

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

1385 8th Street, Suite 130
Arcata, CA 95521
FAX (707) 826-8960
TDD (707) 826-8950



August 10, 2022

Christopher G. Hart
Mendocino Railway
100 West Laurel St
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Violation File Number: V-1-22-0070 - Mendocino Railway Roundhouse
Property Location: 100 West Laurel Street, Fort Bragg, CA 95437;
Mendocino County Assessor's Parcel Numbers
("APNs") 008-053-29, 008-054-16, 008-020-18, 008-
053-34, 008-151-26, and 008-151-23.
Violation¹ description: Unpermitted development, that includes, but is not
limited to, the replacement of the "Roundhouse", the
replacement of a structure located off of West Alder
Street with an added concrete patio, the replacement
of a storage shed allegedly used to store rail bikes, a
lot line adjustment, and restricting public parking.

Dear Mr. Hart:

The California Coastal Act² was enacted by the State Legislature in 1976 to provide long-term protection of California's coastline through implementation of a comprehensive planning and regulatory program designed to manage conservation and development of coastal resources. The California Coastal Commission ("Commission") is the state agency created by, and charged with administering, the Coastal Act of 1976. In making its permit and land use planning decisions, the Commission carries out Coastal Act policies, which, amongst other goals, seek to protect and restore sensitive habitats; protect natural landforms; protect scenic landscapes and views of the sea;

¹ Please note that the description herein of the violation at issue is not necessarily a complete list of all development on the subject property that is in violation of the Coastal Act and/or the City of Fort Bragg LCP that may be of concern to the Commission. Accordingly, you should not treat the Commission's silence regarding (or failure to address) other development on the subject property as indicative of Commission acceptance of, or acquiescence in, any such development. Please further note that "violation" as used in this letter refers to alleged violations of the Coastal Act and/or the City of Fort Bragg LCP, as determined by Commission staff.

² The Coastal Act is codified in sections 30000 to 30900 of the California Public Resources Code. All further section references are to that code, and thus, to the Coastal Act, unless otherwise indicated.

August 10, 2022

Page 2 of 5

protect against loss of life and property from coastal hazards; protect and enhance public recreation opportunities; and, provide maximum public access to the sea.

The Coastal Act establishes a permitting system for proposed development, as that term is defined in the act (see below), in the “Coastal Zone.” The Commission is the original permitting authority, but local governments with territory within the Coastal Zone are required to develop Local Coastal Programs (“LCP”s) to implement the Act, and once the Commission certifies a local government’s LCP, permitting and enforcement authority in the area covered by that LCP is generally delegated to that local government. Although the property at issue here is within the City of Fort Bragg’s LCP jurisdiction, the Commission can assume primary responsibility for enforcement of any Coastal Act and LCP violations at issue in this case pursuant to Section 30810(a) of the Coastal Act, which provides that the Commission may issue an order to enforce the requirements of a certified LCP in the event that the local government, in this case the City of Fort Bragg (“the City”), requests the Commission to assist with or assume primary responsibility for issuing such order. During a July 12, 2022, phone call with City staff, Commission staff were asked to assume primary enforcement responsibility for this case.

Commission staff was notified on July 7, 2022, and on August 4, 2022, of unpermitted development occurring on APNs 008-053-29, 008-054-16, 008-020-18, 008-053-34, 008-151-26, and 008-151-23 (“subject property”), including, the replacement of the entire roof and the windows/walls of the structure known as the “Roundhouse,” which constitutes the replacement of the entire structure. The potential impacts of the unpermitted development include the disturbance and removal of toxic construction materials that may have been used in the Roundhouse’s original structure. These materials have the potential - especially during their disturbance/resuspension, deconstruction, temporary storage, removal, and disposal - to impact hydrologic and biologic coastal resources.

Commission staff became aware of further unpermitted development during our investigation of the Roundhouse replacement. Unpermitted development including, but not limited to, the replacement of a structure off of West Alder Street, on APN 008-151-26, including completely new interior, wiring, plumbing, flooring, roof, windows, fencing, and a concrete slab partially enclosed patio, imposing new restrictions on parking on the subject property that has historically been available to the public, and the replacement of a shed on APN 008-054-16, which reportedly is being used to store rail bikes. Additionally, the Lot Line Adjustment (“LLA”) that Commission staff first addressed in our December 21, 2018 letter to the City, which letter was then sent to you as an attachment to Commission staff’s June 11, 2019 letter to Anthony LaRocca as counsel for Mendocino Railway (“MR”), remains unpermitted development.

Section 30600(a) of the Coastal Act and Section 17.71.045(B) of the City of Fort Bragg’s certified LCP require that any development occurring within the Coastal Zone

August 10, 2022

Page 3 of 5

must first be authorized by, and must be undertaken in accordance with, an approved coastal development permit (“CDP”).

Section 30106 of the Coastal Act and Section 17.71.045(B) of the City’s certified LCP defines “development” as:

“Development” means, on land, in or under water, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure; discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste; grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of materials; change in the density or intensity of use of land, ... change in the intensity of use of water, or of access thereto; construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes, kelp harvesting, and timber operations which are in accordance with a timber harvesting plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of the Z’berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (commencing with Section 4511).

Commission staff have sent several letters to MR, including letters dated June 11, 2019, November 2, 2020, and February 3, 2021. In our November 2, 2020, letter we stated that:

“We also remain unconvinced that Mendocino Railway’s (“MR”) rail holdings are necessarily still appropriately considered to be a part of the interstate rail network for purposes of the ICCTA, and thus believe that the proposed development plans at the former Georgia-Pacific Mill site may be outside the jurisdiction of the Surface Transportation Board (“STB”) pursuant to 49 U.S.C. § 10501(a). Finally, even if MR’s holdings were determined to be subject to STB jurisdiction, we believe that certain portions of the proposed development would also be subject to federal consistency review by the Commission.”³

Furthermore, as we have also mentioned elsewhere, even if MR’s rail operations are still subject to STB’s jurisdiction, that jurisdiction does not extend to non-rail-related activities merely because they are conducted by an organization that also operates rail lines. Thus, any such activities would remain subject to the Coastal Act’s permitting requirements, in addition to potentially being subject to the Commission’s federal consistency review authority.

We request a full description of all development that has occurred on the subject property without a CDP. Please include all staging areas and construction debris

³ Jessica Reed letter to Mendocino Railway dated November 2, 2020 p.1.

August 10, 2022

Page 4 of 5

removal plans in your description. Depending on the extent, type and nature of the unpermitted development that has occurred, resolution may require that you obtain authorization to remove, and then do remove, the unpermitted development or that you obtain authorization of the development “after-the-fact,” as well as compliance with other provisions of the Coastal Act, including potential requirements for mitigation and the payment of penalties. **In order to ensure no further harm to coastal resources and to avoid the potential for continuing accrual of penalties, please cease all unpermitted development immediately and respond by August 26, 2022.**

While we are hopeful that we can resolve this matter amicably, please be advised that the Coastal Act has a number of potential remedies to address violations of the Coastal Act including the following:

Sections 30803 and 30805 authorize the Commission to initiate litigation to seek injunctive relief and an award of civil fines in response to any violation of the Coastal Act. Section 30820(a)(1) provides that any person who undertakes development in violation of the Coastal Act may be subject to a penalty amount that shall not exceed \$30,000 and shall not be less than \$500 per violation. Section 30820(b) states that, in addition to any other penalties, any person who “knowingly and intentionally” performs or undertakes any development in violation of the Coastal Act can be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$15,000 per violation for each day in which each violation persists.

Sections 30821 and 30821.3 authorize the Commission to impose administrative civil penalties in an amount of up to \$11,250 per violation of the Coastal Act, for each day that each violation persists. The administrative civil penalty may be assessed for each day the violation persists, but for no more than five years.

Finally, Section 30812 authorizes the Executive Director to record a Notice of Violation against any property determined to have been developed in violation of the Coastal Act. If the Executive Director chooses to pursue that course, you will first be given notice of the Executive Director's intent to record such a notice, and you will have the opportunity to object and to provide evidence to the Commission at a public hearing as to why such a notice of violation should not be recorded. If a notice of violation is ultimately recorded against your property, it will serve as notice of the violation to all successors in interest in that property.

I look forward to hearing from you by **Friday, August 26, 2022**. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact me at (707) 826-8950, by email at joshua.levine@coastal.ca.gov, or by writing to the address in the letterhead above.

August 10, 2022

Page 5 of 5

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JL", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Josh Levine

North Coast District Enforcement Analyst

Cc: Lisa Haage, Chief of Enforcement
Aaron McLendon, Deputy Chief of Enforcement
Alex Helperin, Assistant General Counsel
Melissa Kraemer, North Coast District Manager
Sarah McCormick, City of Fort Bragg, Assistant to the City Manager

