

McKinleyville Municipal Advisory Committee
Minutes
May 13, 2020
Zoom Platform – Online Meeting

Approved 5/27/2020

Members Present: Barbara Georgianna, Kevin Dreyer, Kevin Jenkins, Maya Conrad, Bonnie Oliver, Greg Orsini, Mary Burke, Twila Sanchez

Absent: -----

Guests Michael Richardson)
John Miller) Humboldt County Long Range Planning
John Ford) Department

Meeting called to order at 6:05 p.m. by chair, Kevin Dreyer

Approval of Minutes:

Motion made by Greg Orsini, seconded by Kevin Jenkins that minutes of the regular March 29, 2020 meeting be approved

VOTE: YES: Barbara Georgianna, Greg Orsini, Kevin Dreyer, Kevin Jenkins,
Maya Conrad, Bonnie Oliver, Mary Burke
NO: ---
ABSTENTION Twila Sanchez

Unanimous approval

Public Comment on Items not on the agenda.

- Attendee asked if there was something MMAC could do to honor McKinleyville High School Class of 2020 graduates since COVID 19 is preventing a regular ceremony.
- Concern expressed about McKinleyville homeless population with the shelter-in-place order. Is there something that can be done regarding sanitation?

Prior to this meeting, all committee members received an email from John Miller, Humboldt County Long Range Planning Department, directing them to the following locations so that complete survey results could be viewed:

- [https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/86148/Final-McKinleyville-Town-Center-Survey-Results-Part 1-PDF](https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/86148/Final-McKinleyville-Town-Center-Survey-Results-Part-1-PDF) [16 pgs. In length]
- [https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/86147/Final-McKinleyville-Town-Center-Survey-Results-Part 2-PDF](https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/86147/Final-McKinleyville-Town-Center-Survey-Results-Part-2-PDF) [111 pgs. In length]
- <https://humboldt.gov/DocumentCenter/View/83905/Survey-Responses-2-14-2020-PDF> [86 pgs. In length]

Overview of Town Center Survey Results - Michael Richardson

The on-line survey ended March 16, 2020 – there were 330+ responses. Brief comments were given about the construction of the survey instrument and how best to report results.

Michael reviewed Survey Results – Part I survey. Questions 1-22 as follows:

1. *What is your relationship to McKinleyville?*

“I live in McKinleyville” 80%

2. *“What is your experience with previous McKinleyville Town Center planning efforts?”*

I am aware of.... 64%

I’ve never heard of... 25%

3. *“As envisioned in the Community Plan town Center will include a core commercial area that will serve as an employment center for McKinleyville. ..Pick the top three you would like to see ...”*

-small specialty shops, restaurants, live/workspace 27%

-small specialty shops, restaurants, large retail
(i.e. grocery, department store) 14%

-small specialty shops, restaurants, office space 9%

----in this question there were discrepancies in responses

Overall conclusion seemed to be many small specialty shops, restaurants, live above work space, and large retail

4. *“I hope the town center offers people a new opportunity to...” [top 5 picks]*

Gather with friends and socialize; bring the family for kid-friendly activities; attend arts & cultural events; enjoy biking, walking and other outdoor recreation; live in the town center area near all this exciting new development

Survey can be read to support several conclusions. Many nuances in this section

5. *“There were 8 example of non-commercial land uses from the Community Plan and Town Center workshops. With priorities from the previous question, select up to 4 things you want to see in Town Center.”*

Performance venue, community hall for events/gathering, town green/park, open space with trails [received most responses] 9%

6. *“How should housing and commercial uses [businesses like offices, shops, and restaurants] be treated in zoning regulations for the Town Center?”*

Housing & commercial uses are both important, treat them the same 62%

7. *“What types of housing should be encouraged in the Town Center area?”[could make multiple responses]*

-Apartments above businesses 12%

-No additional housing 11%

-Apartments above businesses-condo/townhouses 8%

Question – can we accommodate all these types or just select a few:???

8. "Any other comments on housing in the Town Center area?"

Responses to this were varied. Part 2 of the report has all the responses. 13 people didn't want any housing in the Town Center and 10 people wanted low-income housing interspersed with other housing. Interesting take away from the comment is "consider a variety of types and styles for tiny house villages, these communities can be full on productive, contributing, economically viable entities in their appearance and function."

9. Ten different storefront/building designs [graphics shown] were shown. "Which designs echo what you would like to see in the Town Center. Select all that apply."

- small building design
- McKinleyville Fire station design
- small open type
- absolutely no strip-mall type**

10. "What do you like about the designs you chose in the above question?"

- Clean, old style charm mixed with commerce and a city facelift. We have so many businesses not very visible or inviting. Well-lit spaces that are safe, clean and a good mix of modern but old charm would be ideal.
- Design is not critical- ensure town center is homey and has small-town feel makes the spaces inviting and welcoming, especially ones that encourage pedestrian activities – small shops, cafes, places to sit and converse, gathering places.
- Front overhangs updated small town feel, diverse buildings with landscaping in the shopping and parking areas and as many trees and plants as possible.

11. "Are there specific buildings or collections of buildings in McKinleyville (or elsewhere) you would like to see replicated or echoed in the Town Center?"

-There were 147 responses and about 120 were unique [see in Part 2]. Highlights are Fire Station in McKinleyville; A & L Feed; Arcata, including the Plaza; Ferndale

12. Of following transportation-related efforts, what do you think this plan should prioritize? Town Center area which includes Central Ave. between Hiller Road and Railroad Drive (1=very important; 5=not important)

- a. *Improving pedestrian safety*
1 – very important 59%
- b. *Improving bicyclist safety*
1 – very important 49%
- c. *Providing connections & routes for bicyclists and pedestrians*
1 – very important 52%
- d. *Providing safe equestrian access*
Not as important as other modes 29% said not important
- e. *Accommodating more vehicle trips*
32% chose "3" 25% said not important 13% very important
- f. *Addressing vehicle speed & improving roadway safety*
25% not concerned 38% felt it very important

- g. *Providing adequate vehicle parking*
50% very important [1 & 2]

13. *“McKinleyville Shopping Center only a short walk across Central Avenue from Pierson Park. How could County work towards safely linking these two destinations in the Town Center Area?”*
There were 220 responses and 212 were unique, which are in Part 2. Of ideas provided, 143 people encouraged pedestrian solutions (pedestrian safety, raised/lighted crosswalk, longer crossing lights) ‘ 73 voted for a footpath over Central Ave.

14. *“Are there any other changes you would like to see to Central Avenue to improve pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and/or safety?”*
There were 165 responses and close to 150 were unique, and are contain in Part 2. Some highlights are: Pedestrian safety measures, traffic safety measures addressing speed, landscaping or adding greenery, a trail system, law enforcement measures; wider sidewalks, and fine as it is.

QUESTIONS 15 – 17 RELATE TO WETLANDS [Ranking scale 1 – 5 with 1 = strongly agree, and 5=strongly disagree]

15. *“Wetland buffers are a barrier development and they should be reduced as much as possible.”*
49% strongly disagree[5] 13% chose [4] 21% are in the middle[3]

16. *“The Town Center wetland areas should remain in their undeveloped state.”*
58% strongly agree [1, 3] 45% strongly disagree [5, 4, 2]

17. *“Any wetland impacts to Town Center wetlands should be offset by wetland restoration in other areas of McKinleyville.”*
42% strongly agree [1] 23% strongly disagree [5, 4]

18. *“As define in the Community Plan, “open space” can mean a number of different things. How would you prioritize the following types of open space for the Town Center area?”*

-Undeveloped nature preserve with trails	42%
-Developed central square/town green	20%
-Landscaped public park designed for Recreational activities [like Pierson Park]	15%

19. *“What would you spend your money on in McKinleyville but don’t because you don’t have good local options? List 4 things.*
There were 280 responses and 269 were unique and are contain in Part 2. Responses generally fell into the following categories: restaurants, clothing [some brand name specific], outdoor activities, performances youth [kids and/or teens], variety, groceries, higher class stores; arts/crafts

20. *“Are you able to work in McKinleyville? If not, why?”*
There were 253 responses – 160 unique which are in Part 2. Of responses provided, 30 said “yes” to working in McKinleyville and 86 said “no” . Summary of responses
-job elsewhere; job availability; retired, office space; work in Arcata; work in Eureka; willing to move to McKinleyville

21. If funding is needed to implement the Town Center Plan, what sources should be pursued (1=priority source of funding, 5=don't pursue) Nine different options follow:

- a. *"Private sector investment from outside the community (i.e. distribution center that would come with community amenities)*
1 [Prioritize] 25%; 2 19%; 3 27%; 4 12%; 5 [don't pursue] 18%
- b. *"Private sector investment from existing businesses."*
1 [prioritize] 32%; 2 30%; 3 24%; 4 7%; 5 [don't pursue] 6%
- c. *"Public sector funding for community amenities that would come in tandem with affordable housing.:*
1 [prioritize] 28%; 2 26%; 3 18%; 4 13%; 5 [don't pursue] 15%
- d. *"Infrastructure improvement district [could impact revenue for public services such as fire departments]*
1 – [prioritize] 20%; 2 26%; 3 23%; 4 15%; 5 [don't pursue] 15%
- e. *Private start-up investors*
1 [prioritize] 33%; 2 28%; 3 22%; 4 10%; 5 [don't pursue] 7%
- f. *Grant funds for infrastructure improvements, wildlife preservation, etc.*
1 [prioritize] 61%; 2 19%; 3 9%; 4 3%; 5 [don't pursue] 8%
- g. *"New taxes paid by McKinleyville residents."*
1 [prioritize] 11%; 2 13%; 3 22%; 4 17%; 5 [don't pursue] 37%
- h. *"Public borrowing (such as bonds) that is repaid through revenue from Town Center properties."*
1 [prioritize] 17%; 2 24%; 3 27%; 4 15%; 5 [don't pursue] 16%
- i. *"Community fundraisers/ crowdfunding.*
1 [prioritize] 25%; 2 18%; 3 35%; 4 12%; 5 [don't pursue] 11%

22. "Any additional thoughts/comments on the topics raised in the survey?"

There were 140 responses and all of them unique and contain in Part 2. Brief summary of responses: survey concern; logistics; Town Center positive; survey satisfaction; survey question confusion/technical(or input) error; wetlands[general]; trails; open space; affordable housing; financial stability; and surgery not accessing enough of community.

Michael Richardson indicated survey results will be the touchstone for discussion of items Planning Department will bring back to MMAC. Committee member asked if it is possible to "map" the various areas. Felt we should engage in forward thinking.

Board General Comments:

Next Steps – Greg Orsini – we should continue to use Zoom for meeting and continue to move forward on the Town Center. Others noted and surprised that not more "public people" attended the Zoom meeting, it was advertised.

Next Meeting:

The next regular meeting will be Wednesday, May 27, 2020, 5:30 p.m. via Zoom.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Georgianna