



Gateway Plan Town Hall

On December 9th at 5:30 PM, City staff conducted a public meeting over zoom. There were roughly 50 participants at the meeting, many of whom stayed for the full hour-and-a-half meeting and took part in the small group breakout sessions. The meeting started with an introduction from Community Development Director David Loya, then transitioned to breakout group sessions with notes taken by City consultants and staff. This meeting focused on four main topics within the draft document, to capture feedback on proposed chapters of the Plan. The four topics were:

- Breakout Group #1: Housing, Residential Growth, and Land Use Options
- Breakout Group #2: Community Amenities and Design Standards
- Breakout Group #3: Mobility Infrastructure and Streetscape Design
- Breakout Group #4: Conservation, Open Space, Parks, Arts & Culture, and Historic Resources

Watch the recorded video here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-O8-3oQvM50&list=PL7tMg3MmkA5qJHW0ypCUBOfCJctLuxZiD&index=10>

General Themes from breakout groups and Q&A

- Timing of Council and Planning Commission review clarification
- Appreciate what the City is doing to address housing needs
- Make information as available as possible (QR Codes may not be that helpful to everyone), consider the needs of people who may not have ways to participate
- Reach out to Wiyot tribe, how are they involved
- Timeframe for development of the units – how will that progress?
- Acknowledgement that plan is the most pedestrian friendly and environmentally friendly plan in the County
- Opportunity for car share should be part of the plan
- Infrastructure needs to be addressed (fire, water, sewer, etc.)
- Concerns about shading
- Concerns over two story building minimum
- Concerns over reduction in parking ratios and how lack of parking may affect users who can't walk or bike (families with children, seniors)

Session	Breakout Group #1: Housing, Residential Growth, and Land Use Options
Purpose	Note-taking sheet for breakout group #1
Session Hosts	David Loya (City of Arcata) Vanessa Blodget (Planwest Partners)

Themes/Questions Captured by the Note-Taker (comments from staff and consultants captured in sub-bullets):

- Housing is a primary importance to the community and needed to bring in employees (especially for Open Door)
- Will City use Eminent domain?
 - City has never used it, City does not plan to
- Racial equity and social justice, who is the City already working with? what does that mean to the City?
 - City is working with a racial equity working group. The City’s goals are to create policy that are anti-racist.
- Road on L Street, how is the City going to acquire the RR and road through that area?
 - Work with RR and acquire from willing landowners
- Underbuilding parking? What does that mean? What is privately owned public open space?
- Community benefits and amenities – some are things that should be required for all new development (i.e. bike parking, solar panels, etc.) Are those tables in the plan?
 - The details will be in the zoning code
- How did you come up with 3,500 units?
 - calculation of total build out if every parcel was developed to full capacity
- Arcata infrastructure is failing, how will the plan accommodate this?
 - Marsh WWTF will need to be improved to address SLR and population growth
- Where is the money going to come from to make necessary infrastructure improvements? How will we know what is needed? Especially WWTF. Timing of when that will be evaluated?
 - will be addressed in EIR and in other City plans that are currently being developed (WWTF planning)
- Will City help property owners find the grants and money needed to develop to what is in this plan?
- Can’t imagine what 7 or 8 stories would look like. Don’t think that is necessarily the direction we should be going. Concern over 8 stories.
- Like the idea of higher density housing in Arcata
- Think that the plan build out could be realistic (how do we know it’s not going to happen given the current conditions related the climate, housing market, Covid, HSU polytechnic, etc.)
- How can individuals develop their property? What fees would they have to pay? M Street high voltage lines?
- Look at maps to evaluate specific site constraints?
- 4-subareas – put total acres for each sub area on the map
- Can non-conforming uses stay, or will they be required to move?
 - Decision has not yet been made, City Council and PC will provide guidance. Some uses may have a sunset (i.e. mini storage, gas facility).

Session	Breakout Group #2: Community Amenities and Design Standards
Purpose	Note-taking sheet for breakout group #2
Session Hosts	Gillen Martin (City of Arcata) Rob Holmlund (Planwest Partners)

Themes/Questions Captured by the Note-Taker (comments from staff and consultants captured in sub-bullets):

- A question was asked by an M Street resident in Gateway Hub as to why their neighborhood was not considered Gateway Neighborhood (single family homes have been there since the 40s/50s, there are 6 households in the area—why isn't it classified as a neighborhood?)
 - Rob recommended that the resident advocate for a change in the land-use designation if that is how they feel/would like to make that recommendation/request
 - The same resident asked if how they can take advantage of community amenities/the benefits program as a smaller property owner (noting especially if quality of life in the neighborhood drops substantially due to this Plan)
- A question was asked regarding whether or not the community amenities would be vetted by City Committees or just “rubberstamped”
 - amenities would have been pre-approved—if this plan continues to move forward, committees will be guiding amenities
 - How many points amenities should count for within the point system is still part of the conversation/something the City is hoping to get input on in the coming months
- It was brought up that the pre-recorded presentation was unlisted on the City's YouTube—have to navigate to it through the website, should be listed on the YouTube; Another person noted the video was very helpful
- It was voiced that a presentation on community amenities specifically would be helpful; the roadshow went to 6 committees to rank amenities, would be nice to have more of the information fleshed out for the public
- Will there be an order/sequence to the development/what will be constructed?
 - The transportation modifications will on the whole be expensive; despite 8th & 9th street projects—those may be pretty fast, potentially next 5 years; overall system (especially the alliance section) = potentially 20+ years until completed. New construction projects will come first, if property owners with large enough parcels want to develop large scale buildings, they must pay into the water/wastewater system etc.--so this will be incremental
- Will this impact wetlands?
- Concern was raised that the L Street turnaround will affect open space/recreation
 - The trail/recreation opportunity will remain unchanged, but the street will run alongside—the individual does not have desire to run/bike alongside cars
- A question was asked re: the fire department
 - If projects get tall enough that, this Plan places it on those stimulating the need for new infrastructure will have to pay their fair share of the new infrastructure
- A question was asked as to whether this will come with any additional property taxes/a unique property tax district
 - this Plan is not currently proposing anything along those lines
- A question was asked as to parking spaces
 - There will be parallel spaces on some streets and angled in on others—angled in allows for a net zero loss in many areas
 - The plan does not prohibit off-street parking on private properties; new developments, it is on the developers to plan for parking. It is on developers to create enough parking for their projects to be livable and successful—not in their financial interest to not plan for parking

- If we have a lot of rentals in the district, who is going to manage those rentals?

Session	Breakout Group #3: Mobility Infrastructure and Streetscape Design
Purpose	Note-taking sheet for breakout group #3
Session Hosts	Netra Khatri (City of Arcata) Todd Tregenza (GHD Inc) Rosanna Southern (GHD Inc)

Themes/Questions Captured by the Note-Taker (comments from staff and consultants captured in sub-bullets):

Netra presented slides, picking up where David left off, discussing K/L Street couplet, new Class I trail along N Street

- Pleased with overall bike/ped
- Would like to see car-sharing, designated spaces (ZipCar)
 - Transit would be improved, maybe a new route
- Confused about K/L couplets, what is the purpose? Why City didn't consider Q Street?
 - Todd explained that the goal is not to increase traffic, but to promote a car-free lifestyle
 - Benefits of couplet:
 - Existing congestion around 11th/K Street
 - Simplify intersection, less spillback
 - Can Add more ped/bike amenities
 - We did consider Q Street – environmental constraints
- Resident near gateway project; concerned about parking for residents
- College students – can we have them require no car?
 - Netra – City has parking zones, but not yet considered for this area
- 11th Street – Class III Bike Route
- Concerned about people travelling the wrong way on one-way streets
- Concerned about Trees removed on L Street at Creamery
 - Todd responded - goal is to keep green space/buffer and trees/landscaping as much as possible
- 11th Street – Consider turn pocket from 11th to L Street
- Concern related to infill large building; Fire Dept. is small – what's the plan for emergency access in such a dense area. City no longer has a ladder truck, but Eureka does.
- On-street parking, live at 12th/M Street – what's going to happen there?
 - No changes to existing available parking there
- K/L Street one-way couplets – measurements 58' cross-section doesn't fit
 - Drawings are in a concept. Minimum is within 50'. Will be designed to fit within ROW.
- Concern about parking, but a very good Public Transit system in place will be needed.
 - Netra – City's goal is to expand transit. Looking at adding Green Line.
- ROW at RR tracks – at Alliance- info on Rail banking process
- Ensure the Mobility diagram is accurate and covers only the area within the public right-of-way, not private property
- Expressed appreciation for more ped- and bike-friendly infrastructure. Recommend Not to refer these as "alternative" modes.

Session	Breakout Group #4: Conservation, Open Space, Parks, Arts & Culture, and Historic Resources
Purpose	Note-taking sheet for breakout group #4
Session Hosts	Emily Sinkhorn (City of Arcata) Delo Freitas (City of Arcata)

Themes/Questions Captured by the Note-Taker (comments from staff and consultants captured in sub-bullets):

- Historic context-How to ensure perspective and character is retained, especially with the context of historic structures. Look to Emeryville for inspiration.
- Safety for recreation-Allow kids, families to live in those areas. Allows access to the marsh. If we have so much development-having safe crossings for children to get to the marsh.
- Maintenance for greenspaces and trees. Encourage native plants...vine maples, native trees.
- Reality now is planning for dogs - companion animals, provide open spaces for companion animals
- Parks - privately owned/publicly accessible parks...concerns about private ownerships of public land around free speech
- Start naming the parks and open spaces and other district names with Wiyot placenames in consultation with Wiyot Tribe. One participant concerned about naming-doesn't like Gateway because it connotes negative thoughts-not arts, culture, history, look for a name in Wiyot language?
- Love having trees, concerns around maintenance leaves covering stormwater drains, street sweeping more, residents pay stormwater fees
- Participant noted they would like to have more of a general conversation. Lives on Wagner Block. "L Street return" is of great concern. Stoplights would be amazing.
- Concerns about shading to other's gardens. Then people can't grow food. Concerns over two story building minimum.
- How do we consider the needs of people who may not have ways to participate? Open space-managing young kids and trying to get groceries-with the infrastructure as planned-how can we create room for families? How do you get kids to 2 different schools, etc. Without a car?
- Support of current Creamery District character-making a one-way street may change the character. Don't compromise the space.
- Participant notes there is a real need for housing and this Plan supports this.
- Allow kids, families to live in proximity to the marsh. Allows access to the marsh. If we have so much development-having safe crossings for children to get to the marsh.
- We have to figure out ways to make housing. Plenty of time for input.
- Loves having trees, but there needs to be more maintenance.
- Loves requirement that in some places there is art required.
- Support for street furniture, places to sit, places to eat.
 - Standards support that, but sidewalk width may not be wide enough for vibrant zone and clear path of travel.