

From: [Jones, Marie](#)
To: [Lemos, June](#)
Subject: FW: Items for the 29th
Date: Monday, October 22, 2018 12:24:55 PM

Hi June,

Can you please include this letter in the packet for the 10/29 meeting?

Marie Jones
Community Development Director
707-961-1807

From: Chris Hart <chart@sierrarailroad.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2018 12:10 PM
To: Jones, Marie <mjones@fortbragg.com>
Subject: Items for the 29th

Hi Marie,

There are a number of items that caught my eye related the next meeting on the 29th. It occurred to me that it may be more productive to reach out to you in advance on these topics.

1. **Play Structures:** I recall from one of our discussions that there was a possible problem having play structures for children in our proposed plaza next to the Dry Shed. I assume it was either because it would be zoned Light Industrial (but I only found restrictions for schools) or because of restrictions stemming from the environmental clean-up of the property. Do you recall the issue and do you have any preferred ways that we could seek to get it allowed, if I'm correct that there was a problem?
2. **North Park Site:** There is a proposed park in the residential area, which seems like a fine idea. Is there an assumption that the land owner would sell or gift the property? Similarly, is the construction of the park something that you'd see the residential developer paying for? This may be an items to be determined years from now, but I thought I'd touch base with you on it to see if there are any initial assumptions.
3. **Pond #10 and trail:** Ditto for this area and the trail to reach it.
 - a. And while I know it is not a forgone conclusion that railroad tracks would be built, I thought I would note for planning purposes that if both the tracks and pond #10 park were created that we would need a safe pedestrian crossing. Very manageable, but thought I'd mention it.
4. **Parking Lot:** Similar questions whether there are any assumptions about the land and who pays for the development.
 - a. Similar to 3a, if both the parking lot and track were installed, I wanted to note that we

would need either a pedestrian or vehicle crossing depending upon whether the track was east (road crossing) or west (pedestrian crossing) of the parking lot.

- b. One concern I have with the location of the parking lot shown in the latest map is that it seems to solely cater to the trail. If it were further north, east or south, there might be more shared benefit to our Mill Site projects. If we are being expected to contribute the land and/or develop this parking lot it would be better if there were more mutual benefit from this parking area. I assume you proposed that site because it was halfway between the Glass Beach and Redwood Avenue access points.
5. **Circulation 5-24:** The document shows coastal trail connections on Pine, Fir, Redwood and Alders. That is 4 out of 5 consecutive streets. My first reaction is that it would be better to spread out the access points more so that it was every 2-4 blocks instead of consolidating them all to this 5-block area. If you're trying to create a more dynamic walking grid I could see that for a downtown fronting onto a beach, but do we need this many access points consolidated together to just access a trail?
6. **Circulation 5-24 #2:** There is mention of a bike lane on Redwood Avenue. I see this two different ways and would welcome your thoughts on it. On one hand, I see Redwood being by far the busiest street and I would much rather divert bicycles to a different street to avoid the higher level of congestion and danger on Redwood. On the other hand, I can see that having the bike lane on this street is *because* of that congestion. Rather than being there to encourage more bike traffic the bike lane would be on Redwood to protect the bike traffic that will be there. What do you think?
7. **OS-15.11 Revegetation of Undeveloped Mill Site Properties:** This item states that as infrastructure is developed, existing asphalt shall be removed from the adjacent blocks which shall be planted with native grass seed and graded to facilitate stormwater infiltration. Given the possible environmental and cultural issues out there, I was interested in adding something like *"Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing herein shall require disturbance of soil or removal of asphalt or other ground cover in a manner that would lead to additional cultural or environmental approvals, investigations, restrictions, or related costs."* I would completely understand if there is pushback on this for a variety of reasons, but I was also concerned about the benefit / cost of automatically having to disturb the asphalt and triggering all sorts of issues.
 - a. On a related note, I was worried about Holmes lumber that relies upon the asphalt. If residential is developed, I am concerned that we would have to automatically remove adjacent asphalt and thus make the site more difficult for Holmes to use since they'd now be working on dirt and mud.
 - b. I should note that I do understand the motivation by the City or future residents that would question why they should look out onto old asphalt instead of fields. However, given that we're not dealing with a clean slate here, I'm seeking a better approach than automatic triggers.
8. **Land Use Permit for Railroad:** One of the proposed items in the documents was adding a land

use permit for railroad activities that we object to. We did have a meeting with your City Attorney last week and we're working through this item with him.

9. **Commercial, Visitor and Residential:** In that same meeting with the City Attorney we did discuss that we're fine working within the City's zoning for the commercial, visitor and residential and have no intention to exert any unique railroad authority in these areas. We discussed ways in which we might document this to give the City something stronger than just assurances.
10. **Timber vs Urban Reserve:** I remain concerned with this item that was tentative finalized up at the last meeting changing the land in the west and north from Timber to Urban Reserve. I question why the land should be switched from its current Timber Industrial Resources zoning that both the current owner and prospective owner want. This position is reinforced by that area being used by Holmes Lumber who is our one and only existing customer. And the issue is even harder for us since the zoning is being changed to something more restrictive. I recall one of the Council or Planning members raising the possibility of us wanting a lumber mill or something huge, but that certainly isn't our intent. I'm open to how to address concerns about leaving it as Timber and as noted in #9 we're open to discussing ways to allay concerns about the type of development that could happen. If you have any suggestions on this, I would welcome them.

I would welcome your thoughts on whichever items you feel comfortable commenting at this time. If you would like to go over this in person, I'm also happy to schedule time. Best regards,
Chris

Christopher G. Hart, President
Mendocino Railway
Skunk Train
Sacramento RiverTrain
Sierra DinnerTrain

1222 Research Park Drive
Davis, CA 95618
530-554-2522