

Lemos, June

From: Mary Rose Kaczorowski <mrkaczorowski@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 17, 2019 4:45 PM
To: Jones, Marie; Miller, Tabatha; Lemos, June
Subject: For Submission to Ft. Bragg City Council Members & Planning Commissioners

Dear Ft. Bragg City Council Members & Planning Commissioners

I wish to raise up some points about the Food Trucks Issue and I want to remind you of past City Council studies on this Food Truck issues with City Staff reports as recent as 4 years ago.

Note please refer to <https://www.advocate-news.com/2015/05/21/food-trucks-in-fort-bragg/>

See above link for previous City of Fort Bragg discussion on this topic and note that we have been there before: "There are Regulations in other cities that include proximity requirements, something surprisingly lacking from the current municipal code. As it stands, Fort Bragg has no distance requirement, meaning if mobile vending units were to acquire permitting they could legally set up in front of restaurants (excerpt from article aforementioned link)."

Want to support Food Trucks? How about permits for Food Trucks at Timberwolves Football games, Soccer Tournaments and special events where they would average more income then serving the small bar crowd at 2:30 a.m.?

In comparison --U.C. Berkeley 's Food Truck policy - is a perfect example that is cognizant of many issues that I do not see the City Council addressing including fire safety, emissions, competition with existing food service businesses, etc. Note requirements regarding noticing.

<https://campuspol.berkeley.edu/policies/foodtrucks.pdf>

If a major university is cognizant of these issues and has set strict regulations why not Fort Bragg?

Please note that in this small town noise significantly echoes at night in the downtown area.

The downtown areas of East Laurel and Franklin Street have numerous second-story residences that will be affected by noise and emissions be it generators, hygiene, crowds, and grilling plus increased trash and disruption of quality of life. Police and City workers who maintain streets ARE ALREADY at capacity as is.

Note that our apartments on the second floor above stores, and restaurants are higher than the 350ft. that is being required for noticing a permit in process.

There is a strict noise ordinance on the books and to waive this ordinance for food trucks does not protect our right as residents to enjoying peace and quiet. This right is paramount and adding this dimension of food trucks needs to make sure that food trucks be placed away from **any residential areas**.

I have resided on East Laurel Street for three years. I often catch or see individuals urinating in business entry doorways or even using drugs.

I have also experienced the car show events where the vehicles are parked Along E. Laurel Street as early as 6 a.m. and revving up their motors all morning and day to show off their vehicles. This is a daytime event where our apartment

entrances on the lower level are blocked and there is no place to escape the noise, emissions, and crowds other than leaving the apt. for the day.

The food trucks need to be by the Company Store, Skunk Train Area, and Purity Parking Lot not downtown near residences.

Why allow Food Trucks until 2:30 in the morning to cater to the bar crowd and at the expense of disturbing working people living in second story-units? The General Store on Redwood next to The Golden West offers food. All Bars I believe offer food.

I am all for downtown plaza events ... take this concept next to Town Hall or next to City Hall between Sears and entrance to where Noyo Print Works used to be and at reasonable hours.

In addition, I am sure if you set these trucks up in front of restaurants that are already struggling they will not be pleased and does this really serve help local restaurants or places like Headlands Cafe and other establishments that are open late?

Thank you!

Mary Rose Kaczorowski
P.O. Box 1684
Ft. Bragg CA 95437

Lemos, June

From: Miller, Tabatha
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2019 9:22 AM
To: Lemos, June
Subject: FW: Mobile Vending Ordinance

From: Jacob Patterson [mailto:jacob.patterson.esq@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2019 9:51 AM
To: Miller, Tabatha <TMiller@fortbragg.com>
Subject: Mobile Vending Ordinance

Please take a look at Section 1, Paragraph 4 of the draft proposed ordinance concerning the CEQA determination. It reads "There is no possibility that the adoption of this ordinance will have a significant impact on the environment, and therefore, the adoption of this ordinance is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations)." This claim of exemption is conclusory and doesn't provide any explanation or basis for the finding. I don't think this is adequate as written and suggest it should be revised to provide an (at least cursory) explanation of why the cited exemption applies with reference to specific supporting facts. There could also be a relevant recital providing some factual support for the finding. The supporting analysis is sometimes provided in the accompanying staff report but there is no CEQA discussion in this staff report nor was there any for the companion resolution at the last meeting, thus there is no supporting analysis that can be referenced or inferred from the overall context and review process.

I have other concerns about particular provisions in the ordinance but I won't go into them here. I shared some in prior comments and an email exchange with Marie and it looks like some of them are addressed in the draft ordinance, which is appreciated.