

The California State rules for sustainable building are quite good and getting better, but we could have much more in this document about the restoration of wildness and natural landscapes out on the mill site. This will not require expense so much as a change of mind set. If we want to nurture the wildness of these Headlands and restore creeks and coastal prairie then we should say so. This would set our Fort Bragg Headlands future apart from typical development schemes. Our community wants a restoration based economy, not a blue print for more exploitation of our environment.

My sense is that some people have been worn out by G-P and they just want to get on with it. Understandable, but this is risky and possibly missing great opportunities. The fundamental problem is we are still working with a document that was significantly influenced by G-P who was paying for it. Back then the community was told to hold it's fire and let G-P finish their proposal. We, the community, and the Coastal Commission would then be able to weigh in.

Unfortunately G-P threw tantrum and stopped funding the work in 2012. So now we are trying to create a new document. The city staff HAVE made changes based on the Coastal Commission and community comments. This is very good. More needs to be done. For just one of many possible examples, Attachment 3 is called "Final Decisions." A number of these need more thought out. Transportation is a huge challenge. How we will get around out on the Headlands, twenty years from now, is an interesting question. A sustainable future will not be one in which we are all driving our individual gas guzzlers. Then there is the fact that this report proudly states that we have completed a coastal park with multi use trail. But the city needs to be clear that we will have to close that central part of the trail when we finally clean the mill pond. Good health for our community is an essential part of the restoration economy.