

A Special Meeting of the San Anselmo Planning Commission was called to order in the Council Chamber by Chairman Hayes on September 13, 1982 at 8:00 p.m. Staff Present: George Davison, Planning Director, T. J. Robbins, Assistant Planning Director, Lisa Burglin, Planning Technician.

1. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Bergeson, Harle, McPeak, Peterson, Sharp, Signorelli, Hayes

Commissioners Absent: None

2. Z-215 Mr. and Mrs. Peter Fraser and Mr. and Mrs. Jack Horn
A/P Nos. 7-071-03, 7-101-02, 7-154-04, southwest of No. 360 Redwood Road
and No. 107 Allyn Avenue

A. Review of Draft Focused Environmental Impact Report.

Chairman Hayes briefly outlined the scope and purpose of the Draft Focused EIR, placing emphasis on determining the adequacy of the document, consideration of mitigation, with an objective to accept this document, or an amended document, and went on to outline procedure which would be followed: (1) staff comment (2) Consultant (3) comments from floor (4) back to Planning Commission.

T. J. Robbins outlined the history of the application, stating the Town received the application in December of 1981, thereafter a scoping meeting was held and a decision made on areas to be addressed by the EIR. Proposals were then solicited, and administrative draft submitted and a 30 day review period of Draft EIR in which it was available to the public.

Mr. Malcolm Sproul of Larry Seeman Associates was introduced. He outlined the significant points, traffic conditions on Redwood Road, surface run-off and construction noise. He read from the summary on Pages 1 and 2 to emphasize these points and possible mitigation. He stated the impacts of Phase II construction cannot be evaluated at this time because of inadequate information.

Mr. Robbins informed members of the audience their questions would be taken down and would all be answered in the course of the Environment Impact Review. Each member speaking from the audience was asked to state his/her name and address.

The Planning Director made note of a letter from the Town of Fairfax dated August 20, 1982 which addressed the problems of access for Phase 2 through the Town of Fairfax. The Planning Director stated there should not be homes in one jurisdiction which are reachable only through another jurisdiction; the rear parcel should be left open with an easement from the San Anselmo side; it should not be left landlocked. He cautioned the Planning Commission about requesting subsurface exploration too early in the process because of the effect on the neighborhood. He mentioned that drainage is

a serious problem at the basin in the vicinity of lower Scenic and Floribel; the drains are simply inadequate; emphasis should be placed on debris control. Water storage is inadequate in the area for the homes already there, and has been for 20 years.

Peter Fraser stated he was the project sponsor and at this point introduced his Consultants Dietrich Stroeh and William A. Schenck of Stuber and Stroeh.

The meeting was then opened to public comment from the floor .

The following persons spoke from the audience: Comments have been edited so that they appear only one time in the minutes.

Mary Sarde of Fairfax; Jonathan Braun of 479 Scenic Avenue; Gay Kagey, 280 Redwood Road; Jerome Draper, 295 Los Angeles Boulevard; Dan Adair, 45 Allyn Avenue; Ron Paolini, 45 Avenue Del Norte; Mrs. Stewart, 107 Allyn Avenue; John Sanftner, 9 White Way; Paul Brand, 130 Allyn Avenue; Karen Garret, Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; Karen Thompson, 296 Redwood Road; Mary Cone, 349 Redwood Road; Russell Cone, 349 Redwood Road; Jim Hastings, 234 Floribel Avenue; Clay Freeberg, 10 Ivy Lane, George Magid, 49 Canyon Road.

Concerns of the above are:

1. Extremely narrow access through Fairfax on Crest and Hillside for Phase II: There are 15 turns and curves within 1/2 mile on these streets.
2. Compliance with San Anselmo General Plan, the last paragraph of page 13 points out the basic dilemma. The figures given are highly subjective and the comments based on density are also highly subjective.
3. Page 15 indicates the owner has "No Trespassing" signs posted on the property. They have not been observed by hikers.
4. There is no traffic and circulation evaluation of Phase 2 (9 houses).
5. Roadway grades on Grieder Road are unacceptable to Fire Department.
6. Fireflows are inadequate; water tank will be required for Phase I, not just Phase 2.
7. Construction noise, the bulk of which for Phase I would occur between the third and seventh year should be considered as an unavoidable significant adverse impact.
8. The County Fire Chief should be contacted for his suggestions.
9. Inadequate discussion of traffic levels on Sir Francis Drake Boulevard; no mention of traffic levels in Fairfax.
10. No mention of fiscal responsibility (mentioned a law suite against the Town for a house that slid on Allyn Avenue).
11. Bridge Way was destroyed in the January flood and there has been no road since that time.

12. Culverts in the area have never been adequate.
13. The time specified as needed by the San Anselmo Police Department to go through Fairfax to respond to a call from dwellings in Phase 2 was 2 minutes. This is questionable.
14. The visual impact of a water tank, especially from a higher elevation than the tank, should be considered.
15. There might be a problem with Fairfax Public Works.
16. There is an incompatibility with the zoning on the other side of the hill in Fairfax.
17. Traffic situation not addressed properly; mass movements are stated as insignificant or mitigable. This is questionable.
18. Redwood Road in San Anselmo is too narrow to accommodate additional traffic; there are too many blind corners; Where would the property come from to either widen or construct turnouts. Would this be through condemnation? All the garages on Redwood Road seem to be built on the street.
19. Trimming of trees on Redwood Road as a mitigation is very smallest "band aid".
20. At 232 Redwood Road there is a corrugated metal pipe that goes through the street and onto the property that is all rusted; there is also a wooden flume on the property that carries the storm and drain waters. Who will take care and maintain those?
21. The property at 107 Allyn Avenue gets the biggest runoff of any property, the culvert that carries the water down the hill to the creek is on this property, who would maintain that?
22. Present traffic on Redwood road, lack of pedestrian paths, blind corners, no passing areas are the most serious objection to this dense development.
23. Noise reverberates all along the canyon, "honkers" and barking dogs are the most offensive.
24. There are inconsistencies regarding trails on Page 15, paragraph 4, and item 6, page 74. This conflict in the report should be resolved.
25. Fire flow tests took place in the summer, the fire department was trying to get a kinetic residual pressure on hydrants--all of the hot water heaters on the hill were suctioned. Water supply already inadequate.
26. The purpose of the fire road off Laurel Avenue was questioned as well as its future.
27. Page 1, paragraph 1, states the development would have relatively "few" significant adverse impacts. Speaker believed this is a poor choice of words, he felt there were many.

28. Presently a fire truck could not make it up Redwood Road--there are no red curbs.
29. A list of people interested in the development had been submitted to the Planning Department, but the speaker did not receive notification.
30. Slides are not studied.
31. Phase 2 needs an additional EIR. There is a statement that when the second phase is started there will be one. How long is an EIR good for? Cannot do an EIR now for 10 years from now as feeling may change in ten years. Suggests eliminating Phase 2 now and consider it when it going to be acted upon, possibly 1992.
32. Site 17 - 24 are unstable and steep and there may be an impact on residents below. This should be studied further and mitigation pursued.
33. There is no mention of the old garbage dump.
34. A new street is mentioned, but no mention of where the water from the street would go.
35. The wording in the EIR is subjective--it should be objective type wording.
36. The areas not addressed are: Fiscal impact-- possible liability for Town if future problems develop as a result of approval of the project, e.g. landslides. Fiscal impact to property owners who will incur costs to adjust to changes in the hillside, water erosion on hill above, etc.
37. Noise, dirt and dust pollution problems were given minimal consideration in EIR. This is a 4 year building project, possibly extending to a 10 year buildout.
38. Phase 2 needs to be addressed now.
39. Certain owners on Redwood Road have had variances granted for carports, garages and access. Those properties would have their parking displaced and could possible cause future litigation.

Fairfax Planning Commissioner Adelaide Wilson said the Fairfax Planning Commission is concerned over the parcels with access through Fairfax. Hillside is a very bad road, one of the steep, cement roads with curbs and there are many garages built to the edge of the cement. Crest is very steep and there is a blind curve downhill. The Fairfax Planning Commission is concerned about have a density designated without an access shown. These eight parcels are in the Fairfax view corridor, or ridge land area and will come under certain planning and building restrictions the Town of Fairfax has adopted. The ridge land area does not permit homes on the ridges and the area calls for low profile type houses.

Sponsor Peter Fraser discussed trails and their use, saying he had owned the property for five years. He had put up "No Trespassing" signs, and so had the previous owner of 35 years. He did not wish to deny use of the trails; however, he wished to prevent prescriptive rights. People do not have permission on the property. He feels he must protect his rights and does not wish to accept possible liability.

He stated further that he understood sometime during the 1930-1940s the entire length of Redwood Road had been accepted by the Town. The street had been installed, accepted and became Town-maintained in order to obtain gas tax funds. He could not, at this time, reveal his source of information until it was verified; however, he said if this were true, then his property has a right to use Redwood Road and to put some development on it.

Mr. Bill Schenck of Stuber-Stroeh described the composition of his firm and their experience; he said they specialize in working in the engineering and planning process. They first looked at the Town's requirements and understood the first step toward development of the property was primarily the zoning process, including where the development would be and where access would be, but not the details of site design, but more of how the development of the property would integrate into the larger community. The next stage would be the tentative map with more specific detail as to steepness and design of roads, building site, analysis of water systems, and a more careful and thorough soils report than is done so far.

With regard to Phase 2, it looks clear Phase 2 must be included in the zoning application, and it is recognized that Phase 2 represents a very complex set of questions of jurisdiction, access, community separator, timing, etc. It is anticipated at some future time the Cary property in Fairfax will develop and at that time Phase 2 will be in a more appropriate position to develop. The timing is unknown at this time. Stuber-Stroeh is open to suggestion from the Town as to how better to handle Phase 2.

Mr. Schenck had 2 general comments on the EIR, he felt it was stringent and almost adverse. The company has made a long list of comments on the EIR, which are available to staff and commission. They were made on the administrative draft. He has a problem with the "degree of specificity" in the EIR. Although this is a zoning application, it appears to him the EIR was written in terms of a tentative map. At this time grades of roads, width, etc. have not really been considered other than to be sure a cul-de-sac could be placed along the general line as shown with a grade of 18% or less. The drawings presented were schematic.

The second comment concerned soils, geological and visual analysis. There was question as to the 10% vegetation to be removed. With regard to the soils investigation, he requested the determination of the adequacy of the EIR be continued until Stuber-Stroeh can do more soils investigation.

Community Separator. This term is not very well defined. The term, he said, applied to more urban areas where development has spread over "hill and dale" and the concept of community separator would be used in the sense of preserving a specific community. This development cannot be considered such an urban area. One of the possibilities for development of Phase 2 would be deannexation from San Anselmo annexation into Fairfax. This possibility has not been studied.

Traffic. It is recognized that traffic would have a major impact. Two traffic consultants have looked at the project. The map on Page 58, shows the TIRE index which is admittedly complex. It was explained that it measures the experience people have on the road. He said it was the most sophisticated he had seen. It indicated the traffic increase to be in the lowest range that is shown, still page 73 of the EIR identifies traffic as an unavoidable adverse impact, this is an inconsistency in the EIR that needs rectifying.

Surface Water Runoff. There is no disagreement with the analysis and the numbers developed. The additional runoff created by the new development is estimated to be 6%, which dilutes as it runs down the hill, ending at Center Boulevard at approximately 1%. The 1% is minimal, but is mitigateable by specified drainage work. Hence surface runoff is challengeable as an unavoidable significant adverse impact; potential would be a better choice of words.

Housing Element: It has been stated that the project does not comply with San Anselmo's Housing Element. As long as it is legally approved, it has to comply with the Housing Element. This project will meet all standards.

Construction Noise: The EIR discusses construction noise as though it is going to be continuous for 10 - 15 years. At most there will be 10 - 15 houses built over that period of time, and construction will not be continuous. There is relatively little construction through the winter periods, and other development construction noise will be intermittent.

Mr. Dietrich Stroeh outlined his background briefly. He stated that the Sanitary District as well as MMWD have a quite simple policy; they adhere to the standards set up by the City; whatever the Fire Departments require will be implemented by the Water District. He said the water tank need not have a visible impact; it can be buried or screened. There will be another EIR required at the Water District level.

At this time discussion was brought to Planning Commissioners, and their

comments were as follows:

Phase 2 access through Fairfax is a problem. It should be stated whether it is possible to bring a road in from Redwood Road.

Traffic along Redwood Road and the lack of a gauge as to how much improvement can be made along Redwood Road, information is inadequate. Some widening could have an effect, but can enough widening be done to have a positive impact? Need more emphasis in that area.

Page 15 mentions proposals to retain certain lands as open space. Questions were raised as to how title will be held and how assurance will be given to Town that lands permanently remain in open space.

Traffic mitigation, pages 62 - 64. When Redwood is widened or reconstructed, will that not change the character of the neighborhood?

Noise: The question of construction noise was addressed; however, there was no mention of post construction noise from increased residual traffic.

Phase 2. The EIR is not complete until Phase 2 is much more thoroughly addressed. There is a burden to look at that.

The TIRE index on Page 58 is too sophisticated, does not seem to relate to the actual circumstances.

Where the report refers to "City" it should be changed to read "Town" of San Anselmo. Concern about the Census Tract. San Anselmo is becoming a Town of single families and single people, and the census count has gone down. How much could that affect this area and the traffic. Would like to have that addressed.

Commissioner Signorelli said the footnote at bottom of Page 10, of the EIR SHOULD have the following addition after the 2nd sentence, add another sentence: The recent amendment to the Land Use Element provides for 12 to 20 units per acre in the conservation zone and in areas that exceed 30% slope. (Refer to first paragraph @ Page 39 of Housing Element dated 12-1-81).

Page 16; some of the properties changed ownership: Property formerly owned by O'Hare is now in the name of Crocker National Bank. The fourth paragraph, 4th line from the bottom, 7-182-07 is shown as being part of the Dal Bozo project, it is now in the name of Margaret Conard; the other two parcels are owned by Michael McCormac. The Kroot project, 7-182-02, a portion has been sold and is now 09. Page 78, 4th paragraph, 4th line, refers to a long driveway to site 22, it should refer to site 20. Where the report refers to Oak Street, it should be changed to Oak Avenue. The soils report, while comprehensive, puts the "Fear of God" into people without really telling what can be done for mitigation. There are all kinds of problems that need solving, traffic, storm drain, water pressure, roadway erosion and fire protection. The tank location should be explicit. The slope aspect was treated somewhat lightly.

The levity shown in the Mitigation Measure on Page 38 weaken the document by discussion of large dogs, deer resistant plants, etc.

It is questioned what specifically would be called for in the additional soils studies. While it would be unfortunate to upset the neighbors with in depth soils studies, it is not possible to assign numbers prior to this. It is hoped that the staff would find some way to let the neighbors know it is going to be done and would be to the neighborhood's advantage.

With regard to access for Phase 2, both sides (neighborhood and applicant) should be looked at. The PPD application procedure is flexible enough that density can be assigned once there is a final EIR for Phase 2. At that time the applicant can look and see whether it is a feasible density that he can live with. The whole purpose of PPD is to allow that flexibility and the applicant would be treated unfairly if the Planning Commission listens overly to the Town of Fairfax and simply deny it because the only access that is shown so far is through the Town of Fairfax. The fact that there could be annexation/deannexation is a good point. With the soils report there will be more information, and when there is a final EIR, it is hoped there will be enough information available to alleviate concerns.

Drainage and Debris Control. The DEIR should specify some way to take care of the problem.

The statement has been made that a water tank on the hill would be a tremendous inducement to growth. The Commission had already heard there exists a dangerous condition regarding water for fire fighting; it would be inconsistent for property owners to say they already have inadequate water for fire fighting, so they don't want a water tank which could lead to more growth. It would be preferable for the owners to try to extract from the developer off-site improvements that would make the neighborhood better for those who already live there, drainage, fire protection, etc. There can be no more growth than the General Plan, Housing Element, Conservation element, etc, permits

The question of Redwood Road acceptance should be investigated.

It would be interesting to know the densities that would have been allowed by the previously proposed density ordinance.

The Tire index on Page 58 should be clarified so the numbers mean something. There was a brief conversation about whether other developers using Redwood Road should share in the cost of improving the road.

The Open Space question has not been resolved; access to open space should be clearly identified.

The DEIR should clearly address common ownership.

M/S McPeak, Peterson, to refer the DEIR back to the Consultant for dealing with public and Commission comments; that we refer back to the applicant the access for Phase 2, to determine if he still wants to go with the Fairfax access, or provide access from within the project, off Redwood Road; that action by the Planning Commission be continued until these things have been brought together by the Consultant.

Motion passed unanimously. P.C. 9/13/82

The Chairman then declared the Public Hearing closed. He explained this meant no additional items will be brought up. Notices will be mailed out 10 days before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 a.m.

TheIma Foster

Addition to above:

Gay Kagy, 280 Redwood Road submitted a written list of what she deemed to be deficiencies in the draft EIR as well as a list of specific corrections and requests for consideration. A copy is herewith incorporated for consideration by the Consultant and made a part of these minutes.

September 13, 1982

San Anselmo Planning Commission
Larry Seeman Associates

Gentlemen:

There are a number of major deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Redwood Hills Specific Plan, July, 1982 prepared by Larry Seeman Associates. In my opinion they are:

1. NO TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION evaluation of Phase 2 (9 houses) was conducted. "Only the impacts of Phase 1 development are discussed here. The impact of Phase 2 is not discussed because access is not yet available and could be through either San Anselmo or Fairfax..." (pg. 59) Rebecca Hammond, Town Planner, Fairfax supports the contention that as long as Phase 2 is shown on the Specific Plan and is included in the rezoning application, access should be addressed in the EIR (letter to Dept. Public Works, San Anselmo August 20, 1982)
Traffic based on Phase 1 only is designated in the EIR an Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impact.
2. ROADWAY GRADES ON GRIEDER ROAD ARE UNACCEPTABLE TO FIRE DEPARTMENT. Alternative 1 proposed by Larry Seeman Associates modifies the roadway alignment and grade of Grieder Road serving Phase 1 to from 18% to 19% with one section 25% grade (pg. 75) These grades are unacceptable to the San Anselmo Fire Department (Rick Mollenkopf, September 13). It appears either a new road alignment will be necessary or extensive cut and fill grading and construction of retaining walls on geologically unstable soils will take place in order to reduce the grades.
Request deletion of "These changes improve the ease with which fire fighting equipment could reach addresses on Grieder Road." (pg. 75) "Ease" is misleading. It is not possible for a fire truck to climb grades exceeding from 15% to 18% (Rick Mollenkopf, September 13, 1982).

Since the fire hazard on the project site varies from high to extreme (pg. 43), it is vital that firetrucks can reach the property both for protection of the houses to be constructed as well as to minimize the spread of fires to existing houses in the neighborhood.

3. FIREFLOWS ARE INADEQUATE, WATER TANK WILL BE REQUIRED FOR PHASE 1 (not just Phase 2 as stated in the EIR). (Mollenkopf, September 13, 1982) In reference to the proposed Phase 2 tank the EIR states, "The logical location for this tank would be at an elevation of 693 feet atop a knoll along the ridgeline." (Young, MMWD, Pg. 54)

A precise site for the water tank and capacity needs to be determined. Site may have to be purchased if selected site is not part of developer's holdings. Visual and growth inducement impacts of tank need to be evaluated in EIR.

4. AN ADDITIONAL IMPACT SHOULD BE DESIGNATED UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT: "Phase One is planned for completion over a period of about ten years, with the bulk of the construction assumed to occur between the third and seventh year. During this period, daily construction noise would continue." (pg. 65)

There is no adequate mitigation measure for daily construction noise for a continuous ten year period. Since this would be comparable to the Chinese water torture for residents, I believe it should be designated "significant".

As in the Traffic section, no evaluation for Phase 2 was made in the Noise section.

For the above deficiencies, as well as the additional information requested by the Town of Fairfax per Rebecca Hammond's letter of August 20: 1) alternative access to the subject property, 2) inducement to growth in Fairfax created by the extension of the road system, 3) land use compatibility, and 4) traffic impact on Fairfax streets, it appears a somewhat expanded EIR is needed before rezoning decisions can be reached. Therefore, I would like to request that Item B on tonight's agenda be continued until this information is available.

Attached to this letter is a memorandum of my conversation with Assistant Chief and Fire Marshall Rick Mollenkopf on September 13 relative to Items 2 and 3 above.

Additional comments on the Draft EIR are listed in order by page number on the attached sheet.

- Page 14. "The Town has been relying on the Lane Use Map and in the case of previous applications for development has made interpretations on the basis of the density ordinance." The reason the proposed density ordinance was finally "buried" and never adopted is because its proposed densities were considerably higher than those granted on applications for development during the past two years. Suggest this sentence be deleted.
- Page 15. "The project sponsor has not granted permission for trail users to trespass and has, in the past, placed NO TRESPASSING signs on the property." I have hiked regularly on both trails and along the northern and southern boundaries and have never experienced a No Trespassing sign since 1958. Suggest this sentence be deleted.
- Page 15. "Phase Two would, therefore, be much closer to the ridgeline. It could also require access through and/or development of ridgeline property in both San Anselmo and Fairfax." Sentence should be added stating that this is in conflict with the San Anselmo General Plan.
- Page 21. "Therefore, the project sponsor's engineer should design a system to retain water on the site without undermining slope stability." I would like additional information on how this is proposed to be accomplished.
- Pages 17 through 23 Soils and Geologic Conditions - There is no mention of the abandoned mine uphill from the redwood grove.

- Page 31. 3rd paragraph... "site, from invaded areas that those have not been disturbed." that should be replaced with "to"
- Page 38. Mitigation Measure (c.) "Keep a large dog in the yard in the evenings." This would be a noise impact (24 dogs) and should be addressed in the Noise section.
- Page 39. "The existing system is adequate to meet the domestic water requirements of residents in the surrounding area." This should be revised to read, "The existing system is inadequate." The "However" in the following sentence should be deleted also.
- Page 40. "Phase One would rely on extensions of the existing system, however, and the capacity of the extended system to meet fire flow requirements cannot be assessed at this time." This should be changed to read, "The new tank and supply system could be designed to meet these requirements for both Phase One and Two. Fireflow requirements cannot currently be met and the extent to which they are inadequate will be determined by the San Anselmo Fire Department upon commencement of the 1982 fall rains."
- Page 43. "Potential Impacts. However, some improvements in the existing system could be necessary to provide the required fireflow at the desired pressure." This should be deleted and substituted with "Construction of a water tank will be necessary to provide the required fireflow at the desired pressure."
- Page 53. 4th paragraph... Add statement "Uphill and traveling east on Redwood Road there are scattered houses only."
- Page 54. 3rd paragraph. "Phase Two homes would require..." should be changed to read "Phase One and Two homes would require water from a water storage tank if fireflow volumes were to be provided at adequate pressure."
- Page 54. Rod should be changed to Road in Mitigation 1.
- Page 69. 2nd paragraph. "...the effect of the project would be to slightly increase the number of calls for existing staffing of these departments." Add to this sentence "and slightly decrease the level of services available to existing residents within the Town."
- Page 69. No mention is made that police and fire services are more costly to provide in outlying areas such as Redwood Hills.
- Page 69. Earlier in the report mention is made of possibility of sewer line breakage due to geological failure (pg. 20) and that Grieder Road has two sections located on geologically unstable soils. My question is that if the road and underlying sewer and water lines are dedicated to the Town, and the road and lines should undergo ground failure, what is the fiscal responsibility, if any, of the Town? (A recent road failure on Redwood Road near Gerlach was estimated to cost \$58,000 for the second round of repairs.) (Alan Bruce letter to Dr. Sigel)
- Page 71. 3rd paragraph. "Sales tax revenues generated from purchases by residents of San Anselmo, ... amount to approximately \$33 per resident." It is highly unlikely that the entire sales tax revenue for the town was generated by residents. Therefore the assumption that 60 additional residents would yield an additional \$1,980 in sales tax revenues for the town is incorrect.
- Page 73. Mitigation 2. Mention should be made that surface water runoff exceeds capacity now each winter.
- Page 73. Mitigation 3. Are Town Department of Public Works or residents responsible for keeping ditches and trash racks free from vegetation and debris?
- Page 73. This overview should add a 10th item: "The specific plan does not comply with the low/moderate housing provision in the Housing Element of the San Anselmo General Plan."

- Page 75. "Other advantages of this alignment are that the length of road that parallels the minor drainage would be reduced (or the need to fill the creek would be eliminated)." This statement appears one page from the end of the report. No previous mention is made of the need to fill the creek. If the project developer's plans included filling the creek, it should be stated in the text of the report. San Anselmo has a policy of retaining creeks in their natural state.
- Page 75. Last sentence is incomprehensible. Perhaps the "at" should be deleted.
- Page 76. Phase One Modified Alternative Map. Is access to Lot 6 by foot through Lot 7? If this is the case it should be mentioned in the text.
- Page 79. Bernard Del Santo's name was spelled incorrectly.
- Page 10. The footnote reads, "The Land Use Map indicates that one lot would be allowed per acre in the conservation zone." This is a misstatement. It should be revised to read... "one lot or less" The General Plan for San Anselmo does not guarantee one lot per acre, rather that is a maximum.

Respectfully submitted,

Gay Kagy

Gay Kagy