1 MUIR BEACH COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT 2 Minutes of the Board of Directors' meeting held on 3 Wednesday, June 24, 2020 4 5 OFFICIAL MINUTES ONLY UPON APPROVAL 6 7 Prior to approval of these minutes by the Board of Directors in a public meeting, these 8 minutes are draft only and subject to change. Upon approval by the Board, these 9 minutes become the Official Minutes of the meeting. 10 11 12 **Item 1: Closed Session** 13 14 No closed session was held. 15 16 17 Item 2: Call to Order 18 19 Leighton Hills called the meeting of the Muir Beach Community Services District Board 20 of Directors to order at approximately 7:10 pm. 21 22 Gary Friedman, Victoria Hamilton-Rivers, Leighton Hills, Directors present: 23 Peter Lambert, Steve Shaffer 24 25 Staff present: Mary Halley, District Manager Chris Gove, Fire Chief 26 27 Ernst Karel, Meeting Secretary 28 29 30 **Item 3: Reconvene in Open Session** 31 32 Because no closed session was held, the meeting was called to order in open session. 33 34 35 Item 4: Approval of Agenda 36 37 38 MOTION: To approve the agenda 39 Moved: Hamilton-Rivers, seconded by Friedman 40 Vote: AYES: Unanimous 41 42 43 <u>Item 5: Consent Calendar</u> 44 45 Item(s) not included in this agenda: None

46

MOTION: To approve the consent calendar Moved: Shaffer, seconded by Hamilton-Rivers

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

Item 6: Items Removed from Consent Calendar

No items removed.

<u>Item 7: Possible Lease of Portion of Lower Water Tank Property to Adjacent Neighbor</u>

Discuss for possible approval, preparation by a real estate attorney of a draft lease for a portion of the lower water tank water system property owned by the CSD adjacent to 66 Starbuck, that has been encroached on with two parking spaces and an area used for landscaping, to be detailed in the draft lease. Terms and conditions to be considered could be either annual renewing or a 5-year renewing lease with 3% annual rent adjustment, and all other relevant provisions. Notwithstanding, the 1-year or 5-year lease term would reserve the right to cancel early if that area became needed for any CSD or water system purpose. Note that this parcel is neither park land nor easement property, rather a parcel owned fee simple by the District to house its lower water storage tank.

Hamilton-Rivers worries that this is cart-before-horse given that we have just appointed a committee to address such issues, and that the issue seems to be forced by the fact that Greg Kidd wants to pave the driveway. The issue is clarified that it is part of the CSD's property that he wants to pave. Hamilton-Rivers feels, and Shaffer concurs, that we have no need to protect the time and money of Kidd in this scenario, that instead the issue needs due consideration. Shaffer notes that we need to have Starbuck repaved ASAP, and the board agrees that he will need to get the road paved within 2-3 weeks. Friedman understood that we are requiring that the area be engineered. Halley says that there were basic drawings submitted, and that it is ready to be paved.

Direct neighbor Paul Jeschke says that the project has changed repeatedly, and that it probably should be looked at by an engineer. Kidd has taken out a storm drain, so drainage could be a real problem when the rains come. The storm drain needs to be addressed, and the road needs to be repaved. Halley reports on the status of the storm drain. While the work was being done, he offered to have the water go down to Seacape, and Halley recommended it follow the water line, which was then sketched out, and then abandoned. She suggests the CSD resolve that issue more formally. Hills suggests we ask Kidd to follow the original plan to take it to Seacape, and if he doesn't, then we would call our geotechnical engineer to engineer what happens with the water. Shaffer suggests that Halley sends Kidd a letter saying that we want the paving taken care of by July 15 and follow through with a conversation with the commitment to take the drainage down to Seacape. The request includes that he remove the new curb

framing on CSD property as well. After July 15, the district will pave it and send him the bill. Lambert concurs that such a deadline is reasonable and concurs also with Hamilton-Rivers that it's good to postpone this rather than put the cart before the horse.

Item 8: 341 Sunset Way Fence Proposal

The property owners at 341 Sunset Way would like to present their proposal for the replacement of a previously existing fence needed for safety and privacy concerns.

Linda Lotriet reads a written statement, which is copied here:

Dear CSD Board and Community members:

Now that the project is completed at the turnaround by our house at end of Sunset, we have to solve privacy and security needs. At this moment, we understand there are four facts about matter.

18 19

First, historically there was a wire fence with greenery growing in it for, we've been told, 40-50 years at that location. It provided privacy and security for Janet Stump's family and a backdrop for her gardening. We saw parts of her magical garden and only glimpses of a house behind the greenery.

22 23

Second, two legal opinions, including one by an independent attorney hired by the CSD, and one by our land-use lawyer say that as long as what we put up does not interfere with the express stated purpose of the easement, the CSD or the actual owners of the easement which are the original Bello Beach subdivision owners have no right to make demands about it or anything in the unused portion of the easement.

Third, it is said that the CSD has a "policy" that things like gardens, fences, garages, structures or sheds that are currently on unused parts of easements are "grandfathered," but that new, man-made structures are discouraged or not allowed. Actually, there are no such policies that were formally adopted anywhere on the CSD website. And only if they were passed by the Board and appear on the website do they actually "exist. The CSD has recently acknowledged that the lack of formal policies that are clear, consistent, fair and even legal is a priority and have begun the process to address treatment of the easements.

Finally, then let us summarize the impact of this project on our available options to provide privacy screening and security - two factors which face every Muir Beach homeowner. The project has left us with limited options to accomplish feasible privacy screening and safety. The road is now closer to the house and has been elevated by about 6 feet in the area closest to our home. That means for example, if any privacy screening is placed even a few inches on the house side of the road / wall, the height of the wall that the road rests on means a normal 6-foot fence won't even reach the level of the grade of the new road. Viewing from the road, it is all open with a small curb. On our side, the view is of a rough, industrial wall with protruding bolts, with the road looming down on the house and yard area. The contractors left a series of bolts on our side in the cement wall for the purpose of installing posts that could hold a guardrail and privacy screening.

As of yesterday afternoon – and even before that -- there is an urgent need to erect something in that space. The danger it poses to pedestrians, and especially children, is high. The contractor "formally" moved out of the area last night. The road is now elevated to its final height, and there is nothing to indicate there is a dangerous drop on the other side of a low 9" curb. I have requested Cuco to be on standby for Thursday. And as the contractor provided, Cuco will use the bolts that the contractor installed for this purpose.

50

Thank you for the time to provide this explanation.

52

Hamilton-Rivers reports that the CSD has also received legal advice that concurs that 1 2 Lotriet is able to build whatever fence they feel is appropriate, and that 3 Halley says that right now there are the bolts that line the wall, which were put in for 4 some kind of guard rail structure, and understands that they want it to be a 6' fence from 5 the roadside. Discussion continues about the nature of the proposed fence (a combination of light and opaque, but as open as possible in other areas, but something 6 7 aesthetically nice that people would like), and issues of safety and liability that arise 8 from the new height of the roadway and the steepness of the cliff down to the beach. Sandmann has said that they have a right to have a fence there, and in addition Halley 9 10 feels that it would be good to have community support. Halley further feels that this is not an issue for the new easement/roadway committee. Hills feels that the CSD should 11 be the ones building the fence on the CSD's wall, and that several months ago Lotriet 12 was offered the option to pick what the guardrail/fence would be, which was specified by 13 the engineers at 42". He is concerned that the proposal is to extend the fence into 14 Dusty's Path, and that is the kind of thing for the committee to consider. Halley agrees 15 16 that Dusty's Path is a pedestrian easement and that we definitely don't want anything to 17 block that path; also the Fire Department has said that they want 3' distance from the 18 hydrant. Lotriet and Lambert have honored that, and so a drawing/sketch/plan is called 19 for. Lotriet responds that the plans do take into account the 3' for the hydrant, and that 20 there had been a fence for decades along Dusty's Path, but that was partially taken down by the CSD even though Sandman had said that the CSD only had the right to 21 22 take down a fence as needed for the construction, so this shouldn't have been taken 23 down. She suggests that going to the county for permitting could invite review of every aspect of the road project, which has created several problems for their property, and 24 25 that permitting authorities would take into consideration all of these. They felt that the 26 CSD required more permits than they actually had gotten, and so there is the possibility 27 that the whole thing could be reopened for evaluation of the process.

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

Beth Nelson, who also lives on that side of Sunset, concurs that there are big privacy issues there, having seen people crawl up the cliff to their house, and so on. In her professional work dealing with easements elsewhere, she feels that surveys and lawyers are what's required here. Hamilton-Rivers gets why they want a fence up there, and does not want to hold them up. The only thing that concerns her is going beyond county rules for nonpermitted fences. Would a compromise be that it could be 6' from the surface of the road itself? Shaffer feels that we at least need to know if such a fence would require a permit from the county. Discussion continues around how the proposal relates to permitting issues, safety concerns, and so on.

373839

40

41

42

Lotriet emphasizes that it's a current danger, that children have been running on the wall and could fall. Shaffer repeats that he's just talking about asking anonymously whether it's allowed. Friedman says that the CSD could approve the plan but only contingent on whether the county would confirm it's lawful. Hamilton-Rivers agrees and wants them to be able to proceed if the planning office approves in theory.

43 44 45

46

Halley asks if it would be okay with Lotriet and Lambert to leave the fence along Dusty's Path for later. Lotriet says the fence has been replaced that the fence was taken down

without their permission and against the advice of the CSD's own lawyer. She goes into other aspects of the history of problems the CSD has caused for them at that site. Friedman apologizes to Lotriet for those problems, and asks if the two aspects can be separated, that the fence along the roadway proceed, and a temporary fence be put along Dusty's Path. Lotriet says that there was a fence there historically, and much of it is still there. Discussion continues along these lines.

1 2

Chris Gove says that the proposed fence will be no problem with the county. Gove adds that the CSD should not be involved with the aesthetics of people's fences.

MOTION: To approve the fence to be 6' above the level of the pavement, per

the drawing Lotriet showed, physically connected to the back of the

wall, subject to confirmation with the county.

Moved: Friedman, seconded by Shaffer

Vote: AYES: Unanimous, but for abstention by Lambert

<u>Item 9: Committee to Develop Policies for CSD Management of Lands and Easements (preliminary update)</u>

Committee Chair Mary Halley announces the formation of the committee:

Committee Goal: to research and develop a MBCSD Land and Easement Management Policy.

Committee Members:

Mary Halley (MBCSD DM and Committee Chair)

Victoria Hamilton-Rivers (MBCSD Board member)

Leighton Hills (MBCSD Board Member)

Christian Riehl (MBag) David Taylor (MBVFD)

Kasey Corbit (MB resident with legal background in easements)

The question is whether the Board should define and approve a legal expense budget for this committee. Hills says that early on there was an allotment of \$2500 for this effort; Halley had understood there was a \$2000 allocation for legal fees. Although this had been previously approved, there is a confirmation with an additional vote.

MOTION: That the board consider a budget for the Lands and Easement

Management committee that has a legal budget of \$2500 maximum

Moved: Hamilton-Rivers, seconded by Shaffer

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

<u>Item 10: District Manager Report</u>

 Halley goes over the highlights from her 6/24/20 District Manager Report, a written document which (as always) is included with the monthly meeting packet available online at http://www.muirbeachcsd.com/meetings.

1 2

Additionally, Halley found out today that the Muir Beach CSD was approved for a Per Capita Grant from the state, for recreation projects, for \$177,952.

Cuco has asked for a few pieces of the redwood from the old upper tank, not the nicely stacked wood but the other less prime wood. The board says that's fine.

Item 11: FY20-21 Draft-Budget

The second reading of the proposed FY20-21 Draft-Budget will be presented by the District Manager for further discussion and preliminary approval. (See FY20-21 Draft-Budget attached) Approval of the Final FY20-21 Budget to be held on July 22, 2020.

MOTION: To grant a preliminary approval for the Draft-Budget

Moved: Shaffer, seconded by Hamilton-Rivers

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

District Public Service Announcement: Board Elections November 3, 2020

The filing period for those wanting to run for the November 3, 2020 Board elections begins July 13th thru August 7th. Two positions are ending, those of Hamilton-Rivers and Friedman. If incumbents do not file by the 7th the period extends to the 12th for everyone other than incumbents.

Hamilton-Rivers announces that she will be stepping down from the board and is grateful for the support and confidence of the community. She would like to encourage anyone who might consider it to run, as it is hugely rewarding to be of service to the community. She personally has learned a great deal about governance, about herself, and about the community, and in addition has become comfortable with public speaking.

Beth Nelson thanks Hamilton-Rivers for her very measured and valuable contributions, which is echoed by Laurie Piel. Paul Jeschke would like to see Hamilton-Rivers continue, but if she does not, then the board should publicize the election, the details of which should be published on the CSD website, Nextdoor, and Piel's newsletter.

Item 12: Public Open Time

Gary Friedman reads a statement about BLACK LIVES MATTER and encourages people to participate in this crucially important movement.

1	
2	Halley thanks Hills and Gove and Cuco and Karel for responding to the water main
3	break when a car went into the creek on a Friday night.
4	
5	Gove announces that Tuesday September 8 will be a big chipper day for the
6	community.
7	
8	Shaffer asks about whether the driver has been identified; Halley is making progress,
9	has the insurance information, and we will be making a claim. Shaffer thinks we should
10	add \$4500 to reimburse the nine people \$500 for the inconvenience they faced for
11	going days without water.
12	
13	K 40 D K 0 D 1 M 1 K
14	<u>Item 18: Recognitions & Board Member Items</u>
15	Chaffey also them by a very an a vide year and add to the victor reading hypothesis
16	Shaffer also thanks everyone who responded to the water main break.
17 18	Next meeting is scheduled for July 22.
19	Next meeting is scheduled for July 22.
20	
21	Item 19: Adjournment
22	ichi 13. Adjodriment
23	There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting is adjourned.
24	e.e being he raine. basiness to seme before the beard, the meeting is adjustified.
25	Meeting adjourned at 9:11 pm.