

**From:** [George](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Cc:** [McCormick, Sarah](#)  
**Subject:** Re: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:59:20 AM

---

Thanks June. I think I'd rather play music, but I'll consider it. I will be making a written comment, but we need more information to adequately consider the Skunk's proposal. Briefly, I think the separating of the LCP process into three parts is a good idea.

George

On Jan 11, 2021, at 8:47 AM, Lemos, June <[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)> wrote:

If you attend tonight's Council meeting you are welcome to make your comments under Public Comment for Item 8C and they will become a permanent part of the official record.

June Lemos, CMC  
City Clerk  
City of Fort Bragg  
416 N Franklin St  
Fort Bragg CA 95437  
707.961.2823 ext. 104

---

**From:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:45 AM  
**To:** Lemos, June <[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Cc:** McCormick, Sarah <[SMcCormick@fortbragg.com](mailto:SMcCormick@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.

Thanks June. This seems a little "off kilter." Any response to the Mendo Rail piece requires their current proposal—it seems to me. I detest to old one, included in the packet. But, it appears, that is old news.

George

On Jan 11, 2021, at 8:26 AM, Lemos, June <[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)> wrote:

Good morning, George:

Agendas for ad hoc committees are not required to be published, so I

have not seen the current Mendocino Railway proposal that was shared with the Mill Site ad hoc committee on November 30, 2020. I am copying Sarah McCormick with this email and asking her to please contact you to respond to your questions.

Sincerely,

June Lemos, CMC  
City Clerk  
City of Fort Bragg  
416 N Franklin St  
Fort Bragg CA 95437  
707.961.2823 ext. 104

---

**From:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:14 AM  
**To:** Lemos, June <[jlemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:jlemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** A question regarding Agenda item 8C.

Hi June,

What's this? The Agenda summary states this regarding the Mendocino Railway Company:

1. Since this time the concept has morphed into a phased development initially utilizing train cars for residences and lodging. Mendocino Railway shared their current proposal with the Mill Site Ad Hoc Committee on November 30, 2020. And is this what we should be responding to? Is there a summary of the Skunk's current proposal?

George

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:** [George](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Subject:** A couple more thoughts on 8C.  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 4:28:34 PM

---

Honorable Fort Bragg City Council members,

The key issues are the Skunk is trying to push forward with plans outside of the planning process. Their ideas for development are all pretty terrible, but they might come around if our community is clear and firm about what we want. The City needs the Skunk Train to take on the responsibility for paying for their plans and development ideas. As always, it's complicated, but the city council is looking for community support to break up the overall mill site LCP-Local Coastal Plan process into three parts, so the city can make headway on the plans for the rest of the property. This seems sensible to me. Item 8C is hard to understand because the current Skunk plans are not included in the packet. Thus, it is hard to engage with their current bad ideas.

The current Skunk ideas for development are quite different than the tired old bubble maps of Attachment #1. From what I gather, the city council is tired of the Skunk ignoring the community's wishes. If I understand this correctly, thank you, City Council members. The Skunk is already fighting with the California Coastal Commission about a number of issues. I will enumerate these and other issues:

- 1 It appears they are trying to avoid oversight. You will recall, this has been going on for some time.
2. They are never the less also telling the Fort Bragg City Council what out to be done with property south of their holdings.
3. They are still pushing for a big hotel, less wildlife corridor, and their new really bad idea is they are going to solve the cities housing crisis by essentially creating a trailer park—made of old rail cars—which could also be vacation rentals for their ridiculous fancy hotel.
4. They are moving everything around, in their revised plan, but I can't tell you specifics because they are not posted anywhere. A problem don't you think.
5. If I have any of the facts wrong, about their vision, obfuscation or questionable behavior, more transparency, and an effort to work with our community will help a great deal.
6. I think it is a distraction for us to try to push back on ANY of their ideas right now, but the city is looking for flexibility in planning these three separate pieces of the former mill site, and I think this is a good idea.
7. The Skunk proposal ignores most of the pressing issues that our community has faced since the closing of the mill.
  - a. Climate Change and our community response to it must be forefront in any plan.
  - b. Native American desires for their ancestral places and sacred sites must be respected.
  - c. Where will the water come from and how will this impact decisions?
  - d. The Skunk still has some clean-up issues. Not as serious as the central parkland area but requiring much more transparency.
  - e. Open and sincere collaboration with all of our community is the only sensible path forward.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these important issues. And thanks to all of you

and your hard working staff for all that you do for our community!

George Reinhardt

[noyohadlands.org](http://noyohadlands.org)

[forbraggheadlandsconsortium.org](http://forbraggheadlandsconsortium.org)

**From:** [Leslie Kashiwada](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Cc:** [george reinhardt](#); [Susan Kelley](#); [Bill Lemos](#); [David Jensen](#); [John Gallo](#)  
**Subject:** Re: A thread to consider regarding tonight's agenda packet — Fwd: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 11:27:24 AM

---

Dear June (and City Council as part of this email thread),

I endorse the comments by George Reinhardt and John Gallo. An updated Skunk Train proposal needs to be provided for review and comment, and a wildlife corridor must be included in it.

The consultant for the Skunk Train made the nonsensical statement that a wildlife corridor was not necessary because the southern end of their property abuts a dead-end mess of fences which are themselves barriers to migration (he used a much more controversial term). I say this is nonsensical because it denies a future possibility of restoring that area as a functioning estuarine habitat. The bottom line is the ocean will reclaim the berm and, because of this, the area needs to be cleaned up and restored. Those fences are useless in containing the contaminants once the ocean breaches the berm and the earthen dam holding back Pond 8.

The wildlife corridor (and any proposal development) also needs to account for sea level rise and continued erosion of the bluffs.

Thank you,  
-Leslie

---

On Jan 11, 2021, at 11:00 AM, John Gallo <[gallo.ja@gmail.com](mailto:gallo.ja@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello June and City Council (c/o George Reinhardt via this thread or other),

it is imperative that any future proposals under discussion contain AT LEAST as much of a wildlife corridor and open space as we called for in our presentation to the Council during the Fall 2019 meeting about this. Also, that presentation should be mentioned and provided in the background documents. Please let me know if you would like me to send the .pdf again.

Thank you,

John Gallo  
Member of the Fort Bragg Headlands Consortium

On Mon, Jan 11, 2021 at 9:18 AM george reinhardt <[georeinhardt@comcast.net](mailto:georeinhardt@comcast.net)> wrote:

Hello FBHC,

June is submitting this thread in the packet. Someone please make a comment about more open space/wild life corridor — obviously, only if you wish. Also, Why isn' there even a mention of our presentation?

George

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Lemos, June" <[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.  
**Date:** January 11, 2021 at 9:00:44 AM PST  
**To:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Cc:** "McCormick, Sarah" <[SMcCormick@fortbragg.com](mailto:SMcCormick@fortbragg.com)>

If you like, I can submit this email thread as a public comment on Item 8C. I'm just about to republish the agenda with comments on other items.

(Personally, I'd go with the music.)

June Lemos, CMC  
City Clerk  
City of Fort Bragg  
416 N Franklin St  
Fort Bragg CA 95437  
707.961.2823 ext. 104

---

**From:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:59 AM  
**To:** Lemos, June <[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Cc:** McCormick, Sarah <[SMcCormick@fortbragg.com](mailto:SMcCormick@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.

Thanks June. I think I'd rather play music, but I'll consider it. I will be making a written comment, but we need more information to adequately consider the Skunk's proposal. Briefly, I think the separating of the LCP process into three parts is a good idea.

George

On Jan 11, 2021, at 8:47 AM, Lemos, June  
<[JLemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:JLemos@fortbragg.com)> wrote:

If you attend tonight's Council meeting you are welcome to make your comments under Public Comment for Item 8C and they will become a permanent part of the official record.

June Lemos, CMC  
City Clerk

City of Fort Bragg  
416 N Franklin St  
Fort Bragg CA 95437  
707.961.2823 ext. 104

---

**From:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:45 AM  
**To:** Lemos, June <[Jlemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:Jlemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Cc:** McCormick, Sarah <[SMcCormick@fortbragg.com](mailto:SMcCormick@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: A question regarding Agenda item 8C.

Thanks June. This seems a little “off kilter.” Any response to the Mendo Rail piece requires their current proposal—it seems to me. I detest to old one, included in the packet. But, it appears, that is old news.

George

On Jan 11, 2021, at 8:26 AM, Lemos, June <[Jlemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:Jlemos@fortbragg.com)> wrote:

Good morning, George:

Agendas for ad hoc committees are not required to be published, so I have not seen the current Mendocino Railway proposal that was shared with the Mill Site ad hoc committee on November 30, 2020. I am copying Sarah McCormick with this email and asking her to please contact you to respond to your questions.

Sincerely,

June Lemos, CMC  
City Clerk  
City of Fort Bragg  
416 N Franklin St  
Fort Bragg CA 95437  
707.961.2823 ext. 104

---

**From:** George <[george@mcn.org](mailto:george@mcn.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 11, 2021 8:14 AM  
**To:** Lemos, June <[Jlemos@fortbragg.com](mailto:Jlemos@fortbragg.com)>  
**Subject:** A question regarding Agenda item 8C.

Hi June,

What's this? The Agenda summary states this regarding the Mendocino Railway Company:

1. Since this time the concept has morphed into a phased development initially utilizing train cars for residences and lodging. Mendocino Railway shared their current proposal with the Mill Site Ad Hoc Committee on November 30, 2020.

And is this what we should be responding to? Is there a summary of the Skunk's current proposal?

George

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.

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:** [djensen@mcn.org](mailto:djensen@mcn.org)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Cc:** [George](#); ["Leslie Kashiwada"](#); ["John Gallo"](#); ["Bill Lemos"](#); ["Susan Kelley"](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 8.c, January 11, 2021 meeting for Fort Bragg City Council  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 12:32:23 PM

---

Ms. Lemos and members of the Fort Bragg city Council,  
Due to my inability to attend this evening's meeting, please accept my comment on the following agenda item.

Concerning any and all plans for future development of the former Georgia-Pacific mill site, and in particular concerning Item 8.c on the agenda for tonight's (January 11, 2021) meeting of the Fort Bragg City Council, I share the concerns previously expressed by George Rinehart and John Gallo concerning proposed development, particularly in the northern section of that property, and any resultant erosion of sensible open space allotments.

However, my main concern is that the City of Fort Bragg clearly address the adequacy of water supplies for ANY future development on that site. This past summer the City of Fort Bragg again was forced to declare a water emergency – prior to any expansion of residential or industrial users. The health and safety of the current citizenry of this town must be prioritized above the profits of those who seek to gain from the development of the mill site property. I request that those who are responsible for the management and leadership of Fort Bragg realistically and scientifically insure that the city is able to provide sufficient water supplies BEFORE any expansion of residential or industrial development is considered, let alone approved.

David Jensen, Fort Bragg City resident, utility customer and business owner

**From:** [maureen@mcn.org](mailto:maureen@mcn.org)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Subject:** planned development for north side of Mill Site.  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 3:27:06 PM

---

My question is regarding the density. Where is the water coming for this high density development?

I am aware of Fish and Wildlife reports of the city overdrawing water from the Noyo which is needed to support what little salmon we have left.

"FORT BRAGG, 8/31/20 — Facing the lowest Noyo River water flows ever recorded, the Fort Bragg City Council voted unanimously to declare a “stage 2” water emergency at a special meeting held by Zoom webinar Monday night. Residents of Fort Bragg are asked to reduce water use by 20 percent and refrain from watering outdoor landscaping, among other measures."

"The City of Fort Bragg’s water supply system relies solely on three surface water sources: Waterfall Gulch (tributary to Hare Creek), Newman Gulch (tributary to Noyo River), and the Noyo River (diversion at Madsen Hole). The city has no wells and does not use groundwater."

Maureen Gealey

**From:** [Erica Fielder](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Subject:** City Council Meeting Tonight  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 4:16:17 PM

---

Regarding the Mill Site North Proposal:

This proposal looks to be way too dense for the site. The community's original ideas were to more closely match the architecture to that of existing town design, to leave more open space, to not make the housing so dense. How will 500 units affect our small town traffic and other services like medical, emergency, water? I reject this plan and request that the City Council start anew with older ideas the community has proposed.

Sincerely,

Erica Fielder

\*\*\*\*\*

Erica Fielder  
[efielder@mcn.org](mailto:efielder@mcn.org)  
707-671-4072

See unique interpretive displays on our new website:

<https://www.ericafielderstudio.com>

See more interpretive panels about nature and culture on our Facebook page:

<https://www.facebook.com/ericafielderstudio>

**From:** [Linda Jupiter](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Subject:** Tonight's City Council agenda item #8C  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 4:34:32 PM

---

Dear City Council members,  
I just had a chance to quickly look at the staff report and railroad proposal regarding the Mill Site.

When I looked at the railroad proposal I was horrified. I and my fellow Fort Braggers would no longer be living in our idyllic town by the sea, but would be living in a Bay Area or Southern California suburb.

Most likely I'll be dead by the time this would finally occur, but my heart breaks for everyone left behind here in Fort Bragg.

Salud,  
Linda Jupiter  
Fort Bragg  
*Uninvited dweller on Northern Pomo land*

**From:** [Jenny Shattuck](#)  
**To:** [Lemos, June](#)  
**Subject:** Not sure which item it falls under  
**Date:** Monday, January 11, 2021 7:30:51 PM

---

Will there be a report out from adhoc about north portion of mill site new plan by owners, or by owners? Also, does this mean they will start over and completely disregard the plan already submitted?

Does breaking into 3 parts make this less input from public?

Does this change our housing Element plan?