

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO

Minutes of the Town Council Meeting of November 13, 1990

7:40 p.m.

Interviews with applicants to the Robson-Harrington House Association Board of Directors.

8:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Mayor Chignell convened the regular meeting with Councilmembers Colteaux, Kanis, Walsh and Zaharoff present.

2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

William DeBisschop, 91 Elm Avenue, said homes are being sold with substandard sidewalks and driveways, when property owners should be required to repair them. There is a sidewalk with a four inch crack on Scenic Avenue which is difficult for persons with disabilities, such as himself, to traverse. He said the Town shouldn't waste its money to repair streets if the sidewalks are not fixed.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, said she had obtained close to 600 signatures on a referendum petition regarding the salaries of the Town Administrator and Assistant Administrator, but the Town Clerk had refused to accept the petition based on the opinion of the Town Attorney that the petition was illegal. The petition was simply lodged at Town Hall. She said it was the same format as the previous referendums she had done, and that last year the appellate justices told the Town that ordinances and resolutions have the same weight of law. She said she believed that Town Clerk Foster represents the State of California and the voters of San Anselmo, and is not subject to the opinion of the Town Attorney. She said it was time for political action to have an elected Town Attorney or a recall.

Walsh said she was not happy with the way this was handled, and requested it be on the November 27 agenda.

3. CONSENT AGENDA.

- (a) Receive a portion of the minutes of October 23, 1990, for reference only.
- (b) Acknowledge and file warrants: Nos. 4341-4649, in the amount of \$490,380.12.
- (c) Announce expiration of terms, Board of Review.

M/s, Zaharoff/Kanis, to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

4. APPOINTMENT TO ROBSON-HARRINGTON HOUSE ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS. (1 seat)

M/S, Walsh/Zaharoff, to appoint Shirley Graves to a term to expire February 28, 1992. Motion passed unanimously.

5. RESOLUTION REGARDING THE APPEAL OF A USE PERMIT FOR ANTHONY HOUSE AND ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTARY CONDITIONS.

At the Council meeting of October 23, 1990, the Council directed the Town Attorney to prepare a resolution outlining the agreements as understood by Council, by representatives of Anthony House and by citizens concerned about the Anthony House. In addition, the Council requested that the Town Administrator work with representatives from the Anthony House and the neighborhood

to prepare the groundwork for the formation of a Neighborhood Council. Town Administrator Camuglia reported that two such meetings had taken place, and the resolution was prepared and reviewed by the neighbors and Anthony House.

John MacGregor, 18 Rosemont, asked whether the Town Council had reviewed the letter of November 12. He said the neighbors had thought that a consensus could be achieved. The neighbors feel keenly about having the responsibility of the Town Council being referred to them. They were concerned about lack of 24 hours accountability, which the neighbors feel is antithetical to the normal conduct of R1H, where all persons are accountable for what occurs on their premises. The group that met last Saturday are the immediate neighbors who are most impacted by the presence of this new facility. He said he expected that the letter will be part of the proceedings. The neighbors feel that the Anthony House issue is whether a private agency can coerce local government to abandon its laws, whether this Town Council has plans and policies to deal with issues of this type, and felt the Town had no policy to handle claimed exemptions. All of the disputes that occur within the Town is subject to the scrutiny of the Town Council or Planning Commission, however Anthony House is not subject to this scrutiny, which he did not believe was the intent of Congress. He asked what kind of oversight can be applied. In the future, any resident can benefit from municipal services without submission to locally enforced rules. Twenty-four hour supervision would only regulate against a corporate absentee landlord outside the community.

Jay Ciccotti, 27 Rosemont Avenue, said when he first got involved in this, he got angry because he felt his needs were not being addressed. He was angry at the women who were so eager to protect abused women, but who he said have been abusive and could not care less how the neighbors felt. Everybody is defending a legal position.

Faye O'Opel, Anthony House Board of Directors, said that they have tried to dialogue with the neighbors. She lived in San Anselmo 10 years, and owns a home in Marin. She said she has heard from many residents that they want equal protection. Anthony House does abide by the laws, and has no intent of not abiding by the laws of San Anselmo, the State of California, the United States of America, and moral laws. They are not absentee landlords, they have staff there every day, and will have staff there every day. There will be responsible adults on the premises 24 hours a day. If the neighbors have a concern, they can knock on the door. She said they do care about how residents feel, they do care about people feel next door. They have not had any problems in other homes. She said they believed in neighborhood councils. They understood that a 24 hour monitoring is of concern, and they are not entrenched against overnight security. If a problem comes up, they will directly address that situation. They appealed to the neighbors who bring forth their dissident opinion about the neighborhood Council. If the Council does not work out, the neighbors will have remedies include mediation, appeals to Town Council since there is a resolution, or a private lawsuit, but their hope is that it will never come to that.

Robert Stoddard, 444 The Alameda, an ex-psychiatric nurse, said this was the wrong location for Anthony House, close to an elementary school.

William Foti, 111 Butterfield Road, asked how this could be allowed if the General Plan has a limit of no more than 18 people per gross acre. Town Attorney Roth said he had been

advised that the density limit had never been enforced, and to enforce it in this case would be selective enforcement.

William DeBisschop, 91 Elm Avenue, said that if the Town Attorney does not want to use laws, why doesn't the Town throw them away.

Frank Treadway, 127 Butterfield Road, said he was interested in equal protection. The Town Council has an obligation to rule on the use permit. He said he looks to the Town Council to help enforce laws, and is looking to the Council as the government of the Town to take a stand on this issue. He said they can't ask people to voluntarily submit to conditions. He was concerned that up to 16 people were allowed and felt it should be reduced to the legal level of 13 people. The neighborhood council puts the burden on citizens to do the work of the Town. From the beginning the Town did not do its job, the Town has been biased towards them. Adjacent to a school is not the property location, and he questioned the police and fire security.

Mrs. Treadway, 127 Butterfield Road, expressed concern about the neighborhood council. She asked why have one if they cannot have 24 hour supervision. If there was 24 hour supervision, they could immediately square away any problems. She said the neighbors require certain things, nothing they have asked has been approved, the people who are most impacted by the project should be on the neighborhood council, and 24 hour security should be a number one priority.

Sarah Nome, 77 Alder Avenue, said the resolution does not jive with the materials in the minutes. She wanted to see the resolution clarified that residency was limited to 16 humans, and she thought they had guaranteed 24 hour supervision to the Police Chief. She said this property will go off the tax rolls, increasing the burden on R-1 homes. She said she did not see this institutional pressure put on Ross or Belvedere. The Town has many parcels removed for institutional use, she said. Anthony House should be closer to the Police Chief and the downtown. San Anselmo appears to be on the cutting edge of not even asking for a use permit.

Donna Garske, Anthony House, said the limit was 16 people total.

Nancy Rubin, resident of the neighborhood and a licensed clinical worker, said she remained concerned about the lack of 24 hour supervision.

Barbara MacGregor, 18 Rosemont Avenue, expressed concern about the ingress and egress to the parcel, parking along the easement will create problems for getting in and out, and will affect the immediate neighborhood.

Sally Weires, 136 Butterfield Road, said Anthony House borders on the creek, and would hope that the creek ordinance would apply to them. Roth said there was an ordinance prohibiting nuisances in the creek.

Norman Gover, 87 Butterfield Road, said no one could be more disturbed than he about the need for this facility. He said that when we try to readjust our society to address the imbalance of power problems, he realized there are going to be things asked of people. Neighbors are being asked to help solve a problem. These are women and children who live down the street and across town, there are human faces to this issue.

Norma Weires, 136 Butterfield Road, said they were not being asked, they were being told.

Mr. Foti said that he was asked to abide by laws, and he was asking the Council to abide by the same laws.

John MacGregor said, in response to the comment from Mr. Gover, that it was important for the neighborhood to help Anthony House, just as it was important for Anthony House to ask the neighborhood to participate with them. He said he believed that Ms. D'Opel was sincere that 24 hour supervision is negotiable, then there may be room for nourishing the neighborhood Council. He said the Town Administrator has been very able and skilled in her offices in offering her services, and is a very able administrator.

Darske said the meetings that took place with the Town and the neighbors were to set up process and structure, and it would be in the neighborhood forum that they would discuss specific issues such as 24 hour supervision. She said they have not had a need to have 24 supervision in other locations. It was consistent with their program to have residents taking care of each other. If problems do arise in the future, it will be up to the Board of Directors of Anthony House to address them.

Chignell asked whether there was any legal requirement to have a Fire Department survey. Public Works/Planning Director Kottage said they will include a fire department survey in the resale report.

Colteaux said he was very concerned on both sides of the issue. He said he wanted to establish an ordinance that will help the Town to address these issues in the future. Fortunately, he said, they had a group that is tendering their cooperation, and it is their promises which forms the basis of any action. He said the beginning of the neighborhood council process will not be smooth, but hopefully the council will avoid problems before they arise. Zaharoff has volunteered to be a part of that Council, and he felt the neighborhood is well protected.

Kanis said the applicants have demonstrated that they intend to be good citizens of the neighborhood and will go beyond what would be expected under a use permit. The answer the applicant gave on 24 hour supervision was reasonable, he said; they were prepared to address the issue of a 24 hour monitor if needed. He had initially raised the subject of 24 hour staffing, and he now felt that the security and safety of the community will follow.

Zaharoff said she hoped her colleagues would see fit to appoint her to the neighborhood council. She said she shared the neighbors' concerns about Brookside School; she had attended Brookside and her children will attend Brookside. She expressed that she also had an interest in the Anthony House neighborhood.

Walsh said that no one tells her what to do or what not to do, and one of the reasons she is on the Council is to exercise control in her town. The agreement came as a result of Anthony House and everyone here listening to concerns. Not all of the concerns will be known until they arise. If the concerns do occur, the mechanisms of the Anthony House and the Town will be there to address them. If the use becomes a fiasco, there is a nuisance abatement procedure to handle it.

Chignell commented that he had been a police officer for 21 years, during which time he had escorted many batterers to be arrested, and observed that Anthony House addresses a need that exists throughout the state. He also lived in

the neighborhood, was a 20 year resident of the community, and was distressed at some of the comments he had heard about exposing the location and that some of the neighbors will not participate in the neighborhood council. Neighborhood councils have worked in many communities in Marin. He had some concerns about overnight supervision, but would not hold up the process. If problems arise with overnight staffing, he trusted that they would be resolved. San Anselmo's ordinances and General Plan say the use must be permitted, and he had received 162 letters in support of the house, with 56 from the immediate neighborhood, and 25 letters in opposition. He said he trusted that the neighborhood will discover Anthony House to be a good neighbor.

M/S, Kanis/Walsh, to approve Resolution No. 3130 for the appeal of the Anthony House use permit, acceptance of voluntary conditions, with the first paragraph to read: Whereas, Anthony House representatives have agreed in writing that the management of Anthony House will voluntarily abide by the following conditions, and the Town Council has agreed to accept the compliance of said conditions." Motion passed unanimously.

Colteaux asked that the second unit assigned to this property be placed back into the second unit pool for the neighborhood. It was the consensus of the Council to place that issue on the next agenda.

Colteaux said he wanted a draft of a model ordinance very soon to provide as much protection to R-1 H zoning as possible in light of federal laws that affect the zoning. Roth said before preparing the ordinance, he would speak further with Colteaux on his intent.

M/S, Colteaux/Walsh, to appoint Councilmember Zaharoff to the neighborhood council. Motion passed unanimously.

6. APPEAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL OF VARIANCE V-2315 AND PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN PP-14, THE ALAMEDA RESIDENCES, FILED BY JAMES HELFRICH.

Planning consultant Jayni Barker presented the staff report summarizing the Town Council's previous action on the appeal and requests for further information, and the information contained in the staff report.

Kanis asked whether the geotechnical evaluations of (e) and (f), specifically the determination that site (f) was not feasible, is based on an actual study of site (f), or is it based on other similar studies. Barker stated that subsurface investigations were not made on the building locations, but on adjacent sites.

Gary van Honken, engineer, said they had done a boring in adjacent locations of less than a few feet away. If the access was going to be from certain sides, they would have to have ten to fifteen foot high retaining walls. Other sites were more geotechnically feasible.

Jan Backforth, 349 The Alameda, said every Planning Commissioner at the first meeting felt that (f) was not to be considered a site. At the next Planning Commission meeting, there was a change of Commissioners in attendance, and the sites were changed to (a), (b), (c) and (e). Many people who spoke last time spoke in favor of (d). Site (f) would destroy 100 trees. She supported (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Alix Thayer, read a letter she submitted from she and Stephen Thayer, urging the Council to vote against the variance. She said that three of the proposed estates

would overlook their home and their backyard privacy would be gone. However, their major objections centered around the environmental impact of the proposed project, resulting from the removal of tons of soil, and flooding problems resulting from water runoff. There has already been too much building in the hills in their area, and the consequences in terms of flood control, soil erosion and destruction of beautiful p[roperty have been ignored, they said, and the Council has a responsibility to the community who placed their confidence in those they elected.

Mary Mitsui, 106 Deer Hollow Road, said that building on The Alameda is the safest. A great deal of water cascades down into the overburdened and rickety drainage system on The Alameda. This was her backyard and he did not want it flooded again.

Dan Goltz, 107 Holstein, said which site is not the issue. The applicant needs a variance because of the easement, which is manmade. He questioned the findings made by the Commission. He said to bring the dirt road up to standards would be a large job in drainage, paving and equipment, and the trees could not handle that. Concerning the finding regarding preservation of substantial property rights, he said the last sentence does not fit the first two sentences. The proposed drainage provides some solution. However, there will be a substantial amount of grading and loss of trees from the top of the hill. If houses were built below on The Alameda without a variance, a retaining wall would be needed. By allowing this variance, it will make a very detrimental situation. It will create a security problem for police. The General Plan says building on the ridge zone is not allowed. He urged the Council to concentrate on whether the findings could be made, rather than what is the proper site.

Mike Nelko, 443 The Alameda, said a graded road would help out. He would not like to see a house on site (f), urged the Council to make a decision, and commented that everybody there that day did not want it directly across the street.

Tom Kirk, 20 Broadmoor Terrace, ^(VARBOURG) said no one wants the last house to be in their backyard. A two-story house at (d) or (e) will be equally visible on either side of the ridge. Site (e) would be more of an impact to Deer Hollow. If direct proximity has any bearing at all, the difference is 25 feet compared to 1500 feet. He said he was appalled that with four acres, there is going to be a house only 25 feet away.

Roberta Stoddard, 444 The Alameda, said site (e) puts her home and property in jeopardy on landslide. It would require trees to be removed, which would exacerbate the slidings she has already experienced. She said she did not know if the road was feasible, noting that the slide off the road is right by her house.

Sally Fish, 120 Deer Hollow Road, expressed concern about the houses on the hill, flooding and traffic generated by this project. She said access to these homes would be quicker on Deer Hollow Road, where there are families with small children. She said she did not want construction trucks going down her street.

James Helfrich, applicant, said he was asked to end the road as far down as possible. Site (c) has a 40 foot wide easement. To have access on The Alameda would require a 40 foot wall. He said that considering soils stability and design flaws, site (f) would be more harmful than using the pads. To go upstream requires spending money to resolve flooding problems, which he has agreed to do, even though

it is in an area that is not being affected by this development. The drainage and erosion control will be better than it is now. He said they want to alleviate the problem of flooding in Sleepy Hollow. They have been repeatedly asked to drill at specific locations. Concerning the stability of site (e), it is bedrock, and what they are proposing will shore up the area above her house, and it will be safer than it is now. There is a lot of erosion on that hill they would like to take of now. He said they are trying to keep a balance of cut and fill so as to avoid truck trips that people are concerned about. Regarding site (f), it would probably require the removal of 1000 truck trips of fill. They will repave not just their section of development on The Alameda, but all the way down to the corner, complete with widening, curbs and gutters. He said they felt the sites are out of the ridge zones. Concerning site (e), he said they were willing to keep their house at least 35 feet away from the property line, although the adjacent property has a house that appears to be located in the sideyard setback. The easement is existing, and others do not have access on The Alameda, he said.

Pauline Stuber, project engineer, said they were asked to study the feasibility of site (f), and there is a slide area, the easement is existing pertinent to the property up the hill. The only place feasible for a house is in the middle area. The road there would be a 25% slope, and then would have to transition down in a very short distance. Access from The Alameda would require a horrendous cut and probably a large retaining wall along the back with no backyard and the house looking right out into a retaining wall up to 20 feet high. They did not feel that was feasible. Concerning drainage, they will pick up the drainage almost to the end of the cul de sac, picking it up at various points all the way down, putting it into the system, and also adding a supplemental drainage system to tie into that, closing off an open ditch area in between two pipes that currently causes problems, and tying that all together in a closed system, which should help the drainage system considerably. To get from the driveway to a house from the uphill area, probably would have to end up on a deck, wouldn't be able to have a driveway. The house on the Alameda frontage would probably in excess of 40 feet high.

Kanis said the house shown on section b is not the only way a house could be build, and if the size of the house was reduced, less fill would have to be removed.

Mitsui said the community is being asked to absorb this variance so that the property owner can build big houses on a hill. That was not their responsibility as members of the community.

Charles Richardson, 429 The Alameda, said he felt a little bitter about the way he has been treated by San Anselmo. They have a terrible road, terrible drainage, the Town has done almost nothing on the road, and at least Helfrich will fix the road and some other things, like providing fire protection.

Mary Kirk questioned why site (d) was not being discussed.

Goltz said that the findings cannot be made, the project is detrimental to the community.

Walsh said she was opposed to ridgeline building, but the Council has to consider the rights of the property owner. The applicant has gone out of his way on the application, and the Council can delay, but sooner or later the legal questions will prevail. This proposal has opportunities it

in where storm drainage and slide problems can be erased. She said she was totally opposed to site (f), the neighbors were opposed to site (e), and site (a), (b), (c) and (d) were more in conjunction with what the neighbors want.

Colteaux said the applicant has some property rights, and that this site can and eventually will be developed. But he could not make any of the findings necessary for the variance to support this particular configuration. This site should be considered as a planned development because it needs so much flexibility for its development. He said it was pretty clear that the density here is too great by one building site. He said he did not think this was the proper way to go about it considering this piece of land, and he could not make the findings for the variance.

Kanis and Zaharoff stated their concurrence with Colteaux's comments that they could not make the findings to approve the variance.

Chignell said he still had some questions, but he had to respect the judgement of the Planning Commission regarding the findings that they made to approve the project.

Al Bianchi, attorney for the applicant, asked that the record reflect that the applicant requested that if the Council denies the application, it state the findings to support the action.

Colteaux said he was unable to make the findings, he cannot find that it will not be detrimental to the neighborhood.

Roth advised the Council it should making factual findings in either granting or denying the appeal of the variance.

M/S, Colteaux/Kanis, to grant the appeal on the variance because we are factually unable to find on the record the facts to support granting the variance.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Colteaux, Kanis, Zaharoff

NOES: Walsh, Chignell

Having determined the variance must be denied, the effect of the Town Council action was to grant the appeal of the preliminary plan development. The foregoing action also mooted a determination of the negative declaration and no further action was taken with regard to the negative declaration.

7. PUBLIC HEARING ON RESOLUTION ACCEPTING CALETA AVENUE INTO THE SAN ANSELMO PUBLIC STREET SYSTEM.

Public Works/Planning Director Kottage stated that the road had been brought into condition suitable for dedication.

M/S, Zaharoff/Walsh, to accept Caleta Avenue into the public street system of the Town of San Anselmo. Motion passed unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION REGARDING HOLIDAY LIGHTS IN THE DOWNTOWN.

The Chamber of Commerce has collected more than \$7,000 from merchants and building owners towards major renovation of the holiday light system, estimated to cost about \$9,500. The Town is being asked to contribute \$2,000 to help light the downtown for the holidays.

Joyce Brown, President of the Chamber of Commerce, said they have had some good response from property owners in

this effort, and it would be nice if the Town would participate.

Kanis expressed his appreciation for the Chamber's efforts, disappointment about the merchants and owners who were not willing to carry their fair share, and realized they could only do so much.

Colteaux said he felt gratified about the way the business people have made such an effort about the lights, hoped it would be the beginning of a permanent solution, that this was an investment. He complimented Town Administrator Camuglia for her work on this project.

Chignell praised the work accomplished, and noted it was one of a series of endeavors that have been public-private partnerships.

M/S, Kanis/Colteaux, to appropriate \$2,000 from the Contingency Fund to contribute to the repair and installation of Christmas lights for downtown San Anselmo. Motion passed unanimously.

9. ORAL REPORT FROM THE ROSS VALLEY FIRE SERVICE.

Interim Fire Chief Tom Campbell was introduced. He commented that the fire department seemed to be moving in a positive manner. He distributed a questionnaire to all of the firefighters and has met with the firefighters individually, to determine what is going well, and their areas of concern. He said he sees a lot of enthusiasm, with good ideas for improvements.

Walsh said the Ross Valley Fire Board of Directors has been meeting regularly, will meet again on Thursday, and expect to have a final figure from the auditors on the amount of the embezzlement. Chief Campbell will help with the selection of a permanent fire chief, and the department has done an excellent job and has had the support of the community.

Chignell noted that the Fairfax Town Administrator, Administrator of the Fire Service, has said he would be available to the Councilmembers of both towns if they have any questions.

10. ORAL REPORT REGARDING APPLICATION FOR STATE PROPOSITION 85 FUNDS FOR LIBRARY REPAIRS AND RECONSTRUCTION.

Town Administrator Camuglia explained that the Town had an opportunity to submit a pre-application for Proposition 85 funds to determine how competitive San Anselmo's application is compared with other applications, before going through the expense of preparing a full application. The rules have been changed since the first pre-application submission, in that land currently used for a library site cannot be counted towards the local agency's one-third funding share. Dan Goltz and Bill Ollinger have worked on the project in the meantime and have come up with a proposal in which land not currently used for a library is used in the library project, by expanding the library on a platform over the police parking lot. The issue before the Council was whether to pursue the \$1.2 million renovation project as previously submitted, or to pursue the expanded, approximately \$5 million project that includes land not currently used for a library. The recommendation of the Library Advisory Board was to pursue the first design.

Dan Goltz, 107 Holstein, explained that the second proposal would include the value of the land of the parking lot, for an additional \$200,000 cost.

It was the consensus of the Council to submit a pre-application for the original plan.

11. DISCUSSION REGARDING EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT/PURCHASE FUND.

Town Administrator Camuglia explained that the Council had appropriated \$50,000, but had held authorization of expenditure of those funds pending further information and review. Camuglia said she tried to identify the equipment that the Town would be looking at for acquisition over a five year period. She recommended that the non-fixed assets to be established for the Equipment Fund have a value of between \$1,000 and \$25,000, which a normal life expectancy of between 1 and 10 years. Any products or equipment valued at less than \$1,000 and/or with a life expectancy of less than one year would be found in a department's office or department supplies categories. Any products or equipment valued at more than \$25,000, with a normal life expectancy of greater than 10 years, or that which involves maintenance or improvement to a fixed asset would be found in the Capital Maintenance Fund. The total cost of the equipment recommended for acquisition during this fiscal year was \$82,300, which could be financed with a lease-purchase agreement or outright purchase.

The Council discussed some of the advantages and disadvantages of acquiring equipment with a lease-purchase agreement compared with outright purchase.

The Councilmembers expressed concern about losing review of equipment for each department. The consensus was to review the items requested for each department, on the next available agenda.

12. COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS TO STAFF; STAFF MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

Minutes - Zaharoff expressed concern about the time spent to take and transcribe minutes, and inquired about having summary minutes with the motion and vote, and transcribing from the tape recording when a written record was needed. Walsh expressed concern about elimination of a written record. Staff will look into alternatives and what other municipalities do.

Long-term Finance Committee - Walsh asked when the recommendation would be scheduled on the agenda. Camuglia responded that it would be either November 27 or December 11.

Recreation Center - Colteaux inquired about the policy of having rock and roll bands play at the Recreation Center.

Curb numbers - Colteaux inquired about the business that leaflets homes about painting house numbers on curbs.

Isabel Cook - Chignell expressed concern about the hourly fees being charged for use of the facility, and that fees should be set by the Council.

American Legion Log Cabin - Chignell said he expected that the Town would work with the American Legion on the noise issue.

Hilldale and Jordan - Chignell asked if the stop sign could be expedited if it does not interfere with long-range plans.

AB3158 - Camuglia reported that new state legislation requires the payment of \$1250 and \$850 for filing with the

County of every negative declaration and environmental impact statement respectively, as a bail out for State Fish and Game. Both cities and private parties will be assessed these fees.

13. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Beth Pollard