

Lemos, June

From: Mary Rose Kaczorowski <mrkaczorowski@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Lemos, June; Jones, Marie
Subject: Fwd: Request Removal of Item from tonight's City Council Agenda

I do not see my email request from this morning as submitted to the City Council attached to the Agenda on the

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Mary Rose Kaczorowski** <mrkaczorowski@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 13, 2018 at 11:33 AM
Subject: Request Removal of Item from tonight's City Council Agenda
To: <LPeters2@fortbragg.com>, <Wlee@fortbragg.com>, <dturner@fortbragg.com>, <mcimolino@fortbragg.com>, Norvell, Bernie <Bnorvell2@fortbragg.com>, Perkins, Scott <sperkins@fortbragg.com>

Please pull the item # 5 D Hare Creek Mall from tonight's City Council Agenda until a future City Council meeting.

I am seeing that the overwhelming majority of the public comments submitted about this plan have valid technical arguments that can be backed by CEQA and must be addressed.

It is important to understand that the development of the Hare Creek property as in the erection of structures (buildings, including roads, conduit, and electrical structures) or physical changes to land and activities have significant impacts and constraints.

In addition, any activities that may change the density or intensity of the land use, or use or access to water, or which involve major removal of vegetation or soil have significant impacts under CEQA.

The aforementioned activities also have impacts on surrounding environmentally sensitive habitat.

An analysis of the potential negative impacts of allowing the activity on coastal resources intended to be protected must be done and with up-to-date analysis.

I want to highlight that the Hare Creek project has significant impacts such as :
Traffic impacts, Air Quality Impacts,
Impacts on Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas Ecosystem and species,

storm water and drainage management affecting the area and the creek and others.

Any further review needs to also disclose any conditions or prior permit applications that were unfulfilled by prior or current owners. Several Surveys/Reports/Investigations/Evaluations are outdated or incomplete(i.e., 2008, 2014, 2015, 2016).

Thank you,

Mary Rose Kaczorowski

Connect with me on:

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/mrk2008>

Lemos, June

From: Miller, Tabatha
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 4:01 PM
To: Lemos, June
Subject: FW: removing item # 5D Contract with Michael Baker from consent calendar as it warrants a discussion and schedule for Nov. 26 under conduct of business

FYI

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

From: Annemarie [mailto:aweibel@mcn.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 3:59 PM
To: Peters, Lindy <LPeters2@fortbragg.com>; Lee, Will <Wlee@fortbragg.com>; Turner, Dave <dturner@fortbragg.com>; Cimolino, Michael <MCimolino@fortbragg.com>; Norvell, Bernie <Bnorvell2@fortbragg.com>
Cc: Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@fortbragg.com>; Jones, Marie <mjones@fortbragg.com>; Perkins, Scott <SPerkins@fortbragg.com>
Subject: removing item # 5D Contract with Michael Baker from consent calendar as it warrants a discussion and schedule for Nov. 26 under conduct of business

To the Members of the City Council,

The owners/developers of the Hare Creek Center have been trying to develop this property since 1991. The City Council was not willing to give the contract to the environmental consultants Dudek who wanted \$224,125 but gave it to Michael Baker who charged \$66,105. This was only possible by deleting the technical drainage and groundwater recharge study, the geotechnical services, the archaeological report, the cultural subtask, and the water supply study. These were priced at about \$60,000, but the agreed upon money (\$66,105) included responses to comments on the DEIR. We, members of Citizens for Appropriate Coastal Land Use (CACLU), believe that a consultant should not be chosen based on the lowest bid, but be the most qualified consultant. Now Michael Baker needs \$48,350 more as they ran out of money before being able to respond to the DEIR comments (the assumption was to respond to 100-200 comments, and 120 were received). The consultants want to use standard responses for most of these and base the comments on available information without using new data, impact analyses, consultation with traffic consultants, or other subcontractors. Initially Marie Jones was going to work with the consultants, now Scott Perkins is. The City Council was clear when they voted to look for a consultant and not have the EIR done in-house. We are curious what experience Scott has with EIR's? You refer to the last batches of letters that will not be covered by your base price. Which ones? This seems unclear and confusing. The DEIR comments were not placed on the web page for all to see. Many of the commenters requested that the DEIR needs to be recirculated. It is highly flawed and inadequate! By voting on all 11 items on the Consent Calendar you are not following the intent of the Coastal Act Section 30006 that indicates that the public has a right to fully participate in decisions affecting coastal planning, conservation, and development.

Achievement of sound coastal conservation and development is dependent upon public understanding and support. The continuing planning and implementation of programs for coastal conservation and development should include the widest opportunity for public participation. From the 1,200 pages of comments the overwhelming majority expressed strong opposition to this project. Please allow input by removing the item from the agenda and scheduling the topic for the next City Council meeting.

Thanks, Annemarie Weibel for CACLU

11-13-18

13 Nov 2018

JD/5H
SE

City Council Members

City of Fort Bragg

Fort Bragg, CA 95437

RECEIVED

NOV 13 2018

CITY OF FORT BRAGG
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT

To whom it may concern:

Please remove items 5 B and 5 H from the Consent Calendar.

The Consent Calendar is for routine, non-controversial items. Neither of these items is about a routine or noncontroversial project and both projects need more to be public exposure, scrutiny and discussion. Each step of their path through Fort Bragg planning and approval process needs to be an opportunity for public exposure to these projects.

Sincerely,

Sue Boecker

CC: City Manager

Marie Jones

Planning Staff

Resubmitted Nov 12, 2018 & Rcvd by _____ on _____

May 22, 2018

Re: Tampering with Official Documents

Fort Bragg City Council, Fort Bragg Planning Commission, & Community Development Dept.:

I highly object to edit of letter I delivered (on 2016 Sept 23) to City Hall for Marie Jones, regarding Hare Creek Project. Changes were made, including removal of the following preface to my questions; "This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) needs to respond to these questions". This leads me to question transparency of the review process, and intensions of those having control or access to these official documents. **Who edited letter? How many other person's letters or comments have been edited – or deleted?**

Respectfully submitted on May 22, 2018 by
Guy R. Burnett
19200 Harbor Avenue, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
G:\Dewey\305\HareCrk tamperg20181112

Marie Jones, Community Development Director
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-961-2827 ext 108 ; mjones@fortbragg.com

((Highlighted sections were removed AFTER submission to the city))

September 22, 2016

Dear Ms. Marie Jones:

The following environmental issues need to be resolved and answered. As identified in the attached quotes from past studies performed on the "Hare Creek Project" site, recommendations to safeguard the existing water have been ignored.

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) need to respond to these questions:

1. What is the precise location of the 24 borings?
2. Which borings penetrated the terrace deposits and extended down into the Franciscan Bedrock?
3. Which borings penetrated the Franciscan Bedrock and extended below it?
4. Which borings encountered ground water? At what depth was water encountered?
5. How many of the borings entered active aquifer but did not go deep enough to reach ground water table?
6. Where are the wells, septic systems, gravity sewer lines, lift stations, and pressurized sewer lines in Todds Point?
7. Interview each resident and property owner in Todds Point to determine which wells on Todds Point have experienced loss of water? What have owners been required to do to maintain water usage on their property? Record results of each interview in EIR.
8. What are the levels of encountered aquifer confining strata?
9. Will all drilling results and water quality test results for the project area be made public?
10. The EIR needs to include certification that proper well abandonment procedures were followed, identify materials used, amount of material used for each boring, contractor name, license number, and receipts or invoices for all work done.
11. Will the project principles be required to test all existing wells on Todds Point, to establish a base line for water quality? The water quality tests, scope of contaminants to be tested for, and procedures for proper testing and handling shall be done after meeting with Todds Point residents and property owners to define test parameters.
12. Will the project principles be required to post a construction bond for future need to install connections for any/all Todds Point residents and property owners and pay for all water service for Todds Point residents if this project negatively impacts water quality?
13. I request all issues brought by Todd's Point residents at City Council Meeting of March 23, 2015 be included in the EIR scoping parameters. These include but are not limited to a new traffic study, impact of black top paving, impact of bio-swales in area of possible borings penetrating to ground water, light pollution from parking lot, building interiors, and skylights (no light from project area should extend beyond project boundaries). Lights after closing hours should be reduced to bare minimum. Project entry road should not connect with Bay View. Height of buildings should be based upon existing topography.

Thank you,

Guy R. Burnett,
19200 Harbor Avenue, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
G:\D Dewey\300soc_sc\305_grps_new\305 EIR 20181112

May 22, 2018

Resubmitted Nov 12, 2018 & Rcvd by _____ on _____

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Hare Creek Project

Fort Bragg City Council, Fort Bragg Planning Commission, & Community Development Dept.:

Appendix F, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation shows that the Krazen & Associates Inc. (KAI) report #03216024 dated October 10, 2016 has simply been reprinted and submitted as current and timelessly relevant to the Hare Creek Project. **It is not timelessly relevant!** The foundation for this report is actually dated April 10, 1995.

KAI pg1 states, "It is suggested that two years be considered a reasonable time limit for the usefulness of this report" (April 1995 – April 1997). So, by definition, this review has been obsolete for 20 years. In addition, much of the "Facts" in this report are based upon a report dated April 10, 1995 (KA project No 32-94374) which is a 23-year-old document.

The report states, "Your site was analyzed using the most appropriate current techniques and methods, undoubtedly there will be substantial future improvements in this branch of engineering." This DEIR is based on a 23-year-old document that its own authors give a 2-year credibility period, coupled with anticipated "future improvements in this branch of engineering". Therefore, the KAI report "KA Project No.32-94374" and "KAI 03216024 Report (Hare Creek).doc", in good conscience, **should be rejected**, and a NEW report be required for basing the results of Geotechnical Engineering Investigation.

I submitted thirteen (13) questions on September 23, 2016, see attached. From my review of this DEIR, none of these questions have been addressed.

- Questions 1-6, and 8-10 should be addressed, to determine if the conditions meet the guidelines of the 'California Drinking Water Source Assessment and Protection Program'. See attached yellow highlighted pages.
- Questions 7, and 11-13 need addressed to determine a baseline for bench-marking degradation of water source for Todds Point.

It is clear the Pattons and city staff have no interest in developing a quality, professional EIR for this project. They would not tolerate using 20-year-old technology to inspect or diagnose mechanical issues, or endorse used parts to repair their personal vehicles ... but they don't hesitate to employ these shortcut methods and procedures, when it comes to the health and safety of our water supply.

All imported fill should be certified free of contaminates, and tested to the standards below:

EPA 508: Pesticides	EPA 548.1: Endothall
EPA 515.1: Herbicides	EPA 549.2: Diquat
EPA 525.2: 3 Reg SVOAs	EPA 632: Diuron
EPA 531.1: Carbamates	N-Nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) (by method EPA 1625M)
EPA 547: Glyphosate	Dioxins: Full List

Since almost two years have passed with no action on these important issues, I anticipate response confirming that these issues will be addressed in any future EIR for this project. If there is intension to table or marginalize these questions, I would like to know BEFORE the EIR is prepared.

Respectfully submitted on May 22, 2018 by
Guy R. Burnett
19200 Harbor Avenue, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
G:\Dewey\305\HareCrk DEIR 20181112

Marie Jones, Community Development Director
Community Development Department
416 N. Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
707-961-2827 ext 108 ; mjones@fortbragg.com

September 22, 2016

Dear Ms. Marie Jones:

The following environmental issues need to be resolved and answered. As identified in the attached quotes from past studies performed on the "Hare Creek Project" site, recommendations to safeguard the existing water have been ignored.

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) need to respond to these questions:

1. What is the precise location of the 24 borings?
2. Which borings penetrated the terrace deposits and extended down into the Franciscan Bedrock?
3. Which borings penetrated the Franciscan Bedrock and extended below it?
4. Which borings encountered ground water? At what depth was water encountered?
5. How many of the borings entered active aquifer but did not go deep enough to reach ground water table?
6. Where are the wells, septic systems, gravity sewer lines, lift stations, and pressurized sewer lines in Todds Point?
7. Interview each resident and property owner in Todds Point to determine which wells on Todds Point have experienced loss of water? What have owners been required to do to maintain water usage on their property? Record results of each interview in EIR.
8. What are the levels of encountered aquifer confining strata?
9. Will all drilling results and water quality test results for the project area be made public?
10. The EIR needs to include certification that proper well abandonment procedures were followed, identify materials used, amount of material used for each boring, contractor name, license number, and receipts or invoices for all work done.
11. Will the project principles be required to test all existing wells on Todds Point, to establish a base line for water quality? The water quality tests, scope of contaminants to be tested for, and procedures for proper testing and handling shall be done after meeting with Todds Point residents and property owners to define test parameters.
12. Will the project principles be required to post a construction bond for future need to install connections for any/all Todds Point residents and property owners and pay for all water service for Todds Point residents if this project negatively impacts water quality?
13. I request all issues brought by Todd's Point residents at City Council Meeting of March 23, 2015 be included in the EIR scoping parameters. These include but are not limited to a new traffic study, impact of black top paving, impact of bio-swales in area of possible borings penetrating to ground water, light pollution from parking lot, building interiors, and skylights (no light from project area should extend beyond project boundaries). Lights after closing hours should be reduced to bare minimum. Project entry road should not connect with Bay View. Height of buildings should be based upon existing topography.

Thank you,

Guy R. Burnett,
19200 Harbor Avenue, Fort Bragg, CA 95437
G:\D Dewey\300soc_sc\305_grps_new\305 EIR 20181112

Unanswered Questions since 2003:

August 23, 1995: Nolan Associates to Mr. Scott Mommer:

“out of 24 borings, 20 penetrated the entire thickness of the terrace deposits ... and extended down into the Franciscan bedrock. Only one boring (boring T-13, Krazan and Associates, 1995), located on the extreme Northwest edge of the property, encountered groundwater.”

August 27, 2003: memo from Dick LaVen to Dave Goble:

“of 24 borings in the area of the K-Mart site only one hit water in the winter of 1994-1995 ... These wells need to be mapped.”

“It is rumored that people’s wells run dry now (2003) and they need to import water. We need to identify them and their locations on a map and have the well owners explain their problems.”

“The Nolan Associates’ report does not tell us where wells were drilled and came up with dry holes. The dry holes should be identified and mapped.”

“12) Is there a detailed inventory of surface topography?” This should include the following (per Guy Burnett) “d) wells; e) septic; f) have interviews of residents and water use on the site been compiled”

December 12, 2003: I.L. Welty & Associates to Dave Goble.

“2. Review well log information collected by others as we discussed with Welty, they will conduct a well survey of the Todd Point area to identify all current wells”

“6d: Documentation of on-site hydrological conditions, including geographic materials encountered during the drilling in the vicinity.”

December 16, 2003: Dick LaVen to Dave Goble

“2. Please include the boring logs from Krazan Associates and the locations of those borings.”

There have been discussions of many bores, wells being placed around this property. Holes of this nature provide direct intrusion into pristine aquifers which we on Todd Point depend upon.

Many times a request for identifying the location of these holes has been presented, but apparently ignored. I have been unable to locate copies of: drillers’ log, mapped hole locations, documentation of proper, legal abandonment (see attached) including receipts for fill material, evidentiary photos, confirmation or declaration by contractor performing the abandonment procedures.

These holes into our water supply represent a real threat to our aquifer. In addition, 20,000 CY of grading will remove critical aquifer protection. Once an aquifer is compromised additional wells are of no use; recovery is virtually impossible.

This glaring omission of ignoring a clear danger to the environment is self-sufficient evidence of a flawed document. **Therefore I ask the City Council to approve the appeal of Negative Mitigated Declaration for this property, reject the appeal for Coastal Development Permit (CDP 8-13), Design Review (DR 7-13), Use Permit (USP 5-13), and Lot Line Adjustment (LLA 3-14).**

Monitoring Well Standards

Section 19. Requirements for Destroying Monitoring Wells and Exploration Holes.

General requirements for destroying monitoring wells and exploration holes are contained in [Section 23 of the Water Well Standards](#). Special considerations for monitoring wells and exploration holes are as follows:

A. *Monitoring Wells*. Monitoring wells shall be destroyed in accordance with the following requirements and [Section 23 of the Water Well Standards](#), irrespective of their original date of construction:

1. *Preliminary Work*. A monitoring well shall be investigated before it is destroyed to determine its condition and details of its construction. The well shall be sounded immediately before it is destroyed to make sure no obstructions exist that will interfere with filling and sealing.

The well shall be cleaned before destruction as needed so that all undesirable materials, including obstructions to filling and sealing, debris, oil from oil-lubricated pumps, or pollutants and contaminants that could interfere with well destruction, are removed for disposal.

The enforcing agency shall be notified as soon as possible if pollutants or contaminants are known or suspected to be present in a well to be destroyed. Well destruction operations may then proceed only at the approval of the enforcing agency. The enforcing agency should be contacted to determine requirements for proper disposal of all materials removed from a well to be destroyed.

2. *Sealing Conditions*. The following minimum requirements shall be followed when various conditions are encountered:
 - a. The monitoring well casing, and any other significant voids within the well, shall, at a minimum, be completely filled with sealing material, if the following conditions exist:
 - The monitoring well is located in an area of known or potential pollution or contamination, and,
 - The well was constructed and maintained in accordance with these standards.

Sealing material may have to be placed under pressure to ensure that the monitoring well is properly filled and sealed.

b. A monitoring well shall be destroyed by removing all material within the original borehole, including the well casing, filter pack, and annular seal; and the created hole completely filled with appropriate sealing material, if the following conditions exist:

- The well is located in an area of known or potential pollution or contamination, and,
- The well's annular seal, casing, screen, filter pack, or other components were not constructed or maintained according to these standards so that well destruction be merely filling the well casing with sealing material, as in "a" above, would not prevent potential water-quality degradation from the movement of poor-quality water, pollutants, or contaminants through the destroyed well structure.

Material to be extracted from the original borehole shall be removed by means of drilling, including overdrilling, if necessary. The enforcing agency should be contacted to determine requirements for proper disposal of removed materials.

Casing, filter pack, and annular seal materials may be left in place during sealing operations, if the enforcing agency agrees they cannot or should not be removed. In such a case, appropriate sealing material shall be placed in the well casing, filter pack, and all other significant voids within the entire well boring. Casing left in place may require perforation or puncturing to allow proper placement of sealing materials. Sealing material may have to be applied under pressure to ensure its proper distribution.

c. Monitoring wells shall, at a minimum, be destroyed in accordance with the requirements of Section 23 of the Water Well Standards if located in an area free of any known or potential contamination or pollution.

B. *Exploratory Borings.* Exploratory borings shall be completely filled with appropriate sealing material from bottom to top, if located in areas of known or suspected contamination or pollution. Borings located outside such areas shall, at a minimum, be filled with sealing material from ground surface to the minimum depths specified in Section 23 of the Water Well standards. Additional sealing material shall be placed below the minimum surface seal where needed to prevent the interchange of poor-quality water, pollutants, or contaminants between strata penetrated by the boring.

Appropriate fill or sealing material shall be placed below and between intervals containing sealing material. Sealing material is often economical to use as fill material.

The boring shall be inspected immediately prior to filling and sealing operations. All obstructions and pollutants and contaminants that could interfere with filling and sealing operations shall be removed prior to filling and sealing. The enforcing agency shall be notified as soon as possible if pollutants or contaminants are known or suspected to be in a boring to be

destroyed. Well destruction operations may then proceed only at the approval of the enforcing agency. The enforcing agency should be contacted to determine requirements for proper disposal of removed materials.

C. *Placement of Material.* The placement of sealing material for monitoring wells and exploratory borings is generally described in [Section 23 of the Water Well Standards](#) and [Appendix B \(Bulletin 74-81\)](#). The following additional requirements shall be observed when placing sealing material for monitoring well or exploratory boring destruction.

1. *Placement Method.* The well or exploratory boring shall be filled with appropriate sealing, and fill material where allowed, using a tremie pipe or equivalent, proceeding upward from the bottom of the well or boring.

Sealing material shall be placed by methods (such as the use of a tremie pipe or equivalent) that prevent freefall, bridging, and dilution of sealing materials, and/or prevent separation of aggregate from sealants. Sealing material may be placed by freefall only where the interval to be sealed is dry and no more than 30 feet in depth. Fill material shall be placed by methods that prevent bridging and voids.

2. *Timing and Placement.* Sealing material shall be placed in one continuous operation (or "pour") from the bottom to the top of the well or boring, unless conditions in the well or boring dictate that sealing operations be conducted in a staged manner, and prior approval is obtained from the enforcing agency.

3. *Groundwater Flow.* Special care shall be used to restrict the flow of groundwater into a well or boring while placing sealing and fill material, if subsurface pressure producing the flow is significant.

4. *Sealing Pressure.* Pressure required for the placement of cement-based sealing materials shall be maintained long enough for cement-based sealing materials to properly set.

5. *Verification.* It shall be verified that the volume of sealing and fill material placed during destruction operations equals or exceeds the volume to be filled and sealed. This is to help determine whether the well or boring has been properly destroyed and that no jamming or bridging of the fill or sealing material has occurred.

D. *Sealing and Fill Materials.* Materials used for sealing exploratory borings and monitoring wells shall have low permeabilities so that the volume of water and possible pollutants and contaminants passing through them will be of minimal consequence. Sealing material shall be compatible with the chemical environment into which it is placed, and shall have mechanical

properties consistent with present and future site uses.

Suitable sealing materials include neat cement, sand-cement, and bentonite, all of which are described in [Section 9 of these standards](#). Bentonite shall not be used as a sealing material opposite zones of fractured rock, unless otherwise approved by the enforcing agency. Drilling mud or drill cuttings are not acceptable as any part of sealing material for well destruction. Concrete may be used as a sealing material at the approval of the enforcing agency.

Fill material, if any, shall meet the requirements of [Section 23 of the Water Well Standards](#). Fill material shall be free of pollutants and contaminants and shall not be subject to decomposition or consolidation after placement. Drilling mud or cuttings are not acceptable as any part of fill material.

E. *Additional Requirements for Monitoring Wells and Exploratory Borings in Urban Areas.* The following additional requirements shall be met for destroying wells and exploratory borings in urban areas, unless otherwise approved by the enforcing agency:

1. The upper surface of the sealing material shall end at the depth of 5 feet below ground surface; and,
2. If the well casing was not extracted during destruction and sealing operations, a hole shall be excavated around the well casing to a depth of 5 feet below ground surface after sealing operations have been completed and the sealing material has adequately set and cured. The exposed well casing shall then be removed by cutting the casing at the bottom of the excavation. The excavation shall be backfilled with clean, native soil or other suitable material.

F. *Temporary Cover.* The well or borehole opening and any associated excavations shall be covered at the surface to ensure public safety and to prevent the entry of foreign material, water, pollutants, and contaminants; whenever work is interrupted by such events as overnight shutdown, poor weather, and required waiting periods to allow setting of sealing materials and the performance of tests. The cover shall be held in place or weighted down in such a manner that it cannot be removed, except by equipment or tools.

I urge the Fort Bragg City Council to remove item 5D from the consent agenda for today's meeting. We citizens haven't had adequate time to study the final Draft Environmental Report (DEIR) for the Hare Creek Mall proposal.

This is a massive, more than 360-page document to read and learn whether or not our concerns over the preliminary Draft Environmental Impact Report were properly addressed. This final DEIR was only made available this month.

Item 5D needs to be placed as an agenda item for a future meeting to allow us to study and comment on it before the Council approves more funds to be expended to finish the flawed final DEIR document by the same company who wrote it in the first place. Even worse, in order to see the studies the final DEIR was based on, the public cannot study them on line from their computer at home. They have to go to city hall and get CDs from the City to see them.

From what I was able to read in the final DEIR, I can see that my traffic concerns were not addressed at all. My major concern is that the increased traffic resulting from the proposed strip mall coming from south of the Hare Creek Bridge will be gridlocked by the unsafe, crumbling bridge.

CALTRANS has already stated that the Hare Creek Bridge needs to be replaced. However, when I called CALTRANS to find out when that replacement will be done, I learned that it's not even on their schedule. A CALTRANS spokesperson told me this means it could be 8-10 years before the replacement happens.

I am a member of Seniors On Bikes Fort Bragg. We encourage more people to ride their bicycles for exercise and pleasure. We lead many different rides in Mendocino County. Our rides include bicycling south to Mendocino and Big River. I've lived in Fort Bragg for ten years and have observed a sizeable increase in the traffic in our community. I dread riding my bicycle over the Hare Creek Bridge now and I am a very experienced bicycle rider. I don't feel good about how much more dangerous that route will be with even more traffic.

I worked for six and a half years for a bicycle delivery company in Santa Barbara whose population was more than 50,000 when I was working. If that bridge is not replaced, it is only a matter of time before a bicyclist is seriously injured or killed.

Cyclists from all over the world come to the west coast of the United States and ride from as far as Canada to South America. They spend money in every community they ride through including Fort Bragg. These tourist dollars are a serious boon to Fort Bragg's troubled economy. Even more international riders will be enticed to come here due to the beautifully constructed new north and south coastal trails.

A whole new traffic study needs to be done to address this issue. This alone tells me that the Final DEIR is woefully inadequate. Once again I urge you to take item 5D off the consent agenda and place it on a future City Council meeting so that the public has adequate time to address it. Otherwise there will be accusations of a lack of transparency in Fort Bragg City Council proceedings and possibly resulting lawsuits.

Ed Oberweiser

19244 Benson Lane, Fort Bragg, CA 95437 707-964-7965