

**BROOKTRAILS TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Tuesday, July 8, 2008**

The Board of Directors of Brooktrails Township Community Services District met in regular session on July 8, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at the Brooktrails Community Center.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Roll call showed the following directors present: Williams, Ziady, Orth, Horrnick and Skezas. Also present were General Manager Chapman and District Counsel Neary.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

Counsel Neary reported that the Board met with counsel on a matter of anticipated litigation, received information and gave direction; no action was taken.

C. ADDITIONS/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

D. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

1. June 24, 2008. Director Orth moved to approve the minutes; Director Horrnick seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

E. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

2. KOA Corp. and Mendocino County Dept. of Transportation – Brooktrails Second Access Road. General Manager Chapman introduced Bob Parker of the Mendocino County Department of Transportation (DOT). Mr. Parker said he was impressed with KOA Corporation's preparation of exhibits for this meeting, and in particular the map showing the alternate routes along with the fill and cut required for each. This data is important because we will have to meet federal and state funding standards. This is the feasibility study and eventually we will have a recommended route to present to the County Supervisors and the District Board. Mr. Parker reported two major objectives to balance: egress, and improving traffic circulation in the vicinity. Partners in this effort are MCOG, the County Supervisors, and the Brooktrails Board. The feasibility study should be completed by August 2008.

Farhad Iranitalab of KOA Corporation, the road consultants, said they were looking at some (although not all) of the actual issues in building this road. They looked at factors such as traffic, accidents on Sherwood, traffic counts and where vehicles were coming from; they found that at least 85% of people like to go south, and 40% would like to bypass and go to Highway 101. KOA looked at how to get people from the southwest and northwest corners to the bypass interchange. There were impacts on aesthetics, slope and drainage that had to be included; the goal is to move the most people for the least cost. They had developed five alternatives, adding a new Alignment I. Today's meeting was just to gather information. Therefore, he could not go too deeply into each alignment; however, they did have a range of cost for each. Mr. Iranitalab said the County has their own road standards which they will follow.

Director Orth noted that all the alternatives cross at one point and it was possible to use either intersection alignment at Primrose and Brooktrails Drive. Alignments C and G would have to have a rail crossing as well as a light to have access to a state highway. He felt we should study a combination of I and H. Mr. Iranitalab said that any combination of these was possible. Mr. Parker said they would like to receive comments and recommendations in writing; this could be done to him or to the Brooktrails website. He felt it was very appropriate to consider a combination of some of these.

Director Williams asked about having an access route coming in higher up on Sherwood Road due to the population in that area. Mr. Iranitalab said the count showed that fewer people were coming in from that area, and commented if people had to go north and then east and then south, a lot of people would simply not use it. Director Williams asked where, if we get more water, most of the growth in Brooktrails will likely be. Mr. Chapman said it would be the airport side; that's why our capital improvement plans include putting a one-half million gallon tank over there. Mr. Iranitalab said there were a total of 8,000 – 10,000 vehicle trips south of there today. If you placed another 2,000 houses you're talking about 15,000 – 20,000 vehicles in circulation. Director Williams said we cannot do the growth unless we have the second access, so that kind of traffic should be anticipated.

Director Orth said we first petitioned the County for the second access road in 1985 for the safety issues, so it has never been considered a need to accommodate growth until now. We do recognize that putting in additional water facilities requires this project, to accommodate further growth.

Mr. Parker asked for questions. Richard Estabrook asked what level of CEQA documentation they anticipated. The response was the maximum. Mr. Estabrook asked if the Brooktrails Fire Department or

CDF had been involved in this; Mr. Parker said they haven't formally been involved yet but they wanted input from all types of residents and stakeholders.

Mark Edwards said he worked for the North Coast Resource Management and had been involved in the project for quite a few years, and they were willing to support Alignment C. He said some of these roads couldn't be built. He said they believed the study had an artificially narrow analysis of alternatives and excluded the full extent of feasible alternatives and several alignments north of Sherwood Drive or the KOA Highway 20. He supported the airport corridor connected to the northwest and he thought this was primarily for emergency access. He pointed to a road B and said he didn't think it was buildable. He asked what the merit was in having everyone rush down Sherwood Road all trying to get on a connector road that was low on the hill; he would say a higher access would be safer although it might not be the shortest route. He said he could only imagine the protestations from everyone that would come from a proposal to build a road through pristine agricultural property [Padula Ranch]; all the properties along this road enjoyed looking out across the valley. Now, he said, you'd spend \$20 million for a growth-induced road. He said you should look at Alignment C, and they are on record saying they would give the County the right-of-way; you wouldn't be subject to condemnation and eminent domain costs. He said it's not simply engineering costs, but what does it do to the environment and your neighbors, and what is the true cost as there are a lot of hidden costs.

A Ms. Wellman said her driveway connected with a higher alignment and she said a high percentage of the accidents on Sherwood are from icy conditions. She said the costs of maintaining a longer and higher road would be expensive; she said it was about more than just an emergency, it was about going to work. She said any road would affect somebody, and nobody wanted traffic going by so the choice is tough. And it will have to go through somebody's property.

Mr. Iranitalab said just building a road by itself doesn't do anything. He said cost is very heavy no matter how you look at it and Alignment C is one of the most expensive on their preliminary cost estimates. You're talking about \$16 - \$19 million on that alignment. C and H are the most expensive, because of the airport and a lot more environmental impacts than the others. Cost on I is between \$8 - \$12 million. Alignment B is \$5.5 million; D is \$16 - \$19 million; G is \$13 - \$16 million; H is \$14 - \$18 million. He added that Alignment C wouldn't be the best alignment to relieve congestion on Sherwood. He said you have to look at slope and drainage too. He wanted to try to avoid adding more traffic going down Sherwood Road.

Director Williams said he drives Sherwood from Primrose and while there was traffic there, there's never really enough to be a bother. Director Orth said none of these routes are going to be non-problematic, whether it's eminent domain and private property issues or who's going to use the road, when and why. Due to CEQA processes, none of these lines might be the final project, but we have to listen to the experts.

President Skezas noted for the audience that the consultants would like to have comments in writing. Mr. Parker said they could be sent to him at DOT or electronically to the Brooktrails website.

An audience member said C, G and H are all counterproductive; they all go through mountainous areas and out to 101. He felt Alternative I was the best route because it drops off at the Highway 101 off-ramp. He said he lived off Lupine. All these roads, he said, seem to come into the same spot in the heart of Brooktrails and you needed to get into a more populous area because no one's going to drive through this mountainous pass just to relieve traffic; drivers are going to take the quickest, straightest route. He asked if anyone had ever looked at doing something with Highway 20. Director Orth responded that this had been done in the past but there wasn't enough population; he said we do have an emergency access dirt road down to KOA Campground today (Highway 20).

Director Orth commented on the frontage road design that was obtained as part of the CalTrans bypass design; the purpose of the bypass was to eliminate stoplights, and therefore you couldn't have a stoplight at the interchange with a second access road. You also had to accommodate the railroad, and these are some of the problems in the process.

Director Williams asked where the ranch (Padula) was in relation to Alignment I. He said what he didn't like about it was the riparian issues. Changing subjects, Mr. Parker said he wasn't sure H was actually buildable because there was a big cliff. Director Williams said he would never think of putting an access road on a 12% grade. Comments were made about the short steep incline at the entrance to Brooktrails, Sherwood, Goose, and other roads with steep inclines.

An audience member asked, if any alternatives went through private property, would that leave them free to subdivide. Director Orth said there would be a mitigation plan which would have to address those kinds of issues. But the airport area itself restricted development because of the airport emergency zone. An audience member asked if anyone had an estimate of the time it would take to take these routes. Mr. Estabrook said there was a study posted on the website he did in the late '90s on the question of time savings of various alternatives.

President Skezas thanked the public for attending and the presenters.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

G. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

H. CONSENT CALENDAR

3. Review of Accounts Payable report and authorization to issue checks. A Director moved (inaudible) to approve the payment of the outstanding invoices; and Director Williams seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Retroactive approval of check for Niesen appraisal – Dean Chapman. Director Horrick moved to approve payment of the outstanding invoices; Director Orth seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

I. ACTION AGENDA

5. Consideration of lease purchase of first response fire truck. Mr. Chapman advised that the price has been confirmed since the packet went out at approximately \$59,500.00, although we have not yet been provided with the payment schedule. Director Horrick asked whether it was an SUV or a big truck. Fire Chief Schoeppner said they couldn't quote us the 2009 model prices until July 1; there was a difference of \$588.00 from the quote in the memo. Director Williams asked if we couldn't get a used truck; Chief Schoeppner said he felt you shouldn't buy anyone else's headache. He said this is a state contract price and you won't get it any cheaper; the new bid today was \$588 cheaper than the original bid. Directors asked about a used 2008. Chief Schoeppner said you can't find one. Under the state contract, you can't buy 2008s. He confirmed it is a heavy-duty chassis with towing capability, such as for our disaster trailer; he described the truck would carry a foam tank and medical gear. Mr. Chapman said we had budgeted \$55,000.00 originally, but there was approximately \$24,000 of equipment to be added to the base price, for a total of about \$60,000.00. Director Horrick moved to authorize up to \$60,000.00 for purchase of the truck and the outfitting. Mr. Chapman said he didn't have the lease payment schedule and would come back with that when they received it. Director Ziady seconded the motion. Wallace Stahle commented from the audience he was in favor of the purchase. The motion carried unanimously.

Chief Schoeppner distributed some printed fire status updates to the directors and said containment work would continue for as much as 60 days. Chief Schoeppner said the stress of the fires along with their regular response incidents has been hard on the firefighters and he felt a little extra thanks to them would go a long way and he was really proud of them.

J. ADDITIONS TO FUTURE AGENDAS

Director Orth said on the next agenda we need comments from the Board for the July 29 deadline of the Second Access Road feasibility study. Mr. Chapman said we would have the minutes too.

K. SPECIAL REPORTS

From Directors: Director Orth spoke about taking his REMADE proposal to Fort Bragg and Willits.

From District Counsel: Counsel Neary said the court had ruled in the District's favor that day in the Paland trial.

From General Manager: Mr. Chapman said we are still about 10 acre feet ahead in the supply and have been providing water of about 150,000 gallons per day for use by CDF at the airport (landing pads for helicopters). He said this was treated water and certainly would complicate calculations about water loss in his next annual report. He confirmed for Director Williams that seepage at the dam was within acceptable limits.

L. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

M. ADJOURNMENT

Director Horrick moved to adjourn the meeting; President Skezas declared the meeting of July 8, 2008 adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

GEORGE SKEZAS, President

ATTEST:

MICHAEL V. CHAPMAN