APPENDIX A-2

Comments on Initial Study/NOP

VMT/ ORCEM PROJECT NOTICE OF PREPARATION

Comments Received During Public Review Period

1. Martin J. Robbins – Email dated June 19, 2014
2. Peter Brooks - Email dated June 17, 2014
3. Department of Fish and Wildlife - Letter dated June 17, 2014
4. Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control District – Letter dated June 12, 2014
5. Isaac Rio-Aguilar – Email dated June 3, 2014
6. Combined Responses From Next Door Web Site

Michelle D. Hightower - Comments on EIR for the Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project

From: "Martin J. Robbins" <robbins@sanfranciscobayferry.com>
To: <MHightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us>
Date: 6/19/2014 10:17 PM
Subject: Comments on EIR for the Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project
CC: "Keith Stahnke" <stahnke@watertransit.org>, "Chad Mason" <Mason@watertra...
Attachments: image003.jpg

Michelle,

From the point of view of ferry operations to/from Vallejo, a ferry service owned by WETA and operated as San Francisco Bay Ferry ... we provide two comments as follows regarding the subject EIR and project.

1. San Francisco Bay Ferry requires that the federal navigation channel in Mare Island Strait remain open and clear to normal and scheduled ferry traffic from 5:00am to Midnight year round, during both construction of this project and during ongoing operation of this site; if built.
2. Currently our ferries transit the area of this project at a low wake speed of 10 knots. San Francisco Bay Ferry requires that our ferries be able to maintain this speed during all transits of the area; again during both construction of this project and during ongoing operation of this site; if built.

Thank you for including our comments on the subject EIR and project.

Martin J. Robbins
General Manager – Vallejo
Phone 415.726.0356 – 24/7/365
www.sanfranciscobayferry.com

State of California – The Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
Bay Delta Region
7329 Silverado Trail
Napa, CA 94558
(707) 944-5500
www.wildlife.ca.gov

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., *Governor*
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, *Director*

June 17, 2014

Ms. Michelle Hightower
City of Vallejo
555 Santa Clara Street
Vallejo, CA 94590
mhightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us

Dear Ms. Hightower:

Subject: Vallejo Marine Terminal/Ocrem Cement Plant Project, Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report, SCH #2014052057, City of Vallejo, Solano County

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provided for the Vallejo Marine Terminal/Ocrem Cement Plant Project (Project) located at 790 and 800 Derr Avenue, in the City of Vallejo, along Mare Island Strait. The proposed Project includes two separate projects, the Vallejo Marine Terminal LLC (VMT) Project and Orcem California Inc. (Orcem) Project.

VMT Project

The proposed VMT Project focuses on the removal of a deteriorated timber wharf and construction of a deep-water terminal, including wharf improvements, laydown area, and trucking and rail connections on approximately 10.5 acres. The VMT Project also establishes other uses (outside the 10.5 acres) on the project site, including potential storage and reuse of several existing former General Mills buildings for administrative and commercial office purposes. The VMT terminal would be constructed in two separate phases over a period of time. Construction of the terminal would require fill and dredging within Mare Island Strait for both phases.

Orcem Project

The proposed Orcem Project involves use of a separate 4.83-acre portion of the former General Mills site for the construction and operation of an industrial facility for the production of a cement material.

Together, the proposed projects involve demolition and construction on both land and in the water.

Trustee Agency Authority:

CDFW is a Trustee Agency with responsibility under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for commenting on projects that could impact plant and wildlife resources. Pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1802, CDFW has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and the habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species. As a Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources,

CDFW is responsible for providing, as available, biological expertise to review and comment upon environmental documents and impacts arising from project activities, as those terms are used under CEQA [Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code].

Responsible Agency Authority:

CDFW has regulatory authority over projects that could result in the "take" of any species listed by the State as threatened or endangered, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 2081. If the Project could result in the "take" of any species listed as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) will be required. CEQA requires a Mandatory Finding of Significance if a project is likely to substantially impact threatened or endangered species [Sections 21001 (c), 21083, Guidelines Sections 15380, 15064, 15065]. Impacts must be avoided or mitigated to less-than-significant levels unless the CEQA Lead Agency makes and supports Findings of Overriding Consideration (FOC). The CEQA Lead Agency's FOC does not eliminate the Project proponent's obligation to comply with Fish and Game Code Section 2080.

General Comments

Please include a complete project description of all phases of the Project, including the equipment to be used, access roads, staging areas, construction procedures, construction schedule, and dredging methodology.

Biological Resources

The EIR should include a detailed description and complete assessment (including but not limited to type, quantity and locations) of the habitats, flora and fauna of the Project site, including endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. Rare, threatened and endangered species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition (see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15380).

The EIR analysis should include the reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect changes (temporary and permanent) that may occur with implementation of the proposed Project activities (pursuant to CEQA, Section 21065). An analysis of the cumulative effects the proposed Project activities would have on rare, threatened and endangered aquatic and terrestrial species and sensitive habitats should also be included (pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355). The scoping process should include various methods of assessing the occurrences or suitability of habitat for fish and wildlife species, including aerial imagery, historical and recent survey data, field reconnaissance, scientific literature and reports, as well as "positive occurrence" databases such as California Natural Diversity Database.

Special-Status Species

The Project site has the potential to support rare, threatened and endangered aquatic and terrestrial species, and sensitive habitats. Special-status plant and wildlife species that are either known to occur, or have the potential to occur in or near the Project site, include, but are not limited to, Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*), longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*), steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), salt-marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*), California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris*

obsoletus), California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*), Suisun shrew (*Sorex ornatus sinuosus*), San Pablo song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia samuelis*), saltmarsh common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*), pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*), fragrant fritillary (*Fritillaria liliacea*), Mason's lilaeopsis (*Lilaeopsis masonii*), Delta tule pea (*Lathyrus jepsonii* var. *jepsonii*), and soft salty bird's-beak (*Cordylanthus molle* ssp. *molle*). Take avoidance and minimization measures for listed species should be determined in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW, and fully disclosed in the EIR.

Fully protected species such as salt-marsh harvest mouse, California clapper rail, and California black rail may not be taken or possessed at any time and no licenses or permits may be issued for their take except for collecting these species for necessary scientific research and relocation of the bird species for the protection of livestock (Fish and Game Code Section 3511). Therefore, the EIR should include all appropriate measures to ensure complete take avoidance of these fully protected species.

It is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any bird pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 3503. Birds in the order Falconiformes and Strigiformes and their nests are also protected under Fish and Game Code Section 3503.5.

Information on state-designated sensitive species can be found on the CDFW website at http://dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/.

Plant species that are listed by the California Native Plant Society, such as Mason's lilaeopsis (listed as 1B.2, meaning that it is fairly endangered in California), may also occur at or near the Project site. The online inventory of CNPS-listed plants can be found at http://www.cnps.org/cnps/rareplants/inventory/.

The EIR should specify that protocol-level breeding/nesting season surveys will be conducted at the Project sites. CDFW recommends that surveys be conducted during the season prior to the start of Project-related activities. These full surveys are used to establish baseline site data for Project planning, and to develop appropriate avoidance, minimization and mitigation measures. Surveys should also be conducted at a Project site within two to seven days prior to the start of activities in the event that special-status species move into an area, and to subsequently avoid direct take of individuals. Survey and monitoring protocols and guidelines are available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/survey_monitor.html. Botanical surveys should also be conducted throughout the blooming period for plant species potentially occurring at a Project site. Please refer to the CDFW protocols for surveying and evaluating impacts to rare plants, available at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/Protocols_for_Surveying_and_Evaluating_Impacts.pdf.

California Endangered Species Act Permit

Please be advised that a CESA permit, pursuant to Fish and Game Code Sections 2080 et seq., must be obtained if the Project has the potential to result in take of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during Project activities or over the life of the Project. Issuance of a CESA Permit is subject to CEQA documentation; therefore, the EIR must specify impacts,

mitigation measures, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. If the proposed Project will impact CESA listed species, early consultation with CDFW is encouraged, as significant modification to the Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. More information about the CESA permit process can be found on the CDFW website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/cesa/.

Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement

Page 11 of the Initial Study states that, "no jurisdictional streambeds or waters of the state would be affected." Mare Island Strait is considered jurisdictional pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. CDFW may require a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (LSAA) for the proposed Project-related activities within or near Mare Island Strait. Notification is required for any activity that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, change the bed, channel, or bank including associated riparian or wetland/marsh resources, use material from the stream/channel bed, or substantially adversely affect fish and wildlife resources. Issuance of an LSAA is subject to CEQA. CDFW, as a Responsible Agency under CEQA, will consider the CEQA document for the Project. Therefore, the CEQA document must specify impacts, mitigation measures, and include a mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Lorie Hammerli, Environmental Scientist, at (707) 944-5568; or Ms. Karen Weiss, Senior Environmental Scientist (Supervisory), at (707) 944-5525.

Sincerely,

Scott Wilson

Scott Wilson
Regional Manager
Bay Delta Region

cc: State Clearinghouse

Michelle D. Hightower - Vallejo Terminal / ORCEM Project -- NOP public comment

From: Peter Brooks <peterjbrooks@msn.com>
To: "mhightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us" <mhightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us>
Date: 6/17/2014 3:49 PM
Subject: Vallejo Terminal / ORCEM Project -- NOP public comment

Hello Michelle,
Please let me know if comments via email are acceptable for the NOP for the Vallejo Marine Terminal / ORCEM Project.

My public comments are below.
Peter Brooks
714 York Street
Vallejo, CA 94590

PUBLIC COMMENT:
I propose that the City of Vallejo and the City of Vallejo Planning Division refrain from referring to the Orcem product as "green" cement.

The correct, scientific term for the product is Ground Granulated Blast-Furnace Slag (GGBFS) or simply "slag" cement.

The term "green" cement is just a marketing term which is used by the cement industry. I believe that using the term "green" cement creates an inaccurate image of the proposed project by Orcem.

Using the correct, scientific term "slag" cement will ensure that citizens and our elected officials are discussing an actual, existing product to be created by Orcem not a term created by a marketing team. (I contacted Mr. Ken Caldeira, senior scientist at the Carnegie Institution for Science at Stanford, who clarified this point for me).

Thank you for your consideration.
Peter Brooks

Michelle D. Hightower - Comment on VMT/Orcem EIR

From: Rolf Ohlemutz <Rohlemutz@vsfcd.com>
To: "Hightower, Michelle D." <MHightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us>
Date: 6/12/2014 9:25 AM
Subject: Comment on VMT/Orcem EIR

Michelle,
In response to the subject Notice of Preparation, VSFCD has the following comments and concerns regarding the project:
The District owns and maintains an 18-inch sanitary sewer (SS) interceptor that traverses the property for a distance of about 2,400 lineal feet (LF). For a distance of 1,100 LF, northwest of Sandy Beach Road, the interceptor runs along the shoreline at the toe of a large slope on the property of the applicant. District staff has observed erosion along the shoreline. There is a second segment of 24-inch SS interceptor at the north end of the project that is also close to the shoreline, but this area is not at the toe of a large slope, is more accessible and does not appear to be subject to the same level of erosion as the area to the southeast.
Given the increase in ship traffic as a result of the project, it is anticipated that the erosion will increase in rate as a result of the wake action of the large ships that will be using the ship terminal. The District is concerned that the increase in the rate of erosion could destabilize the sloping soil that surrounds the SS interceptor. Failure of the interceptor would pose potential harm to the environmental health of the nearby shoreline and waterway. The District feels that the increased risk to this critical sewer facility should be mitigated by the addition of rock slope protection along the shoreline on the outboard side of the interceptor.
Rolf Ohlemutz
District Engineer
VSFCD

Michelle D. Hightower - Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project

From: Isaac R <irtriathlete@yahoo.com>
To: "MHightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us" <MHightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us>
Date: 6/3/2014 8:17 AM
Subject: Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project

Vallejo, CA 94591
June 3, 2014

Attn: Michelle Hightower, Senior Planner
City of Vallejo
555 Santa Clara Street
Vallejo, California 94590

From:
Isaac Rios-Aguilar
1001 Taylor Ave, Vallejo, CA 94591

Dear Mrs. Hightower,

I'm writing to you today to express my family's concern regarding the **Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project** and the environmental impact it will create in our neighborhood.

Our main concern is the air quality, hazardous emissions that we will be breathing due to prevailing winds as well as the increase of traffic and hazards created by the additional loads into our already poor roads and streets.
We are also avid anglers, and we believe that the deep-water terminal will affect the already stressed biological resources and water quality.
We're aware of the necessity for new employment opportunities as well as new city resources; however, we strongly believe that the negative impacts in our immediate environment and quality of life, greatly out weights the benefits for this type of project in our community. Please, we urge you to not proceed with this project.

Thank you very much

Cordially,

Isaac Rios-Aguilar, family and neighbors

NEXT DOOR COMMENTS

Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project2 Jun

Economic Development Department from City of Vallejo

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Vallejo Marine Terminal/Orcem Project has been posted to the City's website for public review and comment until June 19, 2014. The City of Vallejo (City) will be the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will prepare an EIR for the project. The project is proposed to occupy the former General Mills property at 790-800 Derr Avenue. A description of the project, an Initial Study and the NOP can be found here: http://bit.ly/1kk1UYy

The documents can also be found on the City's website under City Hall, Departments & Divisions, Planning Division page, then click on Major Development & Specific Plan Docs and then VMT/Orcem Project. For more information, please contact Michelle Hightower, Senior Planner, at 707.648.4506 or mhightower@ci.vallejo.ca.us.

Lisa, Frank and John thanked you

David H. from Vallejo Heritage 2 Jun

A cement factory in Vallejo... Kiss your air quality goodbye.

Gary, Linda, Susan and 2 others thanked David

David H. from Vallejo Heritage 2 Jun

After reading all of the associated documents, I am terrified. This project will further cement (pun intended) Vallejo as a place to avoid. All the beautiful properties along the water at the entrance of Carquinez Bay will be a direct recipient of the carcinogenic dust cloud from the new facility... As well as Grace Patterson Elementary School... This insane plan needs to be put down!

Jamie and Jerry, Rebecca, Linda and 1 other thanked David

According to this article, the cement will be environmentally friendly and the cement plant is said to be "green."

http://www.timesheraldonline.com/news/ci...

That being said, do you still think the plant will pose an environmental and health threat to Vallejo environment and the Vallejoans manufacturing this stuff?

Brandon S. from Vallejo Heritage 2 Jun

I don't understand all the bad hype when this is still in the planning stage and environmental impact studies haven't even been done yet.

Let's get some perspective. Who are we? What do we have to ... View more lose? What do we NEED to gain?

Doesn't our city need the business? We are not Walnut Creek, full of Apple Stores and Nieman Marcus shops... We don't have the luxury of turning up our noses to real business, and they surely know it.

Vallejo grew fat on the teet of the military industrial complex of ships, bombs, and nuclear subs, but now a green concrete plant is too scary?

Let's not remain the bankrupt failure everyone calls us. If we turn away businesses we risk falling deeper into obscurity and increasing amount of crime and despair.

We need more money, more cops, better schools, more social programs, and better funded government to go out and get more money to get more of the above.

I would take a bit of dust in the air in exchange for less lead flying through it.

Bob, John, Linda and 5 others thanked Brandon

Rey A. from Hollyvine 2 Jun

Well articulated, Brandon!

I, as well, understand the cons, but the pros you speak of, outweigh then. But you are correct...who know if it will even happen as it's just in the preliminary stages.

Let's wait and see and follow the developments...

Brandon and Madison thanked Rey

Rey d. from Echo 3 Jun

I agree with Brandon. Vallejo need the business.
To those people who contradicts improvement; what do you have to contribute to better our economy?

Brandon thanked Rey

David H. from Vallejo Heritage 3 Jun

I lived next to a cement processing center for two years. Green cement is just like clean coal - it's green washing BS. Even the PDF's say "less toxic"... Not non- toxic.

Linda, Susan, Dave and 2 others thanked David

David H. from Vallejo Heritage 3 Jun

What do I have to contribute? I"m the archetypal person everybody keeps saying Vallejo needs to attract - SF tech worker. I saw Vallejo as a promising bedroom community with the last affordable homes ... View more on the water in the Bay Area. Vallejo could very easily evolve into Benicia. A cement processing center will only take Vallejo further down the wrong path and endanger all children attending the school 1/4 mile away. Instead of toxic industry, Vallejo should demo that site and build a recreation themed area to draw tourists and more people like me who want to invest in something better.

Dana, Linda, Susan and 4 others thanked David

Linda P. from Somerset Highlands Park 3 Jun

Thank you David, I agree with you 100%. Vallejo has enough problems without adding a dirty business like cement whether it's supposedly "green" or not. I live in East Vallejo, and if I leave my ... View more windows open at night, my house is covered in grimy grit from the quarry the next day. Don't we have enough problems already? We may not be WC with Neiman Marcus and Apple stores, but adding this kind of business is a sure-fire way to make sure we never become one. We have to decide: Do we want to continue to be Richmond Jr., or are we willing to do what it takes to be better than that?

Linda, Jamie and Jerry, David and 1 other thanked Linda

Susan T. from Cal Meadows 3 Jun

137 Kit Carson was broken into last night since the eviction. Its being boarded up again. Eyeballs open, lets alll keep our eyes on it.. FYI

Rey thanked Susan

Doug S. from Grant Mahoney Park 3 Jun

This is a great use for this property. I did some work at this site back when the mill was in operation. There were fork lifts and trucks but the site is fairly self contained in a pocket along the water. I want to hear the details before making a decision. The dust will have to be handled with modern equipment.

Thanks Brandon

Brandon, James and Judy thanked Doug

Graham S. from Home Acres 3 Jun

While the project may or may not have it's merits, the fact remains that Vallejo has a city attorney that is risk adverse to the point of letting criminals break the law, bankers break the law, and ... View more developers break the law.

While I am not yet a nay sayer for this project I see nothing in their plans that indicates they will be paying their fair share for usage of our infrastructure. The city has a demonstrated habit of

passing these costs onto the citizens vs the actual end user.

As a person who works in Maritime there are some risks associated with the support operations that will take place with the discharge operations that can endanger our waterfront.

While yes this project is in the planning stages out is important for our government to be messaging that they have the citizens best interests in mind over the interests of a business venture that has the potential to further stain our already neglected infrastructure.

Personally I feel that our city government needs to address these important infrastructure impacts and how they plan to mitigate them so we can make informed decisions for out against the project.

Linda, Linda, Susan and 2 others thanked Graham

Roberto F. from Bay Terrace 3 Jun

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant ... View more Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.
Aesthetics

Air Quality
Biological Resources
Cultural Resources
Geology/Soils
Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Hydrology/ Water Quality
Land Use/Planning
Noise
Public Services
Recreation
Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems

Can the city of Vallejo attract better businesses? There is so much potential for good businesses to be attracted to this area. Whats going on with the Mayor's leadership?

Linda, Linda and David thanked Roberto

Kathy G. from Hillcrest Estates 3 Jun

Brandon, thanks for the voice of a calm, reasonable response. We can foster a positive outlook and keep an open mind until all the information is in or we can light torches and storm the castle to kill the monster, even if we don't know if it's a monster yet !.... Thanks again.

Colleen and James thanked Kathy

Judy L. from California Lighthouse 3 Jun

I agree we don't need to protest until we have all the information. It is a "self-contained" site. I'll bet not many people even know it's there. Please don't compare us with Benicia. Benicia has ... View more oil refineries in their back yard. The refineries support their city coffers. We have potential tax dollar opportunities from more diverse businesses, not just one. Hope many more businesses will look at us.

Linda and James thanked Judy

Kevin F. from Mare Island 3 Jun

Vallejo has a track record for going for quick and easy, and a track record of mishandling real growth opportunities. When you have an image as the local dump, that is the kind of business you ... View more attract. You can do the easy thing, and take what's handed you, or you make an effort to attract core business that generate positive economic growth. It's a 'no brainer' (literally)to just follow old patterns; even if they led the city to bankruptcy.

Dana, Linda, Linda and 2 others thanked Kevin

David H. from Vallejo Heritage 3 Jun

This will be a 24 hr processing facility with a rail line that bisects the heritage district. I, personally, would not want to deal with rail noise in the middle of the night. Most Heritage District homes are 80+ years old with 0 noise dampening capabilities... Do you want to hear freight trains @ 2am?

Ellen, Linda, Linda and 2 others thanked David

Jamie and Jerry E. from North Sommerset Highlands 3 Jun

I actually like the sound of trains at night, but I don't like the dust of the quarry in my house. If it is anything like being near the quarry, I would vote NO!

Linda thanked Jamie and Jerry

James C. from Grant Mahoney Park 3 Jun

I also think we should not jump the gun and form conclusions just yet. Obviously there is the potential for significant environmental impacts. But it is also true that with the EIR there will ... View more undoubtedly be mitigations required to greatly reduce or eliminate impacts. The community will have the opportunity to weigh in with concerns and they will have to be responded to. I think there is room for some industrial operations here which I presume will

provide some decent paying blue collar jobs. From what I've read green cement sounds like a much more environmentally friendly product than regular cement. Maybe that will be something we will be proud of associating with Vallejo. We still have many places and opportunities for tech or other types of businesses on Mare Island and elsewhere. Can we get them to come? Hopefully. There are certainly efforts afoot to do just that. In the meantime, these folks are prepared to make a significant commitment developing the site. I don't think we should rain on the project just yet. Many people think we do too much of that in this town already turning our nose at every potential development and waiting for some pristine, perfect projects to drop at our feet . . . as if we are ever going to please everyone. This wouldn't have been my first choice for a scenic site like the Mills property, but given the location, it works for this type of business, and the business will be relatively isolated from the rest of the city.

Judy, Linda and Evangelina thanked James

Kathy G. from Hillcrest Estates 3 Jun

Thank you everyone. The exchange of opinions is great! Helps to hear the varying perspectives.

Ellen, Linda and Linda thanked Kathy

Bruce P. from Hyde Park 3 Jun

What is with Vallejo? Compare this to the mega-million reconstruction of Walnut Creek's Broadway Plaza. I could be wrong of course. Tourists and shoppers could converge on a cement factory, but if that were the case, wouldn't it be better to place it downtown?

Linda and Linda thanked Bruce

James C. from Grant Mahoney Park 3 Jun

Good idea Bruce! But seriously, I grew up in a factory town on the shores of Lake Michigan. It may seem odd today, but we were proud of our manufacturers and we had a good balance of blue collar and ... View more white collar jobs. And . . . yes you could take tours and tourists did visit them. It was really cool to see tractors, for example, being assembled. Those industries and jobs were destroyed by globalization. I think we need to encourage that balance again. As an aside, do we hate our heritage . . . the shipyard? Pretty industrial looking if you ask me and they are working on ships again! Very cool. Certainly no shopping mall. I like Vallejo because it isn't some status conscious, snobby community with tony shops and a lot of beemers, though a few boutique shops wouldn't hurt and we could definitely use a few more dining choices. This venture, if it succeeds, will bring revenue to the city, and we definitely need that . . . even to become more attractive to other kinds of businesses, tourists, and new residents.

Bob, Judy, Linda and 1 other thanked James

Brandon S. from Vallejo Heritage 3 Jun

We saw the lights on at the dry docks tonight. Very cool!

James thanked Brandon

Rey d. from Echo 4 Jun

This is waste of time. Let's get the facts first before arguing!

Charlie M. from Nebraska and Sonoma 4 Jun

I am also in favor of getting more facts. The newspaper article was so optimistic, a grain of salt is warranted, but it's at least conceivable that the operation will have minimal impacts and be a boon to the city. C'mon, riverfront condos would've been a nice alternative, but where is the demand and I couldn't have afforded one anyway.

James and Linda thanked Charlie

Judy L. from California Lighthouse 4 Jun

Cities can't be built solely on tourist attractions. Coming up with a good mix is the key. Train sounds can be heard in many areas of Vallejo. Freeway traffic too. If we want commerce and businesses, this is part of it. I'm waiting to hear the rest of the story.

Bob and James thanked Judy