

From: [Kim](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: Proposed Grocery Outlet Store
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 4:35:39 PM

To: City of Fort Bragg Planning Commission and Fort Bragg City Council

RE: Proposed Grocery Outlet Store

This letter is in support of the approval the proposed Grocery Outlet store in Fort Bragg California.

To whom it may concern:

Groceries are essential. Affordable groceries even more so. We have wonderful grocery options in this town, I shop at all of them on a regular basis. But, I also drive out of town and shop at the grocery outlet in Willits. I've shopped at many grocery outlet stores in Northern California - they are independently owned by community-minded people, offering affordable food and non-food items, in a clean and safe environment. To me, this is a no brainer - while the amount of people pouring into Fort Bragg year round has increased exponentially; the amount of places to shop for essential groceries has not. The commercially-zoned proposed site on South Franklin is a perfect fit in my humble opinion. That area looks terrible now, trash and a falling apart building - A grocery outlet would be a perfect fit for that part of town.

What else would be a good fit there if not a Grocery Outlet Store? Should it just remain a trashy empty building? There is plenty of room for a good business there, with a lot of locals and tourists to support all of the stores here. Let's keep tax revenue local and not let it go over-the-hill or to Amazon.

Thank you for your time, Kim Taylor

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Kim](#)
To: [Albin-Smith, Tess](#)
Cc: [Lemos, June](#)
Subject: In Favor of Grocery Outlet
Date: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 2:06:22 PM

Dear Councilwoman Albin-Smith,

At the last Fort Bragg city council meeting you stated that 70% of your emails were in favor of a moratorium against the Grocery Outlet Store, that wants to open in Fort Bragg.

I beg to differ — The majority, on and off social media, appears to be very much in favor of the Grocery Outlet project.

I won't go into why I think it will be a much needed addition to the town; that is another letter if needed, and one that has already been submitted previously. I just wanted you to be aware that your email numbers against it, may not be the same numbers that most of us are seeing — appears that the majority is very much in favor of the Grocery Outlet Store.

Thank you for your time,

Kim Taylor

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Michael Toschi](#)
To: [Gurewitz, Heather](#)
Subject: Re: New Grocery Outlet Opening Date?
Date: Thursday, May 6, 2021 8:57:30 AM

Is there going to at least be signs leading motorists from Highway 1 to Grocery Outlet that is going to be hidden back track there instead of where I am sure it would have been preferred on Highway 1 Heather?

Or what about the motel and/or gas station moving or closing to make more visibility for motorists on Highway 1 as well as make that into just a brand new shopping center altogether with Grocery Outlet being the anchor tenant and then just QSRs with or without drive-thrus and what small stores and things like that Heather?

Sent from my iPhone

> On May 6, 2021, at 8:52 AM, Gurewitz, Heather <Hgurewitz@fortbragg.com> wrote:

>

> Hello Michael,

> The new building will be located behind a two-story motel and a gas station that are located directly on Hwy 1, however, I am sure there will be some level of visibility from the highway depending on where you are standing/driving. Our visual analysis is not yet complete so I cannot give you a more clear answer.

> -Heather

>

> Heather Gurewitz

> Associate Planner

> City of Fort Bragg

> 416 N. Franklin St.

> Fort Bragg, CA 95437

> (707) 961-2827 x118

>

> *** Due to COVID-19 City Hall is currently closed to the Public except by appointment. I will respond to emails in the order they are received. Thank you for your patience during these difficult times.***

>

> Please note that my emails are subject to frequent Public Records Requests, and the contents of emails sent to or received by me may be reviewed by members of the public.

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Michael Toschi <michaelatoschi@gmail.com>

> Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 8:08 AM

> To: Gurewitz, Heather <Hgurewitz@fortbragg.com>

> Subject: Re: New Grocery Outlet Opening Date?

>

> And is there going to be any visibility for it from Highway 1 Heather?

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On May 6, 2021, at 8:05 AM, Gurewitz, Heather <Hgurewitz@fortbragg.com> wrote:

>>

>> Dear Mr. Toschi,

>> There is a proposed project for a Grocery Outlet on South Franklin St. between South Street and North Harbor Drive on the west side of the street. The City is in the process of reviewing the application and it will have a public hearing at the Planning Commission on May 26th at 6:00 pm. We are preparing all the public notices so that they will go out in a timely manner to neighbors and the community.

>> Sincerely,

>> Heather

>>

>> Heather Gurewitz
>> Associate Planner
>> City of Fort Bragg
>> 416 N. Franklin St.
>> Fort Bragg, CA 95437
>> (707) 961-2827 x118

>>

>> *** Due to COVID-19 City Hall is currently closed to the Public except by appointment. I will respond to emails in the order they are received. Thank you for your patience during these difficult times.***

>>

>> Please note that my emails are subject to frequent Public Records Requests, and the contents of emails sent to or received by me may be reviewed by members of the public.

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Michael Toschi <michaelatoschi@gmail.com>
>> Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 7:46 AM
>> To: Gurewitz, Heather <Hgurewitz@fortbragg.com>
>> Subject: New Grocery Outlet Opening Date?

>>

>> Hi Heather,

>>

>> When is the new Grocery Outlet location in Fort Bragg going to open?

>>

>> -Michael Toschi (Inquirer)

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>> Email correspondence with the City of Fort Bragg (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.

> Email correspondence with the City of Fort Bragg (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.

From: [Jaen Treesinger](#)
To: [CDD User](#); [Gurewitz, Heather](#); [E*Trade Securities Llc](#); [Dr Richard Louis Miller](#); [O"Neal, Chantell](#)
Subject: Ft. Bragg Planning Commission ?? Grocery Outlet on 5-26 at 6pm at Town Hall
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 8:46:55 AM

I have conducted business in Ft. Bragg for more than 3 decades. I am against approval of Grocery Outlet or other discount chain stores in Ft. Bragg. Discount chain stores are not the solution, as they move profits out of our community. We need to support the web of small business owners who provide jobs to our community. we must focus on local, independent forms of economic development that actually strengthen our economy.

Jaen

From: [Judith Valadao](#)
To: [Lemos, June](#); [CDD User](#)
Subject: In favor of Grocery Outlet
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:34:58 AM
Attachments: [In favor of petition.pdf](#)

This is the full list of our online petition as of 5-25-2021. Please add to the Planning Commission public comment for the meeting of 5/26/2021

Thank you

We care deeply about the future of our City and the folks who live here. That is why we support reasonable growth in Fort Bragg. While we support local businesses we also support allowing other businesses to come into Fort Bragg for those who otherwise shop online or travel over the hill for more affordable shopping. It makes no sense to be labeled an “economically depressed City” and not have affordable shopping for those who are hurting financially and barely making ends meet. In a City where so many depend on the Food Bank and Thrift Shops: shouldn't there be more shopping options?

The proposed Grocery Outlet will not hurt our existing businesses, like Harvest Market, Colombi's Nellos and Purity. These are the “go to places” for many and that won't change.

What Grocery Outlet and even Dollar General will do is: make it possible for local folks to shop at home instead of traveling over the hill or shopping online.

The argument that 851 South Franklin is a bad location for the Grocery Outlet because so many will be traveling there to shop is proof in itself that it is needed. Why would so many shop there otherwise?

In their own words “hundreds of cars going in and out of this grocery store at this busy intersection, each and every day.” It is possible the folks in those cars may be the ones who would have been traveling over the hill or shopping online. It makes very little sense to oppose a business because it will be busy.

Much of the traffic in and around Fort Bragg are tourists. Does it make sense to tell locals because there are so many tourists in town, our community should keep businesses out that may help the many in our community who otherwise can't afford to shop locally?

WE SUPPORT reasonable growth. **WE SUPPORT** Grocery Outlet and **WE SUPPORT** the location at 851 South Franklin Street.

Thank you for signing this petition and for supporting the community who live and work here.

change.org

Recipient: Fort Bragg City Council

Letter: Greetings,

Raise awareness that many locals want grocery outlet

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
Ryan Bushnell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Rick Jeffery	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Judith Valadao	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Susan Bushnell	Clarksville, TN	2021-04-09
Evelyn Anderson	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-09
carrie engle	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Kristine Gilmore	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Patricia Peeler	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Brittaney Dondanville	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Joseph Kreisel	Brentwood, CA	2021-04-09
Mike Tubbs	Redwood valley, CA	2021-04-09
Janet Nylund	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Tammy Lowe	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Richard Millis, II	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Gary Koski	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Laurie Koski	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Bruce Koski	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Marcie Lazarus	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Naomi Mannonen	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Ronald Valadao	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09

Name	Location	Date
Kimberly Gillette	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Tina Rose	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Kim Taylor	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Ashley Vance	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Sarita Colberg	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Julie McHenry	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Jennifer Clark	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Jessica Turner garcia	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Charles A Peavey	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
sandy ellingwood	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Robin Scaramella	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Janelle Fraser	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Fred Zatkoff	San, CA	2021-04-09
Alyssa Babcock	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Donald Anderson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Carrie Hull	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Michele Anderson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Kim Evans	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Marilyn Costa	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Jimmie Teem	Myrtle creek, OR	2021-04-09
Sandra Jones	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-09
Paula Deeter	Medford, OR	2021-04-09

Name	Location	Date
Crystal Rowley	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Kelly Wooden	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Nathan Strouth	Federal Way, WA	2021-04-09
Evelyn Hautala	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Cheri Maas	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Crystal Porcayo	Yakima, WA	2021-04-09
Kelly Mehtlan	Ukiah, CA	2021-04-09
Mike and sherrie White	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Morgan Davenport	Fort Bragg, OR	2021-04-09
Pat Collins	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Judy Bremer	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Cathy Perkins	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Pam West	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Stacey Anderson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Angel Serrano	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Ervin Spowehn	Fort Bragg, US	2021-04-09
Polly Bishop	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Linda Rambo	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
James Mallory	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Dawn Ferreira	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Lisa Davenport	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Johanna Maxey	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-09

Name	Location	Date
Richard Daniels	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Brian Hurley	fort bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Jane Woodward	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Michael Ferguson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Debra Bryant	Willits, CA	2021-04-09
Susan Owens	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Tyler Allen	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
cheryl schuessler	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
David Schuessler	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Mandi Waymire	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Gina Balassi	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Karen Norton	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
David Howe	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Peter Robblee	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Glenda Holloway	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Sarah Van Horn	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Nancy James	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Karen Knoebber	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Traci Kelley	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Sue Spowehn	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Laura Rogers	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Eric Martin	Fortuna, CA	2021-04-09

Name	Location	Date
Lara Nielsen	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
REBECCA Kinney	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Russell Jewett	Fremont, CA	2021-04-09
Ryan Ferguson	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Marilla Peeler	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Marleigh Caparros	Swedesboro, US	2021-04-09
JON INWOOD	Brooklyn, NY	2021-04-09
Franco Carlo	New York	2021-04-09
Sean Patrick	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Patty Stuckey	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Terri Russ	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Mike Peat	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
Brenda Sallinen	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-09
kirbo good	Centreville, US	2021-04-09
Cora Stone	Medford, OR	2021-04-09
Brenda Choi	Los Angeles, CA	2021-04-10
Kasey Hockett	Fort Bragg, US	2021-04-10
Donna Winkler	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Marian Holmes	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Deanna Lawrason	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Hannah Hiatt	Phoenix, US	2021-04-10
Fran Nelson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10

Name	Location	Date
Vanette St John	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Jeanne Kinney	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Josie Drake	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Donna Niemeyer	Pasco, WA	2021-04-10
Jessica Dias	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Laurel Hosford	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-10
Zena Coughlin	Redwood Valley, CA	2021-04-10
Shirley Graves	US	2021-04-10
Traci Colbert	Willits, CA	2021-04-10
Jonna Mabery	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Monica Hernandez	Newark, US	2021-04-10
Dawn Messex	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Martin Scribner	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Diane Lionberger	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Wilma Woods	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Lynn Stampfli	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-10
Rantala Roy	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Brenda Perkins	Yoder, CO	2021-04-10
Carrie Sallinen	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Jerry Ball	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Linda Muncy Bishop	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Carol Sisco	Dayton, NV	2021-04-10

Name	Location	Date
Kari Shelley	Eureka, CA	2021-04-10
Erin Grant	Eureka, CA	2021-04-10
Jen Souza	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Colleen Pierce	Aberdeen, WA	2021-04-10
Darlene Glenn	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-10
James Mullen	North Versailles, US	2021-04-10
Atanacio Cha'vez Johnson	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-10
Cynthia Manzano	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
debbie adamczak	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Debra Bryant	FORT BRAGG,CA, CA	2021-04-10
Janice Harrison	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-10
Sherry Fischer	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Dawn Ciro	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Ann Meadlin	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Jesieka Grover Silva	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
James Bugenstien	US	2021-04-11
Linda Reeder	Los Angeles, CA	2021-04-11
John Graves	Boonsboro, MD	2021-04-11
Julia Seaholm	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Lorie Reynolds	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Tracie Smith	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Mark Fish	Albion, CA	2021-04-11

Name	Location	Date
Roxanne Rohe	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Orsi Hannah	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Marc Dallaire	Bel Air, MD	2021-04-11
Katie Exline	Grants Pass, OR	2021-04-11
Sarah Bushnell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-11
Rusty Sherry Bell	Casper, CA	2021-04-11
Kathryn McCully Mccully	Henderson, NV	2021-04-11
Leti Soria	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Eric Nylund	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Anna Shaw	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Sharon Lee	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Danae Waugh	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Renee Haas	Ukiah, CA	2021-04-12
Judy Dawley	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Rachel Miskelly	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Eggy Preuss	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Michael Johnson	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-12
Dina Gregory	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-12
Sonny Simpson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
David Thorpe	Little River, CA	2021-04-12
Karen Parker r	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Christopher Hodges	Plymouth Meeting, US	2021-04-12

Name	Location	Date
Adrian Navarro	Tracy, US	2021-04-12
Artemis LoPriore	US	2021-04-12
Kassandra Evans	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Will Lee	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Daniel Ferguson	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Kelly Forward	Sturgis, SD	2021-04-12
Diana Welch	Ukiah, CA	2021-04-12
Emily Pendergrass	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Melissa Jensen	Sandpoint, ID	2021-04-12
Debbie Wisniewski	Las vegas, NV	2021-04-12
Paul House	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Dera Miller	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
carolyn leason	malden, US	2021-04-12
tess tickle	NYC, US	2021-04-12
Apryl Bonham	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
sean davies	Washington, US	2021-04-12
Stella Dragness	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Brian Yanez	San Francisco, US	2021-04-12
Patti Schumacher	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Jonna Mathews	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Lorraine Williams	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
ANTHONY VEEDMONT	El Paso, US	2021-04-12

Name	Location	Date
Janet Figueiredo	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-12
Tamara H	US	2021-04-12
Greg Ward	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Andres Ogando	Hialeah, US	2021-04-13
Kathryn Hee	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Amani Hamilton	Minneapolis, US	2021-04-13
LARRY BUNNER	Pahrump, NV	2021-04-13
Susan Hee	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Olivia Reynolds	Fort bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Eva Chilton	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Kari Paoli	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Isabel Rogerson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Lynn Chastain	Victoria, VA	2021-04-13
dana carr	Estacada, OR	2021-04-13
Joshua MARGERISON	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Judy Filmer	Vallejo, CA	2021-04-13
Austin Ward	Corvallis, OR	2021-04-13
Marcia Mollett	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Nicole Clark	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Claire Normoyle	Mckinleyville, CA	2021-04-13
Anna Smith	Killeen, US	2021-04-13
Ahtziri Barrios	Porterville, US	2021-04-13

Name	Location	Date
Paula Christensen	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Jevaughn Cassanova	Philadelphia, US	2021-04-13
larry cote	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Deborah Kinney	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Ed Ratliff	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-13
Stephanie Bishop	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Maria Mello	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Stephanie Berry	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Grace Tubbs	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Brittany Yates-Tuomala	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-13
Liza Daniel	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Michelle Matson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Diane Butterfield	Ukiah, CA	2021-04-13
Michael Renzi	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Thurman Atkinson	Saint John, US	2021-04-13
Elleanna Kendrick	Fleming Island, US	2021-04-13
Ed English	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Sheila English	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Lynnett Cooper	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Lisa Green	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Rachel Schnars	Erie, US	2021-04-13
Jerry Grogan	Lincoln, US	2021-04-13

Name	Location	Date
Guilherme Renault	Astoria, US	2021-04-13
Carley Brennfleck-Miller	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
jayleigh ritenour	Turtle Creek, US	2021-04-13
lynn mayhew	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-13
Colton Goodenow	Bellevue, US	2021-04-13
Garth Hagerman	Mendocino, CA	2021-04-14
Daniel Robinson	Pepperell, US	2021-04-14
Lynn Wegiel	US	2021-04-14
Blake Martinez	Mesquite, US	2021-04-14
Patricia Androff	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
keeley Oberheim	Abingdon, US	2021-04-14
Agim Demirovski	Staten island, US	2021-04-14
Carlos Felix	Oak Grove, US	2021-04-14
Jason Grayson	San Francisco, US	2021-04-14
Dan Ahmad	Greensboro, US	2021-04-14
Dan Butterfield	fort bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Antonio Arizmendi	Bellflower, US	2021-04-14
Tayler Darden	Manteca, US	2021-04-14
kylisha davis	Manteca, US	2021-04-14
Rose Matson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Morgan Cooper	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-04-14
Virginia Raper	Fort Worth, TX	2021-04-14

Name	Location	Date
Dianna Mertle	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
alma murrieta	Douglas, US	2021-04-14
Michele Nhothibouth	Fresno, US	2021-04-14
Karmah Mendez	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Sarah Mechling	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Tyler Wilhelm	Clinton, US	2021-04-14
Joy De Lara	San Rafael, CA	2021-04-14
Grace Cochran	California	2021-04-14
Tommy Jet	US	2021-04-14
Marjie Beckman	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
paul meyers	Akron, US	2021-04-14
Maryam Bijvand	Los Angeles, US	2021-04-14
Jacqueline Bazor	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Nabiha Ahmed	Alexandria, US	2021-04-14
Shay Ashford	Atlanta, US	2021-04-14
Noelle Wooden	San Francisco, CA	2021-04-14
James Gregg	Indianapolis, US	2021-04-14
Jesse Ruiz	Tulare, US	2021-04-14
Maja Kendl	US	2021-04-14
Michele Smith	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-14
Okuyasu Nijimura	Erie, US	2021-04-14
Sharon Harrelson	Clovis, US	2021-04-14

Name	Location	Date
Cassie Bass	mullins, US	2021-04-14
Debra Dutra	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
James Taylor	Anaheim, US	2021-04-15
Sukie Shagame	US	2021-04-15
Stacy Weeks	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Aimee Pricer	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Jessica Latner	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Lucy bowles	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Mimi Hershenson	Carlsbad, US	2021-04-15
Jolene Hernandez	Placentia, US	2021-04-15
b b	Las Vegas, US	2021-04-15
Nicolas Klassen santiago	Fort George G Meade, US	2021-04-15
Kennedy Thomas	Atlanta, US	2021-04-15
karen partida	Chula Vista, US	2021-04-15
Shawn Mersing	Philadelphia, PA	2021-04-15
Marie Samson	Manteca, US	2021-04-15
Churros Loser	Pomona, US	2021-04-15
lorilie morey	rohnert park, US	2021-04-15
Shanda Lanser	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Julia Lanser	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-15
Jesse Taylor	Knoxville, US	2021-04-15
Jared Peterson	Anaheim, US	2021-04-15

Name	Location	Date
Mortada Abdulradha	Pompano Beach, US	2021-04-15
Ella Ogg	Minneapolis, US	2021-04-16
Koda Turner	Chico, US	2021-04-16
John Whitney	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-16
reuel brundage	willits, CA	2021-04-16
Isabell Burns	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-16
Carol Millsap	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-17
Benjamin Mitchell	Pittsfield, US	2021-04-17
Melisa c Rosales	Lodi, US	2021-04-17
Brennen Wells	Byron center, US	2021-04-17
michael Fobbs	Pittsburg, US	2021-04-17
Yusra Sartaj	US	2021-04-17
Peyton Schobelock	Lewis Center, US	2021-04-17
Zane Grey	Hillsborough, US	2021-04-17
Susanna Chu	Lancaster, US	2021-04-18
Troy Sanchez	Lake Orion, US	2021-04-18
Naomi Mendez	Merced, US	2021-04-18
Brianna Olsen	Sparta, US	2021-04-18
Danny Lanser	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-20
Brad Clark	Dallas, TX	2021-04-21
Liz Smethurst	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-27
Barbara Van De Walker	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-28

Name	Location	Date
Dawn Motherwell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-04-29
Christine Churchill	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-01
Carol Robinson	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-01
charles jenkins	Atlanta, US	2021-05-04
Tranna Washington	Atlanta, US	2021-05-04
V Foster	Atlanta, US	2021-05-04
Cody Burris	Williamsburg, US	2021-05-09
Anita Galli baez	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-11
Robert Gordon	Mendocino, CA	2021-05-14
Linda Bishop	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-19
Alyse Wooden	Mendocino, CA	2021-05-21
Michele Pense	San Francisco, CA	2021-05-21
Felicia Holmes	Ukiah, CA	2021-05-21
Kathy Shafsky	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Joe Braga	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Sandra Liljeberg	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Laura Rogers	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Betty Peterson	Fernley, NV	2021-05-21
Tammy Johnston	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Kathy Orsi	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Robin Vargas	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
John Redding	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21

Name	Location	Date
Teena Zatkoff	Caldwell, ID	2021-05-21
Lynn Orsi	Ukiah, CA	2021-05-21
Sherry Friscia	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Sandra Bradford	Weaverville, CA	2021-05-21
Deanne Thomas	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Jesus Campos	Egg Harbor Township, US	2021-05-21
Sara Noonan	Albion, CA	2021-05-21
Tara Mcgregor	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Mark Vollmer	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Elizabeth Paoli	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Tammy Liwe	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Janelle Fraser	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
michele mehtlan	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Dan Raymann	San Jose, CA	2021-05-21
Lisa Walker	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Nick Plaskon	Macomb, MI	2021-05-21
Alice Welsh	Ukiah, CA	2021-05-21
Lucinda Maulsby maulsby	Decatur, TX	2021-05-21
Nancy Philips	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Tabetha Connell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Gina Balassi	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Cindy Olvera	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21

Name	Location	Date
Elaine Tavelli	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Lena Gentile	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Jennifer Ornelas	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Robert Taylor	Fort bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Douna Scramaglia	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Lanette Gordon	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Evan Anderson	Lake Stevens, WA	2021-05-21
Heather Baird	Fort bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Erica Zissa	Mendocino, CA	2021-05-21
Allisson Amaya	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Daniela Wilkens	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Jessica Fitch	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
JACLYN CAINE	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Deborah Hughes	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Ginny Munoz	Fort Bragg, OR	2021-05-21
Tyler G	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Lesley Bryant	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Martha Rayon	MOUNT VERNON, MO	2021-05-21
Gabe San	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Luz Delgado	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Hailee Kelley	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Ariane Casey	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21

Name	Location	Date
Michael Hilburn	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Diana Berry	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Alaina Zimmerman	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Sharon Smith	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Kenzie Bowman	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Sophie Vieira	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Becky Munoz	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Jacob Campa	San Antonio, US	2021-05-21
Janet Phenix	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Rosalie Taylor	Burney, CA	2021-05-21
Sherie Mottlow	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Kayla Sanchez	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Gary McCray	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Ava Pjerrou	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Sharon Cottrell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
James Godwin	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Tamara Baxman	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Regina Smith	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Lisa Manzano	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Linda Stanton	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Janice Schultz	Lakeport, CA	2021-05-21
Alicia Cruttenden	Everett, WA	2021-05-21

Name	Location	Date
Sarah Flowers	Fort bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Kylara Shealor	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Ronalie Silveira	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Marilyn Costa	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Jennifer Ellis	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Elizabeth Canady	Albion, CA	2021-05-21
amanda baer	Point Arena, CA	2021-05-21
Christina Wideman	Marysville, CA	2021-05-21
Madeline Maxi	Olivehurst, CA	2021-05-21
Sarah Custer	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
LARRY MASTERSON	San Francisco, CA	2021-05-21
Martha Harbour	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-21
Olivia Bruchler	Berkeley, US	2021-05-22
Bonnie Lifvendahl	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-22
Linda Hilliard/Thurman	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-22
Kathy Larkin	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-22
Darnell Michlig	Westport, CA	2021-05-22
Laurie Garrison	Santa Rosa, CA	2021-05-22
Debbie Jones	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-22
Donna Norvell	Fort Bragg, CA	2021-05-22
Adriana Santana	Point Arena, CA	2021-05-22
Jeff Costa	Clarkston, WA	2021-05-22

Name	Location	Date
Linda Lowery	OCEAN SPRINGS, US	2021-05-22

O'Neal, Chantell

From: Judith Valadao <j.valadao@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 7:48 PM
To: Albin-Smith, Tess
Cc: Lemos, June
Subject: Support Grocery Outlet

Councilperson Albin-Smith

This is just to make it perfectly clear that my husband and I are in full support of Grocery Out. I think had you checked all the signatures turned in before the meeting you would have seen overwhelming support. Marcia did her homework and saw that.

Those in opposition to Grocery Outlet are asking that names from two prior petitions be added in opposition to Grocery Outlet. Isn't that odd, taking the signatures of two different issues and ask that they be added to yet another petition on yet another issue?

Should this actually happen those in favor of Grocery Outlet will most likely ask that that 2500 signatures collected in opposition to a name change be added as being in favor of Grocery Outlet. After all "what's good for goose is good for the gander" right?

Just so you know. There are 50 pages of local signatures submitted by Paul Clark. Currently the online petition in favor of Grocery Outlet is currently at 287 with a majority being local. These were gathered in 4 days. (remember that, 4 days)

The online petition against the Grocery Outlet has 217 signatures. You can count how many are actual locals or even live in the 95437 area. It has taken over 3 weeks to gather these. (3 weeks)

Just thought I would point this out...because it sure doesn't sound the same as your claim of 70% of your emails opposing.

Have a beautiful day,

Judy Valadao

O'Neal, Chantell

From: Judith Valadao <j.valadao@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2021 8:54 AM
To: Lemos, June
Subject: additional online signatures in favor of Grocery Outlet
Attachments: More Signatures continued.pdf

Thank you

Judy Filmer	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
Joshua Margerison	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
dana carr	Oregon	2021/04/12
Lynn Chastain		2021/04/12
Isabel Rogerson		2021/04/12
Kari Paoli	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
Eva Chilton	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
Susan Hee	Nevada	2021/04/12
Lorraine Williams	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
Jonna Mathews	Fort Bragg	2021/04/12
Patti Schumacher		2021/04/12
Brittany Yates	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Stephanie Berry		2021/04/13
Stephanie Bishop	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Ed Ratliff		2021/04/13
Deborah Kinney	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
larry cote	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Nicole Clark		2021/04/13
Marcia Mollett	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Austin Ward		2021/04/13
Michelle Matson	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Garth Hagerman		
lynn mayhew	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Carley Brennfleck-Miller	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13

Lisa Danner	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Lynnett Cooper	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Sheila English	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Diane Butterfield	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Michelle Matson	Fort Bragg	2021/04/13
Dianna Mertle	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Virginia Raper	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Rose Matson	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Debra dutra	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Michele Smith	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Noelle Wooden	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Jacqueline Bazor	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Marjie Beckman	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Grace Cochran	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Joy De Lara		2021/04/14
Karmah Mendez	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Lucy Bowles	Fort Bragg	2021/04/14
Jessica Latner		2021/04/15
Aimee Pricer	Fort Bragg	2021/04/15
Stacy Weeks		2021/04/15

From: [Helen Van Gelder](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: I oppose the Grocery Outlet store
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 4:15:21 AM

I oppose the installation of the Grocery Outlet store anywhere in Fort Bragg. I think it is unnecessary. Our grocery needs are well-covered. We have enough markets and we have grocery discounts at The Dollar Store. We have an excellent Food Bank and double food stamps at the Farmers Market. We do not need another chain store taking money out of the community and competing with the established businesses.

Helen Van Gelder
120 Livingston St.
Fort Bragg

From: dvincent@wildblue.net
To: [CDD User](#); [Gonzalez, Joanna](#)
Subject: Grocery Outlet
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 2:56:01 PM

To: Fort Bragg Planning Commissioners

Hello there,

I am a single Dad living in the vicinity of a Grocery Outlet here in Willits. Grocery Outlet coming to Willits a few years ago allowed me to afford meat, dairy products and many other grocery items that I could not afford for my son and I when the only alternative was Safeway. Many people that I know shop first at Grocery Outlet and secondarily at Safeway only for a few items they might not have been able to find at Grocery Outlet.

The savings are substantial and incredibly meaningful in our scenario. For a recent example Bragg Apple Cider Vinegar was, a few days ago, \$3.00 at Grocery Outlet verses \$5.00 at Safeway. Many in our community are thankful to have a grocery store that provides for the feeling of not being ripped off after shopping for groceries. It's easy to assume that it would be the same for members of your community of Fort Bragg as well. Any questions? Please give me a call at 707-984-6248.

Many folks need help affording groceries. It just seems like the right thing to do for your constituents in that it would be a direct way that local government could directly help people out.

Sincerely,
Dan Vincent

From: feather@mcn.org
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: Proposed grocery Outlet
Date: Saturday, May 22, 2021 6:05:37 PM

To Whom it May Concern,

I have been a resident of the Mendocino coast since 1986. I was initially concerned about the first location on the west side of Highway 1 near the college, and am glad it did not go in there. A shopping center in that location is not a good idea for various reasons I wont go into here.

However, the old Social Services bldg on the corner of South and Franklin Streets seems to be a much better idea.

I shop at Grocery Outlets in Ukiah and Willits and would love to be able to save gas in the process of not going over the hill to shop. This will make a lot of lives easier - especially the poor and working poor who live on the coast but who rarely if ever make a livable wage.

I am concerned about traffic and parking for that location - would that field to its immediate south be used for a parking lot?

Finally, I think Grocery Outlet is a good idea for Fort Bragg. Thank you for not putting in a Dollar General. Those stores are dirty and disorganized.

Sincerely

Lisa D Walker
32430 Forest Lane
Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-813-3023 (home)
707-357-8593 (cell)
feather@mcn.org

From: [Annemarie](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 11:57:23 PM
Attachments: [3 public comments GO .odt](#)
[Grocery Outlet comments .odt](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As I will not be able to pack 17 pages of public comments into 3 minutes during my allotted time tomorrow I am forwarding you my comments about the Initial Study that were not included in the CEQA public comments here.

I am also attaching my comments to the City Council at the time of discussion about a moratorium with information about the Grocery Outlet.

Thanks, Annemarie

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study
Date: Tue, 25 May 2021 22:24:29 -0700
From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
To: O'Neal, Chantell <coneal@fortbragg.com>
CC: Lemos, June <Jlemos@fortbragg.com>, Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@FortBragg.com>

Hi,

I am reviewing the information about the Grocery Outlet Bargain Market in preparation for tomorrow's meeting.

Checking on the CEQA public comments (attachment 6) my 17 pages public comments about the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the Grocery Outlet are not included, which makes me question if the person in charge of the environmental review at LACO Associates, Inc. received and reviewed it. Chantell O'Neill confirmed that she received my comments. These comments were also not included under public comments (attachment 11).

Do you have a list of the public comments you forwarded to the person who reviews these comments at LACO Associates, Inc.?

Has the person who reviews these comments at LACO Associates, Inc. received my comments about the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist?

While I am awaiting your response I am asking you to at least post both public comments of mine under public comments for tomorrow's Planning Commission public hearing.

1. My comments about the Initial Study sent on 2-16-2021 to Chantell O'Neill, June Lemos and Tabatha Miller. See attachment.

and

2. My comments sent to City Council members, June Lemos and Tabatha Miller for the City Council meeting 1-11-2021 public comment item 8B sent on Monday, January 11, 2021. See attachment.

With a hearing that garners so much community interest it would be good if you could download the public comments tomorrow as they come in so that the public gets to see it as they come in.

Thanks, Annemarie

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study

Date: Tue, 16 Feb 2021 16:54:35 -0800

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>

To: O'Neal, Chantell <coneal@fortbragg.com>

CC: Lemos, June <Jlemos@fortbragg.com>, Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@FortBragg.com>

Hi,

Please accept my comments. Please confirm that you received it.

Thanks, Annemarie Weibel

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

Public Comments by Annemarie Weibel, member Citizens for Appropriate Coastal Land Use about Initial Study (IS), and Environmental Checklist for Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) regarding the Best Development Grocery Outlet Bargain Market planned for Fort Bragg.

The Grocery Outlet Bargain Market is a discount (bargain) store that buys goods from consumer packaged goods (CPG) manufacturers that have excess inventory or the packaging is damaged, for pennies on the dollar. Pepsi, Coca-Cola, and Nestle are such companies. Nestle is ***the world's biggest CPG that had a market cap value of \$267.5 billion at the end of 2017, with revenue approaching \$91 billion. The goal of the 74 year old Grocery Outlet business is to sell as many products to as many consumers as possible. They have 300+ stores across the nation and more than 1.5 million shoppers.***

The Coastal Act (in Public Resources Code, Section 30001.5), sets the following goals for LCPs in the Coastal Zone: • Protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the Coastal Zone environment and its natural and artificial resources. • Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of Coastal Zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state. • Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the Coastal Zone consistent with sound resource conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners. • Assure priority for coastal-dependent and coastal-related development over other development on the coast. • Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation in preparing procedures to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses in the Coastal Zone.

The mission of the Coastal General Plan is to preserve and enhance the small town character and natural beauty that make the City a place where people want to live and visit, and to improve the economic diversity of the City to ensure that it has a strong and resilient economy which supports its residents. The following concepts articulate a vision of Fort Bragg that embraces its past and prepares for the future. Fort Bragg is: • A friendly city with a small town character and a strong sense of community. • A city which seeks to preserve its natural beauty and provide access to the scenic and recreational resources of its natural setting. • A city that values its roots in the fishing and timber industries and seeks to maintain a connection to its past, while preparing for the future. • A city with strong connections to its heritage and a commitment to the preservation of historic resources. • A city which strives to create an environment where business and commerce can grow and flourish. • A city that embraces its role as the primary commercial and service center on the Mendocino coast. • A city which promotes itself as a tourist destination and which provides the necessary infrastructure and services to support a growing population of transient visitors. • A city that supports efforts to preserve and strengthen the vitality of commerce in its central business district. • A city that fosters a business climate which sustains and nourishes the growth and expansion of local businesses and cottage industries. 1 - Introduction Page 1-9 July 2008 Fort Bragg Coastal General Plan • A tolerant city that welcomes and values the cultural diversity of its residents. • A city that values its youth and considers their needs in the planning of public spaces and facilities. • A safe city that emphasizes community-oriented policing and crime prevention. • A city that strives to provide housing opportunities for all income groups. • A city that provides an

adequate road system and public infrastructure to serve its residents, businesses, and future growth.

Various potentially significant environmental impacts are:

Aesthetics:

1 a, b, c, and d have significant environmental impacts that require a revised draft IS/MND along with corresponding mitigation measures, or need an EIR.

The project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista per the City's Community Design Element.

Policy CD-1.1: Visual Resources: Permitted development shall be designed and sited to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas,...., to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance scenic views in visually degraded areas.

Policy CD-1.4: New development shall be sited and designed to minimize adverse impacts on scenic areas visible from scenic roads or public viewing areas to the maximum feasible extent.

Policy CD-1.10: All proposed divisions of land and boundary line adjustments shall be analyzed for consistency of potential future development with the visual resource protection policies of the LCP, and no division of land or boundary line adjustment shall be approved if development of resulting parcel(s) would be inconsistent with these policies.

Policy CD-2.1 Design Review: All development that has the potential to affect visual resources shall be subject to Design Review, unless otherwise exempt from Design Review pursuant to Coastal Land Use & Development Code Section 18.71.050. Design Review approval requirements shall not replace, supersede or otherwise modify the independent requirement for a coastal development permit approved pursuant to the applicable policies and standards of the certified LCP. Ensure that development is constructed in a manner consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines.

Policy CD-2.5 Scenic Views and Resource Areas: Ensure that development does not adversely impact scenic views and resources as seen from a road and other public rights-of-way. Program **CD-2.5.1:** Adopt additional Citywide Design Guidelines for scenic views and resources identified in Map CD-1. Consider including, at a minimum, the following guidelines: a) Discourage continuous buildings that block scenic views and require view corridors providing unobstructed views of the shoreline and/or the sea from public rights-of-way. d) Minimize the size of advertising, business identification, and directional signs to ensure scenic views are not obstructed. f) Prohibit or require screening of the following uses in scenic view corridors: signs and fencing which block the scenic views, mechanical equipment, refuse containers such as dumpsters, and the outdoor storage of materials.

My comments: This building does not restore and enhance scenic views of the building itself. We are told that the architectonic features make it look interesting. Have we learned nothing from masters like Frank Lloyd Wright? The new building with its columns and decorative attachments visually degrades the area. By tearing down the current building and moving the planned building further to the north some ocean views will be eliminated. It does not matter if this view to the ocean or to the river is only a sliver, a slice or a keyhole view. A visual analysis of the project's potentially significant impacts of the existing ocean views that will be blocked is necessary. It does not matter if the proposed project is not located in an area designated as having "potential scenic views toward the ocean or the Noyo River" if the project does not address the Coastal General Plan. The draft IS/MND indicates that "the proposed project would likely be visible from State Highway", therefore the ocean would also be visible from the

building site. Boundary line adjustments need to be analyzed for consistency of potential future development with the visual resource protection policies of the LCP. Development needs to be constructed in a manner that is consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines.

Policy CD-5.1: *Parking Location: Wherever feasible, locate parking facilities to the rear of the development so that the building facade is contiguous with the street frontage, and parking areas are hidden from the street.*

Program CD-5.1.1: *Consider adopting the following standards for parking facilities: a) establish standards for shade tree planting; b) establish an appropriately-scaled landscaped perimeter around parking areas; c) provide bicycle and motorcycle parking in all new parking facilities that include more than ten spaces.*

My comments: *With the entire parking lot proposed on the southern end of the merged parcels the parking lot and the area for delivery trucks will be visible from both N. Harbor Drive and S. Franklin Streets instead of placing the parking lot in the rear of the building. There is no analysis in regards to **CD-5.1** or why it is not feasible to do that. Also listening to the engines and looking at the supersized delivery trucks should not take place along a road that has views of the ocean and the Noyo River. To have cars and trucks use the same entries or exits is not safe or aesthetically pleasing. Is one an entry, and the other an exit? Having trucks enter or exit such a narrow road as N. Harbor Drive would force them to use the other lane to make this maneuver. 37 new trees would be planted along the north, south, and east boundaries, with a few along the west boundary, as well as one tree within each of the parking lot landscaping islands, but only 8 trees (Monterey cypress) would provide substantial shade for the parking spaces (once they are mature).*

Program CD-2.5.1 d) *Minimize the size of advertising, business identification, and directional signs to ensure scenic views are not obstructed. f) Prohibit or require screening of the following uses in scenic view corridors: signs and fencing which block the scenic views.*

My comments: *You list the illuminated signage, the installation of a six-foot-tall illuminated monument sign on the southeast corner of the Site. The monument sign would have 15 square feet of branding on each side, in addition to the unbranded base (see Signage Package; Appendix E). Additionally, an 83.3 square foot illuminated channel sign would be located on the sign parapet along the front elevation. These signs do not support the need for aesthetics in a town that survives from tourism (mainly eco tourists that come here to escape the Grocery Outlets and other big box stores where they live). Even Auto Zone was asked to change their branding that they usually use. When McDonald's first moved to Fort Bragg they could not use their golden arches branding. The entry to the store with its 15 square feet of branding on each side, in addition to the unbranded base and additional 83.3 square foot illuminated channel sign located on the sign parapet along the front elevation should not be visible from S. Franklin Street and N. Harbor Drive. Neither should the installation of a six-foot-tall illuminated monument sign on the southeast corner of the Site. It seems to me that all these issues are pointing out that this location should be abandoned and a location for example north of town in the industrial area chosen. Regardless, Grocery Outlet needs to adapt their branding to comply with **CD-2.5.1 d**. Coastal General Plan Map CD-1 <https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1264/Map-CD-1-Scenic-Views-in-the-Coastal-Zone-PDF?bidId=>*

Agriculture/Forestry:

As this property is now zoned Highway Visitor Commercial it would be hard to rezone it. It would be better to plant the whole area with food and feed Fort Bragg's residents and tourists.

There are 3 mature trees on the property (see photos sent in) that prove that there are more plants in the northern lot than just shrubby plants. The checklist seems to confuse the lots.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emission:

Policy LU-10.5: Minimize Impacts on Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses. New development shall: 1) be consistent with requirements imposed by an air pollution control district or the State Air Resources Control Board as to each particular development, and 2) minimize energy consumption and vehicle miles traveled.

My comments: Due to the fact that the City of Fort Bragg adopted Climate Action Plan setting goals and a policy requiring the reduction of GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions, this project is inconsistent with **LU-10.5** absent the incorporation of energy reduction techniques or on-site or off-site carbon sequestration efforts as mitigation measures and/or permit conditions to offset the projected increase in GHG emissions and energy use. The draft IS/MND projects that GHG emissions and energy consumption will increase due this project regardless of the vehicle miles traveled. Not tearing down the building would greatly help with ***air quality and greenhouse gasses. In addition to the hospital and doctor's offices, there is also a local clinic close by and there are also several senior housing facilities, as well as a***

daycare. Dust and greenhouse gasses will not only be felt by people living in the neighborhood, but also by the many people who work close by (mental health, environmental health, social services, etc.)

Where is the additional air quality study?

Biological Resources/Biota:

Policy OS-5.1: Native Species: Preserve native plant and animal species and their habitat.

My comments: The Biological Review from August 2019 lists many possible species, but apparently only a gopher mound and a crow was seen. The Review did not consider the mature trees (two Monterey cypress on the west side of the "northern lot" and the pine tree just north of these two trees near South Street). See photo submitted. In order to protect and nurture animals we need to retain mature, healthy trees as much as possible as with water shortage and the harsh local climate (includes wind), trees here do not grow very fast. This project interferes with the continued ability to see native animal species observed on this site. Just because no animals were seen that day and when the biologist was present does not mean that they do not exist at times. The annual X-mas bird watch by the Mendocino Coast Audubon Society lists the birds that have been seen in area 3 in Fort Bragg (which includes the Project site) since 2011. https://www.mendocinocoastaudubon.org/mcas_xmas_fb.html
Great Blue Herons: 1 in 2011 and 7 in 2017, 5 in 2018 (protected state, least concern/not listed, migratory); White-tailed Kites: 2 in 2017, 1 in 2018 (protected state, fully protected according to some websites, but not on the list); Osprey: 1 in 2018 (not listed, but protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act); Canada Geese: 3 in 2011, 31 in 2015, 36 in 2018 (not listed but protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act); Bald Eagles: 2 in 2017 (state and federal protection, migratory); Belted Kingfisher: 2 in 2017, 4 in 2018 (not listed); Snowy Egret: 1 in 2018 (not listed but protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act). The Review also lists the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the California and Federal Endangered Species Act, as well as others. Talking with local birders, and citizen scientists who report to <https://ebird.org/home> would give you better information. I believe that you already have received a photo with a Great Blue Heron seen at the Project site. I personally have observed huge flocks of Canada Geese resting in

the grass at Redwood Elementary School, and the Middle School for years during their migration.

The bat study needs to be completed ASAP. The review did not tell us at what time of the day the biologist looked for bats or other species. The Review is inconsistent with **OS-5.1**.

Policy OS-5.2: *To the maximum extent feasible and balanced with permitted use, require that site planning, construction, and maintenance of development preserve existing healthy trees and native vegetation on the site.*

My comments: *The Project shifts the new building closer to the existing healthy trees in the northwest portion of the site. The checklist mentions that there are no trees on site that could provide nesting habitat for native birds which is wrong and also mentions that what is there is ornamental, which is wrong as well. The bioretention basin would be where the root system of the cypress tree would have the maximum impacts and damage. The placement of the building or the northwestern bioretention basin do not have any demonstrated connection to the permitted use or the project's economic viability. In addition the Project proposes to remove and replace this mature pine tree located just north of these two Cypress trees near South Street with new landscaping. I also could not find information about the size of the bioretention basins. Thus, this project is inconsistent with **OS-5.2**.*

Policy OS-1.2: *provides that "any area that meets the ESHA definition is ESHA and shall be accorded all the protection provided for ESHA in the LCP."* **Policy OS-1.1** defines ESHA as "Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area" means any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments." "The following areas shall be considered ESHA: Any habitat area that is rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and is easily degraded or disturbed by human activities or developments. Any habitat area of plant or animal species designated as rare, threatened, or endangered under State or Federal law. Any habitat area of species designated as Fully Protected or Species of Special Concern under State law or regulations. Any habitat area of plant species for which there is compelling evidence of rarity, for example, those designated 1b (rare or endangered in California and elsewhere) or 2 (rare, threatened or endangered in California but more common elsewhere) by the California Native Plant Society. Raptor foraging and roosting habitat constitutes ESHA, in which fill for a shopping center is not allowed. "Development within Other Types of ESHA shall protect ESHA against any significant disruption of habitat values and shall be limited to the following uses: a. Resource Dependent Uses.

I am glad to read that you want to comply with regulations set by the International Dark-Sky Association. Artificial lights have devastating effects on many animals and especially bird species birds that migrate or hunt at night, and navigate by moonlight and starlight. Artificial light can cause them to wander off course and toward the dangerous nighttime landscapes of cities. Every year millions of birds die colliding with needlessly illuminated buildings, illuminated signs like the Grocery Outlet signs and towers. Migratory birds depend on cues from properly timed seasonal schedules. Artificial lights can cause them to migrate too early or too late and miss ideal climate conditions for nesting, foraging and other behaviors.

The checklist seems to confuse the lots.

Biological Resources/Soil:

Policy OS-1.3: *Development in ESHA Wetlands: Diking, Filling, and Dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted where there is no feasible less*

environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects, and shall be limited to the following uses:

- a. New or expanded port, energy, and coastal-dependent industrial facilities, including commercial fishing facilities.*
- b. Maintaining existing or restoring previously dredged depths in existing navigational channels, turning basins, vessel berthing and mooring areas, and boat launching ramps.*
- c. New or expanded boating facilities and the placement of structural pilings for public recreational piers that provide public access and recreational opportunities.*
- d. Incidental public service purposes, including but not limited to burying cables and pipes or inspection of piers and maintenance of existing intake and outfall pipelines.*
- e. Restoration purposes.*
- f. Nature study, aquaculture, or similar resource dependent activities.*

My comments: *The project indicates the presence of hydric soil, which the LCP identifies to constitute protected wetlands, in which cut and fill grading for a Grocery Outlet store is not a permitted use according to **Policy OS-1.3**. Therefore it is crucial that the biological study includes a follow up studies during the wet season and throughout the year to rule out the presence of wetland species.*

Cultural/Tribal Cultural Resources:

My comments: *Was the city consulted, as in the past the city had a list of all the tribes that automatically wanted to be notified of any developments in their vicinity? Was a local archaeologist hired to do the field work or consulted?*

Economic Resources:

Policy LU-4.1 Formula Businesses and Big Box Retail: Regulate the establishment of formula businesses and big box retail to ensure that their location, scale, and appearance do not detract from the economic vitality of established commercial businesses and are consistent with the small town, rural character of Fort Bragg.

My comments: *The Grocery Outlet store would be in close proximity to existing commercial businesses offering the same or similar products (i.e., Harvest Market, Safeway, Purity, Down Home Foods, B&C Grocery, Columbi's Market, and Nello's Market. They along with gas stations and liquor stores will have to compete with this formula business and it will detract from their economic vitality and is not consistent with the small town, rural character of Fort Bragg. These economic impacts have not been analyzed in the draft IS/MND and the project is likely inconsistent with **LU-4.1** as a result. The impact on existing grocery stores must be analyzed. Can the community support another grocery store or will one of the existing full-service stores go under? Are the anticipated tax receipts from the proposed Grocery Outlet Bargain Market offset by loss of tax receipts at the other stores? If so, by how much? In addition we need to strive towards self sufficiency and local control, not line the pockets of the 1% and be starving when the prices raise due to gas increases. Also having these mega trucks deliver goods on our roads tears up the roads, makes driving unsafe, and stops us from baking our own bread and tending our gardens. I am concerned that the many cheap items for sale attract many middle and low income people who are addicted to alcohol & tobacco and through their addiction face personal economic challenges.*

Energy:

Policy OS-6.2: Development Review Process: Make energy conservation an important criterion in the development review process.

My comments: *The checklist indicates that the project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation. I*

disagree. Also much of this energy would not have to be spent if the current building would be kept in place. The draft IS/MND does not include a review or discussion of energy conservation related to the proposed project, nor is such information contained in the application materials. Without such analysis or review during the review process, this project remains inconsistent with **OS-11.6**.

Geology/Soils:

My comments: The Project site is located within the area of the North Coast segment of the San Andreas Fault System, which locally is bounded by the San Andreas Fault Zone on the west and the Maacama Fault Zone on the east. The USGS has estimated that the San Andreas Fault System has a 10% probability of generating an $\geq M6.7$ earthquake between 2000-2030 (Mendocino County General Plan EIR sec. 4.6. Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources, at 4.6-5) and the estimated maximum capable earthquake magnitude for the Maacama Fault is $M7.3$. (Id., at 4.6-6.) In addition, the region located off Cape Mendocino, is characterized by thrust faults, capable of strong and extended seismic shaking; the 1700 earthquake on the Cascadia Subduction Zone is estimated to have been a $M9.0$ event. (Id.) A geology and soils impact is considered significant pursuant to CEQA (CEQA Guidelines threshold of significance) if implementation of the proposed project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including, but not limited to, liquefaction, if the development is located on expansive soil, and/or if the development is located on soil that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

Kazan assessed these issues with the geotechnical report in 1995 for the City of Fort Bragg/Hare Creek mall Project and referenced an estimated 0.10g horizontal acceleration associated with an historical earthquake.

The USGS Earthquake Design Map would inform us of the peak acceleration contours.

I am concerned that a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature would be directly or indirectly destroyed and the mitigation should at least that an

archaeologist would be present every time the ground of that southern plot would be touched.

Hazards/Hazardous Materials:

My comments: The Project involves proposed trenching and placing utilities underground, which potentially includes hazardous materials in their conduits, fixtures, and equipment. The Project centrally relies on a spatially and temporally extended food and goods production, storage, disposal, and transportation chain that, in its individual components and cumulatively, likely also has potentially significant adverse effects on the environment in California (as well as elsewhere). A Day Care also is close to the site. The IS/MND should be revised to address these direct and cumulative Project impacts and be *recirculated for public review and comment*.

Health/Safety:

My comments: *The store with its emphasis on filling shelves from floor to ceiling is designed to give customers the feel of abundance so that it is tempting to buy the goods. Candies, chocolates, and soft drinks (Pepsi and Coca-Cola aisles) are causing obesity, diabetes, and weight issues. Many of the goods contain red, yellow and green dyes that cause cancer. Compared to the area that offers frozen and canned food, fresh produce is minimal. Is this what we gift to our children, our future? Cheap alcohol is another temptation. Stores like this contribute also to other severe health conditions. Together with the lack of money for health insurance and lack of medical care locally, the negative consequences of stores like this will overwhelm our town's ability to cope. In addition I am very concerned that our town would be negatively effected by the weekly advertisements (they already got the town ready when for about one year the newspapers included weekly*

advertisements for the Grocery Outlet), circulars (extra bargain items) and Wow! deals you won't believe! Are we as a city so desperate for money from these bargain stores that we do not realize that we are shooting ourselves in the foot? Tourists will not frequent these stores while visiting this area or will not visit our town anymore as this is not what attracted them to our town in the first place. Some locals might shop there, but to the detriment of other stores that will be forced out. Why have we still not created a Formula Business Ordinance? The community has been waiting for 5 years for such an Ordinance. The production, packaging, storage, and transportation of these goods would likely have significant adverse effect on the environment directly, indirectly, and cumulatively. The Project emits mentioning the height of the proposed retaining wall.

Hydrology/Water Quality:

Policy OS-12.1: Developments of Special Water Quality Concern. The categories of development listed below have the potential for greater adverse coastal water quality impacts, due to the development size, type of land use, impervious site coverage, or proximity to coastal waters. A development in one or more of the following categories shall be considered a "Development of Special Water Quality Concern," and shall be subject to additional requirements set forth in **Policy OS-12.2** (see below) to protect coastal water quality.

Developments of Special Water Quality Concern include the following: c) Developments that result in the creation, addition, or replacement of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area. d) Parking lots with 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area, potentially exposed to stormwater runoff. h) All developments within 125 feet of the ocean or a coastal waterbody (including estuaries, wetlands, rivers, streams, and lakes), or that discharge directly to the ocean or a waterbody, if such development results in the creation, addition, or replacement of 2,500 square feet or more of impervious surface area.

a. "Discharge directly to" the ocean or a waterbody means outflow from a drainage conveyance system that is composed entirely of flows from the subject development or redevelopment site, and not commingled with flows from adjacent lands. i) Any other development determined by the review authority to be a Development of Special Water Quality Concern.

My comments: The store itself is a 16,000 sq. ft. building, the parking lot is 24,299 sq. ft., and the hardscape is 30,669 sq. ft., which does not include the building. The impervious surface area that is potentially exposed to stormwater runoff is astronomical. This project is inconsistent with OS-12.1 since it does not include the requirements set forth in

Policy OS-12.2 (see below) to protect coastal water quality because it does not include a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a qualified licensed professional, which supplements the Runoff Mitigation Plan required for all development.

Policy OS-12.2: Additional Requirements for Developments of Special Water Quality Concern. All Developments of Special Water Quality Concern (as identified in **Policy OS-12.1**, above) shall be subject to the following four additional requirements to protect coastal water quality: 1) Water Quality Management Plan. The applicant for a Development of Special Water Quality Concern shall be required to submit for approval a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a qualified licensed professional, which supplements the Runoff Mitigation Plan required for all development. The WQMP shall include hydrologic calculations per City standards that estimate increases in pollutant loads and runoff flows resulting from the proposed development, and specify the BMPs that will be implemented to minimize post-construction water quality impacts. 2) Selection of Structural Treatment Control BMPs. As set forth in **Policy OS-10.4**, if the review authority determines that the combination of Site Design and Source Control BMPs is not sufficient to protect water quality and coastal waters as required by Policy OS-9.3, structural Treatment Control BMPs shall also be required. The WQMP for a Development of Special Water Quality Concern shall describe the selection of Treatment Controls BMPs, and applicants shall first consider the

BMP, or combination of BMPs, that is most effective at removing the pollutant(s) of concern, or provide a justification if that BMP is determined to be infeasible. 3) 85th Percentile Design Standard for Treatment Control BMPs. For post-construction treatment of runoff in Developments of Special Water Quality Concern, Treatment Control BMPs (or suites of BMPs) shall be sized and designed to treat, infiltrate, or filter the amount of stormwater runoff produced by all storms up to and including the 85th percentile, 24-hour storm event for volume-based BMPs, and/or the 85th percentile, 1- hour storm event (with an appropriate safety factor of 2 or greater) for flow-based BMPs. 4) Goal for Runoff Reduction. In Developments of Special Water Quality Concern, the post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rate shall not exceed the estimated pre-development rate for developments where an increased discharge rate will result in increased potential for downstream erosion or other adverse habitat impacts.

Policy LU-10.4: Ensure Adequate Services and Infrastructure for New Development.

Development shall only be approved when it has been demonstrated that the development will be served with adequate water and wastewater treatment. Lack of adequate services to serve the proposed development shall be grounds for denial of the development.

My comments: The draft IS/MND includes no meaningful analysis of the adequacy of the City's water supply sources and infrastructure to provide water to the proposed project.

LU-10.4 requires that such analysis be included and this project is thus not consistent with **LU-10.4**. The City has developed a water model that predicts future availability of water supply based on historic water supply and usage rates. Unfortunately, the City's water model does not adequately include analysis of the projected impacts of climate change and sea-level rise on the City's future water supply. However, when data about historic king tides, the impacts of which will increase when projected sea-level rise occurs, and their interference with the City's ability to divert water from the Noyo River is included, the City's own water model projects that the City will not have adequate water supply for existing development with a mere one-foot increase in the sea level, let alone adequate water supply for new development like this project. The City of Fort Bragg has a demonstrated inadequate municipal water supply system, which has involved saline water contamination of, and restrictions on use of, its water supply (e.g., during the recent multi-year drought), with associated significant adverse effects on coastal resources. The municipal water system thus has inadequate capacity to accommodate the proposed new commercial development, which is not a coastal-dependent land use, but which would by its demand for very limited potable water in the City serve to preclude coastal-dependent land uses, essential public services, basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and coastal *visitor-serving land uses*. The draft IS/MND does not state, or analyze, what the maximum daily demand of water might be or whether the City's available potable water supply (e.g., during drought conditions, when certain of the City's water production sources are inoperative) is adequate to meet that cumulative demand for potable water by the Project. The City should analyze the true potential maximum daily and annual (364.25 day) Project demand for water, and in a recirculated *IS/MND present that analysis for public review*.

Land Use/Planning:

Policy LU-3.5: Re-Use of Existing Buildings: Encourage the adaptive re-use and more complete utilization of buildings in the Central Business District and other commercial districts.

My comments: Rather than to reuse and adapt and the vacant existing building on the site with almost the same floor area as the new building, this project, which is in a commercial district, proposes to demolish the existing building. The IS/MND includes no explanation or analysis of the viability of the existing building to serve the project objectives rather than a new structure.

Policy CD-1.10: *All proposed divisions of land and boundary line adjustments shall be analyzed for consistency of potential future development with the visual resource protection policies of the LCP, and no division of land or boundary line adjustment shall be approved if development of resulting parcel(s) would be inconsistent with these policies.*

Policy LU-5.6: *The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving and commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.*

*My comments: This project involves the development of the southern parcel into a parking lot for general commercial development, the proposed Grocery Outlet store. That parcel is frequently used by the Harbor Light Lodge and Super 8 customers who need more space for their RV's, for locals who attend events at the Harbor Light Lodge (traffic school, meetings of the Mendocino Coast Democratic Club, etc.) and need additional parking and for parking of large vehicles (big rig trucks and recreational vehicles) of transient visitors staying at the adjacent lodging facilities, as well as visitors and locals seeking coastal access to the Noyo Harbor and Noyo Beach via the existing public access trail and stairs across North Harbor Drive and adjacent to the Harbor Light Lodge. To usurp this area this project would be converting a visitor-serving use that provides public opportunities for coastal recreation through the adjacent access trail and stairs. This project would not be consistent Because general commercial development (the proposed use) is disfavored compared to visitor-serving uses that provide and enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation (the existing use of the southern parcel) this project is not consistent with **LU-4.1**.*

Fishing and logging are no longer the main income here, but tourists and locals love to frequent the north side of Noyo Harbor often using N. Harbor Drive. Having a Grocery Outlet at this location would significantly impact priority coastal dependent commercial fishing, tourism, restaurants, markets, ocean tours, and traffic in the Noyo Harbor. The draft IS/MND omits analysis of alternative potential sites within the Project site for development that is specifically and fully consistent with all applicable standards of development review. The Project is inconsistent with numerous Coastal Commission certified LCP land use plan (Coastal Element) policies. The IS/MND should specifically and fully analyze the Project, considered as a whole, for consistency with these LCP policies, and be recirculated for public review and comment.

The draft IS/MND failed to disclose and analyze the Project's cumulative effects on land use and conflicts with adopted controlling land use standards of development regulation. The City should analyze the true cumulative effects of the Project and its conflicts with the controlling standards, and in a recirculated IS/MND present that analysis for public review.

Noise:

The policies of the Noise Element are not part of the City of Fort Bragg certified Local Coastal Program and do not govern the review and approval of coastal development permits. A. Purpose The purpose of the Noise Element is to protect the health and welfare of the community by promoting development which is compatible with established noise standards.

*This element has been prepared in conformance with Government Code Section 65302(f) and the guidelines adopted by the State Office of Noise Control, pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 46050.1. Existing and future noise problems in the Planning Area are identified. Policies and implementation programs are provided to reduce the community's exposure to excessive noise levels. Accomplishing this task requires an evaluation of the noise generation from sources such as roads, highways, and stationary sources such as industrial facilities. **Noise Element • Policies N-1.1 through N-1.6.***

Policy N-1.6 Mitigate Noise Impacts: Mitigate noise impacts to the maximum feasible extent. Program N-1.6.1: Require acoustical studies and noise reduction measures, when warranted, for new developments and roadway improvements which affect noise sensitive uses such as residences, schools, hospitals, libraries, and convalescent homes. Program N-1.6.2: Require acoustical studies and noise reduction measures for any project that would potentially generate non-transportation noise levels in a residential area such that noise levels would exceed the planning standards set forth in Program N-1.2.2 and/or Table N-5. Program N-1.6.3: Work with Caltrans to ensure that adequate noise studies are prepared and alternative noise mitigation measures are considered when State and Federal funds are available. Program N-1.6.4: Consider and carefully evaluate the noise impacts of all street, highway, and other transportation projects. Program N-1.6.5: Recommend acoustical studies and noise reduction measures for all projects that would be exposed to noise levels in excess of those deemed normally acceptable, as defined in Table N-4. Program N-1.6.6: Consider developing an ordinance that regulates the allowable hours of construction activities. Program N-1.6.7: Consider requiring post-construction testing and sign-off by an acoustical engineer for residential projects exposed to an Ldn in excess of 65 dB to ensure compliance with applicable exterior and interior standards in the Noise and Land Use Compatibility Standards. Program N-1.6.8: Restrict truck traffic to designated routes. <https://city.fortbragg.com/DocumentCenter/View/1259/Element-08--Noise-PDF?bidId=>

My comments: Based on the checklist I am concerned with these issues. a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The impact would be substantial and needs more than a simple mitigation. Working on a Saturday should not be permissible, working from 7am to 7pm also not acceptable. By keeping the current building people would get less noise. The demolition of the current building and building of a new one that would take close to 1 year is not easy to deal with especially for the neighbors, as well as the tourists who pay a lot of money to stay at one of the lodges. To break up concrete is a noisy activity. Big trucks delivering building materials and idling their engines adds to the noise.

Noise would bounce back from the south side of the harbor and reverberate all over the harbor area.

Population/Housing:

My comments: Based on the draft IS/MND the store will be operated by 15 to 25 full-time staff and 2 managers. What are the salary ranges for these full-time employees? Many employees will be part-time to avoid paying benefits that often come with full-time employment. These benefits are crucial when the hourly wage would be \$13 an hour for employers who have 25 or less workers. That means no sick leave, no health insurance, no

pregnancy support, no time off after giving birth to bond with the baby, etc. For that salary a even a single person can not survive around here. Also there are no rentals available that are affordable, or no rentals period. Why do we keep building stores when people can not find places to live? Housing needs to be built by the company as a mitigation.

Public Services/Wildfires:

My comments:

Whereas the draft IS/MND describes the Project to include bioswales I did not see the size of them, nor the identified percolation capacity or perimeter overland flow controls. **There are four types of bioswales that can be constructed based on the needs of the location.** How can we comment on a preliminary grading and drainage plan? Does this IS/MND propose deferral of a Project grading plan to City grading ordinance review, notwithstanding that the LCP prohibits excavation of hydric soils (an LCP regulatory wetland)? Does the Project drainage scheme proposes to infiltrate storm water runoff beneath the development envelope? When will the final grading and drainage plan be complete so it can be recirculated for public review? Why are we not creating permeable paving and use rainwater harvesting? Mitigations have to be worked out as fire hydrants might not have enough pressure and, the city might not have enough water, and the police might not have enough personnel to deal with homeless and poor people who will make this place the new hangout on their way to the river or ocean. The cameras only work inside the building and not in the whole neighborhood for a store that is open from crack of dawn until 10pm.

Recreation:

Policy LU-5.6: The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving and commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agriculture or coastal-dependent industry.

Policy LU-5.7: Adequate parking should be provided to serve coastal access and recreation uses to the extent feasible. Existing parking areas serving recreational uses shall not be displaced unless a comparable replacement area is provided.

My comments: This project involves the development of the southern parcel into a parking lot for general commercial development, the proposed Grocery Outlet store. That currently vacant parcel is frequently used for parking of large vehicles (e.g., big rig trucks and recreational vehicles) of transient visitors staying at the adjacent lodging facilities (i.e., the Harbor Light Lodge and Super 8) as well as visitors and locals seeking coastal access to the Noyo Harbor and Noyo Beach via the existing public access trail and stairs across North Harbor Drive and adjacent to the Harbor Light Lodge. This project seeks to convert a visitor-serving use (i.e., an informal parking area) that provides public opportunities for coastal recreation through the adjacent access trail and stairs. Because general commercial development (the proposed use) is disfavored compared to visitor-serving uses that provide and enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation (the existing use of the southern parcel) this project is not consistent with **LU-4.1**. It is also not consistent with **LU-5.7** as the parking lot would displace an existing parking area serving recreational uses and public access to the coastal resources of Noyo Harbor and Noyo Beach without providing a comparable replacement area.

Policy OS-16.7: *Mitigation measures required for impacts to public access and recreational opportunities shall be implemented prior to or concurrent with construction of the approved development. Mitigation shall not substitute for implementation of a feasible project alternative that would avoid impacts to public access.*

My comments: This project includes the replacement of an existing unimproved parking area providing public access to recreational opportunities with a parking lot to serve a general commercial use but it does not include any mitigation measures (e.g., an off-site replacement of the existing parking area that provides relatively equivalent access to the coastal resources) to address or reduce these impacts. The lack of mitigation required by **OS-16.7** prevents this project from being consistent with it. Mitigation should be included and analyzed in the draft IS/MND.

Transportation/Traffic:

Policy PF-1.2(b) requires that “Demonstration of adequate road facilities shall include information demonstrating that (i) access roads connecting to a public street can be developed in locations and in a manner consistent with LCP policies; and (ii) that the traffic generated by the proposed development, and all other known and foreseeable development, will not cause Levels of Service (LOS) of roads, streets, and intersections within the City to reduce below LOS standards contained in **Policy C-1.1** of the Circulation Element of the Coastal General Plan.”

My comment: As we do not know if the traffic studies were performed during the summer school vacation on a summer holiday or major local event weekend (e.g., the Fort Bragg Salmon Barbecue on the first Saturday in July) they thus do not constitute true peak day measurements of traffic. The project could contribute to future traffic intersection impacts. This impact would be cumulatively considerable. The Project is based on inadequate data to connect Grocery Outlet to Highway 1, without directly or cumulatively incurring unmitigated significant adverse traffic impacts. Further, given the existing and planned traffic capacity limitations of Highway 1, including, but not limited to the area of its intersection with N. Harbor Drive, South Street, and Cypress Street, the Project will impermissibly function to significantly adversely effect and preclude Coastal Act priority public access and recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses in the affected area. The draft IS/MND does not mention construction vehicles that would access the site via Highway 1, which may likely have significant impacts on public access, recreational, and other Coastal Act high priority traffic use of Highway 1 in the area. Would it require “temporary rerouting” during construction that connects the public, visitor-serving roads with Highway 1. Would the City need to (a) analyze the potentially significant environmental, coastal resource, and public access recreational impacts of any such road, and the changes in the kinds and intensities of use it may likely entail, as part of this IS/MND before acting on this MND or Project CDP?

Policy C-1.2: Coordinate Land Use and Transportation: Ensure that the amount and phasing of development can be adequately served by transportation facilities. **Program C-1.2.1:** Review development proposals for their direct and cumulative effects on roadway Level of Service standards. During the development review process, City staff will determine whether traffic studies need to be carried out and the scope of such studies.

My comments: A traffic study was prepared for this project, and concluded that the project would contribute, in a cumulatively considerable manner to further deterioration of the LOS standards at several studied intersections established by the Coastal General Plan, but no mitigation has been designed. Without such mitigation measures, the project cannot be considered to be “adequately served” by the City’s transportation facilities. Moreover, there is no discussion or analysis of the site’s access to public transportation or pedestrian-oriented facilities. Thus, this project is not consistent with **C-1.2**.

Policy C-1.3: Do not permit new development that would result in the exceedance of roadway and intersection Levels of Service standards unless one of the following conditions is met: a) Revisions are incorporated in the proposed development project which prevent the Level of

Service from deteriorating below the adopted Level of Service standards; or b) *Funding of prorata share of the cost of circulation improvements and/or the construction of roadway improvements needed to maintain the established Level of Service is included as a condition or development standard of project approval.*

My comments: This project is also inconsistent because neither of the listed conditions for potential approval are met by the proposal. This is true despite the traffic study specifically recommending intersection improvements to the intersection of Main and South Streets. That said, no such mitigation measures are feasible for that intersection because of CalTrans prohibition on signalized intersections in close proximity to the Noyo River Bridge. Without such mitigation or other revisions to the project to prevent the LOS from deteriorating further, it is inconsistent with **C-1.3**.

Policy C-1.4: Include specific time frames for the funding and completion of roadway improvements for projects which cause adopted roadway and intersection Level of Service standards to be exceeded. Require security, bonding or other means acceptable to the City to ensure the timely implementation of roadway mitigations.

My comments: This project is not consistent with C-1.4 because there are no time frames established for the completion of roadway improvements and the project causes the LOS to exceed the applicable standards.

Policy C-1.5: Traffic Impact Fees. When traffic impact fees are collected, establish a schedule from the date of collection of said fee for the expenditure of funds to construct roadway improvements that meets project needs. Where a project would cause a roadway or intersection to operate below the adopted traffic Level of Service standards, the roadway or intersection improvements should be completed in a timely manner but no later than five years after project completion.

My comments: This project results in intersections projected to operate below LOS standards, but no roadway or intersection improvements are proposed. Because roadway and intersection improvements are necessary per the traffic study as well as relevant Coastal General Plan policies discussed, the project must also incorporate a timeline for such improvements that ensures completion within the maximum five years permitted by **C-1.5**. Absent these revisions the project is not consistent with **C-1.5**.

Policy C-6.2: Improve Existing North Harbor Drive: Consider improvements to North Harbor Drive to increase capacity and safety for vehicles and pedestrians. Any improvements to North Harbor Drive shall be consistent with all applicable policies of the LCP including, but not limited to, the wetland, environmentally sensitive habitat area, public access, and visual protection policies.

My comments: This project involves improvements along North Harbor Drive (e.g., sidewalks) but there is no analysis of the consistency of the proposed improvements with the applicable policies of the LCP, including policies concerning maintaining public access to coastal resources served by the informal parking area on the southern portion of the parcels. Thus, this project is not consistent with **C-6.2** absent revisions to include consistency analysis of the proposed improvements to North Harbor Drive.

Policy C-9.3: Where feasible, incorporate pedestrian facilities into the design and construction of all road improvements.

My comments: The northeastern boundary of this project is adjacent to the intersection of S. Franklin and South Streets, which is currently a two-way stop on S. Franklin Street. That intersection does not include north-south crosswalks for safer pedestrian access across South Street nor does it include installing stop signs on South Street to convert the intersection into a four-way stop, which would improve conditions necessary for safe pedestrian access. The City Council has previously identified this intersection for pedestrian

and vehicular safety upgrades, including conversion into a four-way stop. The draft IS/MND does not include this relevant information or corresponding analysis of the issue of pedestrian safety for patrons to access the Grocery Outlet across South Street. This should be addressed by revising the draft IS/MND to include such analysis and the likely addition of an additional mitigation measure to upgrade that intersection to a four-way stop or providing a prorata fair-share contribution to those intersection improvements.

Policy C-9.7: Improve Pedestrian Safety.

Program C-9.7.1: Continue to provide traffic controls and well-lit intersections in areas with a high volume of pedestrian movement.

My comments: The Project provides no continuous pedestrian sidewalk along S. Franklin Street as required by **Policy C-9.1**. This project also does not propose to provide recommended traffic controls at the intersection of Franklin and South Streets, which is likely to produce a “high volume of pedestrian movement” because the Grocery Outlet likely to attract patrons without the means to afford private vehicle transportation since it is a discount grocery store in a location that is to the south of most residential development in the City. As such, it is reasonable to predict the bulk of patrons accessing the site on foot will be travelling from the north along Franklin Street and across South Street. The draft IS/MND does not include any analysis of safe pedestrian access through this intersection (or otherwise) and it should be revised to include this critical information and analysis. Thus, the project is not consistent with C-9.7 without revising the IS/MND to analyze and address this area of concern.

Policy C-14.1: Development to Pay Its Fair Share: Require new development to pay its fair share of transportation improvements to maintain levels of service and traffic safety in the City.

My comments: See consistency analysis for **C-1.2, C-1.3, C-1.4, C-1.5, C-9.3, and C-9.7**. This project is inconsistent with **C-14.1** because it does not require the project applicant/developer to make any fair-share contribution for necessary transportation infrastructure improvements that the traffic study identified were necessary to maintain LOS and traffic safety in the City. The Project, for want of a vehicular traffic mitigation plan that reduces its impacts to below the level of significance and establishes coordinated non-motorized means of circulation (e.g., connecting ADA-compliant sidewalks, and bike paths), will have impermissible direct and cumulative significant adverse effects on public recreational traffic, contrary to the requirements of the Coastal Act (PRC sec. 30604(c), 30254) and LCP policies **C-1.3, C-1.4, C-9.2, C-9.4, C-10.2, C-10.5**.

Where is the 100-foot turning radius for emergency vehicle turnaround?

The Traffic Impact Analysis notes, that these streets and intersections including the issues with Highway 1 are inadequate to serve current traffic demands during peak hours, and the Project is incapable of implementing traffic mitigation measures that reduce the Project’s significant adverse effects on traffic to below the level of significance. As more money was allocated to establish Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) thresholds there is no point to try to comment on the traffic study. It needs to be recirculated. I did send previous comments to the city council especially in regards to the traffic study and will save these additional comments until the study gets recirculated again.

Utilities/Service Systems:

Policy OS-11.6: Use Permeable Pavement Materials. To enhance stormwater infiltration capacity, development shall use permeable pavement materials and techniques (e.g., paving blocks, porous asphalt, permeable concrete, and reinforced grass or gravel), where appropriate and feasible. Permeable pavements shall be designed so that stormwater

infiltrates into the underlying soil, to enhance groundwater recharge and provide filtration of pollutants. All permeable pavement that is not effective in infiltrating as designed will be replaced with effective stormwater detention and infiltration methods.

My comments: This project involves a significant amount of hardscaping and paved areas but no indication that the hardscaping and pavement proposed for this project “shall use permeable pavement materials and techniques” anywhere on the project site. Although there are non-paved landscaping areas that will be permeable, there is no analysis indicating that permeable pavement materials were considered at all for the paved areas, let alone rejected as infeasible. This project is inconsistent with **OS-11.6** because it neither incorporates permeable paving materials nor analyzes and rejects such materials and infeasible in accordance with **OS-11.6**

Mandatory Findings of Significance:

My comments: According to the checklist a, b, and c pose significant impacts.

Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects). c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The Project does not conform, in various specific parts, to the mandatory standards of the City LCP land use plan (“Coastal General Plan”) or to the mandatory standards of the City LCP CZO (“Coastal Land Use and Development Code”). These Project inconsistencies constitute unmitigated significant direct and cumulative adverse effects on the environment, on coastal resources, and on public access and recreational opportunities in the coastal zone, contrary to the City LCP and the Coastal Act.

The Project is not served by adequate existing public water and street/ roadway/intersection infrastructure and therefore does not conform, in specific parts, to the mandatory standards of the City LCP land use plan (“Coastal General Plan”) or to the mandatory standards of the City LCP CZO (Coastal Land Use and Development Code). These Project inconsistencies constitute unmitigated significant direct and cumulative adverse effects on the environment, on coastal resources, and on public access and recreational opportunities in the coastal zone, contrary to the City LCP and the Coastal Act.

Some drawings mention “Not to Scale”, which renders shown dimensions both internally inconsistent and unsupported.

Unless some serious mitigations are used, the whole document rewritten and given for review I believe that we need an EIR to deal with this project.

Thanks for considering my input.
Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel

2-16-2021

From: [O'Neal, Chantell](#)
To: [Peters, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study
Date: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 1:32:43 PM
Attachments: [3 public comments GO .odt](#)
[Grocery Outlet comments .odt](#)

Sarah,

It doesn't look like you are on this one. Please add and collate. I don't want to mess with your system!

-C

-----Original Message-----

From: Annemarie [<mailto:aweibel@mcn.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 10:24 PM
To: O'Neal, Chantell <COneal@fortbragg.com>
Cc: Lemos, June <Jlemos@fortbragg.com>; Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@fortbragg.com>
Subject: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study

Hi,

I am reviewing the information about the Grocery Outlet Bargain Market in preparation for tomorrow's meeting.

Checking on the CEQA public comments (attachment 6) my 17 pages public comments about the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the Grocery Outlet are not included, which makes me question if the person in charge of the environmental review at LACO Associates, Inc. received and reviewed it. Chantell O'Neill confirmed that she received my comments. These comments were also not included under public comments (attachment 11).

Do you have a list of the public comments you forwarded to the person who reviews these comments at LACO Associates, Inc.?

Has the person who reviews these comments at LACO Associates, Inc.
received my comments about the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist?

While I am awaiting your response I am asking you to at least post both public comments of mine under public comments for tomorrow's Planning Commission public hearing.

1. My comments about the Initial Study sent on 2-16-2021 to Chantell O'Neill, June Lemos and Tabatha Miller. See attachment.

and

2. My comments sent to City Council members, June Lemos and Tabatha Miller for the City Council meeting 1-11-2021 public comment item 8B sent on Monday, January 11, 2021. See attachment.

With a hearing that garners so much community interest it would be good if you could download the public comments tomorrow as they come in so that the public gets to see it as they come in.

Thanks, Annemarie

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject: comments regarding the Grocery Outlet Initial Study
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 2021 16:54:35 -0800

From: Annemarie <aweibel@mcn.org>
To: O'Neal, Chantell <coneal@fortbragg.com>
CC: Lemos, June <Jlemos@fortbragg.com>, Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@FortBragg.com>

Hi,
Please accept my comments. Please confirm that you received it.
Thanks, Annemarie Weibel

--

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

The \$24,644 requested by LACO Associates, Inc. (LACO) for consulting planning services for the Grocery Outlet Project which includes a Coastal Development Permit 8-19 (CDP 8-19), Design Review 1-19 (DR 1-19), Parcel Merger (MGR 1-19), a demolition of an existing 16,436 SF former office building, and construction of one 16,000 SF retail building, a 53-space parking lot, site landscaping, and the merger of three existing parcels apparently turns out not to cover their cost.

LACO asks for an additional \$13,400, bringing the new contract total to \$38,044 (amount not to exceed). Why is LACO citing unforeseen circumstances (namely challenges with Vehicle Miles Travelled) and is requesting an additional 54%. It seems clear that these companies underbid to get the job and then ask more money as time goes on. That also happened with the environmental consultant that was in charge of the DEIR/EIR for the Hare Creek mall. Why is a contract set up that makes it possible to get a 54% increase? How many more times will LACO come back and request more money? Why could not Grocery Outlet pay that difference? We should demand that they do not come back for any more money or if they do that Grocery Outlet pays for it. I found out that there seems to be also a study dealing with Air Quality, but have not seen it online. Please post. The Biological Review needs a follow up study in regards to bats. When exactly did those studies take place (Day, Month, Year)?

Why does a project like this not require a Mitigated Negative Declaration? Based on the superficial Traffic Impact Analysis alone this seems crucial. There seems to be no way that a project like this can be exempt from CEQA!

Is Grocery Outlet required to get a permit from one or more state or federal agencies (as it adds traffic to a state road)?

The Traffic Impact Analysis identifies 54 parking spaces, whereas the staff report indicates 53 spaces.

As we experience with other big box stores like the Dollar Tree these trucks need a lot of space and having them enter from Franklin Street and exit onto N. Harbor Drive or S. Franklin Street makes this problematic as N. Harbor Drive is approaching Hwy 1/Main Street in a westerly direction and enters immediately at the end of Noyo River Bridge. The westbound approach indicates RIGHT TURN ONLY. Therefore it would not be possible for trucks or would not make any sense for them to exit onto N. Harbor Drive.

Exiting S. Franklin Street is also problematic as there is no stoplight on South Street and therefore trucks would have to drive to Cypress Street to get to Hwy 1.

Apparently multiple 24 hr traffic counts were made on key roadway segments on a summer Thursday, Friday and Saturday to define the periods of intersection analysis. The counts were made at these locations:

Cypress Street between Main Street and S. Franklin Street

South Street between Main Street and S. Franklin Street

Harbor Drive between Main Street and S. Franklin Street

S. Franklin Street between Cypress Street and South Street

S. Franklin Street between South Street and North Harbor Drive.

What Saturday? Was it during July 4th, the Salmon Barbecue? What year? What month? With public schools & college in session or not? During Covid?

New intersection turning movement counts (motor vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles) were then made on a weekday and on Saturday during the two-hour peak periods at these locations: 1. Main Street / Cypress Street 2. Main Street / South Street 3. Main Street / N. Harbor Drive 4. S. Franklin Street / Cypress Street 5. S. Franklin Street / South Street 6. S. Franklin Street / Harbor Drive.

Again, what Saturday? Was it during July 4th, the Salmon Barbecue? What year? What month? With public schools & college in session or not? During Covid? From when to when was the two-hour peak period? The difficulty is not only the amount of time a turning movement takes, but the space available for these big trucks to go around a curve without ending up in another lane.

Long Term Year 2040 conditions were assessed based on Caltrans local area growth rates and information available from the City of Fort Bragg regarding other approved projects in this area of the community. The extent to which other approved projects should be considered in future forecasts in addition to the growth rate was apparently considered. There is one approved project in the area of the Grocery Outlet Store that would be expected to result in traffic volume increases beyond that already addressed by the assumed background growth rate. The Plateau Housing Project will be located on the east end of South Street south of Kemppe Way. There is also a project in the works for a Dollar General store located at the corner of S. Franklin Street and Maple Street. Operating hours would be from 8:00 AM to 9:00 PM. seven days per week. This also needs to be considered.

With Harvest Market moving their business onto the former mill site along Hwy 1 and the mill site planning development maybe before 2040 it is not good enough to only consider already approved projects.

Traffic studies need to also include the Simpson Lane turnaround, the intersection of Hwy 1 and Hwy 20 and other intersections farther north of Cypress Street on Hwy 1.

We are told that with increased development by 2040 trucks will comprise more than 3% of the daily traffic (21,200 vehicles per day (vpd) south of Cypress Street, with the daily volume rising to 24,200 vpd) in the peak month.

Cypress Street is the main access to the hospital, doctor's offices, a pharmacy, and also the main access to the emergency room and ambulance. Many places for elderly and low income residents are located in the area surrounding the hospital. The police department is at the corner of Cypress Street and S. Franklin Street.

Located on S. Franklin Street is the court, the environmental health department, the mental health department and Social Services department. There is a dip in the road slowing traffic down at the intersection of S. Franklin Street and South Street.

The clinic is also located on South Street (east of S. Franklin Street).

With all the businesses that are located in this general neighborhood doing a Traffic Impact Analysis on a weekend would not show that much traffic as during the week. When were the studies done? What month, day, and year? During Covid?

N. Harbor Drive is a scenic road leading to the scenic harbor and used by many locals and tourists who want to see the north side of the harbor, go to the beach, eat in local restaurants, and buy fresh fish.

The Hwy 1/Main Street and N. Harbor Drive intersection is not a four-way intersection and there is no stop signs on the eastbound approach. The westbound approach indicates RIGHT TURN ONLY. Therefore it would not be possible for trucks to exit that way or would not make any sense for them to exit onto Hwy 1/Main Street.

The Traffic Impact Analysis mentions that the SR 1 TCR is currently unavailable on the Caltrans website as that source undergoes accessibility updates. This has been like that for at least 2 years and maybe will be for another 2 years, therefore it is important if the analysis is based on actual information by Caltrans.

I am concerned about the LEVEL OF SERVICE E & F.

The Traffic Analysis found it worthwhile to note that at the Hwy 1/ N. Harbor Drive intersection some motorists were observed making left turns and through traffic movements contrary to posted turn prohibitions. You excluded them from the LOS calculations, but they do exist as many tourists who do not know the area and do not realize this issue before they get to that intersection.

The Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) provides transit service in addition to a stop near the County Social Services building at the South Street / S. Franklin Street intersection, and also circles around the hospital by driving on South Street, River Drive, Kemppe Way and Cypress Street and also stop at Safeway accessible from the S. Franklin Street.

To get a good count of this area east of Hwy 1 doing a traffic impact analysis on a weekend would not give high #'s.

If assumptions were made for the Grocery Outlet based on other retail projects in previous Fort Bragg traffic studies I hope that they were not based on the traffic study for the Hare Creek mall as this study was faulty. See public input with MND, DEIR/EIR.

Many locals do not believe that a Grocery Outlet store in a rural community like Fort Bragg would attract customers from a relatively broad area that extends beyond the limits of the community. Our eco tourists are not keen on stores they can go to wherever they live. They are looking for charming specialty stores.

If the availability of right of way to construct improvements is unknown next to Grocery Outlet it can be researched and Grocery Outlet could pay for these improvements.

It seems to me that Caltrans 2014 Growth Factors need to be updated.

I disagree with the statement in the Traffic Impact Analysis that at the intersection of (Hwy 1/ Main Street and Cypress Street the queue will not spill over into the adjoining through lane and as the through travel lane would not be affected that background conditions would be acceptable. This transition area is ok to use for cars, bicycles, and bikes, but if we get many

huge trucks delivering goods (maybe also to Dollar General) it will be hard to see beyond one of these trucks. Traffic accidents will go up and people will do more illegal maneuvers just to pass huge trucks.

Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis Hwy 1/ Main Street and South Street intersection the Level of Service on the westbound approach will drop to LOS E in the weekday p.m. peak hour and in the peak Saturday hour. I read that LOS E exceeds the weekday p.m. peak hour standard of LOS D, but is accepted under the General Plan policy for peak summer conditions. What might be acceptable as far as the General Plan policy for peak summer conditions is concerned might not be acceptable to the residents who live here. Many escaped the big cities in search for a more laid back approach. Summer traffic in Fort Bragg is unsafe and nerve racking.

The Analysis lists the need for mitigation to deal with this above mentioned traffic problem, but indicates that all that is needed is either a roundabout which did not go over well with the Simpson Lane roundabout and for Caltrans get an encroachment permit. Your idea of a mitigation seems crazy. The Grocery Outlet Store project owners and not the proponents should contribute their fair share to the cost of regional circulation improvements by paying adopted fees and making frontage improvements. It is clear that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is needed. The traffic problems at this site alone create impacts that are serious.

The Traffic Impact Analysis concludes by indicating that the regional effect on Vehicles Miles Traveled is likely to be small, but generally will be reduced by offering a closer option for northbound traffic. In a small place like Fort Bragg where Safeway is just around the corner a Grocery Outlet can easily force Purity to go under. That fact is not addressed in the Analysis.

If this Traffic Impact Analysis was done during Covid this project should be on hold until some normalcy will return (people have work, can afford to keep their business open, can afford a car, insurance and gas, etc.) and a better Analysis can be done. We need a development moratorium until Covid is over.

With all of this development, water, respectively lack thereof does not seem to come into play so far. In 2015 the city announced that they would only have 1% water left for the Hare Creek mall and the Avalon Hotel & Conference Center. We are in a drought, the city was not able to procure new water other than a small reservoir (not new water) and citizens & tourists were asked to ration their water due to a stage 1 and stage 2 water emergency this year. The same was true for other years in the past. In previous Fort Bragg water studies there was concern that there is a lack of water pressure for exactly that area of Fort Bragg in case of an emergency.

We need a Mitigated Negative Declaration and a development moratorium until Covid is over. We also need a moratorium on formula businesses until our policy is adopted at least locally.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel
1-11-2021

My public comments about the Grocery Outlet Bargain Market (GOBM)

The Commission considers approval of Coastal Development Plan CDP 8-19, Design Review DR 1-19, and Parcel Merger MGR 1-19, and adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Grocery Outlet Bargain Market.

Based on my research and all my public comments (written and verbal) since 1-11-2021 and based on many public comments listed in Attachment 6 (CEQA public comments) and Attachment 11 (public comments) and research of previous applications (for Hare Creek mall with anchor store Grocery Outlet and AutoZone projects) this project needs an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The mitigations, various Findings, Design Review, Parcel Merger, Standard & Special Conditions are not sufficient to mitigate the many serious effects caused by this project. The CEQA Findings list should not only list three areas of significant impacts such as Biological Resources, Geology & Soils, and Noise, but basically all of the environmental resources. Based on all the elements addressed above the proposed project would cause environmental impacts. The mitigations are not enough to address all potential impacts as they can not all be reduced to a less than significant level. I therefore recommend that an Environmental Impact Report will be done.

Only an EIR will analyze the cumulative (as well as direct) impacts of the project (including the project as a whole) on the environment and protected resource.

Public comments by Leslie Kashiwada PhD, Edward Oberweiser, Mikael Blaidstell, attorney Jacob Patterson, Kyra Rice, Ken Armstrong, Michele Herrick, Evan S. Dick (next door neighbor), the Department of Fish & Wildlife, Mary Rose Kaczorowski, among others and myself highlight these areas clearly. Most of them were submitted during the CEQA review.

Why were my 17 pages submitted before the deadline and confirmed received by Chantell O'Neal not included and reviewed by LACO, Associates, Inc. ? I will also include my comments here including comments I sent to the City Council on 1-11-2021 with information about the Grocery Outlet at the time of discussion about a moratorium of formula businesses.

Based on this fact the Resolution including the CEQA Findings as it reads can not be adopted today.

Based on Public Resource Code 21082.2 a & d clearly state: "that the lead agency shall determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record" and (d) "If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report shall be prepared."

Public Participation:

Public hearings are designed so that the public can find out about a project. With Covid & virtual hearings that process has been basically made impossible. Not everyone has fast speed internet and can access zoom or access the meeting on a smart phone as they wait outside Town Hall wanting to speak while missing what has been said while they are waiting outside for a turn to speak. The public should have been informed and able to see all the

information on the city's web page and not just a few days before this hearing. PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE – DIVISION 20 of the CALIFORNIA COASTAL ACT was designed to protect the “widest opportunity for public participation.”

According to Section 65033 of the State Planning, Zoning, and Development Law (Government Code) the Legislature recognizes the importance of public participation at every level of the planning process. It is therefore the policy of the state and the intent of the Legislature that each state, regional, and local agency concerned in the planning process involve the public through public hearings, informative meetings, publicity and other means available to them, and that at such hearings and other public forums, the public be afforded the opportunity to respond to clearly defined alternative objectives, policies, and actions. There were no clearly defined alternative objectives proposed. At the least more mitigations/special conditions are needed.

The CEQA Guidelines, at Title 14, California Code of Regulations Section 15201 about PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, or any of the CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21000 and after) contain many specific provisions about required notice of environmental documents, and opportunities for public comments on them relating to the a project proposal. Each public agency should include provisions in its CEQA procedures for wide public involvement, formal and informal, consistent with its existing activities and procedures, in order to receive and evaluate public reactions to environmental issues related to the agency's activities.

General Findings: The project is not consistent with all the necessary documents or compatible with existing & future land uses in the area. As far as emergency vehicle and safety is concerned it is not physically suitable, neither does it protect the public from being endangered as far as health, safety, convenience, and welfare is concerned.

CEQA Findings: Many of the public comments agree that there are significant impacts that have not been mitigated yet with thei project. Neither were they with the Auto Zone also dealt with by LAFCO. The same is true for the Design Review, Standard & Special Conditions.

CDP Findings:
It would adversely affect coastal resources.

Sincerely, Annemarie Weibel
5-26-2021

From: [Pam West](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: Grocery Outlet
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 10:53:49 AM

Community Development Department,

I am writing this letter to support Grocery Outlet in Fort Bragg CA.

- choice for groceries
- competitive prices
- job opportunities
- keep shopping local
- more affordable food prices
- help our senior residents on fixed income

Pam West
Local FB resident
Address provided upon request

From: [montanagr1](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: Grocery y Outlet
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 8:53:23 PM

I am for having a Grocery Outlet in Fort Bragg. There's room for another store that can have reasonable prices and a good selection. Please vote to approve it.
Thank you for your time.

Linda Williams
Fort Bragg resident
Sent from my iPhone

From: [don winters](#)
To: [CDD User](#)
Subject: Permits for Grocery Outlet and Dollar General
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 8:39:23 AM

Dear Planning Commission,

I support the building of both Grocery Outlet and Dollar General. I feel that when the areas were given commercial zone status that commercial endeavors should be allowed in those zones. Furthermore, I feel that since about 20% of the population is at or below the poverty line both of these stores are needed. Competition is good for all consumers. There may be more traffic but that is just part of growing....and if you are not growing you are stagnating. I feel that Fort Bragg is in the early stages of stagnation.

Sincerely,

Donna Winters