

## Lemos, June

---

**From:** Linda Jo Stern <lindajostern@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 24, 2021 5:51 PM  
**To:** Lemos, June  
**Subject:** CHAPTER 7.18 FEEDING OF WILDLIFE

Good afternoon, June. As a resident of Fort Bragg, and a frequent user of the local trails and parks, I would like to urge the City Council to vote for the ordinance that will add Chapter 7.18 prohibiting feeding of wildlife. Specifically, feeding of the ravens contributes to the raven population which is then a detriment to the eggs and chicks of many shore birds and songbirds. Feeding of the ground squirrels is not healthy for them and creates an unhealthy relationship between the squirrels who can forage and thrive on their own (without peanuts and cheetos) and the people feeding them who could potentially be scratched or bitten by the squirrels. There is a reason why wildlife is called such - they live in the wild, not in the laps or arms of humans.

If possible, could this new chapter include a requirement for additional signage that would be strongly worded, visually attractive and bilingual in English and Spanish.

Thank you for your consideration.

*Linda Jo*

Linda Jo Stern, MPH  
617-435-8412 (mobile)

## Lemos, June

---

**From:** Jacob Patterson <jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 26, 2021 3:23 PM  
**To:** Lemos, June; Munoz, Cristal  
**Cc:** Gurewitz, Heather; O'Neal, Chantell  
**Subject:** Public Comment -- 7/26/21 CC mtg., Item No. 8A

City Council,

In reviewing the staff report for the proposed ordinance, I was taken aback by how obviously deficient the consistency analysis section is. First, this (or any other) section of the staff report fails to include any actual analysis of the proposed ordinance's consistency with the applicable policies of the City's General Plans. All City actions, including ordinances, are required to be evaluated for and determined to be consistent with the City's General Plans but this requires something more than mere unsupported assertions of consistency without any explanation. How is this proposed ordinance consistent with anything cited in the staff report? The staff report certainly doesn't tell us how. All it does is claim that "The proposed ordinance does not conflict with any elements of the Coastal General Plan" but it doesn't explain how or why that asserted conclusion is justified.

Moreover, the project's alleged consistency with the single policy mentioned in the staff report, Policy OS-5.1, is not explained in any way. How would this new ordinance advance that policy's objective to "Preserve native plant and animal species and their habitat"? This is not explained at all nor can the alleged basis for the ordinance's consistency even be inferred from the rest of the content of the staff report. The City Council should expect better content in staff reports, particularly actual analysis supported by facts related to the specifics of the proposal, not meaningless assertions of consistency without any explanation.

At least this ordinance acknowledges the obvious connection between wildlife food sources and their habitat even though the same staff member erroneously assumed that the definition of bird habitat is limited to nesting locations in the staff report for agenda item 7A. However, this doesn't demonstrate in any way how prohibiting feeding of birds in City property is consistent with the objective of Policy OS-5.1 to preserve native animal species and their habitat.

On a different note, the draft ordinance attempts to rely on a categorical exemption from further environmental review but completely omits any justification or supporting analysis for doing so. Yet again, we have a completely unsupported assertion that "There is no possibility that the adoption of this ordinance will have a significant impact on the environment" without even a cursory attempt to explain how this ordinance could not, in any circumstance, have a significant effect on the environment and therefore is exempt from environmental review. Consistency analysis, and a finding regarding the appropriate level of CEQA review, require substantial evidence in the record to support the required determinations but no such evidence exists for this ordinance. As such, I must object to the City Council adopting this ordinance without first demonstrating, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the ordinance is consistent with the City's general plans and that adopting the ordinance is exempt from environmental review. Changing the existing feeding practices of wildlife on city property (even if those practices were already illegal under state law) obviously has an impact on the environment because both the plants and animals that were receiving nutrients from humans will no longer have access to food or water provided by humans and on which they were likely relying. How will wildlife obtain alternative food sources once food and water supplied by humans is no longer available or at least diminished compared to existing conditions? Is there any evidence that this ordinance will have a beneficial effect on the environment sufficient enough to justify the asserted conclusion? If so, what is it and why hasn't it been presented or analyzed in the staff report and agenda materials? The City Council should direct staff to perform

this necessary analysis and bring this item back for consideration at a future meeting once there is support in the record to justify the asserted conclusions.

Regards,

--Jacob