

Sunset Way Report 12/7/2016

Further to the work of the Sunset Way Ad Hoc Committee earlier in the year, the report from CSW Engineering assessing the condition of our existing water system and Peter Sandman's legal assessment of CSD road easements pertaining to Sunset Way, (both documents are available for public viewing) Matt Silva and I, (as new Co Chairs for Sunset) have met three times now since the last Board Meeting, to pick up where the Committee left off with the intention of short listing the tasks ahead in order to get this project rolling again.

In light of the information that has now been gathered (including the scary price that Ghilotti has given us as an initial estimate for this work) it is perhaps clear to us all, that we are somewhat out of our depth financially with regard to this project and the ILS plans as they stand!

That said, we clearly need to replace our water line as promptly as possible as it is nearing its 40-year estimated life and we need a comprehensive plan in order to obtain bids and carry out any proposed work. At the same time, we also need to widen our existing road to facilitate safe transit for our fire department and emergency response. A minimum of 11 feet (or more) is required for the entire length of Sunset, plus a 2-3 feet area for swales and at least 7 feet for parked cars along the road side i.e. 13-14 feet width where there are no parked cars if swales are involved and 20-21 feet if parked cars are to be considered in measurements.

It probably goes without saying, but in order to contemplate this project, we recommend to the Board the following:

- **Reduce the scope of this project:** we need to rein back our existing ILS plans and focus in on what is only essential in this regard.
- **Deal with existing pinch points:** gain a spirit of co-operation among the community to tackle pinch points along the road where vegetation and parking encroaches upon the existing road easement and get these matters resolved ahead of time with the home owners concerned.
- **Raise funds:** get enterprising about how we can best raise the necessary funding to complete this project as soon as possible.

Again it probably goes without saying but should our water system begin to fail if this project continues to be postponed, our water supply for residents on Sunset, our safety and our water consumption limits, could all become compromised. Our recommendation to the Board is therefore that in terms of financial investment, Sunset Way water and road, should be our top priority at this time with a view to district funding and in order to accomplish this project no later than 2018.

We recommend to the Board that the new Grants Ad Hoc Committee be encouraged, as a matter of priority, to move on researching any available county or federal funding for such a venture and bring that report back to the Board for prompt action.

If grant money is not available or doesn't cover the costs adequately (which we suspect may be the case,) we need to get real about raising additional funds and getting an accurate price for the work that needs to be done.

We recommend to the Board that the following consideration be given to alternative fund raising and with fairly immediate effect and draw some conclusions as to whether we:

- Increase the capital improvement fee for a fixed period and if so by how much?
- Best borrowing options from financial institutions and if so at what rates, given they're changing all the time?
- VFA contribution – as Sunset Way water supply and roads have considerable impact on the MBVFD, is it appropriate that the VFA be approached for funding ideas?

Reining back plans: After much discussion with the Ad Hoc Committee as a whole and a further field study last weekend, Matt and I recommend to the Board that this project be dealt with in one go to reduce costs and limit disruption to Sunset residents and beach access generally. Whatever we plan should be considered in conjunction with the timing of whatever the NPS are planning for Franks Valley Road, Muir woods trails etc. – see latest MBAG report on this subject attached to GM's report December 2016.

Having said that this project should be tackled in one go though, we recommend that any additional work such as Warren/Case retaining wall (if required) be dealt with with the homeowners directly and immediately, along with that area of Sunset around #161, #170 and #175 where the road is slumping and tight, which arguably could hold up the project once it's underway if it's not remedied in part, beforehand. We also recommend that with the exception of that retaining wall (if indeed any reconstruction is necessary given the latest engineers report on the subject,) no further expense is incurred in large engineered walls along Sunset. Berms (as currently exist and are positioned along the road) or concrete replacement curbing, should suffice where road edges need defining.

The existing rock wall application along Sunset, i.e. dry stacked stone, could be extended at the end of Sunset along with adequate grading and slope to ensure this turning area is safe and works for emergency use.

We recommend to the Board that the entrance to Sunset Way stays as it is, that the top of Cove culvert is not widened and stays as is, that Cove Lane is off the plans at this point with the exception of a junction water hook up at the top for later connection and that the end of Sunset turnaround be limited to extending approximately 3 feet in either direction of #330 and #341. Grading in this area should take care of the rest of those turning issues for fire trucks or larger vehicles. We further recommend that with Board

approval, these changes be made to the existing ILS plans without delay, so we can arrive at a set of plans that is more modest in approach and can be put out to tender with at least 3 companies for firmer bids. We need an accurate \$ figure to aim for and we don't currently have one. Do we have Board permission to work with Bill on these plans with immediate effect and get them back to ILS (or whoever) for revision?

Parking: It is clear that a certain number of parking issues on Sunset already exist for residents without even taking into account any obligation we may have for beach parking as a result of receiving FEMA funds in the past. This aspect needs to be addressed from a practical and legal stand point.

Matt and I see a way to create maybe 3 or 4 additional dedicated parking areas to what is existing but this will take further discussion with the home owners concerned to finalize. In any event, we still don't appear to have enough room on Sunset road side, to accommodate our parking needs as residents (or for guests/contractors of residents,) without compromising road width in certain areas, let alone facilitate parking for a broader and more general public use. The question of what constitutes "responsible parking" and "public beach access" and its additional related parking issues, therefore needs further attention and clarity to become workable. We need to be able to maintain clear passage for emergency vehicles 24/7 and accommodate those who reside here as our priority. Trash cans were also a noted issue on road encroachment in certain areas and we will need to develop some policy about this particularly at the end of Sunset where the road narrows to around 9ft and trash can locations reduce this width further.

We recommend to the Board that we adopt a white line approach along Sunset (and possibly in time, upper Pacific?) that clearly indicates road width and where parking is permitted. With the benefit of white lines, (as controversial as this may be) a clear indication that is universally understood, will be provided for parking without necessitating masses of signs and thus should be obvious to those using Sunset, for example, where parking is permitted and where it is not. We also aim to create a few areas along Sunset with the aid of white lines, where vehicles can pass and parking will not be permitted such as outside Click's property @ #140.

Drainage: The existing plans take into account storm drainage. There are a few areas that need further attention but for the most part, these are handled on ILS plans with the concrete swales proposed and underground storm pipes which connect into our existing infrastructure. We will review these areas one more time with Bill and report back with finalized plans.

Vegetation: We already have a Resolution on this subject generally that may need some work to bring it up to date. Generally speaking, with regard to Sunset Way where vegetation encroaches upon our road, it will need to be removed or cut back so it no longer presents problems. Many verges have naturally encroached upon road width as matters stand and some shrubbery also encroaches along Sunset Way. As road width

needs to be at least 11ft to help the ease of passage for fire trucks particularly, it also needs to be considered that it's not just the width of these vehicles we're concerned about. It's also the height. Matt and I therefore recommend to the Board that once these road widths are defined with white lines, whether vegetation encroaches should be measured by whether it clears the road edge at right angles i.e. if you draw a straight line up (vertical) from the road edge, no vegetation should enter that space as a rule of thumb. Where it currently does, it will either need to be kept trimmed back to that extent or removed entirely if that's not possible to ensure. Also, where shrubbery encroaches upon view easements along the road on the ocean side, we recommend to the Board that these shrubs be kept below eye level and not above, as is often the case. A list of pinch points and parking related issues has been compiled for the entire length of Sunset and the homeowners concerned will be contacted as directed by the Board.

Speeding: It would appear from the existing speed humps on the ILS plans that this matter has been addressed. We would recommend to the Board that a speed bump close to the entrance to Sunset be placed to set the pace and tone early on and that speed signage be double sided to encourage greater observation in both directions.

Signage: We haven't yet discussed this issue at any length apart from to recommend that white parking bay lines should help indicate to all, where cars can and must park within the dedicated lines, otherwise our problems will not be resolved. How, or by whom, these violations are policed is a whole other subject! Suffice it to say however, if we are to maintain the rural character of Sunset Way as much as possible, if white lines can do the job predominantly, we hope that we won't have to have signs all over the place up and down the road. We do however need to get clear on "resident only" parking signs and if they can be adopted and if so, to keep them uniform throughout Sunset so they look official enough but not the hodge podge that currently exists. Gerry Pearlman seems to have found some green signs that do the job well and may be considered for adopting community wide at the expense of the home owners concerned.

Dedicated off road parking for certain residents only: As we are all aware, there are certain curb-side spots that are claimed consistently by specific homes they abut and therefore this throws up the question as to how the costs of resurfacing these areas should be approached when they have ceased to be available for general use. We would be interested in Board feedback in this regard.

Cove Lane Beach Parking: This is a subject that is complex and needs to be discussed with the residents concerned. Matt and I recommend that this be handled by him and Gary by meeting with the residents most impacted and examining the facts collectively in order to arrive at an equitable solution. Signage at the top of Cove and the bottom (if deemed appropriate) should be in keeping with the rest of the community.

In addition to Sunset Way, many of the subjects we are currently considering as a CSD and community, have cross over both in terms of subject, funding and application if they

are to be handled efficiently and effectively. We therefore recommend to the Board that Ad Hoc Committees such as: Sunset, Grants, Water, Fire and Trails for example, are viewed as a whole by the Board and approached collaboratively. We also recommend that Bill be kept in the loop by the Chairs of each Committee, even if he is unable to attend meetings, so he has a clear view of the broader picture. None of these subjects are isolated concerns for this community and all of them feed into one another in one way or another. There is therefore no more important time than now, for us to pull together as a community and to be thinking as one.

The Board and Chairs of each committee are therefore responsible for ensuring that isolated decisions are not made, and that resources and community talents are pooled as much as possible. To this end I would personally recommend to the Board that only ONE Director be appointed to each Ad Hoc Committee to ensure that as required, a Board Member can be assigned to any particular discussion on an Ad Hoc at any given time, depending upon what's required. This way, it encourages a more INCLUSIVE approach to the subjects that challenge us all and avoids the potential for Brown Act violations or conflicts of interest. I'd also suggest that Ad Hoc Committees are listed on our web site with details of members and objectives. Does the Board accept this change with immediate effect?

Thank you.