 2 dots: Local development
- 2 dots: Work within zoning/scaling/parameters

- 1 dot: Need an engineering study of bay
- 1 dot: recreational and environmental characteristics of bay
- 1 dot: Local business development
- 1 dot: Energy pilot projects
- 1 dot: No more deepening of the channel
- 1 dot: Explore the energy industries
- 1 dot: No more environmental hazards

Group 5

- 10 dots: No waterfront road that blocks access
- 5 dots: More public involvement in the process
- 5 dots: Environmental, sustainable development with local control
- 3 dots: Local jobs and a stable economy
- 3 dots: Balloon track industry
- 2 dots: Marketing, zoning and available land
- 2 dots: Constitutional voting on the process and possible projects
- 2 dots: Naval ship museum
- 2 dots: Exposition
- 1 dot: EPIC developmental plans and standards
- 1 dot: Environmental concerns with large industry
- 1 dot: Interpretive science center

Group 6

- 6 dots: Public access and open vistas
- 5 dots: Renewable energy sources and industry
- 4 dots: Fishing industry
- 4 dots: Marine research facility/aquarium
- 3 dots: No project is not an alternative/option, should have a non-industrial focus
- 2 dots: Use local resources but not raw materials for industry
- 2 dots: Pulp mill and recycling paper
- 2 dots: Boat building industry with infrastructure
- 1 dot: Leave non-built sites alone
- 1 dot: Promote complementary industry
- 1 dot: Clean mari-culture

Group 7

- 9 dots: Why do we assume we need development and at what cost?
- 3 dots: Value based industry with community character, proper scaling and no LNG types of industry
- 3 dots: Marine science center
- 1 dot: Use existing assets to develop manufacturing
- 1 dot: Environmentally responsible industry: recycling
- 1 dot: Environmental and community concerns with development

- 1 dot: Ecotourism and recreation
- 1 dot: Site 7A should be used for marine science with HSU and CR
- 1 dot: Community voice in process, change and zoning issues
- 1 dot: Target marketing to the international and global markets
- 1 dot: Coordinate businesses with infrastructure here now
- 1 dot: List of desirable growth or community to vote on

Group 8

- 13 dots: Deep-water industry is essential and must be safe
- 10 dots: National estuary research center with tourism element
- 3 dots: Value added resource industry
- 2 dots: Light industry
- 2 dots: Fuel cell technology with wastewater industry
- 1 dot: Inventory of mari-culture but no shipping
- 1 dot: Export aggregates but no gravel or hard rock
- 1 dot: Is a deep-water port appropriate
- 1 dot: Small boat building industry
- 1 dot: Environmentally compatible businesses
- 1 dot: Value added local markets such as raw resources and fishing
- 1 dot: Recreation and tourism

Group 9

- 11 dots: Reorganize the permitting process
- 4 dots: Sustainable resource based exports
- 3 dots: Piling Mitigation banks: recycle old docks
- 2 dots: Gravel hauling with railroad industry
- 2 dots: Aquaculture in Fields Landing
- 1 dot: Need a complimentary plan for the process, involve community
- 1 dot: Permits for small businesses
- 1 dot: Woolery industry
- 1 dot: Educational/marine center
- 1 dot: Need heavy industry with a certain tonnage to keep the channel open

Appendix: 6

Specific Ideas from Groups 1-9

Group 1

- Museum complex
- Bus/train/transit station
- Rezone Parcel 4
- Tourism
- Research facility
- Marine Laboratory
- Rail system

Group 2

- Recreation: biking, hiking, kayaking, boating, sailing, canoeing...
- Transportation
- Educational facilities
- Tourism
- Cruise ship industry
- Environmentally sound development
- Support the Harbor Report suggestions
- Aquarium
- Local industry

Group 3

- Tourism and recreation
- Interpretive center
- Science center with educational component with CR and HSU
- Naval ship museum
- Film/TV industry
- Train station
- Remove the airport

Group 4

- Conduct an engineering study of the bay
- Conduct a geological study of the bay

Group 5

- Marine science museum
- Balloon track industry
- Dock B
- Raw material industry
- EPIC developmental plans and standards

- Cruise ship industry
- Aquaculture industry
- Shipbuilding industry
- Exposition
- Foreign trade zone
- Tax free port
- Naval ship museum
- Container industry
- Glass industry
- Interpretive complex

Group 6

- Recycled products industry
- Maritime/fishing industry **
- Ship repair industry
- Paper product industry
- Small industry **
- Use of Samoa
- Marine research facility with educational component *
- Aquarium *
- Boat building industry
- Natural resources industry: gravel and sand
- Recreation and tourism

Group 7

- Brownfield Reclamation
- Science based/educational facility **
- Recycling industry
- Maritime industry
- Ecotourism and recreation
- Food grade industry
- Light industry *
- No natural resources industry

Group 8

- Light industry
- Educational research facility with HSU and CR **
- Maritime/fishing/oyster industry, ** (fishing only)
- Boat building
- Free trade zone
- National estuary
- Cruise ship industry
- Processing industry
- Tourism and recreation

-Fine arts center

Group 9

-Small/light industry

-Schneider dock

-Woolery industry

-Natural resource industry: gravel *

-Railroad industry

-Cruise ship industry

-Oyster industry behind Bay Shore Mall

-Aquaculture development in Fields Landing *

-Educational marine center with educational component HSU and CR *

-Recycling industry

-Boat building industry

-Tourist ferry

-Value added industry