



# STRATEGIC PLAN

2007 – 2011

Prepared by Ted Loring, Jr.  
November 19, 2007

**Sera Group**

PO Box 600, Eureka CA 95501  
707 441-0981 fax 707 441-0985  
info@seragroup.com

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	2
<b>Executive Summary</b>	
Vision Statement	4
Strategic Objectives	5
Critical Issues	5
Mission Statement	6
General Objectives	6
Management Objectives	7
Implementation	7
<b>Strategic Plan</b>	
Vision Statement	8
Strategic Objectives	9
Critical Issues	10
Mission Statement	10
General Objectives	11
Management Objectives	12
Implementation	12
A Note Regarding Appendices	13
<b>Appendices</b>	
I - Changes Observed	14
II - Comments About Outreach Sessions	16
III - Discussion of Mission & Vision	18
IV - Potential Initiatives	19
V - Brainstorming the Vision Statement	20
VI - General Objectives	21
VII - Management Objectives	22
VIII - Notes from the Outreach Meetings	25
IX - Executive Summary of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan	39



# Strategic Plan

## 2007 - 2011



### Introduction

Every five years, the Board of Commissioners of the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District (District) reviews and updates a strategic plan. The Strategic Plan takes its place alongside the other planning and guidance documents used in the management of the District. The District's enabling legislation contained in Appendix II of the California Harbors and Navigation Code and the Humboldt Bay Management Plan provide specific legal and policy guidance for the balancing of harbor and recreational uses of Humboldt Bay while protecting the environment. The Strategic Plan provides guidance to the District's Commissioners and staff on where the public would like the District to put its emphasis over a five-year period. The Strategic Plan does not detail day-to-day management or project tasks, but rather describes the overall direction the District should go during the Plan's time period.

The previous Strategic Plan was adopted in 2002 and covered a period of 2002-2006. Three strategic objectives were recommended in the 2002-2006 Strategic Plan. The first two objectives were fully accomplished by the end of the planning period. The third has resulted in many accomplishments but remains open ended. Those objectives were:

1. Complete the Humboldt Bay Management Plan
2. Complete the Harbor Revitalization Plan
3. Respond to emerging issues that have a significant economic or safety impact

Toward the end of 2006, the Board of Commissioners of the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District authorized an update of the District's strategic plan for the 2007-2011 time period. Subsequently a committee was appointed which held thirteen meetings were held: one organizational, five to solicit public comment and seven more to develop this report.

This report is the product of planning committee deliberations. It contains a few specific recommendations and a great deal of background material. If adopted, the recommendations will establish high-level priorities for the District. The background material provides a rationale for the strategic objectives as well as cataloging a lot of suggestions worthy of further consideration.

This plan - or any document - will do little good if it just sits on the shelf. It must be used if it is to generate any real value. The ideas it presents should animate District



staff. They should guide the Commission. If they do, then their day-to-day decisions will lead to the long-term objectives being accomplished.

This plan has been designed to guide the District during the period from 2007 through 2011. If it is to provide effective guidance over that next five years, then it must be updated periodically. Ideally staff will provide quarterly updates on efforts to achieve strategic objectives. Annually it would make sense for the Commission to review unanticipated changes in the District's environment and then to update the objectives accordingly.

Thanks are due to the number of individuals who have volunteered a substantial portion of their time to serve on the District's planning committee. Commissioners Roy Curless and Dennis Hunter served with the following public representatives:

Ken Bates	Bob Gearheart	Ted Kuiper
Dennis Mayo	Richard Trygar	Mark Wheatley

Planning efforts would not have born fruit without the commitment of District staff to the process. David Hull and Patti Tyson deserve individual acknowledgment for their contributions throughout the planning program.

Ted Loring, Jr. of Sera Group facilitated planning group meetings. Loring also prepared this report.



# Executive Summary

Strategic Plan  
2007 - 2011



The 2002-2006 update of the District's Strategic Plan came at a point before the Humboldt Bay Management (Management) and Harbor Revitalization (Revitalization) Plans were started. Both are now complete and the marathon job of implementing them is now underway. What should be the District's priorities for 2007-2011? This report provides an answer to that question at the highest level of abstraction.

It would be hard to over-state the complexity of implementing the Bay Management and Harbor Revitalization Plans ... even if the Commission and District staff did not have to devote much time to the daily demands of the District's other, ongoing business. Much hard science, political outreach and public relations will be required to build an actionable consensus shared by the shifting collection of stakeholders and governmental institutions that have one or more interests in the bay.

## Vision Statement

What this plan addresses is the strategic direction in which the District should move. It identifies competencies, which the District must acquire if it hopes to be successful in the effort to build an actionable consensus on any of the major issues likely to arise during the next five years. Those desired competencies are summed up in the new vision statement for 2007-2011:

### ***Local leadership – Regional stewardship – Global significance***

The vision statement reflects the fact that many other individuals and entities have an interest in the issues at the heart of the District's concerns. Equally important, the District has limited authority to dictate solutions independently. It can lead, attracting resources and catalyzing the consensus required to make meaningful change. The direction of change pursued by the District will reflect its self-identification as a steward, not only for the region but for future generations as well. In managing bay resources, the District will seek to develop programs that become widely respected models of how to do it right.



## Strategic Objectives

That is the vision. Four strategic objectives are recommended for the 2007-2011 planning period. They describe strategies, which, if pursued, will lead to the realization of the vision. The strategic objectives are:

1. Encourage an informed and active public.
2. Pursue economic development that is attainable, innovative and consistent with both best environmental practices and the Humboldt Bay Management Plan.
3. Attract the best and most reliable scientific partners to work with the District on bay management issues.
4. Respond to emerging issues with may have a significant impact on environmental protection, recreation, economic opportunity or safety concerns.

## Critical Issues

Both the vision statement and strategic objectives were derived from a consideration of the issues that are likely to dominate discussions at the District during the next five years. Among them are the following ten:

1. Reconciling to the growing demand for recreation, conservation, cultural, historic and industrial uses related to the bay
2. Responding to emerging concerns about potential and legacy contamination of bay materials
3. Informing the public about increasingly complex issues and encouraging active public participation
4. Filling the need for a dredge materials management plan
5. Responding to growing concerns rising out of the anticipated rise in sea level and tsunami danger
6. Implementing ecosystem-based management and assembling the complex data that it will require
7. Responding to emerging concerns about bay and port-related homeland security and personal safety
8. Implementing locally the *Marine Life Protection Act*
9. Responding to the growing demand for accurate inventories of bay resources, uses and infrastructure
10. Finding appropriate and productive uses for underutilized, historic industrial lands



## Mission Statement

No changes to the existing (2002-2006) District mission statement were recommended. As a good mission statement should, the existing one describes the constituency to be served and the services to be provided. Over the 2007-2011 period it will continue to serve as a touchstone for all District operations, helping to identify what is - and is not - an appropriate activity for the organization.

***The mission of the Harbor District is to serve all of the people of Humboldt County by promoting harbor use, enhancing recreational opportunities and protecting bay and tidal environments.***

## General Objectives

General objectives break out and articulate the mission statement in greater detail. The twelve general objectives adopted for 2002-2006 were revised and increased to fifteen. The general objectives recommended for 2007-2011 are:

1. To represent the various constituencies equally and fairly within the responsibilities as stated in the enabling legislation
2. To coordinate and provide leadership to federal, state and local entities on issues relevant to the District mission
3. To promote public access to and around Humboldt Bay
4. To support improvements to visitor serving amenities, including trails, without regard to ability or income
5. To promote regulatory and legislative action favorable to the District
6. To expand and promote the economic infrastructure of Humboldt Bay and to develop opportunities for private entrepreneurship
7. To generate adequate revenues to fund on-going District programs
8. To manage all tide and submerged lands within the District's jurisdiction consistent with the Humboldt Bay Management Plan and utilizing an ecosystem- based management approach.
9. To promote and create recreational and educational opportunities within the District's jurisdiction
10. To promote the protection of the bay and other tidelands
11. To promote the protection of cultural and historic resources
12. To promote public knowledge of the bay
13. To promote public knowledge of the District and its accomplishments
14. To attain a high level of competency and efficiency in the operation of the District
15. To regularly update the District's operating and long range plans

## Management Objectives

Many of the District's day-to-day activities are important even if they do not rise to the level of strategic concerns. All these activities deserve – and will receive – appropriate attention from the Commission and District staff. A long list of



management objectives addresses those activities. They were developed by staff and discussed by the Committee. They are included as Appendix VIII to the Strategic Plan less as a set of recommendations than as an acknowledgement of the full range of concerns embraced by the District.

The balance of this report is loosely based on the process that the planning group used to develop its recommendations. In it you will find much additional detail. The recommendations will be discussed more fully. The context and rationale for them should be clearer.

## Implementation

The Humboldt Bay Management Plan remains the foundational policy document for the District. It sets out policies that will be the basis for reconciling the not-always-compatible demands posed by uses related to the bay. The Humboldt Bay Management Plan is likely to guide decision making at the District for generations to come. Because of the importance of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan to the District and its link to this Strategic Plan, the Executive Summary of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan is contained in Appendix IX of this document. The entire Humboldt Bay Management Plan can be found on the District's website at [www.humboldt-bay.org](http://www.humboldt-bay.org).

The Strategic Plan has a narrower focus. The vision and strategic objectives define competencies that the District hopes to acquire, competencies that will be critical to the District's success in the next three to five years. The Strategic Plan supports the longer-term goal of implementing the Humboldt Bay Management Plan and proposes no actions or activities that will be undertaken by the District that might affect the physical environment until those actions or activities have been assessed pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. The District's ability to achieve that longer-term goal will be greatly enhanced if the vision and strategic objectives are achieved.

Effective action will be required to implement the Strategic Plan; but the specific actions required are not identified in this report. The required action plans will be generated over time from ideas contributed by a number of sources. A major contributor is likely to be the task force(s) created to advise the Commission on the implementation of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan. District staff is likely to make recommendations, as may the Commission itself. Regardless of the source of the idea, any action will be subject to full public scrutiny and environmental review prior to implementation.

The Strategic Plan was created by a diverse group of individuals who came to the table with very different ideas about what the District priorities should be. Yet the Strategic Plan they produced is a consensus document, strongly supported by each and every one of the very different individuals who made up the planning group. That is cause for hope. It suggests that the sometimes-warring groups who have an interest in the bay may be able to unite behind and support the implementation of the Strategic Plan.



# Strategic Plan

2007 - 2011



## Vision Statement

A vision statement is the highest level of synthesis in a strategic plan. It is an intuitively understandable statement that conjures up an image of how the District's efforts will improve it and its environment over the planning period. It describes the key change that the District is hoping to catalyze through its planning efforts.

A vision statement was first articulated during the 2001-planning program. The vision adopted for 2002-2006 is worth noting:

***Bay leadership for the benefit of all***

The old vision statement emphasized the importance of leadership to the District's objectives. Much of what the planning group wanted the District to do required the active cooperation of local, state and federal entities. Creating agendas, generating support for action was critical. Above all else, the plan said that the District must improve its ability to lead others to adopt a common agenda for bay related activities.

The group committed to update the vision statement in 2007. Reflecting on all the input and insights collected during the various planning exercises, the group brainstormed a series of words, phrases and statements that conveyed a sense of the change desired. Working through the concepts, a draft vision statement emerged. Those who are interested can look in the Appendices to find the words phrases and statements captured during the brainstorming process.

The group consensus settled on a vision statement that embraces a tiered set of three values. The recommended vision statement for 2007-2011 is:

***Local leadership – Regional stewardship – Global significance***

The new vision statement continues to recognize the importance of leadership in successfully managing the complex issues associated with Humboldt Bay. It adds two new elements to the picture. *Regional stewardship* suggests that the District has a relationship, not only with the whole region, but also with generations to come. *Global significance* signals a desire to manage bay issues in a way that will define and serve as a model of best management practices for the world at large.

The recommended vision statement for 2007-2011 is nothing if not ambitious. It foresees a future where there is a strong local consensus on how to manage bay issues and where the District is an acknowledged model for bay management.



# Strategic Objectives

Strategic objectives are an elaboration of the vision statement. They define more tangible – though still broad – objectives, which should be pursued over the next three to five years. If the strategic objectives are accomplished, then the vision will begin to become a reality.

For the 2007-2011 period, the planning group committed itself to building a new set of strategic objectives based on the new vision statement. Discussion of potential objectives started as early as the four public outreach sessions. The public dictated pages of detailed suggestions about what the District should (and should not) do<sup>1</sup>. All suggestions were considered. Through a series of planning exercises, the group narrowed its focus to a shorter list of potential initiatives.<sup>2</sup> Meditating on those initiatives, the planning group identified four objectives that will be critical to achieving the world described by the new vision statement. Those four objectives, the strategic objectives should be pursued aggressively during the 2007-2011 planning period. They are.

1. Encourage an informed and active public.
2. Pursue economic development that is attainable, innovative and consistent with both best environmental practices and the Humboldt Bay Management Plan.
3. Attract the best and most reliable scientific partners to work with the District on bay management issues.
4. Respond to emerging issues with may have a significant impact on environmental protection, recreation, economic opportunity or safety concerns.

The strategic objectives are not self-implementing. Commission, District staff and other interested parties will have to develop specific tactics for accomplishing each objective. The recommended procedure is:

1. Develop one or more initiatives for each of the four strategic objectives. The initiatives should be specific activities that can be fully accomplished within a twelve to eighteen month period and which, if accomplished, will move the District substantially closer to accomplishing the strategic objective.
2. After twelve months, evaluate the status of the Strategic Plan and the effectiveness of initiatives implemented. Revise initiatives that are not working. Define new initiatives to build on successes and, again, move the District closer to realizing the vision.
3. Repeat the process annually for the balance of the planning period.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix VI for a sorted version of the note taken during the public outreach sessions.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix IV for the potential initiatives brainstormed by the planning group.



## Critical Issues

Both the vision statement and strategic objectives were derived from a consideration of the issues that are likely to dominate discussions at the District during the next five years. The group worked hard to develop a short, reasonably comprehensive list. They settled on the following ten issues.

1. Reconciling to the growing demand for recreation, conservation, cultural, historic and industrial uses related to the bay
2. Responding to emerging concerns about potential and legacy contamination of bay materials
3. Informing the public about increasingly complex issues and encouraging active public participation
4. Filling the need for a dredge materials management plan
5. Responding to growing concerns rising out of the anticipated rise in sea level and tsunami danger
6. Implementing ecosystem-based management and assembling the complex data that it will require
7. Responding to emerging concerns about bay and port related homeland security and personal safety
8. Implementing locally the *Marine Life Protection Act*
9. Responding to the growing demand for accurate inventories of bay resources, uses and infrastructure
10. Finding appropriate and productive uses for underutilized, historic industrial lands

## Mission Statement

A mission statement defines the basic identity of an organization. It describes the constituency to be served and the services to be provided. It serves as a touchstone to identify what is - and is not - an appropriate activity for the organization.

The existing mission statement was reviewed and approved as written. It reads as follows.

***The mission of the Harbor District is to serve all of the people of Humboldt County by promoting harbor use, enhancing recreational opportunities and protecting bay and tidal environments.***

## General Objectives

The general objectives expand upon the mission statement. They provide a more detailed description of the services and competencies that the organization must develop and deliver to fulfill its mission.

The group reviewed the list of general objectives from the 2002-2006 Plan. They both edited and added to them. A key to the changes can be found in the appendices.



The general objectives recommended for 2007-2011 are:

1. To represent the various constituencies equally and fairly within the responsibilities as stated in the enabling legislation
2. To coordinate and provide leadership to federal, state and local entities on issues relevant to the District mission
3. To promote regulatory and legislative action favorable to the District
4. To expand and promote the economic infrastructure of Humboldt Bay and to develop opportunities for private entrepreneurship
5. To generate adequate revenues to fund on-going District programs
6. To manage all tide and submerged lands within the District's jurisdiction consistent with the Humboldt Bay Management Plan and utilizing an ecosystem- based management approach.
7. To promote and create recreational and educational opportunities within the District's jurisdiction
8. To promote the protection of the bay and other tidelands
9. To promote the protection of cultural and historic resources
10. To promote public knowledge of the bay
11. To promote public access to and around the bay, including trails, without regard to ability or income
12. To promote public knowledge of the District and its accomplishments
13. To attain a high level of competency and efficiency in the operation of the District
14. To regularly update the District's operating and long range plans

## Management Objectives

The vision and strategic objectives focus on change. They describe how the organization hopes to change itself over the next three to five years. They do not describe the full range of activities authorized by the mission statement and general objectives. That is the job of the management objectives.

District staff defined a long list of management objectives. Together they describe operational goals that the staff hopes to achieve over the next three to five years. They are organized under five headings: marina, harbor, recreation, conservation and administration.

The planning group reviewed the management objectives for consistency with the Strategic Plan. They did not analyze them for feasibility or desirability. As such, only a very limited conclusion can be drawn from the inclusion of the management objectives in this report: The planning group found nothing on the objectives list that is inconsistent with the Strategic Plan.

The management objectives recommended by staff can be found in Appendix VII.



## Implementation

The Humboldt Bay Management Plan remains the foundational policy document for the District. It sets out policies that will be the basis for reconciling the not-always-compatible demands posed by uses related to the bay. The Humboldt Bay Management Plan is likely to guide decision making at the District for generations to come. Because of the importance of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan to the District and its link to this Strategic Plan, the Executive Summary of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan is contained in Appendix IX of this document. The entire Humboldt Bay Management Plan can be found on the District's website at [www.humboldtbay.org](http://www.humboldtbay.org).

The Strategic Plan has a narrower focus. The vision and strategic objectives define competencies that the District hopes to acquire, competencies that will be critical to the District's success in the next three to five years. The Strategic Plan supports the longer-term goal of implementing the Humboldt Bay Management Plan and proposes no actions or activities that will be undertaken by the District that might affect the physical environment until those actions or activities have been assessed pursuant to the requirements of CEQA. The District's ability to achieve that longer-term goal will be greatly enhanced if the vision and strategic objectives are achieved.

Effective action will be required to implement the Strategic Plan; but the specific actions required are not identified in this report. The required action plans will be generated over time from ideas contributed by a number of sources. A major contributor is likely to be the task force(s) created to advise the Commission on the implementation of the Humboldt Bay Management Plan. District staff is likely to make recommendations, as may the Commission itself. Regardless of the source of the idea, any action will be subject to full public scrutiny and environmental review prior to implementation.

The Strategic Plan was created by a diverse group of individuals who came to the table with very different ideas about what the District priorities should be. Yet the Strategic Plan they produced is a consensus document, strongly supported by each and every one of the very different individuals who made up the planning group. That is cause for hope. It suggests that the sometimes-warring groups who have an interest in the bay may be able to unite behind and support the implementation of the Strategic Plan.



## A note regarding Appendices

Attached to this report are nine appendices. All are work documents developed by the planning group in the long process of generating this Strategic Plan.

The first two appendices, *Changes Observed (I)* and *Comments About Outreach Sessions (II)* chart the planning group effort to analyze and understand the raft of suggestions received from the public during the outreach sessions. The next three, *Discussion of Mission and Vision Statements (III)*, *Potential Initiatives (IV)* and *Brainstorming the Vision Statement (V)* were foundations for the thought process that went into crafting the *Vision Statement* and *Strategic Objectives*.

The *General Objectives* were reviewed, amended and expanded. Appendix VI shows the changes made to the 2002-2007 list.

Appendix VII, *Management Objectives*, was produced by the District staff. The charge was to outline current plans for managing all of the District's on-going businesses. This section describes plans for maintaining and improving those businesses in the next few years. They are important. In the opinion of the planning group, they are not inconsistent with the Strategic Plan. Largely, they can be left to the care of the District's competent staff.

The eighth appendix, *Notes from Outreach Meetings*, contains a compilation of all the suggestions and comments made by the public during the course of four initial public input sessions. The planning group considered all the ideas listed in this section. They have been included with this report solely to document the wide range of suggestions tabled by outreach participants. They have not been adopted or recommended by the planning group. Inclusion here does not commit the District to pursue, implement or even give further consideration to any of the specific suggestions contained in Appendix V.

Appendix IX is the *Executive Summary from the Humboldt Bay Management Plan*. The entire Humboldt Bay Management Plan can be viewed on the District's website at [www.humboltdbay.org](http://www.humboltdbay.org).



# Appendix I

## Changes Observed

Following is a transcript of a discussion by the planning group. The comments recorded were made by specific individuals. They were not reviewed or approved by the group as a whole. They are included in the Strategic Plan report to illustrate some of the thought process that went into its creation. The specific comments have not been endorsed by the planning group, the Commission or the District.

One of the initial discussions was about change. What changes have become visible during the last five years in the District, the bay or the community at large?

1. There are new players emerging, non-governmental organizations, acting as advocacy groups. Their areas of interest increasingly overlap with the District's.
2. The decision-making environment is evolving. The consultative process, CEQA et al., defines the structure. But ultimate decisions are increasingly influenced by the politics and emotions of the situation, sometimes without regard to established policy.
3. New political strategies for influencing bay-related decisions include: choosing not to participate in the consultative process and the weighing in at the last minute with value-based appeals, direct lobbying of participating state agencies, and trying issues in the court of public opinion.
4. The public trust doctrine is being expanded beyond its traditional scope.
5. The political environment around bay issues is becoming increasingly polarized. At times groups are characterized in a one-dimensional way, as anti-growth or purely pro-development.
6. Citizens around the bay increasingly view it as an amenity rather than an economic resource.
7. Dredging has become a hot-button issue and is not likely to cool off.
8. Legal challenges to controversial decisions are conceivable if not inevitable.
9. The use plan for Redwood Dock now under development is likely to prove controversial, particularly if public concerns are not raised – and resolved – in the study process.
10. The utility of the EIR process has declined. It is difficult to get agencies to comment significantly. Agencies are too busy. Some tend to vacillate between the conflicting roles of resource manager and regulator.
11. Public involvement in bay-related issues is increasing.
12. The process for handling big issues (dredging, LNG, water bags, dioxin contamination) has become increasingly ad hoc and emotional.
13. The community cares deeply but lacks the sophistication to deal effectively with the more complex coastal issues.
14. The Humboldt Bay Management Plan is a major accomplishment, providing a foundation for addressing many bay-related issues.
15. The adversarial nature of recent controversies has negatively impacted the credibility of all participants, at least in the eyes of some of the partisans.
16. Issues of the bay and surrounding watersheds have become entwined. A focus on water quality has lead to increased interest in the bay.
17. Coho and tidewater goby listings have complicated analysis of bay use issues.



18. District staff has increased its capacity and is capable of managing an expanding range of quite complex issues.
19. Global warming and an anticipated rise in ocean levels have become a factor that must be taken into consideration.
20. The District has become a major owner of industrial land adjacent to the bay.
21. Recreational interest in trails and kayaks has increased.
22. Cultural issues, especially those associated with the Wiyot Tribe, have increasing prominence.
23. Implementation of the Marine Life Protection Act will impact the bay and adjacent waters.
24. The de-listing of the Aleutian goose will impact land use adjacent to the bay.
25. The District has become the default operator of its Fields Landing boat yard.
26. Tideland receipts are declining, in part because the District now owns industrial properties on which it had been receiving lease revenues.
27. The major ports of the west coast are maxed out, which will tend to encourage harbor development on the bay and introduce new security concerns.
28. Increasing imports of logs has swung the shipping balance, measured by tonnage, from export to import.
29. Substantial portions of the land adjacent to the bay have been added to refuges or otherwise been given protective status.
30. The link between a vital port and transportation – rail in particular – is as strong as ever.
31. Non-scientific information is increasingly influencing agency decisions.
32. The Eureka Boardwalk has a fenced off a portion of the Eureka channel, limiting the area available for water dependent commercial uses.
33. District issues have become increasingly polarized. It used to be easier.
34. State agencies tend to hold local projects to a higher standard because the north coast is pristine and relatively powerless in the political calculus of the state. We tend to be the place where state political battles are fought.



## Appendix II

### Comments About Outreach Sessions

Following is a transcript of a discussion by the planning group. The comments recorded were made by specific individuals. They were not reviewed or approved by the group as a whole. They are included in the Strategic Plan report to illustrate some of the thought process that went into its creation. Neither the planning group, the Commission nor the District has endorsed the specific comments that follow.

The planning group discussed input from outreach meetings as a whole. What did we hear that was new? What did we not hear that might be significant? Here are some of the comments.

1. Interest in recreational issues had increased markedly.
2. Very few participants commented on economic uses of the bay such as fishing or shipping. Does that reflect the declining economic weight of those sectors?
3. The idea that the District should promote a railroad museum was entirely new.
4. Relatively few people commented on – or showed any knowledge of – the Humboldt Bay Management Plan. From a public perspective, it might as well not exist.
5. The lack of comment on issues associated with economic development and the port suggests a minimal understanding of - or interest in – coastal dependent uses.
6. Fishermen were relatively quiet. Perhaps that reflects the fact that they are relatively satisfied with the local support facilities, especially when they are compared to facilities in other ports.
7. The group had expected to hear more comment about environmental degradation than it heard.
8. There was not a lot of blue-sky thinking. Suggestions were relatively predictable. There was not a lot of innovation or extraordinary creativity evident.
9. Uses for the Redwood Dock were mentioned only briefly. Will the Strategic Plan and the pending consultant's report be compatible?
10. There was very little discussion of job development – or even of conserving the existing, living wage jobs.
11. No one talked about tidal or biomass energy.
12. Potential uses for the Kramer property in Fairhaven were not discussed in any detail.
13. A new concern was raised about whether recreational uses have or will exceed the bay's capacity to host them.
14. Comments suggest that the District should focus most of its energy on issues well outside the narrow confine of the harbor.
15. Comment suggest that the county dynamic is shifting, perhaps under the influence of equity immigrants, folks who tend to see the bay more as an environmental resource than an economic engine.
16. Economic interests seemed to be saying, "If you cannot help, then just do not hurt us."



Individual group members volunteered comments on the sorted notes from the outreach meetings.

- Note #4: The Regional Water Quality Board and District issues form a nexus critical to both.
- Note #8: The goal of permit streamlining is difficult to achieve. The existing process is increasingly influenced by political judo. The EIR process is increasingly dysfunctional. Is a legislative solution the only fix?
- Note # 15: Legacy pollution is an issue of concern to both the Regional Water Quality Board and the District.
- Note #34: With regard to cultural issues and tribal rights, the historic tribal sites are not well mapped.
- Note 41: The Marine Life Protection Act will clearly be a hot button issue in coming years.
- Note 43: A National Heritage Area is more complex than it may seem. It might trigger additional land use planning restrictions.
- Note 73: Jobs, especially longshore jobs, and economic development are critical.
- Note 86: The District should play a role in facilitating a mariculture park, perhaps helping to secure a site and/or providing seed money.



## Appendix III

### Discussion of Mission & Vision

Following is a transcript of a discussion by the planning group. The comments recorded were made by specific individuals. They were not reviewed or approved by the group as a whole. They are included in the Strategic Plan report to illustrate some of the thought process that went into its creation. Neither the planning group, the Commission nor the District has endorsed the specific comments that follow.

The group discussed the mission and vision statements developed in the 2002-2007 Strategic Plan. The intent was to deal with them organically, to discuss how well they fit current District circumstances without attempting to re-write them.

Comments on the mission statement included the following:

- Limiting the constituency to Humboldt County is both too narrow and too wide. Inland areas depend on the bay. The significance is truly regional. Yet much of the county is irrelevant to the District's practical concerns.
- Balance is a key element in the District's makeup, one that is not explicitly referenced in the mission statement.
- There is no reference to the importance of economic enhancement.
- There is no reference to cultural resources as a District concern.

Comments on the vision statement included the following:

- PR issues are a missing dimension.
- Leadership is still a key issue though there's a question whether District leadership is widely accepted.
- A reference to value generated by District initiatives is missing.
- There should be a suggestion of the collaborative nature of any effective actions.
- The statement should position the District within the community, making the linkages clearer.
- The District role is as a local leader.



## Appendix IV

### Potential Initiatives

Following is a transcript of a discussion by the planning group. The comments recorded were made by specific individuals. They were not reviewed or approved by the group as a whole. They are included in the Strategic Plan report to illustrate some of the thought process that went into its creation. Neither the planning group, the Commission nor the District has endorsed the specific comments that follow.

At the August 7 session, the group developed a list of potential initiatives and then used a mechanical ranking system to roughly prioritize them. The prioritized list was discussed in depth at the beginning of the August 16 meeting. The discussion served as a foundation for development of the vision statement.

#### *Potential Initiative*

- Develop productive uses for District-owned lands.
- Map and manage personal safety and homeland security related issues around the bay.
- Implement the Humboldt Bay Management Plan Task Force.
- Develop a coalition that will take on the task of designing an innovative, streamlined permitting process.
- Develop a comprehensive response to the anticipated danger from tsunamis.
- Increase the effectiveness of coordination and cooperation with local port operators.
- Convene local interests to address potential impacts from the local implementation of the Marine Life Protection Act.
- Develop a comprehensive response to the anticipated rise in sea level.
- Promote District successes - regarding economic, recreational and conservation issues – to the public and interested parties.
- Promote the redevelopment of a rail-link and road improvements.
- Build an informational and political basis for deciding the future of rail on the North Coast.
- Support and/or engage in the development of water trails.
- Catalyze the creation of a bay institute and/or a bay interpretive center.
- Clarify the District's jurisdictional boundaries as restoration projects and other factors change the shape of the bay.
- Reinforce eelgrass conservation efforts.
- Devise a measure for the "capacity" of various bay habitats.
- Devise a measure to assess the potential of the bay to host mitigation projects.
- Implement a bay-wide signing program.
- Create an effective inventory of cultural and historic resources around the bay and interpret it.
- Commission a baseline survey of existing recreational uses around the bay and devise a methodology to determine the bay's recreational "capacity".



# Appendix V

## Brainstorming the Vision Statement

Reflecting on all the input and insights collected during the various planning exercises, the group brainstormed a series of words, phrases and statements that conveyed a sense of the change desired. Working through the concepts, a draft vision statement emerged.

For the record, here are the words, phrases and statements captured during the brainstorming process:

- We do more than just harbor
- We need to demonstrate the magnitude of the need in the bay
- There are big benefits in the bay
- We think – all of us – benefit balance with control
- Encourage a sense of informed ownership and pride
- It is ours – we love it
- Consensus and balance are key
- Stewardship is at the heart
- Local stewardship for local, community and regional needs
- Cooperation is key
- Investing in stewardship – responding to community needs
- We want a more informed, active involved community collaborating
- Bay stewardship with an eye to the next seven generations
- Bay stewardship for the benefit of the community
- A world class bay
- Local stewardship – Regional impact (significance) – Worldwide (global) effect (needs) (benefit)
- Protecting and enhancing Humboldt's harbor, recreation and conservation assets for all
- Local stewardship (leadership) – regional benefit (stewardship) – worldwide impact (global awareness – significance)



# Appendix VI

## General Objectives

The general objectives expand upon the mission statement. They provide a more detailed description of the services and competencies that the organization must develop and deliver to fulfill its mission.

The group reviewed the list of general objectives from the 2002-2006 plan. They both edited and added to them. In the list below entries in ~~strike through type~~ have been eliminated. Entries in *italics* have been added to the original statement of general objectives.

1. To represent the various constituencies equally and fairly within the responsibilities as stated in the enabling legislation
2. To coordinate and provide leadership to federal, state and local entities on issues relevant to the District mission
3. To promote regulatory and legislative action favorable to the District
4. To expand and promote the economic infrastructure of Humboldt Bay and to develop opportunities for private entrepreneurship
5. To generate adequate revenues to fund on-going District programs
6. To manage all tide and submerged lands within the District's jurisdiction *consistent with the Humboldt Bay Management Plan and utilizing an ecosystem- based management approach.*
7. To promote and create recreational *and educational* opportunities within the District's jurisdiction
8. To promote the protection of the bay and other tidelands
9. *To promote the protection of cultural and historic resources*
10. To promote public knowledge of the bay
11. *To promote public access to and around the bay, including trails, without regard to ability or income*
12. ~~To improve public awareness of and confidence in the District, its Commissioners and its staff~~ *To promote public knowledge of the District and its accomplishments*
13. To attain a high level of competency and efficiency in the operation of the District
14. To regularly update the District's operating and long range plans



# Appendix VII

## Management Objectives

The vision and strategic objectives focus on change. They describe how the organization hopes to grow in competence or capacity over the next three to five years. They do not describe the full range of the organization's on-going activities. That is the job of the management objectives.

As orientation for the planning group, the District staff produced a long list of management objectives. Together they describe operational goals that the staff hopes to achieve over the next three to five years. They are organized under five headings that correlate to the District's five operating divisions: marina, harbor, recreation, conservation and administration.

The planning group did not analyze the management objectives in detail. Discussion was limited to one issue: whether the objectives appeared to be consistent with the general plan. The objectives have been included in this report to illustrate the range of issues that District staff will likely manage in the next five years. Their inclusion in this report should not be construed as an endorsement or commitment to implement them.

### ***Woodley Island Marina***

1. Improve storm water treatment
2. Rehabilitate oily-bilge water collection system
3. Rehab work dock (broken piling/cross bracing/etc)
4. Improve slips (replace metal work/utilities/ etc as needed)
5. J-Dock and debris deflector
6. Move sewage pump-out to more visible space
7. Complete work dock with 3-5 ton hoist
8. Build mixed-use commercial space on west end of the island
9. Complete interpretive trail on south side of the island
10. Strengthen breakwater
11. Replace H-Dock piling
12. Expand Harbor District maintenance building
13. Improve existing canoe/kayak launch

### ***Harbor***

1. Complete Redwood Marine Terminal Feasibility Study in September 2007 and then implement recommendations
2. Work with City of Eureka to activate Foreign Trade Zone
3. Continue to work with US Army Corps of Engineers to keep navigation channels dredged
4. Complete dredge material management study
5. Work with US Army Corps of Engineers and CA Transportation Commission to complete Long Term Sediment Management Study
6. Continue to pursue container barge service
7. Continue to develop North Coast port alliance with ports of Oakland, Sacramento, Stockton and Redwood City



8. Improve Fields Landing Marine Terminal (then lease terminal)
9. Improve storm water treatment at District port facilities
10. Develop and implement a port marketing program
11. Develop and implement marketing program for Fields Landing Boat Yard
12. Assist NCRA to restore rail service to Humboldt Bay
13. Initiate or participate in navigation improvements
14. Continue to work with local/state federal agencies to develop funding for transportation enhancement projects
15. Assist CalTrans with road improvements to Humboldt Bay
16. Restore Samoa upland dredge disposal site to a usable condition
17. Continue support for commercial fishing facilities improvement
18. Work with industry on shore side aquaculture facility
19. Continue to pursue cruise ship markets (support legislation, marketing, facility improvements etc.)
20. *Work to develop a consensus on the assessment and management of an anticipated rise in sea level.*

### **Recreation**

1. Participate in trail/water-trail planning and implement recommendations
2. Work with Humboldt County on Fields Landing launch ramp upgrade project
3. Improve boating access and opportunities at FW lagoon
4. Improve breakwater at Shelter Cove
5. Continue to work with various museums/historical organizations on promotion of local history
6. Work with agencies and public on development of offshore reef project
7. Work with agencies to develop a small vessel fueling site on Humboldt Bay
8. Continue to promote and implement uniform trail signage around Humboldt Bay

### **Conservation**

1. Standardize various biological monitoring practices (eelgrass, wetland assessment, etc)
2. Oversee, initiate or participate in wetland restoration/enhancement projects Humboldt Bay and the Lower Eel River as recommended in the Final Humboldt Bay and Eel River Integrated Wetlands project (Complete September 2007)
3. Assist in expansion of acoustic fish tag program
4. Maintain and update mapping and natural resource databases
5. Continue interagency coordination
6. Develop mitigation planning
7. Continue to work with the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board on priority pollutant assessment and TMDL implementation in the Humboldt Bay region
8. Develop and implement piling mitigation program
9. Continue removing exotics from wildlife areas
10. Continue to assist State Lands Commission in their ballast water exchange program
11. Combine and expand District Wildlife Area ordinances
12. Develop Marine Protected Area planning alternatives
13. Develop master mariculture Best Management Practices program based on WRAC (Western Regional Aquaculture Committee) and other studies



14. Expand training and readiness of Oil Spill Co-op

***Administration***

1. Establish Humboldt Bay Management Plan Advisory Committee
2. Develop shoreline protection guidelines
3. Work with other agencies to streamline project permitting, as appropriate
4. Revise District permit forms and procedures
5. Implement 2007 Staff Reorganization
6. Revise Ordinance 9 (Woodley Island)
7. Assist, where possible, the community of King Salmon to develop a community-wide channel maintenance program
8. Continue and expand Port marketing
9. Strengthen port-wide terminal security
10. Continue public awareness events such as Humboldt Bay Maritime Expo, Humboldt Bay Symposium and Adopt-the Bay program
11. Work with NOAA to make Humboldt Bay a part of the "Tsunami Ready" Program



## Appendix VIII

### Notes from the Outreach Meetings

Four outreach meetings were conducted as part of the 2007 Strategic Planning process. Each meeting had a specific focus: government, recreation, conservation and harbor. Those sessions were conducted on April 17, May 14, June 6 and June 21 respectively. Despite the pre-defined focus, public comments at each session covered the whole range of District concerns. The following represents the notes from those meetings organized by Harbor, Recreation, Conservation and Other and by segment of Humboldt Bay:

#### **CONSERVATION - the whole bay**

1. Stream protection is essential to maintain and improve the water quality in the bay.
2. The need to maintain and enhance water quality in the bay and in streams feeding the bay is critical.
3. The bay must be viewed as a closed system.
  - Absolute priority must be given to the protection of bay resources.
  - One must deal with upland uses in order to adequately protect the bay.
  - Unknowns will complicate analysis of and approval for projects ranging from dock development to dike maintenance.
4. The District should pay particular attention to estuarine habitats and foster both preservation and enhancement projects.
  - Special attention should be paid to
    - Enhancing the sea-land interface,
    - Former tidelands and
    - Increasing their value as habitat.
  - Seeking the agreement of the Regional Water Quality Board (staff and Board, both) on a shared agenda may be essential to making any progress.
5. The District can play a role in preventing the introduction of (and combating the presence of) invasive species.
  - The District might publicize the problem and encourage others to become involved in addressing the problem.
  - The District might sponsor or coordinate projects with Sea Grant, Fish and Wildlife, Fish and Game and other interested entities.
6. The District should work with other agencies to improve fish passage. Consideration should be given to
  - Tide gates and
  - Levees.
7. The District might fund or facilitate studies on topics including
  - Tide gates
  - Salmon and
  - The Black Rock Fish Assessment.
8. The District should promote programs and processes that will streamline



- the permitting process for maintaining tide gates and levees.
  - The District might facilitate the development of a master Coastal Development Permit that could umbrella individual projects.
  - The District could promote a rationalized process that consolidates the redundant processing required by the various permits.
  - The District might develop a facility for the combined processing of multiple, small projects.
- 9. The District should facilitate the development of a comprehensive plan for the future of existing dikes and levees.
  - The issues associated with dike and levee preservation should be explored and documented.
  - The potential value – positive or negative - of “decommissioning” dikes and levees protecting individual properties should be examined.
  - Strategies for mitigating the increasing regulatory costs associated with dike and levee maintenance should be explored.
  - The District should encourage support for relevant, beneficial projects.
- 10. There is a continuing demand for enhanced fishing opportunities in and beyond the bay.
- 11. It is critical to maintain the estuaries feeding the bay. They are critical to the support of existing fish stocks.
- 12. Artificial reefs would enhance fishing habitat in and around the bay.
  - Building artificial reefs may be consistent with the Fish & Game mission. There are no current programs to support the activity.
  - The District may have a role in developing a program.
- 13. On-going and new developments provide plenty of opportunity for coordinated efforts, such as
  - The five county culvert mapping program,
  - Sedimentation control and
  - Other watershed issues.
- 14. NOAA’s interests include
  - Observations such as a bar camera and wave measuring devices.
  - Tsunami hazard preparedness is a major emerging concern.
  - The bay-forecasting model has a variety of potential uses for project design. It might be used to forecast the effect of climate-change-enhanced events on existing and planned infrastructure.
  - The bar forecast model is a first. It might be extended and used to perfect HAZMAT response on the bay.
- 15. The District should lead in the assessment and mitigation of legacy pollution in the bay, possibly in conjunction with the Water Board.
- 16. The District should take a leading role in assessing and mitigating the impacts of storm water and other contaminants on the bay.
- 17. Support efforts to remediate existing contamination of bay waters and mud. Prevent potential future contamination from any sources.
- 18. With the Coastal Conservancy and others, the District should participate in the development of a Humboldt Bay Ecosystem-Based Management Plan.
  - It would be based on the Humboldt Bay Management Plan.
  - It would develop specific proposals for addressing two to five priorities



- articulated in the HBMP.
  - It would focus on implementation, defining detailed projects for which grant funding could be solicited.
  - Participation by Eureka, Arcata and County governments should be sought.
19. Proposition 84, storm water runoff and other issues present opportunities for productive cooperation.
    - Rebuilding the Fields Landing boat ramp is a good example. It would not have been possible without other parties joining with the District to define and fund the project.
    - Greater cooperation is likely to lead to greater funding for projects.
  20. The Adopt-the-Bay program is promising.
    - The District should promote it more widely.
    - The District should expand its reach.
    - The District should improve follow through on specific projects, e.g. promptly removing trash bags after volunteers have filled them with debris removed from the beach.
  21. Explore options for preserving rookeries around the bay.
    - Raccoons have invaded the cypress grove that creates the rookery on Indian Island and the trees are dying out, leading to degradation and loss of nesting sites.
    - Replacement tree plantings on Indian Island have the potential, through root growth, to disturb the cultural resource inherent in the middens found at the site.
    - Anecdotal evidence suggests that the range of species using the island nesting sites has narrowed since the bridge was built, perhaps because land animals have easier access to the site.
    - The south bay rookery may – or may not – provide adequate nesting sites as available nesting sites on Indian Island disappear.
  22. No uranium mining!
  23. Cal Water Fowl purchases and manages wetlands. They might be partners in wetlands education.
  24. BayKeepers might be willing to support a water-sampling project.
  25. The view shed around the bay is extremely important. Protect it.
  26. A multitude of restoration projects have been and are being implemented around the bay without a lot of coordination.
    - Each bears a huge regulatory burden.
    - The reviews are repetitive and would be simplified if a programmatic EIR were created.
  27. Regulatory streamlining would be of great value.
  28. There are opportunities for data sharing.
    - CENCOOS – a data monitoring program under NOAA,
    - PACOOS, with the Coast Guard and
    - The Pacific Coast Joint Venture.
  29. The District should advocate for maintaining and improving water quality.
    - Could the District play a role in issuing discharge permits in areas not covered by the Water Quality Board?
  30. Help to create a consensus approach to identifying and mitigating the



environmental issues that are associated with the bay's water quality.  
Avoid potentially nightmarish litigation.

31. Avoid capping as a bay clean up strategy. Dredging is the best long-term fix.
32. Work with the municipalities to develop a comprehensive approach to managing storm water pollution.

### **Mid-bay**

33. The District should survey the Park Street marsh
  - Assessing the effectiveness of earlier restoration efforts and
  - Developing or amending the management plan as necessary or desirable.
34. The District should assist in the funding of the Indian Island restoration project, working in conjunction with the Wiyot Tribe. Potential projects include: protecting the midden from erosion, building a dock and creating a landing stage for canoes.

### **North Bay**

35. Promote an inter-agency dialogue, especially with Arcata, about the vision for the bay and how to coordinate individual plans and initiatives.
36. The City of Arcata has adopted and ranked its priorities for bay related uses: resource protection, recreation and economic development. That is, economic development should be pursued only where recreation and resource assets will not be compromised.
37. The City of Arcata has just embarked on a project to assess and mitigate any tsunami impact on city property. The project will assess impacts on the Arcata Marsh (waste water reclamation plant) and the corporation yard.
  - It might be productive to encourage the Department of Mines to conduct one of their initial tsunami studies here, on Humboldt Bay.
  - A sixty-acre expansion of the Arcata wastewater reclamation plant is likely to be planned and may well be implemented during the course of the next five years.
38. The District should develop a policy regarding placement and maintenance of billboards in sensitive habitats.
39. Get rid of the billboards.
40. Participate in the Ma'lel Dunes project.

### **Broader Issues**

41. The State is likely to designate Marine Life Protection Areas along the North Coast during the next two to four years.
42. "Conservation" should embrace cultural as well as other environmental resources.
  - Timber and maritime history should be supported because they produce economic, recreational and conservation benefits.
  - The anticipated development of Samoa should be leveraged to enhance the viability of the roundhouse as a timber heritage site.
    - The shop, roundhouse and cookhouse are the sole remaining elements of the timber-maritime complex.
    - Efforts should be expended to minimize conflicts with cargo handling at the adjacent Redwood dock.
    - Explore the idea of (and compatibility with) siting an aquarium



- or expanded HSU marine science center in the neighborhood.
43. Support the creation of a National Heritage Area in Humboldt.
  44. Make sure that the presentation of history encompasses all generations and all decades. Don't limit the view to just our revered ancestors.
  45. Cooperate with the Shellfish Technical Advisory Committee.
  46. Promote the Adopt the Bay program.
  47. The Bay Refuge has started to develop a fifteen-year master plan that will control development in the south bay and on Indian Island.
    - There is the potential to enter into a memorandum of understanding in support of recreational development.
    - Federal acquisition of the Indian Island property owned by the City of Eureka is possible but not likely during the next fifteen years.

### **Woodley Island**

48. The District should develop a model, exemplary, storm water management plan for Woodley Island.
49. Do not impair the public use of the "green space" on Woodley Island. Do not screw it up!

### **HARBOR - Samoa Bridge to Fields Landing Channel**

50. The District should monitor visiting boats in order to prevent entry of invasive species into the bay.
51. The Port of Oakland is near capacity and Eureka is two days closer to China than any other California port. As a result, there is reason to believe that local port tonnage will increase.
52. Dredging, sediment control and environmental protection are all related but not necessarily compatible issues.
53. The District should continue to support port, harbor and rail development.
54. Continued dredging is essential for viable shipping facilities.
55. The District should keep the channels open – but scientific data is #1.
56. Don't stop dredging. It supports the local fishing industry.
57. The District should consider alternatives to its traditional support for expansion of port use and related activities.
  - The District should assess the potential value of the port with lesser channel depths than it has currently.
  - The District should conduct a realistic assessment of the probability that a rail link will not be re-established (or that impediments associated with the highway system will not be removed) at any time in the foreseeable future. That assessment should guide decisions on how much effort should be invested in port development and promotion.
  - The realistic potential of the port to effect both the environment and the local economy should be dispassionately assessed.
  - A comprehensive and creative study of potential uses for the Redwood Dock should be commissioned.
58. The potential for Humboldt Bay to serve cruise ships is not perceived to be promising.
  - The only ships presently tempted to enter port are those that are being re-positioned or that are circling the globe.
    - Current law – which prohibits gambling on ships while they



cruise between US ports – is a disincentive for ships to call at Humboldt Bay.

- The economic benefit to the local economy from a visiting cruise ship is minimal.
  - Revenues to local businesses and agencies are presently in the range of \$40,000 to \$50,000 per visiting ship.
  - The time in port is minimal, as little as six hours, which limits tours, shopping and other economic activities.
  - Visitors may tour the redwoods or other local attractions; but they have little time or opportunity to spend any money.
  - The environmental impact of modern cruise ships is thought to be minimal.
  - The District is continuing to market the port to cruise lines in concert with other ports on the west coast.
59. Some shippers are (or will be) looking for docking facilities that they can control.

### **Fields Landing**

60. Industrial access to the Hookton Channel should be preserved. Until there are multiple users in Fields Landing, it will be difficult to allocate public funds to the area

### **Mid-Bay**

61. Do not allow industrial/commercial uses outside of the inner reach. Keep them out of both north and south bays.
62. Additional land will be required to properly develop the Redwood dock.
63. Evergreen brings in two break-bulk cargo vessels each month, carrying about fifteen metric tons of cargo. The vessels have the space to carry additional cargo. Other businesses should be made aware of this opportunity.
64. Barges could enhance the port's cargo handling capacity while reducing traffic on 101.
65. Shoaling at the bar entrance is a danger to shipping. The Corps of Engineers has completed a preliminary analysis for a sediment management program, generating nine approaches to mitigating the problem. The feasibility study would cost \$3,000,000. The Corps would pay for half the study cost.
66. Homeland security issues will complicate bay use. Practically, it requires the bay to be closed when ships are loading or unloading.
67. There is the potential to attract a few cruise ships to the bay each year. Most likely, that will occur when the ships are being re-positioned each season.
68. Could Fairhaven become the site for an aquaculture research center?
- HSU is currently leasing space for a lab on a short-term basis.
  - There may be potential conflicts with pulp handling.
  - The highest and best use of the land is probably tied to industrial uses.
  - It is unlikely that a conference or convention space would provide an adequate return on capital.
69. Without access to shipping, the local pulp industry will be less viable.
70. The old roundhouse and shop can service a living railroad while still supporting the Timber Heritage Museum.



71. Participate in the development of the town of Samoa and its adjacent industrial lands.

### **Broader issues**

72. Enhancements to the existing Customs office will be required if port usage increases.
73. Longshore jobs are worth preserving and expanding. They provide living wage jobs for local workers.
74. Fish waste might be the input for a new fertilizer business.
75. The harbor does not work without rail access. The District must enhance its support for re-building the rail link.
76. The District should support a barge service to the Port of Oakland.
77. Help to build the aquaculture support facility.
78. Promote the Fairhaven Business Park.
79. Provide the facilities the Evergreen needs and help them to find cargo for their ships to carry.
80. Maintain effective relationships with dock owners and operators.

### **Woodley Island**

81. There have been periodic breakdowns in the bilge water collection system at the Woodley Island Marina. It is possible that the system needs to be re-built or re-engineered.
82. Coast Guard interests include management of the effects on the bay of abandoned or substandard vessels. It was suggested that imposing an insurance requirement on moored vessels might help.

### **OTHER - the whole bay**

83. Climate change will have impacts that should be factored into the District's Strategic Plan:
- Impacts may include fisheries migration, enhanced El Nino conditions, and a large variety of other changes.
  - Sea levels are likely to rise. More significantly, peak events are likely to become more intense.
  - Impacts are likely to play out over thirty-five years, well beyond the defined scope of this Strategic Plan.
  - Storms and storm tides are likely to threaten existing dikes and the uses, which they shelter.
  - Unknown or unmeasured impacts of climate change will complicate analysis of and approval for projects ranging from dock development to dike maintenance.
84. The existing mission statement commits the District to support harbor use, recreational opportunities and environmental protection. Those values sometimes conflict. The mission should be modified to provide a more clearly prioritized set of values for the District.
85. There will be conflicts between conservation and recreation demands. Expect them. Plan to manage them.
- When a conflict develops, engage early and bring all the interests to the table.
  - Recreation is most likely to conflict with conservation in the north bay, in the south bay and, specifically, in the refuge.
86. The District should support marine aquaculture.



- It could help locate and permit new farms.
  - It could help existing farms to expand.
  - It should support the aquaculture terminal project.
    - As currently designed, the facility would provide space for four companies.
    - The cooperative is half permitted.
    - Disposal or re-use of fish waste is a major issue.
    - Might HSU be interested in the bay as a research site?
  - Working with DFG to develop a programmatic EIR for aquaculture would be an immense benefit.
  - Efforts should be coordinated with the proposed Fishermen's Terminal.
87. Participate with the Corps in the development of a west coast aquaculture plan.
88. The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District has a large supply of raw water available for sale, perhaps as much as an additional 45,000,000 gallons per day. Discharge issues would have to be addressed before the water could be used. Permits for bay or ocean discharge will be difficult to obtain.
89. Develop a financing mechanism for programmatic permits that would front the money now and recoup it over time by licensing the data to individual users as they define their projects.

### **Broader issues**

90. The District should endeavor to represent the community as a whole, using its ability to manage projects across many jurisdictions.
91. The District cannot manage the bay "for the benefit of all." Priorities must be established.
92. The District should facilitate private and public initiatives rather than setting arbitrary priorities for bay related uses. It should support all users.
93. The District should collaborate with others to build larger plans that serve the District's objectives.
94. Efforts should be taken to more widely broadcast public meeting notices and to encourage attendance by interested parties. Specific suggestions include:
- Provide longer lead-time for meeting notices.
  - Provide individual notices to persons and organizations who have commented on the Management Plan or other District projects.
  - Build an e-mail distribution list for notifications.
  - Authorize and request interested individuals and organizations to re-distribute meeting notices to members and other people on their contact lists.
95. An anticipated rise in sea level is likely to affect the District and the community at large. It needs to be taken into consideration in the District's plans.
96. The District should promote community awareness of the potential impacts of a rise in sea levels and should encourage appropriate local initiatives. The Boston 2000 program might be considered as a model.
97. Promoting transportation of goods and people is particularly important.



Rail rights of way should be developed to move goods and people within the area.

98. Work with the rail authority to restore the rail link.

99. Reconsider the District's traditional support for restoration of a rail link to the outside world. While a local tourist train might be self-sustaining, the main line is a money loser that's not feasible without public subsidies.

100. The Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District delivers up to 15,000,000 gallons of water per day for drinking purposes. The existing distribution system will be maxed out with the planned development of Samoa. Significant infrastructure enhancements will be required to increase volumes delivered.

101. Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District interests include promoting linkages to and consistency with the County general plan, especially when it comes to development of adequate infrastructure.

102. Particular attention should be paid to the efforts, pending and future, of the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) and other similar entities.

- The District should help the PFMC to understand the economic impact of its decisions.
- The District may choose to act an interlocutor, speaking on behalf of relevant interests or groups.
- Common ground may exist with NOAA in the study of essential fish habitats, especially when it comes to assessing impacts on listed species and identifying best practices.

103. The District should facilitate improvements in aquaculture practices with particular emphasis on:

- The environment,
- Economics,
- Viability and
- Sustainability.

104. The District should seek to enhance commercial and sport fisheries by, perhaps:

- Increasing community awareness of the fisheries,
- Participating in the designation of Marine Protection Areas

105. Pay attention to capacity and compatibility issues. Seek appropriate compromises.

106. Will capacity issues constrain future development? We need baseline data on current uses before we can begin to answer the question.

107. You need to resolve the conflicts that arise when you promote recreation, conservation and harbor uses.

108. Regarding the Mission Statement

- There is a continuing struggle to properly balance the values associated with harbor, recreation and conservation objectives.
- It may be time to think seriously about changing the historic balance points between different values. It may be desirable to point more clearly at what constitutes an appropriate balance between competing interests.
- The Mission Statement should better reflect the priorities inherent in the management plan.



- As the manager for public trust lands, the District's constituency extends to all of California.
- 10 The mission makes sense; but *environment* should come first.
- 9.
- 11 The mission statement doesn't address the broader concept of  
0. conservation, which should reference cultural as well environmental resources.
- 11 The vision of bay leadership is too narrow. It should talk about the bay  
1. rather than the role of the District. It is not evocative.
- 11 Regarding the Vision Statement  
2.
- The District can properly locate a project anywhere in Humboldt County: in Shelter Cove, on the Trinity or anywhere that a compelling case can be made that a project will serve the District's interests.
  - The District should consider promotional initiatives, especially those that result in cooperative projects such as a web site re-design that consolidates and promotes access to bay and other relevant information.
  - The District should promote shared, early awareness of bay related investigations and cooperation between investigators.
  - The idea that the District should exercise a leadership role is still appropriate.
  - The District should facilitate wide scale participation in projects and studies relevant to its mission.
  - The District should consider the extent to which the Brown act takes the initiative from the Commission and delivers it to staff. To the extent feasible, the Commission should innovate and develop policy for the District.
- 11 The vision statement needs work.  
3.
- The implementation strategy should be clear.
  - The District should do more than act as a facilitator or mediator between conflicting interests.
  - The vision should be of a *working* bay, one that works for all types of uses.
  - Capacity building should be a priority.
  - The slogan should be "Take back the Bay." The District should promote public use and public safety.
- 11 The strategic objectives should reference:  
4.
- More personal use without risk to personal safety, especially to individuals using trails.
  - Historic resources!
  - Completing the Redwood Dock
  - Promoting harbor facilities and the rail restoration required for cargo handling ships
- 11 Knowledge of pending and active research projects being conducted by  
5. other agencies is sometimes minimal. Often it's only when the research is published that general awareness develops.
- A clearinghouse for research ideas and pending projects would be desirable.
  - A web site or other utility might facilitate awareness.



- The Management Plan calls for the District to take a greater role in facilitating coordination.
- 11  
6. Issues associated with the land at the bay margins present opportunities for cooperation.
- State ownership of lands at the bay margin is the most significant change that has occurred around the bay in some time.
  - Change may present the opportunity to leverage new projects.
- 11  
7. The links with Humboldt State present continuing opportunities for cooperation on historic and emerging issues.
- 11  
8. A number of agencies have spheres of influence that overlap the District's: the Regional Water Quality Board, the Coastal Commission and, perhaps, others.
- Effective coordination with those agencies is likely to multiply the District's effectiveness. Conflict (or lack of coordination) is likely to diminish it.
  - A common agenda should be forged. That is likely to happen only if the District takes a leadership role.
  - Effective cooperation will require the District to develop strong relationships with the entities at both appointee and staff levels.
  - Identification of shared objectives may provide the foundation for wider cooperation.
- 11  
9. Do not infringe on the Regional Water Quality Board's jurisdiction.
- 12  
0. The context in which the District works has changed significantly since the District was formed and is continuing to change. The importance of environmental values and research is increasing. The District must anticipate the changes, and recognize the difference they will impose on how the District analyzes situations and what it ultimately elects to do.
- 12  
1. The District should take a leading (or collaborative) role to (a) address conflicts between different bay related uses and (b) resolve capacity related issues.
- 12  
2. Evergreen Pulp has indicated that it wants to participate in the local community. It might be recruited to support selected projects.
- 12  
3. We want it all... and we want it now!
- 12  
4. Do it all; but maintain the proper balance among all the competing interests that the District serves.
- 12  
5. Go fast...even if you are walking on eggshells.
- 12  
6. Find the money to do what needs to be done.

## **RECREATION - the whole bay**

- 12  
7. Build a plan to serve all the people and then make sure that it gets implemented.
- 12  
8. Recreational opportunities should be more heavily promoted, both locally and regionally.
- 12  
9. Promote access to the bay by improving facilities, expanding knowledge of the recreational opportunities and by enabling folks with fiscal or physical limitations.
- 13  
0. There are capacity constraints on bay oriented recreation.



- 13  
1. Capacity issues – and conflicts between different uses – may significantly constrain bay related uses in the future.
- Collecting base line data on current usage would be very helpful from a planning perspective.
  - The community should anticipate and plan for a world where the demand for bay related activities is increasing.
  - The District should take affirmative steps to enable folks to use bay resources who are currently inhibited by physical or fiscal limitations.
- 13  
2. Recreational activities can conflict with other needs. For example, recreational uses can conflict with conservation during peak fly-over periods for Brant duck
- 13  
3. There may be a demand for public shell fishing areas if they were to be developed. Models exist in the pacific northwest.
- 13  
4. There is an historic demand for recreational duck hunting in and around the bay.
- Historic uses were not acknowledged in the plan for the Ma’lel dunes.
  - Conflicts exist between hunting and other recreational uses.
- 13  
5. Preserve and enhance bird-hunting activities.
- Consider harvesting the Aleutian Goose flocks.
  - Identifies strategies that will minimize conflicts between hunters and kayakers such as seasonal notices at launch spots.
- 13  
6. The District should promote the development of more trails on water and land.
- 13  
7. Additional water trails should be developed and promoted.
- 13  
8. Increase public access for kayaks and kayak users.
- 13  
9. Additional boat launch facilities are needed, for both motorized and non-motorized boats. Ideally, non-motorized launch sites would be separate from motorized.
- 14  
0. CalTrans has an interest in
- Promoting mobility and safety,
  - Goods movement and
  - Facilitating bicycle and pedestrian traffic such as an Arcata-Eureka trail.
- 14  
1. Develop camping facilities associated with water use sites.
- Provide opportunities for RV and tent camping.
  - Develop sites only accessible by kayaks.
  - Consider limiting vehicular access to some sites.
  - Look to the Great Lakes and Catalina Island for models of successful water oriented camping programs.
- 14  
2. Update kayak launch sites.
- Provide convenient restrooms, perhaps with showers.
  - Provide facilities to rinse off equipment.
  - Provide improved signage.
- 14  
3. Floating docks are necessary for easy kayak access to the water.
- Potential sites include Fields Landing, Woodley Island (Dock A) and the Arcata Marsh.
  - Involve users in the design of facilities so that their utility is maximized.
- 14 Add amenities to launch sites.



- Toilets
  - Equipment rinse facilities
  - Showers
- 14  
5. Improve signage for water trails.
- Improve signage signaling access points along trails.
  - Provide signage along trails to guide users.
  - Promote water trails to tourists and other visitors. (60% of the existing kayak rentals through HumBoats are to out-of-town visitors.)
  - Explore the potential to partner with local businesses to develop and maintain signs
- 14  
6. Sloughs are attractive – but dead end – venues for kayakers.
- Breaks spots, areas where one could get to the land without tramping through the mud, would be appreciated.
  - Providing access to toilets at break spots would help to preserve water quality.
  - Possible areas where break spots might be developed include:
    - Freshwater farms (Storre is said to be cooperative),
    - Ma'lel Dues, both north and south and
    - The Gunther House site on Woodley Indian Island.
- 14  
7. The sea kayaking association, Explore North Coast, is a 501(c)(3) and would be willing to partner with the District on appropriate projects.
- 14  
8. The Humboldt Kayak Fishing Association might be a partner for fishing tournaments, derbies and enhancement projects.
- 14  
9. HumBoats is interested in partnering with the District to develop water trails and a water taxi business.
- 15  
0. There is a strong, local demand for pedestrian trails. A recent survey suggested that as many as 80% of the local residents use trails.
- 15  
1. A walking trail around the circumference of the bay would be great!
- A connector across the private land between the south bay refuge and the south spit would be highly desirable.
  - Potential negative interactions between walkers and wildlife need to be carefully evaluated. For example, intense use had driven Brant from bay margins in other areas.
  - The south bay refuge is now developing its conservation plan. The issue is very timely.
  - Trail development is made more difficult by the overlapping jurisdictions and, in some-cases, by the fact that trails fall into a jurisdictional no-mans-land.
- 15  
2. Humboldt is the biggest gap in the California coastal trail. We need to fill that gap. The trail is a national asset!
- 15  
3. Can pedestrian trails be paired with the local rail lines?
- 15  
4. Work with RCAA to promote
- Water trails
  - A trail connecting Eureka and Arcata
  - Sediment reduction and salmon enhancement grants
- 15  
5. Promote fishing tournaments and other sport fishing related activities
- Fish cleaning facilities are desperately needed.
- 15  
Promote and enhance bird-watching opportunities.



- Minimize conflicts with motorized boats and jet skis.
  - Build pads for spotting scopes in appropriate locations so that watchers do not have to set up their scopes on roads.
- 15  
7. The use of jet skis on the bay is bound to increase.
- Speed, noise and fuels are likely to create conflicts with other environmental and recreational uses.
  - Education may go a long way toward mitigating potential conflicts.
  - It may be desirable to plan for jet ski-based recreation before use patterns are firmly established.
- 15  
8. Water taxis on the bay should be encouraged.
- There is room for expansion of existing services.
  - Appropriate infrastructure must be developed.
- 15  
9. Support water taxis and kayaks.
- 16  
0. There are speed limits on the bay. There should be a way to enforce them.
- 16  
1. Consider developing limited RV sites adjacent to the water. They are a real moneymaker for other Districts.
- 16  
2. Avoid too many interpretive signs.
- 16  
3. Safe access to the bay for recreational uses must be preserved and enhanced. Issues of personal security area as important as physical access.
- 16  
4. Do not jeopardize personal security.

### **Mid-Bay**

- 16  
5. The Eureka side of the channel is probably the best place to site public access uses.
- Water quality is best on the west side of the bay and poorer on the east, where it is more heavily influenced by run-off.
  - Much industrial use is also sited on the west side.
- 16  
6. A working waterfront (combined with an active museum) has the potential to serve visitors as well as industry, delivering enhanced value to the community.
- 16  
7. Build a fishing pier at King Salmon.
- 16  
8. Improve access to the north spit beach for surfers.
- 16  
9. The Wiyot tribe is planning a public dock on Indian Island in addition to other site enhancements. It might be a good fishing dock, though it would only be accessible by water.
- 17  
0. The new HSU aquatics center might be an important partner.
- 17  
1. Create a canoe & kayak access park at Park Street.
- 17  
2. Create a trail along the levee from the Arcata going west.

### **Broader issues**

- 17  
3. "Recreation" should be understood to include interest in the culture and history associated with the bay.
- Support an excursion train around the bay, perhaps in combination with a boat ride back to Eureka.
  - The ideal use for the roundtable at Samoa is as a base for the Timber



- 17 Heritage Museum's steam collection.
- 4. Enhance the productivity of local fisheries.
- 17 Identify the issues that prevent differently-abled individuals from
- 5. participating in bay related activities.
- 17 If Scotia were to become a museum town, it could anchor a visitor serving
- 6. rail line connecting Scotia to Eureka/Arcata.
- 17 Participate in educational outreach programs such as "Wetlands on
- 7. Wheels"
- 17 Shelter Cove needs a lot of help, specifically with land based facilities and
- 8. the breakwater.
- 17 Trinidad harbor is within the District's jurisdiction; but no current District
- 9. programs serve the area. The same might be said for the Redwood Creek estuary.
- 18 Wind surfers and kite flyers use water related sites, especially in the south
- 0. bay and on Big Lagoon. Conflicts with hunters and other users should be assessed.

### **South Bay**

- 18 Build a trail to connect the south bay refuge with the south spit.
- 1.

### **Woodley Island**

- 18 Consider adding camping spaces to Woodley Island.
- 2.



# Appendix IX

## Executive Summary from the Humboldt Bay Management Plan

