

CAMBRIA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OCTOBER 22, 2009 – VETERANS MEMORIAL BUILDING

- 1. Call to Order:** President Sanders called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and led the pledge of allegiance. Assistant District Counsel David Hirsch reported no reports from last closed session.

Present: Directors Clift, Chaldecott, De Micco, MacKinnon and President Sanders

Absent: None

Also present: General Manager Tammy Rudock, Assistant District Counsel David Hirsch, District Engineer Bob Gresens, and District Clerk Kathy Choate

- 2. Public Comment:**

Amanda Rice, Cambria. Encouraged attendance on October 24, Shamel Park, 2:00 – 4:00 PM, Global 350 (safe upper limit) effort to reduce parts per billion of CO2 in the atmosphere.

- 3. Agenda Review:**

Consent Item 7.C. pulled for separate consideration.

- 4. Acknowledgements/Presentation:**

Galen Rathbun, Forest Committee member presented “County and State Codes Related to Habitat and Fire Protection in Cambria” regarding restrictions related to the forest.

- 5. Special Reports**

A. Sheriff’s Department Report: Commander Ben Hall reported activity about the same as last year; 230 calls and 34 reports. Usual number of drug arrests, juvenile problems, domestic issues and property stolen from three vehicles.

- 6. Manager’s and Board Reports**

A. Manager’s Report: Tammy Rudock summarized and presented the Managers’ reports. Board discussion followed regarding late fee waiver policy. Director Clift inquired about the 12-month “good payment history” provision for late fee waiver and whether that was too lenient. He proposed 24 months. **The Board’s Executive Committee will review and come back with a recommendation.**

District Engineer Bob Gresens presented Utilities report, reported on updated quarterly report by the US Army Corps of Engineers on desalination project; and summarized findings from running the Kennedy/Jenks consultants’ aquifer model. Board discussion followed regarding modeling. Staff suggested running model in fall and spring every year. Board suggested running in December, April and maybe again in July before any projected surcharge discussions. Bob Gresens presented a PowerPoint on well levels, solar power environmental benefits, cost estimates, and new innovations (thin film) in solar power. Board discussion followed regarding cost per acre foot for desalination.

Public Comment:

Janine Jacobs, Cambria. Commented on non-potable water storage, desal, Army Corps involvement in EIR on CCSD website, and Morro Bay estuary larvae issue.

B. Member and Committee Reports

Director Chaldecott commented on today's Cambria stating Cambria is one of the prettiest villages. Thanked Cambria's local service groups hanging for their efforts; flags on lamp posts, landscaping median, chamber, service clubs, businesses and residents working to make Cambria a pretty place.

Ron Crummitt, Chair, Buildout Reduction Program (BRP) Citizens Committee presented an update on recommendations for BRP funding sources to make up for loss of funds from the previous projected rate increase. He provided the overall purpose of reducing buildout, program funding details, recommendations to date, and future considerations for the BRP Committee.

Public Comment:

Amanda Rice, Chair, NCAC, Cambria. In North Coast Area Plan approval process, California Coastal Commission recommended in 2000-2001 having an open space assessment district to fund open space.

7. Consent Agenda

- A. Approve expenditures for the month of September 2009
- B. Approve minutes of Board of Directors meeting October 1, 2009
- C. Consider adoption of Resolution 52-2009 approving the form of and authorizing the execution and delivery of a Purchase and Sale Agreement and related documents with respect to the sale of the seller's Proposition 1A receivable from the State; and directing and authorizing certain other actions in connection therewith
- D. Consider adoption of Resolution 42-2009 approving California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Volunteer Fire Assistance Program (grant) Agreement #7G90099

Item 7.C. was pulled for separate consideration. President Sanders introduced the item. Tammy Rudock reported on Prop 1A status. **Director MacKinnon moved to approve Reso 52-2009 approving the sale of CCSD's receivable to California Communities via the Proposition 1A Securitization Program. Director Cliff seconded. Motion carried 4 – 1. Ayes – 4, No – 1 (DeMicco), Absent – 0**

Tammy Rudock read balance of consent calendar; items 7A, B, and D.

Director MacKinnon moved to adopt the balance of the consent calendar. Director Cliff seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes – 5, No – 0, Absent - 0

8. Hearings and Appeals

None

9. Regular Business

A. Adopt Resolution 51-2009 approving amendment to Settlement, Mutual Release and Covenant Agreement amendment with Joshua Brown and Cathie Brown. President Sanders introduced the item and recused himself from the matter having represented the Brown family in the past and left the room while the matter was considered. Vice President Chaldecott chaired the item. Tammy Rudock presented the staff report.

and Mutual Release and Covenant Agreement with Joshua and Cathie Brown noting a correction to \$1,100 fee will be allocated one half to Resource Conservation and one half to Water. There is an additional signatory party to the agreement, a 13% owner (Church of the Nazarene Foundation) and they would need to be added to this agreement. Counsel stated the Board can provide direction that the approval is subject to including the Church of the Nazarene as a signatory to the agreement.

Director DeMicco moved to approve Resolution 51-2009 approving amendment to Settlement, Mutual Release and Covenant agreement with Joshua and Cathie Brown and agreement will include signatory party of Church of Nazarene Foundation. Director MacKinnon seconded. Motion carried with one abstention. Ayes – 4, No – 0, Absent – 0, Abstain – 1 (Sanders)

Public Comment: None

Vice President Chaldecott adjourned meeting at 1:50 PM for short break to 2:00 PM. President Sanders called meeting back to order 2:00 PM.

B. Adopt Resolution 53-2009 approving agreement between the CCSD and Granville Homes, Inc., for conversion of two EDUs to single family residential allocated to 5860 Moonstone Beach Drive (Moonstone Inn) property. President Sanders introduced the item. Tammy Rudock presented the staff report. The \$1,100 fee for water allocation requiring board approval would be split 50/50 to Resource Conservation and Water. Discussion followed regarding the transfer fees.

Public Comment:

Jeff Roberts, Granville Homes, 1396 W Turnon Ave, Fresno. Concur with staff report recommendations and intent to remove existing structures (one per lot) and replace with two new homes in compliance with NCAP. Visited with Coastal Commission and know the issues and challenges with redeveloping site with conforming standards. Granville Homes Inc. has created an entity called Moonstone Inn LLC and requests that name be used for any correspondence, agreements, and like documentation.

Mahala Burton, Cambria. Commented on non-conforming use, could improve existing structure, and concerned with no net water use. Suggested Granville be required to sell commercial EDUs and purchase residential meter.

Director DeMicco moved to approve Resolution 53-2009 approving the agreement between the CCSD and to include modifying resolution and agreement to be with Moonstone Inn LLC. Director Chaldecott seconded. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes – 5, No – 0. Absent - 0

C. Adopt Resolution 50-2009 approving Certification of Fiscalini Ranch Preserve Master Environmental Impact Report (EIR); and adopt Resolution 54-2009 approving the revised Community Park Plan. President Sanders introduced the agenda item. Tammy Rudock reviewed staff recommendations, summarized the fiscal impact and reported minor edits to the resolutions and changes to the project for the record:

- Resolution 54-2009, page 163, sixth whereas paragraph corrected to, “whereas, the Project Description and Revised Community Park Plan map (Exhibit B) and identified mitigation measures included in the attached Statement of Findings

(Exhibit A) would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project and would not result in any new significant environmental impact.”

- Page 164, number 1, reworded to read: Approve the Fiscalini Ranch Preserve Project, to include the Project Description and Revised Community Park Plan map dated August 26, 2009 and as further set forth in Exhibit B, attached hereto and made a part hereof.
- Page 261, addition of Exhibit B (Revised Community Park Plan) as part of project description
- Resolution 55-2009, Page 262 second line in number 1, correction to Exhibit reference in number, strike C, replace with “D.”
- Page 366, Map title corrected to read “Revised Community Park Plan.”
- Page 228, WS/mm-5 paragraph, third line after the word would, add “meet applicable Title 22 requirements and.” Bottom of paragraph strike (250 parts per million) and replace with “total dissolved solids.” Same line, between the words lower and concentrations, add the word “salinity.”
- Page 243, WS/mm-5 paragraph, line 3 between “would not,” add “meet applicable Title 22 requirements and.” Sixth line after the words treatment process and before onsite, add “use of recycled water that would have lower salinity levels following the start up of the CCSD’s planned desalination portable water supply project (which will also lower the wastewater plants effluent salinity).”
- Next line, between lower and concentrations, add the word “salinity” and strike (250 parts per million) replace with (total dissolved solids).
- In number 3 Supportive Evidence, three changes: third line after word located strike near and replace with “approximately 150 feet from”; next line after words non-potable well; add word “may” and strike “s” on the following word consists. Sixth line before words Title 22, add “applicable.”

Connie Davidson, Davidson Associates, provided an overview of the project, including objectives of the revised Community Park Plan to reduce amenities while providing the active recreation needs; to significantly reduce environmental impact; to provide a non-potable shorter term method to irrigate turf; to create a park with natural, rustic feel with limited or no hardscaping to greatly reduce cost to develop the park; and to respond effectively to the public comments received during the draft EIR. A summary of West Ranch parking was provided. The PROS Commission at September 1 meeting unanimously recommended CCSD Board adopts the revised Community Park Plan. The amendments to the East West Ranch Management Plan must be included with the certified Master EIR and Master Development Plan that will go to County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for approval.

David Foote, FIRMA, provided details on the Revised Community Park and Master Development Plan. The minimum required turf would meet the goal of four games at any given time. The trip generation with four youth soccer games are about 84 parking spaces, derived from traffic consultant in EIR, resulting in scaled back parking from 146 to 97 spaces to accommodate league play and other park users; reduced parking also resulted in a native woodland buffer along the southern edge. Dog Park would remain in same area. Community Center and hard court deleted in center and replaced with picnic grove with scaled back playground, and waterless composting restroom facility. Lighting would occur for safety, no night lighting. Drought tolerant grasses recommended for turf

and transport blended groundwater/treated effluent combination to storage locations to be used when supplemental water is needed. Base rock parking recommended for parking area. Backstop with no bleachers, no dugout. D.G. (Decomposed Granite) path displayed, low rail fence in riparian enhancement areas, and passive type use dog park.

Board questions followed regarding turf area dimensions and simultaneous use for Little League, softball, and soccer, ADA access, emergency access, parking standard to determine number of spaces,

David Foote provided detailed responses to the Board member's questions.

Shauna Scott, Morro Group, Inc., division of SWCA, worked with CCSD to prepare the Master EIR (full scope) for the project (PowerPoint listed all topics). She reviewed the Issue Area Discussions that included regulatory setting, description of existing conditions; unidentified impacts project wide, separated out where it was specific to different areas of the Ranch Preserve. Cumulative effects were also looked at. Mitigation measures were identified and read into the record.

Key challenging issues were related to sensitive resources on the Ranch and she reviewed in detail the mitigation recommendations for all issues. In the final EIR no new parking is recommended on West Fiscalini Ranch Preserve. Generation of noise during use of sports fields was reviewed. No amplification (consistent with Management Plan) is recommended. Redesign of fields substantially reduces noise impact. Revised project eliminated community center and hard courts, eliminating those noises generated by such uses. Water supply demand versus availability and mitigation recommends water conservation measures. The revised project identifies a feasible non-potable water source. Biological resources related to water use; East FRP Santa Rosa Creek corridor, water quality and storm water run-off is a concern and design incorporates use of bioswales and storm drains to filter storm water and identifies measures to reduce use of fertilizers and other chemicals to treat the fields. Mitigation identified in the EIR identified avoidance of the creek and wetland habitat, protection measures and monitoring during construction, use of bioswales to filter runoff and integrated pest management strategies. The revised project includes reduced active park area, so reduced turf to manage, expands buffer between creek from 40 feet to 60 feet along the northern edge and use of bioswales to filter the runoff.

The project objectives for the East FRP were read into the record. The alternatives identified in the draft EIR were no project, a reduced project alternative A and B. Since that time a revised project was developed which mitigated further all possible impacts and reduces other identified impacts in the EIR.

As a result of that, the revised project is identified as the environmentally superior alternative; for the reasons that it eliminates the community center and hard courts, reduces overall park turf by 49%, reduces field use to four games, does not require potable water source, identifies a feasible non-potable water source, expands the buffer between the use and Santa Rosa Creek, and it significantly reduces adverse impacts identified in the draft EIR, including noise and water supply.

Public Comment:

Mahala Burton, Cambria. Read notes commenting on soccer fields as a narrow target user group and recreation survey and opposed design. Need a plan for all age groups, current design is top-heavy for soccer fields. Place burden on school to provide playing fields and suggested selling old grammar school to CCSD for offices and fund new school fields.

Steve Kniffen, Chair, PROS. Rolled out 103-foot long petition signed by 66 people who support the park. Commented on funds received from County for a Community Park. Need play spots for the kids that include grass. Lights, sound, bathrooms, parking, not as pressing as need for a flat place to play in grass. Supports the revised plan and can raise money with an approved plan.

Tim Roche, Chairman, Dog Park. To his knowledge has had no input into the plan and expressed appreciation for the opportunity today. Having a circular dog park doesn't work, usually they are rectangular, long and partitioned. Dog Park uses a lot of potable water and athletic fields need drinking water. Please call on him to provide input.

Stan Balcombe, Cambria. Commented on process of how we handle projects in the community. This project has been going on for eight years but has not seen what is expected to be buildout cost for capital improvement and ongoing operation of the Park and seems like time to have estimate with all the work that has gone into it.

Elizabeth Bettenhausen, Cambria. She is a soccer fan and loves softball. Commented on active recreational center and is having a hard time sorting out the revised proposal. The attainment of soccer fields is at the cost of the main objective, a regional recreation park. Which projects in this plan will have additional EIR work done on them?

Chris Adams, CUSD Superintendent, Cambria. Appreciates how difficult it is to get a plan to unfold and how difficult it is to get field space. As Superintendent feels the school fields should be available to the public when not used by school. Water is a problem for CUSD as well. CUSD wants to partner with CCSD to work in these areas and supports more fields. Offered to help with fields, provide water with water truck, and will continue to support having more fields and has participated in PROS meetings.

Jo Ellen Butler, Friends of Fiscalini Ranch Preserve, Cambria. Commented on Final FRP Master EIR team response to all comments on FRP EIR, mitigation efforts, and alternatives. Applauded finding that confined parking on the Ranch to the community park, the Hwy 1 staging area, and the ADA parking area at North Windsor is the only alternative to preserve the aesthetic quality of the Ranch and will provide environmental protection of seasonal wetlands, sea bluffs and coastal prairie. Opposed to any parking on the Ranch other than these areas. Supports Park Plan of August 2009, as well as revisions for West portion of the Ranch. Expressed concerns in letter provided to Board; aesthetic impact of a water tank. Hwy 1 parking (staging area) possible lighting and requested AES Mitigation Measure 11 added to that parking lot. FFRP supports adoption of Resolutions 50-2009 and 54-2009 and reserved right to oppose the sufficiency of this EIR for any such approval.

Sharon Budge, Cambria. Expressed appreciation for downsize and mitigation efforts. Mitigation is not the same as having a lot less impacts to start with. Document says revised community park plan, realizes County provided money for active recreation, but does not see requirement for league play. Cambria cannot absorb traffic impacts on Burton Drive and reserved for eight Saturdays in the fall. Respects everyone's views, no funding for what is being recommended. Opposed to acceptance of EIR. Supports park; dog park and trails for walking and running, small rustic picnic area. No restrooms, no

playgrounds. Moral obligation to reserve as much open space as possible, not sure how to reconcile with County's active recreation.

Steve Figler, Cambria. In favor of parks and recreation programs and very much in favor of this park. He was a PROS member (with strong background in Parks and Recreation) and was involved with original design of park to make it the best park possible. Expressed concern over design of park related to relatively large parking off Burton Drive that may be an unsafe situation. Suggested a stop sign or traffic light and requested an addendum to the traffic report. Until that happens, as much as he is in favor and hours he participated in, he cannot be in favor of it.

Jeff Hellman, Cambria. Is it mandated that the town has to have a park and was this some kind of a deal that it was either a park or 250 houses? A park such as the one proposed, emphasizing soccer, will attract youth from other areas here and Cambria will see an increase in crime by bringing people in from the outside. Create noise, traffic. The BRP limits growth and the park brings in traffic, all kinds of people. If vote taken believes 85% town would be against having this park as it has been presented. It is not really for the people in this town; orient it to those who live here. Encouraged Board to vote against.

Jerry McKinnon, Cambria. Commented on park's shape resembling an elephant. Do we need it? Thanked superintendent of schools. We have athletic fields at three different schools. We have horseshoes, basketball courts. Who will pay for it? Property taxes? Grants have been reduced. Somebody has to mow, truck the water down, and who cleans up after that elephant? Commented on Rodeo Grounds and Burton Drive junction. How about selling land back to the County?

Jim Webb, Pine Knolls resident, Cambria. He wrote a lot of comments on draft EIR and only fair to say that many of the concerns he noted with draft EIR were addressed. It's a scaled down proposal and much less of an impact than the original. Offered consideration of common sense, this park proposal is in a flood plain and poses a danger if in the plain. Fundamental problem with adding five acres, one foot deep of fill to make playing field. On a flood plain, that material will become portable in a flood event. Bioswale is fancy for a levee with bio on it and will not stop a flood. The top soil would be taken down stream to the mouth of Santa Rosa Creek, where proposed intakes for desal plant are going to be and deposit it there. Bad for steelhead that live in the creek, raises the level of the lagoon, makes lagoon water get warmer quicker. It exposes the young fish to predation and is not addressed in the revised plan. That being said, believes it was a masterful revision.

President Sanders requested the consultants, Shawna Scott and David Foote respond to questions raised during public comment and those the Board member have.

Why so many soccer fields, why not other recreation fields?

David Foote responded there's always a danger in a CEQA document that requires one to look at the worst case scenario for all the analysis. Important to note what has been created is an open field with a backstop that can be striped for softball, football, bocce ball, could be striped for any field sport. The number of four youth soccer games was arrived at by PROS via their connections with youth sports people in the community, to get to what's the minimum turf? Erroneous to characterize five acres of turf for a local youth league as a tournament, not being designed as a tournament venue. Four youth games did generate the size of the parking lot. If that were lowered you would have a smaller parking lot. The turf area is multi-purpose.

Dog Park is depicted as circular on the plan and is smaller than the existing Dog Park on Main Street. Tammy Rudock met with Joyce Heller on site location. The area was given .6 acres with size at least what it is now and she liked that area.

In terms of moving forward from an EIR point of view, does it make a difference whether it's .6 or .8 does it make a difference? David Foote responded. No, it would not change the trip generation. A specific configuration or size is not locked in concrete.

Is not having potable water a mistake? President Sanders responded if we had potable water certain we would provide potable water to the Park, but we don't. That's the problem we have in this community right now. Perhaps, when we have an alternate water source that allows us to lift the building moratorium, we have a sufficient amount of potable water, at that point we could extend potable water to the park and have the kind of potable water facilities there; like bathrooms with flushed toilets, drinking fountains, and an irrigation system.

Is there any legal requirement where we have this kind of a facility and bring the public onto it for us to provide potable water? David Foote was not aware of any. Counsel David Hirsch stated that he's not aware of any legal requirement, but would check further.

What was process used on this project from several years ago to today? David Foote was on a consultant team in 2001-2002 to do the County Parks and Recreation Element and remembers workshops around the County and people prioritized the kinds of things they want. It ended up there was about equal desire for active facilities and passive facilities (trails, etc.).

As a result, the County went forward and adopted policies, priorities, goals for parks in the County and very closely after that the whole Fiscalini Ranch came up. The County had a framework already anticipating that Cambria had certain expressed needs for certain kinds of facilities.

Some people have questioned where did this come from? How did the County come on board, why did they do it? Part of it was because they had done their Parks and Recreation Element, got input from the community and arrived at a certain place, and then they had assumptions about what was needed.

Connie Davidson: Before 2001 County contributed to the purchase of the East Ranch property. The Management Plan, the Community Park concept plan was developed after several public workshops, held here, with different organizations and people who wrote down on butcher block paper some of the needs/desires of the community. All the details are on file to at least two major workshops, collected data and hired RRM Design to design park concept based on that. It went on hold due to lack of funding to move forward in the environmental area. County came forward (six years of good relationship) and asked CCSD what are your priorities? PROS regularly prioritized this Park as the number one thing. PROS meetings are public with posted agendas and on CCSD website. The Park has been directed at the needs of the community. She reviewed EIR process and responsiveness to comments received.

Assuming EIR is approved, what is the next step envisioned? Tammy Rudock responded Steve Kniffen is the voice of the community to try and get funding. It would come back with reasonable funding and Board would have to approve to move forward with a plan of design.

President Sanders added project specific would require going through the process again, with an Initial Study to determine probability of environmental impacts associated. If not addressed in Master EIR, would have to do further analysis that might take the form of a mitigated negative declaration or subsequent EIR. This is the beginning of the process.

Where is the money going to come from to build this Park? And who is going to pay for its operation? Based on current state of finances CCSD on its own could not afford to build this Park. There may be private money in the community that could be raised to build some of the facilities. There are Little Leagues that are completely self-sufficient.

Parking on Hwy 1, AES Measure Mitigation #11 lights on at dusk and off at dark. Any comments from consultants? Shawna Scott, imagines there is no lighting planned for that area, but could apply the same Measure.

Traffic constraint issue at Burton and Rodeo Drive; would a stop sign be appropriate? Shawna responded the intersection was studied specifically by traffic engineer as part of the EIR and a warrant for stop sign was not recommended for any reason; level of service or safety.

Has any analysis or consideration been given to Park being in a flood plain and the consequences of that? David Foote responded it is not uncommon to have recreational facilities in flood plains that could flood periodically. The critical time is when the site is graded and nothing growing. That could be a catastrophic siltation event. It is entirely manageable with diligence to get past that window. No heightened risk being in flood plain. Parking is going to be like the current County road yard in terms of operation and surfacing.

Concern with League play at soccer fields and having teams come from out of town. President Sanders responded that there are not enough leagues here to draw that kind of activity. As a parent of a child who grew up in Cambria, there are a significant number of young people in town; there is a serious lack of recreation facilities. This is an attempt to take a step in the right direction and start filling the gap that exists with respect to recreation facilities.

Director Clift initiated further Board discussion regarding mitigation measures in EIRs or finding determinations that override the issue. Shawna confirmed if mitigation measures cannot be mitigated to less than significant, the lead agency is required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations in order to approve the project. Are mitigation measures actually supposed to work? Shawna responded yes. David Foote added the law requires a mitigation measure monitoring plan.

In the area of parking some of the mitigation measures recommend no parking on the Ranch tie our hands forever and mitigation measures are questionable. In the terms of noise, management plan says no amplified sound, but simply denying any use of certain things such as parking on the Ranch or no amplified sound are very definitive statements that tie our hands in the future. There are some things on signage that are not clear whether lead agency or FFRP decides what signage could be available. In the report, very sensitive to the neighborhoods around the Community Park, very definitive changes to Plan to mitigate neighbors around the Park, but no concessions about the neighbors at the trailheads in terms of parking and traffic in their neighborhood. There's a lack of consistency in how measures are applied.

Was there something different from the Draft EIR and the Final EIR that gave you a new idea, such as management plan, and then changed mitigation from what would seem to be reasonable mitigation to protect the sensitive habitat around any potential parking to a very flat statement to no parking on the Ranch? Tammy Rudock responded starting back at the discussions of the East West Ranch Management Plan being the document that was reviewed and looking at parking on the Ranch during recent Director tours. Parking was described as going on the South end right inside the entrance way (the trailhead), right on the bluff, up next to homes. Went back to Management Plan to determine if this was an area that was described as an area for parking and it's not. It's not consistent with the East West Ranch Management Plan.

How many parking spaces are we talking about? About four spaces. Is there not some difficulty with County Public Works over the striping of the spaces? There was and that striping is all gone. There is no dedicated parking at that location. Page 248 references future parking demand, recognizing a parking demand. There are multiple entries where parking could be put and cannot constrict parking at this stage of the EIR. Where is mitigation for people who live there? Same with amplification, you don't need A if you have B. Then B controls how noisy the situation gets. Under that authority the County shall contribute a total capital outlay of \$500,000 toward acquiring a Community Park at the East West Ranch site. Should the CCSD fail to successfully acquire the East West Ranch or be able to provide approximately 50 acre community park site, resulting from said acquisition, the CCSD shall return all County funds. While funds are not available now, it is not the desire to restrict the footprint to the reduced park size. Requests designation of open space is changed. Everything will be reviewed, why would we constrict ourselves to the most restrictive use of what is intended to be a community park?

Parking at Windsor poses a safety hazard when cars parked there, a fire truck could not make the turn. Staff says Resource Management Plan directed you to change the parking. There is only one place in the Resource Management Plan that says no parking on the West Ranch and that's only (no automobiles) under the definition motor vehicles and it says, "motor vehicles operated by the public will be restricted to the access and designated parking areas and all vehicles used on the proper Ranch will be either emergency vehicles, park, personnel, or construction things." The Vision Statement of the Management Ranch says public access and Resource Management Plan for the Ranch will ensure the public access is maintained in balance with minimum disturbance to, and protection of, sensitive natural habitats and unique scenic and cultural resources. Sensitive nature and proper access are stated here. The Draft EIR

addressed all issues wonderfully and this revised plan has eliminated all of that, and inserted the words “no parking.” The mitigation is now “ride your bike” or “go somewhere else to park,” “park at Cambria Drive and Hwy 1.” The Trolley doesn’t go to the South Windsor Blvd location, it goes close to North Windsor, does not go to Huntington. The trolley now runs Friday, Saturday, and Sunday only. Bluff Trail is most commonly used. There is a significant traffic and parking problem and mitigations do not meet the challenges. Needs to include flexibility for the future.

Shawna Scott stated the EIR is an informational document for the CCSD to use to make decisions and good points were brought up. The findings are the Board’s to modify and make a vote on how the Board would like to modify those. Any changes are at the Board’s discretion.

The next issue discussed was noise. There is a County noise ordinance to abide by that is sufficient to deal with noise. The County noise ordinance has an exemption for parks, could incorporate the County noise standards as a mitigation measure into the EIR.

Mitigation measure regarding changing tractor for mowing to electric lawn mower is impractical and should be eliminated.

The substantive issues are West Ranch parking, noise (amplified sound), and potential future implications of labeling East Ranch area as “Open Meadow.” For parking, return to language in the Draft EIR, noise issue take out A. David Foote commented on whether this would change impacts to Class I versus Class II and how do they analyze that? If Class I findings of overriding considerations need to be made, which have been prepared for that one proposal, but they need to see where they are at in that regard. The concern is environmental impacts of parking on site that have not been measured and dealt with in this EIR, same for the noise issue. In deliberating on the approval it is important that the certification is defensible.

A break was taken for consultants to meet with counsel and staff regarding noise (amplified sound), West Ranch parking, and designation of large part of Community Park being designated as “Open Meadow” to some other designation. After consulting it was requested by staff and counsel to delay this decision to November 16 to have opportunity to work on that. With regard to open meadow reference, would the term future active recreation be acceptable? Board agreed it would. **President Sanders with Board consensus continued this matter to November 16.**

10. Public Comment

Elizabeth Bettenhausen, Cambria. Thank you for clarifying when public comment is appropriate on elements within the General Manager’s report. Requested copies of District Engineers slides shown today. Pleased with receipt of Army Corps Engineers first quarter report and held comments for a later date.

11. Adjourn President Sanders adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m. to closed session, 1316 Tamson Drive, Suite 204.