Re: CPRA Request and Appointment to View Emergency Access Routes for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School

From: Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunifed.org>  
To: Frances Dillard - [redacted]@gmail.com  
Cc: Ted Knight <tknight@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 9:33 AM PST (GMT-08:00)

Good morning,

It appears you submitted one this morning and it will be processed as soon as possible. I will be in touch before Friday to let you know which documents I'll have available. The ones for CHS are the ones your husband already viewed on November 28th. Thank you.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)  
Chief Communications Officer  
Carmel Unified School District  
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022  
cell [redacted]  
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 9:16 AM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:  
I am available at 11 AM and can be at your offices. My husband might accompany me if his schedule permits.

Does a separate CPRA request have to be submitted for Carmel Middle School? It should be easily accessible without complicated logistics?

On Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 9:05 AM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:  
Mrs. Dillard,

Your demand is I believe for one of your previous CPRA requests 2223_48 which is for the Emergency Access Route for Carmel High. I could be available between 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. on Friday for viewing of said documents. Please let me know the half-hour block you wish to book and I will work to schedule that for you.

This request you have submitted just now for the Carmel Middle School Emergency Access Route, is a separate CPRA request and the file may or may not be viewable at that date/time. I will update you after speaking to staff.

Thank you.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)  
Chief Communications Officer  
Carmel Unified School District  
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022  
cell [redacted]  
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 8:50 AM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:  
TO Ted and Jessica,

I would like to view the Emergency Access Plans for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School on Friday, December 23rd. I will be available all day to come to your offices. Please confirm the window of the appointment.

In previous CPRA request to view the Emergency Access Plans, your response was as follows:
The disclosable records are architectural site plans that cannot be reproduced pursuant to their terms. The District makes these records available for inspection, but not copying. Contact the Chief Communications Officer (contact information at right) to arrange a time to inspect the records at the District Office, located at 4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923.

Please note, I have attached Carmel High School's failed inspection from Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

Fire access roads shall be marked with approved signs or markings that state, "NO PARKING--FIRE LANE". Marking shall be maintained in clean, legible condition.

Status: FAIL

Notes: Fire Department staff would like to meet with CHS staff to discuss this item. We require 20’ of fire lane access around the entire perimeter of the school. The fire lane curb needs to be painted with two coats of 100% acrylic water based red paint with white lettering, 3" in height and have a minimum of 1/2" stroke that states, "FIRE LANE NO PARKING". To accomplish the 20-foot fire lane, some areas will need the entire width of the roadway dedicated to the fire lane, in those areas, fire lane signs will need to be placed on the side opposite the painted curb (for example, on the fence along the front of the Admin building).

A separate CPRA request will be submitted for all records from July 2022 with any CUSD employee and any member of the Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

For the School Board Members. The Community has been consistent since the first Draft EIR for stadium lights around the required compliance with the Emergency Access Routes. The community went so far as providing you photos of where the CHS is not in compliance. All this was done before your approval of the Final EIR.

   CHS Inspection Date: 10/11/22
   Authorized Date: 11/07/22
   Special Meeting Board Approval of Stadium Improvements: 11/29/22

You were all fully aware that CHS was not in compliance for public safety. The Final EIR blew off the community's direct inquiries with no response and all of you continue to develop activities that attract larger attendance to a campus that is already over-built and has limited capacity to safely manage large crowds. In addition to the CPRA request above, I would like to put the topic of Public Safety, Traffic Management Plan and Emergency Access Routes on the School Board Agenda. I've done this previously but the topic is never put on the agenda.

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Re: CPRA Release 2223_27 Mit (Budget): Student Safety

From: Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>  
To: Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com>  
Cc: Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>  

Mon, Dec 12, 2022 at 11:00 AM PST (GMT-08:00)

Good Morning Mrs. Dillard,  
On behalf of the Board of Education I am acknowledging receipt of the below email.

Thank you,  
Sara

On Dec 12, 2022, at 8:36 AM, Frances Dillard [redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:

To School Board Members,

I received a letter last week notifying me that my name and/or information may be included in responsive documents to a California Public Records Act Request submitted to Carmel Unified School District. While it continues to aggravate many community members that CUSD insists on releasing our information without permission, this particular CPRA (linked below) was informative. The CPRA includes several e-mail from both Karl (image below) and Jon Lyons where they blatantly admit they are aware of CHS’s safety challenges and CUSD’s serious vulnerability around the school’s liability if an injury occurs.

While I was not able to attend the Special Meeting where you approved the Final EIR for the Stadium Improvement Project, I'm glad I missed the circus and your phony show that you did due diligence in thoughtfully examining the community’s questions and CUSD’s non-responses. When my husband circulates OVERT photos that CHS campus in not in compliance of the national DSA Fire and Life Safety Codes and then the board votes approval for a project that will further bring more events, attendees, parking and traffic problems to an overbuilt campus - you are indeed irresponsible and will be held accountable for any injuries. To be clear - adding more parking lots will not solve the issue. You have already overbuilt on a 22-acre campus. Where is your future thinking and vision for the next generation?

Karl - how about follow-through on your threat below? Please bring the topic of safety issues up at the next school board meeting. I’ve tried to put it on the agenda several times and have been ignored. Until you can produce a valid 810 Fire and Life Safety Form for your Emergency Access Routes - you are part of the problem. The community has offered several times to be partners in better outcomes but we are consistently shut down.

You may feel proud you "approved" the school stadium improvements - but at what cost? Public and student safety should be at the core of your mission. I’ve blind copied several members of the community involved in the EIR efforts who tried to provide fair and honest feedback to the process. What a shame you’ve dismissed the opportunity to be good neighbors and continue to bully your way through building out CHS.

2223_27 Mit (Budget) / Request / Initial Response / Responsive Documents

<image.png>

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.
The document is on site and can be accessed when we reopen on Monday.

On Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 11:41 AM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:
Is it possible for you to provide the name of the architect prior to the on-site inspection?

On Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 11:34 AM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,

The plan, owned by the architect, clearly states it cannot be copied. Your husband will see said notation when he comes to view it on Monday at 2:30 p.m., a time we promptly offered at your request and prior to the 10 day response period (which was provided to you on day one).

Thank you.

On Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 11:28 AM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:
Let’s just be honest with the exchange. CUSD owns the architectural site plan, you paid for it, it’s your property and you have the authority to release at will. Why you are determined to withhold vital information on Emergency Access Routes on CHS draws much suspicion and erodes confidence that the campus is safe. I’m still unclear what an architectural site plan has to do with a public Emergency Access Route that is approved by DSA through an 810 Fire and Life Safety Form. Since we can’t find that document with DSA, we are going to assume CUSD doesn’t have an approved Emergency Access Plan.

In addition, your reference to Government Code is regarding pending litigation. Is there current active pending litigation around Emergency Access Codes at CHS? I’m not aware - can you provide that reference?

Ted - when you reference wasting taxpayer dollars - this is on your end. I’m asking for simple information regarding public safety and the stonewalling is exhausting. You have all the resources on your end. I’m a simple individual community member asking for information that should be readily available to the public.

On Wed, Nov 23, 2022 at 10:55 AM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,

The document responsive to your CPRA request is an architectural site plan. The site plan states on its face that title to the plan is held by the architect and reproduction of the plan is prohibited. Thus, the District can only make the plan available for inspection, but not copying. (See Gov. Code, § 6254, subd. (k) [exempting records “the disclosure of which is exempted or prohibited pursuant to federal or state law”].) This complies fully with the CPRA.

We confirm this document will be available for inspection at the District Office at 2:30 p.m. on November 28th.

Thank you.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022

President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)
My husband will be at your offices on Monday, November 28th at 2:30 PM to view the Emergency Access Route for Carmel High School.

We were advised to inform you that Emergency Access Routes are developed by public funds for public educational facilities. Thus, the public should be allowed to photograph the plan and CUSD is obligated to digitally reproduce for public viewing through our CPRA request.

We continue to be appalled by CUSD’s lack of prioritization regarding public safety and your continued buildout on the Carmel High School Campus. You have dismissed our request to conduct a Vehicle Circulation Study to better address the safety challenges your traffic flow is causing not only on your campus and but in significant overspill to Scenic Highway 1 and surrounding neighborhood. The current Emergency Access Route and proposed implications from the new structure and new occupancy load are not addressed or included in the Final EIR. These are basic community requests on public safety.

School Board Members are invited to join my husband on November 28th at 2:30 PM. Shouldn’t you also be informed of what is the current Emergency Access Route on CHS prior to the November 29th meeting for an informed decision making? Either way, this e-mail thread will be part of our public submission as comments to the Final EIR. We’ll be on record you’ve all been given an opportunity to slow down the project and take some critical key steps to ensure public safety.

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:52 PM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Architectural site plans cannot be reproduced pursuant to their terms.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:50 PM Frances Dillard <dam@ gmail.com> wrote:
I’ll connect with my husband.
Can you explain why copies, photographs, etc can’t be made?

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:42 PM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,
We would be happy to arrange for a review on Monday.
We could have the requested document ready for public review on Monday, November 28th between 8:30 a.m. and 10 a.m., 11 a.m. to noon, or 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Please note this would be for review only - copies, photographs, etc. cannot be made.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:24 PM Frances Dillard <dam@ gmail.com> wrote:
My husband might have flexibility to be on-site Monday.
Can you provide a few time options and he will do his best to clear his calendar for Monday.

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:20 PM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,
Unfortunately we do not have staff with access to this information on site today and no one will be in the office tomorrow.
We are happy to schedule a review of the documents with appropriate notice for a future date.
Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:16 PM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:
Unfortunately I will be travelling for business reasons next week. While CPRA response is allowed 10 days, an Emergency Access Route should be available at any time to the public. Your offices are open today. We can be there by 3 PM to view. Yes, I agree it's a holiday weekend but this is the window CUSD released the Final EIR to be reviewed. With more than 2,000 pages - I need to review current Emergency Access Routes today to properly provide official feedback.

I would think the School Board members would like to see this as well to best inform their decision making for the November 29th meeting. The public is surprised not to see the DSA stamped version as part of the Final EIR.

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 12:06 PM Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,
I will formally confirm your records request shortly and it will be posted online. As you are aware, the district has 10 days to respond to a records request. As most staff are out this week, we will respond next week. Records are not available today. Our offices are closed tomorrow, Thursday and Friday. Thank you and have a Happy Thanksgiving.

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 10:34 AM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:
Jessica - in order to ensure I can successfully view the Emergency Access Plans for Carmel High School, tomorrow morning at 9 AM at your offices - I have expanded this e-mail to inform both Ted and Dan. They can easily delegate to another representative if you are not available tomorrow morning.

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 9:54 AM Frances Dillard wrote:
Hello Jessica,

Earlier this morning, I submitted a CPRA Request for access to the approved Emergency Access Routes for Carmel High School. Please acknowledge receipt of the request. I will be present at your offices tomorrow morning at 9 AM to help expedite the request. Please plan on formally posting the information on your website, but I would like to review tomorrow morning ASAP.

Given the School Board is attempting to exempt themselves from any local ordinances and regulations regarding the Final EIR on the stadium improvement project, one of the community's tools to hold CUSD accountable for public safety is through the Division of the State Architect. The Final EIR was absent from including the current Emergency Access Route through the formality of an 810 Fire and Life Safety Plan/Map/Stamp. The Final Eir was also absent of the implications to the Emergency Access Routes with the proposed new structures including the storage building and the occupancy load of all the new parking lots. CUSD dismissed our request for a vehicle circulation study. You continue to move the stadium improvement project forward without listening to our concerns about public safety.
This is a critical input before the School Board considers approving the Final EIR. I'd like to review the current Emergency Access Route tomorrow at 9 AM.

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

---

Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923
jhull@carmelunified.org
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022

President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)
Jessica Hull (she/her/hers)
Chief Communications Officer
Carmel Unified School District
4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923
jhull@carmelunified.org
office (831) 624-1546 ext. 2022
President, California School Public Relations Association (CalSPRA)
Request More Information Regarding Timeline for Stadium Improvements

From: Frances Dillard <francesdillard@gmail.com>  Thu, Oct 20, 2022 at 5:33 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: Ted Knight <tknight@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur
<tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini
<kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Ted and Board Members,

Below are are my public comments that I didn't have the opportunity to share last night given the appropriate topic was the districting process.

We are requesting more information regarding the sequence of events around the date of November 29th. When will the Final EIR be available to the public? Do Board Members have ample enough time to read the public comments and make an informed decision on the Final EIR in preparation for November 29th?

There is a lot of confusion on what are the next steps regarding your proposed Stadium Improvements.

Your public notice indicates the Final EIR will be brought before a Special School Board Meeting on Tuesday, November 29 at 5:30 PM.

However, the EIR was so poorly done, many of us can’t imagine that in about a 1-month time period, CUSD Leadership will have responsibly addressed any of the community’s concerns. This last draft didn’t even include the basic information on Emergency Access Routes. But perhaps we are wrong and you are withholding critical information until the final EIR. We can’t quite figure out whether the folks managing this project are:

1). Too rushed - trying to push things through a pre-determined timeline, thus, the outcome is sloppy work.

OR

2). You are deliberately being evasive for your own selfish reasons. Let’s face it- you did completely surprise everyone with an entirely NEW Scope of Work in this last draft.

Either way, this entire process has been mismanaged and has been quite frustrating for all involved.

Also, at what point does the public get an update on the budget? The new scope was SIGNIFICANT, and we are wondering what is this all totaling up to?

To the individual School Board Members, especially those running for re-election:

- Is this what responsible decision-making look like?
- Will you be receiving a copy of the final EIR before November 29th for in-depth review?
- Will you be reading the public comments? Given the importance of the investments and outcome we can’t image you wouldn’t be reading the public comments.
- So, as you read the public comments, please ask yourself these questions:
  - Does the Final EIR give me adequate information upon which to approve this project?
  - Does the Final EIR adequately address public safety and land use violations?
    - All your proposed Mitigation Measures were flimsy, superficial and without accountability.
  - Given the admitted finding of “Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts even after Mitigation Measures” in one big area, can you have a clear conscience if you vote for approval?
- Essentially, can you be sure that moving forward is the right choice given all the uncertainties?
- AND is the choice you are going to make legally defensible?
Re: Public Comment Submission for Carmel High School Stadium Improvements SCH# 2021050293

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 2:15 PM [redacted]@yahoo.com wrote:
THIS E-MAIL has the second attachment that is referenced below. Please confirm receipt.

Attached is our feedback on the RDEIR for Carmel High School Stadium Improvements SCH# 2021050293. Please confirm receipt.

Below are the hyperlinks located inside the attachment regarding your objective to “Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds.”

- School Vehicular Access and Circulation Study Conestoga High School
- PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION STUDY FOR LA SALLE HIGH SCHOOL
- Glens Falls School District Traffic Circulation Study

CHS has a chronic traffic circulation problem that we believe endangers students, staff and visitors to the campus on a daily basis. Trying to solve this safety problem through additional parking spaces in an already overbuilt campus neither addresses the root cause or solves the long-term problem. You are not taking the responsible steps to address

- Why are you not considering traffic circulation studies similar to the links above?
- Why are you not doing this step or investment of a Vehicular Circulation Study prior to proposing parking lot solutions? Shouldn’t this inform whether your proposed designs will be effective?
- Why not invite the community to be part of the solution process with an on-line survey to diagnose problematic issues that need to be resolved?
- Why not demonstrate community leadership and bring together County Representatives and Residents for working session on acceptable long-term No Parking solutions through signage that is enforceable by law on a daily basis?

We will reply to this e-mail and include a second attachment with further questions and visuals to demonstrate you have missed critical benchmarking in the Environmental Setting regarding emergency access routes, traffic congestion, traffic circulation and fire and emergency vehicle access.

- Why are you not acknowledging or including benchmarking of the existing challenges in traffic circulation?
- Why are you not acknowledging or including benchmarking of the existing parking problems and over-spills the neighboring streets?
- Why aren’t you transparent with your Emergency Access Routes and prioritization of safety?

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any...
Re: RDEIR: Providing Public Comment on

Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 8:19 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhall@carmelunified.org>)
To: Frances Dillard <dillard@burton.com>
Cc: Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Jonathan Lyons <jlyons@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Sat, Oct 1, 2022 at 2:33 PM Frances Dillard <dillard@burton.com> wrote:

**PROBLEM:**
RDEIR Transportation Impact 11-4. has accurately been captured as: [An Increase in Event Attendance Could Result in Inadequate Parking During Limited Nighttime Events with Potential Emergency Access Issues](#)

The Mitigation Measure 11-4. The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) **does NOT** shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a superficial, flawed short-term fix for a handful of limited nighttime football games. The proposed TMP creates confusion in law enforcement between event attendees vs. residential parking, causes a nuisance in residential parking limiting our our streets. Most importantly, the RDEIR doesn't acknowledge or address the existing chronic problem of inadequate parking and the lack of transparency for existing Emergency Access Routes. This problem currently plagues the CHS campus and surrounding environment on a daily basis.

I am providing this e-mail thread and photos as evidence the proposed TMP doesn't even work during the weekend, daytime-events much less introducing the complexity of execution at night.

**PHOTOS Demonstrate:**
- Lack of plan for on-campus traffic circulation with vehicles parking in front of "No Idling / No Parking" blocking Emergency Access Routes.
- Ticket booth blocking front entrance where the only Emergency Vehicle would have access.
- Conflict of "No Event Parking Signs" with residential cars - how can enforcement tell the difference?
- Cars parked on private property at the corner of Highway 1 / Morse Drive creating safety issues.

**Proposed Mitigation Measures:**
- Drop temporary TMP plans that can't be legally enforced or upheld.
- Work with residents within 1 mile radius on BOTH Sides of Highway 1 to proactively pull together Supervisor Mary Adams and Monterey Public Works for a long-term "No Parking Resident Only" Solution.
- Implement this effort as sign of trust BEFORE attempting to approve stadium lights. You have more than 10 years of chronic traffic, congestion, circulation issues, parking and safety challenges to address.
- Prove you are a trusted community member that cares about long-term solutions.

**HISTORICAL THREAD OF FEEDBACK TO CUSD with Board Members All Aware of the Safety Issues**

On Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 12:45 PM wrote:

Hello Jonathan,

Yes, I did see you hustling today to help with the traffic and parking at today's game. However, you forgot to notify the neighbors of the "No Event Parking" signs. How is law enforcement supposed to tell the difference between attendees and residents? What if one of the residents was having a kid's birthday party and needed the street parking for a party?

Also, I keep emphasizing safety, safety, safety - not sure why this is not a priority for anyone on this e-mail? Your "ticket stands" are blocking the only access for emergency vehicles. You may want to re-think that. If a child was injured today - you are jeopardizing life safety.
I have a lot more notes that I will submit in very detailed form for the DREIR - there is no way you can move to less significant impact even with mitigating measures. You are a land-locked campus that did not properly plan for growth. As the first DEIR stated: Nighttime Events with SIGNIFICANT: Potential Emergency Access Issues

I hope the students won the game despite the adults not taking safety as a serious topic.

On Wed, Sep 7, 2022 at 10:10 AM wrote:

Jonathan,

Congrats on the Padres win at the Shoe Game. As many of the residents noted last night, school spirit seems high and winning games are possible without stadium lights. Please clarify the one statement you made last night: you believe that the "No Event" parking mitigation attempt was successful? Please expand on those key points so that the board can be properly informed. This is one of the "feeders" into the RDEIR. What we witnessed:

- You did not properly notify the California Highway Patrol or the broader Monterey Sheriff's Office.
- Folks did indeed park on Morse Drive and it was complete chaos on who should be ticketed and why. (one photo attached - the neighborhood has large file videos if you want us to send)
- The Monterey County Sheriff on duty only ticketed half the cars: Section 22504 - Stopping, parking, or standing upon highway in unincorporated area
- People departing the game were angry half the cars were ticked and half were not "Why me - Why not him"
- When the California Highway Patrol arrived, they clearly communicated they were unaware of any "No Event Parking" plan.
- CHP pointed to the conflicting unapproved "No Event Parking" signs you put up right under the real legal signs (complete conflict with each other and one being "fake and unenforceable" (Photo attached)
- The residents were conflicted. How are you supposed to tell the difference from resident to event participant?
- You completely ignored the other side of Highway 1. So, everyone jammed those residential streets and unsafe crossings were happening from Hatton street (no sidewalks) to Ocean Ave to try and get to the cross-light.

If all the above was happening at night - oh my - please don't tell me that wouldn't be a safety disaster. Please also remember, there is a new crop of students every year. This is not something that is perfected and you've got it down pat. CUSD has no jurisdiction on the surrounding streets of CHS. You kindly remind us you have no jurisdiction when it works to your convenience.

Speaking of which, you've indicated that the neighborhood needs to work more closely with law enforcement to enforce the signs that are already in place. You've pointed to the fact the SRO (that you pay for) is empowered to write tickets - especially near North Carmel Hills. In speaking with the SRO, he confirmed - he is off the clock by 3 PM when the afternoon pick-up chaos begins.

Please be truthful in the facts less the School Board Members walk away that your traffic mitigation plan was a success.

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient's authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Mon, Sep 26, 2022 at 5:06 PM Lacey Haines wrote:

As a Carmel resident, and homeowner, who lives within walking distance of Carmel High School, I have serious concerns regarding your Environmental Impact Report and there are gaps and areas that need to be addressed. Please provide a factual response to each comment, question and concern listed below.

Show the full impact of the light pollution on our treasured views and night skies.
- Why limit the map to only a 3.5-mile radius on page 127/RDEIR? Show the truth of the light spill. Where is zero?
- Install story poles/balloons allowing people to see the height of the light poles and the visual impact during the day.

Don’t shrink the assessment study area to a narrow swath immediately adjacent to the high school.
- Include all areas of the impact from Carmel-by-the-Sea, Carmel Valley, Jack’s Peak, Carmel Highlands, Point Lobos, Palo Corona, Mission Trails and Santa Lucia Preserve.
- All impacted geographies should be in Environmental Settings with details of impacts across all areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation and parking, soils, erosion and water quality. Please include in the cumulative impacts as well.

Provide full and consistent disclosure on how many practices and games the light will be on.
- Appendix J: VMT Assessment (6 football games), Mitigation Measure 5-2a: (44 games)
- BUT the truth is on page 103 with up to 400 practices and 124 games.
- Include the full impact of all the practices/games in all inputs: VMT, GHG, Energy – it’s part of the cumulative impact.

Why the surprises? This RDEIR includes significant NEW expanded construction projects.
- Re-start community engagement with a legally required Scoping Session.
- There are no details to any of the new plans. Concepts are unstable; thus we can’t provide feedback.
- We say NO to the 18-foot roadway, new parking lots and monstrous viewing platform.
- Dust off the Facilities Master Plan and develop a responsible phased long-term growth approach.

Show the existing and proposed Emergency Access Routes. Are our kids safe?
- 810 Fire and Life Safety forms have never been filed with DSA on any of your construction projects.
- From the Performing Art Center, Swimming Pool, Science Wing to the batting cages at baseball field, we can’t find any record of a CEQA process or signed and filed Notice of Exemption for the public to engage in the details.

You don’t disclose why you aren’t repairing tennis courts. Save demolition dollars and fix them.
- Tennis Students drive far with the Vehicles Miles Travelled and deserve on-campus courts. Easy Fix!

Figure 7-1: Habitat Map shows our beloved trees lining Scenic Highway 1 are in jeopardy.
- RDEIR states that it “appears” to have adequate buffer space between the trees and new parking lot but they provide NO details, specs or measurements.
- Provide a clear map indicating all specs, designs and exact boundary lines of Scenic Highway 1, protected trees and any proposed roadways or parking lots.
Fast-track the adoption of “Late Start”, a CA State Law benefiting all students.

- Focus on implementing Late Start by purchasing more buses and hiring more drivers.
- Please include all the workstreams you promised during special sessions.
- Separate out this workstream. It’s not a construction project and not part of the 4.2 Project Characteristics.

Parking Capacity and Emergency Access will remain a "Significant" Environmental Impact without viable mitigation:

- Parking: Currently not enough parking (276 spaces) for 866 enrolled students, 102 daytime faculty and staff (including kitchen staff) and five nighttime staff (page 65).
- Even with RDEIR proposed new parking spaces (total of 387), the CA Education recommended planning guidelines: 50% of students = parking spaces so minimum should be 433 parking spaces.
- Bleachers: Current bleacher capacity is 1,081(page 57) and yet Appendix K indicates they could absorb more than 2,000 attendees? Where are the Emergency Access Routes?

You fail to identify noise during events as a significant impact despite evidence to the contrary?

- Identify mitigation measures such as; Noise shielding (Acoustiblok fencing), distributed multi-zone PA system and a policy to prohibit all noise makers, e.g. air horns, megaphones, etc

Inspire the next generation with long-term solutions versus short-term band-aids. Assess CMS as viable solution.

- CHS: 22-acres, land-locked campus, 968 students/staff, 276 parking spaces.
- CMS: 60-acres permitting safe and responsible planning with 400 parking spaces now!
  - Since its purchase in 1963, Carmel Middle School’s site was always intended for the future Carmel High School (reference article in Carmel Pine Cone, January 10, 1963)
  - In 2018, CUSD acquired an additional 8.23-acre parcel adjacent to Carmel Middle School
  - The 2019 CUSD Facilities Master Plan already visualizes the potential of SIX (6) athletic fields with lights.

Accurate facts on the Environmental Setting of the existing traffic, parking and safety issues at CHS are not disclosed:

- Why hasn’t CHS already implemented what is on Page 18 of Appendix K: Traffic Management Plan:
  - The school would like to coordinate with the County and nearby neighbors of the school to consider the implementation of potential traffic safety measures that would benefit all street users. These include, but are not limited to ideas such as:
    - Updating required school area warning signage
    - Consider posted speed reductions down to 15 MPH in school areas
    - Calming traffic through use of pavement markings and/or speed reduction measures, which could potentially include additional speed humps
    - Exploring additional stop sign controls at intersection
  - We request that CUSD establish a baseline of a "Safe Routes to School Assessment" that acknowledges school enrollment boundary with a focus on infrastructure improvements, enforcement, tools and safety education and incentives for safe travel. This should be done immediately and outside of the RDEIR. It’s basic safety.

Work with residents to protect their residential streets with permanent long-term No Parking Signs.

- The proposed Mitigation Measure 11-4 of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) does NOT shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a short-term “encroachment permit” fix for limited nighttime football games.
- Don’t create a Public Nuisance (Penal Code 372 & 373a PC) as residents won’t be able to park on their own streets because of “No Event Parking” signs.

Fix the light pollution emitting from the pool lights you installed without a legal CEQA process.

- Install LED filters and use the lights as little as possible. Where is your usage policy?
- In a December 2021, Community Listening Session, you promised to fast track a solution – now a broken promise.

Include the baseball field as part the Environmental Impact and Athletic Improvement Assessment.

- There is a dangerous and closed-off walk-way up to the back-side of the stadium, can you fix?
- Can you confirm that the gate access is approved as an Emergency Access Route? Can a vehicle safely fit there?
Provide the exact street boundary of Scenic Highway 1 as part of the protected Corridor Program.
- GMP 3.3 states "Development shall maintain no less than a 100-foot setback from the scenic route right-of-way". However, the football stadium is within 65 feet of Hwy 1, and the proposed new parking lot and access road (demolition of the tennis courts) is within 60 feet of Hwy 1.

All your photos of KOPS are consistently taken at the lowest point of impact. We want the highest impact points.
- We’d like to see Figure 4-2 Candela Measurement Summary - Edge of Campus and provide photos from the various high points of light spill. Extrapolate this figure out until it reaches zero for all points.
- Specify the exact nighttime you are simulating? Show us 9 PM.
- What is the KOP of the Scenic Highway (day/night) where most of the stadium site is largely visible from the highway?

Included detailed costs and budget breakdown associated with each of components of the project.
- If one of your stated objectives is to meet school budget requirements, where are the costs estimates?
- Please include a breakdown of all attorney fees associated with the stadium lights project.

Clarify CUSD’s competitive bidding process and selection criteria for each the agencies on this project.
- Why do we only see Musco as a vendor and why is there only one design?
- Do we really need a "Show Light Entertainment” packaging on Appendix C Page 13.
- What was the process for selecting EMC Planning Group, Whitson Engineers, and Hexagon Transportation?

Mitigation Measure 11-4: The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is a superficial, flawed, short-term fix with the potential to cause residential nuisance problem:
- Execution of TMP requires an "Encroachment Permit" granted by Monterey County. CUSD is not in control. No guarantees the County will or should consistently give permission on requested dates.
- No valid methodology or basis for establishing anticipated attendees (lack of ticket sale data across all games including soccer, football and/or baseball).
- No valid base for vehicle occurrence: data comes from one homecoming football game on a Friday night, with lights, at Mitty High School in San Jose, CA (no context of how school compares to CHS, # students, campus size, etc).
- All off-campus parking, shuttle service and alternative mode of services are not enforceable (voluntary). The TMP provides little detail of how they would "advertise, communicate, reward or encourage".
- Parking Management is identified only for the residents surrounding the east side of CHS, not the west side where the overflow will now find relief and cause problems.

CEQA requires Environmentally Superiority Alternatives. This is ours:
- Fix the Pool Lights to improve candelas down to 17 at grade and 341 at 15 below. Implement Usage Policy.
- Implement “Green Building Lighting” on any existing fixtures on the campus
- No Stadium Lights: Significant and Unavoidable Impact even with Mitigation Measures
- No Viewing platform/storage building: Concept stage, encourages VMT, increases GHG emissions & Energy
- No 18-foot Roadway: Not required and too close to Scenic Highway 1, encourages VMT, increases GHG & Energy
- Fast track Late Start outside of the CEQA process. It’s not a construction project
- Properly assess the long-term viability of future growth at CMS. No short-term fixes at CHS

Thank you,
Lacey Haines
Concerned Carmel Resident

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.
Re: Feedback on RDEIR: Historical Context for Traffic Management Plan and Existing Conditions at Carmel High School

Thu, Sep 22, 2022 at 4:56 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <j hull@carmelunified.org>)
To: Frances Dillard <[redacted]@yahoo.com>
Cc: <nahcir@car melunified.org>; <aro sen@carmelunified.org>; <shinds@carmelunified.org>; 
<tarthur@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Thu, Sep 22, 2022 at 4:13 PM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mitigation Measure 11-4. The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) does NOT shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a superficial, short-term fix for a handful of limited nighttime football games versus addressing the long-term impact of 400 practices/124 soccer and football game (page 103/RDEIR). In addition, nowhere in the RDEIR as part of the Environment Setting does CUSD disclose the chronic current state of transportation, traffic and parking challenges.

I will be providing deeper commentary on why the Mitigation Measure under the Transportation section but one specific section that was "laughable" was on Page 18 of Appendix K: Traffic Management Plan, it states:

CHS, as a neighbor that generates traffic using these streets, will not increase traffic loads through the implementation of this TMP. However, the school would like to coordinate with the County and nearby neighbors of the school to consider the implementation of potential traffic safety measures that would benefit all street users. These include, but are not limited to ideas such as:

- Updating required school area warning signage
- Consider posted speed reductions down to 15 MPH in school areas
- Calming traffic through use of pavement markings and/or speed reduction measures, which could potentially include speed humps
- Exploring additional stop sign controls at intersection

For the official record, the below e-mail thread goes all the way back from 2013, whereas CUSD did not once recommended any of the above plan for EXISTING transportation, traffic and parking challenges. CUSD has no credibility for executing or upholding any TMP for the proposed stadium lights when they can't even solve current day-to-day problems. Interesting to see both Karl and Dan Paul were central to the exchanges from 2013. No results, outcomes or resolutions to resolving existing traffic or parking issues.

Also to note, the performing art center and swimming pool did not go through a CEQA process and CUSD leadership did not file a signed Notice of Exemption and there is NO 810 Fire and Life Safety form filed with DSA -- thus all this mess is interconnected and not solvable from years ago.

It’s irresponsible to continue building out CHS, attracting more activities and risking safety during nighttime activities. At some point, future thinking of building out CMS as alternative solution has to happen.

Please demonstrate you can think big picture with generational fixes beyond right now satisfaction.

From: John
Date: October 12, 2014 at 4:14:57 PM PDT
To: Karl Pallastrini <karlpallastrini@yahoo.com>
Cc: , Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>, Marvin Biasotti <mbiasotti@carmelunified.org>, Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>, Rick Blanckmeister <rblanckmeister@carmelunified.org>, Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>, karicalstny@yahoocom, karicalstny@aol.com, karicalstny@pebblebeach.com

Subject: Re: Carmel High School Parking Situation on Morse Drive

Hello Karl,

Thank you for responding to Fran’s e-mail. I would like next here to invite Marvin and Rick to meet me one morning on Morse Drive as students begin parking in the neighborhood. It would be enlightening for them to hear from students as to why they park there. I would see this action as a positive first step for the leadership group to understand the problem and honestly demonstrate they will be actively working towards a solution. I can already envision several.

Marvin and Rick, please let me know what morning works for you. I would like to do this prior to the school board meeting on October 29th. Please feel free to call me directly on my cell.

On Oct 12, 2014, at 11:28 AM, Karl Pallastrini <karlpallastrini@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello

The Board of Education is in receipt of your concern regarding the student parking on Morse Drive. Reading through the history of the correspondence, District Superintendent Marvin Biasotti has responded, and continues to be in the process of responding to the parking issue at Carmel High and the surrounding neighborhood. The solutions to this problem are not simple ones. Continuing with the process of discussion with open communication will render the best results. The Superintendent will provide regular updates to the Board on the status of your concern.

Best,

Karl Pallastrini, President   CUSD Board of Education

From: Frances
To: Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Marvin Biasotti <mbiasotti@carmelunified.org>; Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>; Rick Blanckmeister <rblanckmeister@carmelunified.org>; Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>; karicalstny@yahoocom; karicalstny@aol.com; karicalstny@pebblebeach.com

Subject: Re: Carmel High School Parking Situation on Morse Drive

Hello,

I am copying the remaining school board members so that my request for a parking overflow solution doesn’t come as a surprise. I hope we can work together for a proactive plan.

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 10, 2014, at 5:34 PM, Frances Dillard*****@yahoo.com> wrote:
Hello Folks,

You are not providing sufficient information or a pro-active enough strategy to convince me you are taking the problem seriously and looking for a long-term solution. With project spends of $23.8 MM, certainly parking allocation was taken into construction planning. I will be asking your offices for better answers and will be making this a priority to push for change now that construction is over. I request:

- Your student/faculty ratio compared to the available parking spaces compared to the number of vehicles registered over the past four years?
- Are all new parking slots on the campus appropriately marked and used? Seems to be lots of “clean vehicle” markings that are not being used? Are you pushing vehicles off-campus?
- Have you conducted a poll as to why students are parking off-campus? I stood there one day and personally asked the students – all responded not enough parking on school grounds.
- Have you conducted a poll or reached out the neighborhood as to whether this is an issue? Beyond what is legal or illegal, are you not accountable to being a good neighbor?

Glad you indicated you are aware students do park along Morse Drive. What do you think is the problem? Do you agree you didn’t plan for enough parking spaces or are you implying the students are lazy and just find it easier to not register and walk up the hill to class? What do you think is the issue so you can come to a better solution.

This group has a choice, work with me offline to find a solution or I become active during school board meetings, media, neighborhood rallies and any next steps required to solve the problem.

Let me know which way you want me to go.

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 10, 2014, at 4:39 PM, Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org> wrote:

Hello

We are aware that some students park along Morse Drive, and elsewhere in the neighborhoods around CHS. Last year there was more of a parking challenge on campus due to construction. Several weeks ago I had our campus supervisors place “courtesy notices” on the vehicles parked in the neighborhood, recommending that they register their vehicle and park on campus. We also informed them that they may be at risk of receiving a citation from CHP if they park illegally off campus. As a result we received several new registration requests for parking on campus.

I have spoken with the CHP, who said that unless students are parking near a “no parking” sign or blocking a drive-way, the vehicles are legal to park there. We will continue to encourage our students to park on campus but if you feel that a vehicle is parked illegally, or is blocking your driveway, I would suggest you contact the CHP. For you convenience CHP can be reached at 831-796-2100.

Martin Enriquez
Assistant Principal
831.624.1821 x2788
Hello Folks,

I’m disappointed that I haven’t received a response from anyone on this e-mail chain over the last 24 hours. I’m now including Rick Blanckmeister who appears to be in charge of construction planning and should also be accountable for the disastrous neighborhood parking problem created on Morse Drive.

Any immediate response from the group? An acknowledgement that you have received the e-mail would be polite. I will be requesting records for transparency of; number of registered students/teachers for parking spots and number of available parking spots for the past 3 to 5 years over the schools growth in construction and new building additions.

On Thursday, October 9, 2014 5:59 PM, Fran wrote:

Hello Gentlemen,

It has been a year since our last dialogue below regarding the overflow of students parking on the residential streets of Morse Drive. I was promised last year to have patience as you completed construction. In fact, this new school year brings a new meaning to the disaster of overflow parking you have created on our neighborhood streets. It is so baffling there is budget for a new pool, performing arts center, incredible football field and yet, no solution to the parking?

Thoughts before we take next steps on this side?

Begin forwarded message:

From: Fran
Date: May 15, 2013, 4:43:47 PM PDT
To: Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>, Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org>, "dpaul@carmelunified.org" <dpaul@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>,
Subject: Re: Parking Policy for Carmel High School
Reply-To: Frances Dillard @yahoo.com

Hello Gentlemen,

I am adding Dan Paul to this e-mail chain regarding lack of parking at Carmel High School that is causing student overflow on to the residential streets on Morse Drive.
A thank you to Martin who was the only person that returned my call today. I was hoping to hear from Dan today as well. Today was a particularly hellish day on the street. The Sheriff was called to ticket illegally parked cars.
As I mentioned to Martin on the phone - I do believe as leaders you are accountable for creating a lack of parking situation at the High School that is now negatively the neighborhood. I am requesting two things:

1. **Insight into the planning of the new construction on Carmel High School Property:**
   - What was the proposed parking-to-student/faculty ratio? What were the measure taken into consideration during planning?
   - What growth was anticipated? What was short-term/long-term plans to help the neighborhood?
   - Dan - your colleagues on this note seem to imply they are powerless in this process and you are the key to this project planning?

2. **What is the school district doing to put a plan in place to minimize this problem?**
   - I see no active plan - Task Force, policy being discussed or planned?
   - I don't buy the answer "sorry - we can't do anything about this"

Sorry folks, but this is a real problem that requires an action plan (not just an e-mail reply).

Let me know what your next steps.

---

**From:** Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>
**To:** Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org>; Fran
**Cc:** Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>
**Sent:** Friday, April 26, 2013 3:46 PM
**Subject:** RE: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Hello

I see you have specific questions regarding our parking policy. I've taken the liberty to copy and paste your questions below to ensure that I answer your questions completely:

"My question was, do you have a parking policy for students?
- are students required to register their cars?
- is the policy written and communicated in a handbook?
- does your insurance policy have mandatory requirements that need to be met for student safety?
- how are you communicating and enforcing policy?
- were no environmental studies done before construction? What was your plan?"

1. Students are required to register the vehicle if the plan on parking on campus. To register we require a current driver's license, registration and insurance. Students who park off campus are not required to register their vehicle.

2. This policy is communicated to students and parents via handbook and newsletters. Included in the policy are expectations of safe driving and student behavior.

3. I apologize, I'm not sure what you mean by "your insurance". We take great pride of our student driving and parking policies and the enforcement of them. Student safety is our main priority and if you have any information of reckless driving please don't hesitate to let me know.
4. Our driving and parking policies are enforced progressively through written warnings, parking stickers, discipline referrals, suspension of parking privileges, and suspension from school.

I hope I was able to answer your questions. Please let me know if you additional questions.

Martin Enriquez

-----Original Message-----
From: Marvin Biasotti
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 2:53 PM
To: Fran
Cc: Rick Lopez; Martin Enriquez
Subject: RE: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Hello Fran

I want to be clear that I was empathizing with the problem that you brought to my attention. Simply put, if you say you have a problem because CHS students that are parking in your neighborhood, then I accept that on face value.

With respect to your statement that "you" (the district) created the problem, I must disagree. As I attempted to explain in my first response, the school currently offers the same number of student parking spots that it has for at least the last 40 years. We were able to offer more spaces for the first eight months of this year, but only due to a temporary circumstance.

Fortunately, the district was able to include plans for nearly enough spots to replace the temporary parking as part of the current construction project. As a result, when the students return in the fall they will have access to more spots than existed in the past.

As for your questions about the student parking policy at CHS, I will defer to the Assistant Principal, Martin Enriquez. Please expect a response from him in the coming days. Thank you.

Marvin Biasotti
Superintendent
CARMEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
P (831) 624-1546 x 2020
F (831) 626-4052
mbiasotti@carmelunified.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Frances
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2013 7:50 AM
To: Marvin Biasotti
Cc: Rick Lopez;
Subject: Re: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Thanks. We appreciate that:
1. You acknowledge there is a problem
2. You created the problem

My question was, do you have a parking policy for students?
We are not satisfied with how you are handling the situation herein. As leaders, you are required to do more than acknowledge there is a problem. You are accountable for solutions to the community you serve. So, please provide specific responses and your indicated next steps.

We really don't want to rally the neighbors and make this a bigger issue.

Best,

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 19, 2013, at 6:42 PM, Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org> wrote:

> Hi Fran,
> 
> I apologize for my delay in responding as I've been in meetings for the past two days.
> 
> I'll begin by stating that I recognize the problems created by the overflow of student parking into the surrounding neighborhood and wish there was something I could do about it in the near term.
> 
> With the onset of constructing the new science wing at CHS, the availability of parking spaces for students has returned to the historical level. I say that because when the construction of the theater began a few years back, a portion of the student lot at the front of the school became unavailable for student use. To compensate for this loss, we directed the displaced students to park on the grass (now dirt) field in front of the gym. When the regular lot was returned to student use, we continued to allow the use of the dirt field for parking, thus resulting in more parking than had been historically available. We knew that this was a temporary situation that would end when construction of the new wing began on the field.
> 
> In addition to experiencing the effects of the loss of student parking on the field, you are also likely experiencing more intrusion into your neighborhood because it is spring. As the school year progresses, more students become age-eligible to drive and the demand for parking rises accordingly.
> 
> This problem should be mitigated to a large extent when the students return in the fall. This summer we will add approximately 40 new parking spaces to the main lot as part of the building project currently underway. That will return the number of available spots to a level very close to when both the main lot and the dirt lot were available for student parking.
> 
> Beyond that, we will do everything we can to include more parking spaces in the final (hopefully) building project at CHS. At this time next year we expect to be proceeding with the rebuilding of the administration building at the front of the campus. We are currently exploring all practicable options for expanding parking as part of that project.
> 
> Again, I apologize for the problems created by the overflow of student parking. We
truly want to be good neighbors. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have additional questions or concerns.

> Sincerely,
> Marvin Biasotti
> Superintendent
> CARMEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
> P (831) 624-1546 x 2020
> F (831) 626-4052
> mbiasotti@carmelunified.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Fran
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Marvin Biasotti
Cc:
Subject: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Hello Marvin,

My husband and I are residents/homeowners behind Carmel High School.

We'd like to know what is the school's parking policy for the students that park off property?
We must admit that with all the recent new buildings going up on school grounds it appears students don't have anywhere to park....leaving a trail of cars down our residential streets.
Neighbors are getting restless.

Please let us know of your policy and how are you enforcing?

Best
Fran

Sent from my iPad
Good morning Mrs. Dillard,
Thank you for your feedback. I have added Dan Paul to this thread to ensure that your comments are logged in the database.

Thank you again,
Sara

On Sep 15, 2022, at 9:07 AM, Frances Dillard wrote:

Thank you Sara,

We certainly understand there is a School Board “judgement” call when it comes to CEQA: Can it be said with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity could have a significant or even potentially significant effect on the environment.

But, it is that board judgement call that the community is calling into question and on multiple projects from the Performing Art Center, Swimming Pool, Batting Cages, Improvements on the Fields. The board has consistently ignored the rigour of a CEQA process, and has hush hushed the Notice of Exemption (no signatures, filings), etc. The community has never been given the opportunity to participate and voice our concerns of ever-expanding construction projects on a limited campus size. We walk the neighborhood on many occasions when baseball games are happening and that entire gated access is filled with cars parked illegally to block emergency vehicle access. Even without parked cars, if a true CEQA process was followed when installing the batting cages, my sense is that the high risks of emergency vehicles being unable to access the fields fast enough down the narrow lane would have been discovered.

Perhaps I'm wrong - but we find it too coincidental when we are bringing up Emergency Vehicle Access, that CUSD is just happens to conduct a partial boundary survey on a narrow lane. I do think it's the Board's Responsibility to hold the Superintendent and Facilities accountable for student safety. In the corporate world, someone would certainly be fired if they are aware of safety violations that have been present for years and are now moving towards a "clean-up" or "cover-up".

We are talking about the basic fundamentals of student safety. We can't emphasize enough that any further development on the 22-acre campus (especially at night) is going to introduce madness with traffic and safety risks.

On Wed, Sep 14, 2022 at 5:09 PM Sara Hinds wrote:
Mrs. Dillard,
My apologies for the typo on the feedback email address. It should read: feedback@carmelunified.org

Sorry for any confusion,
Sara

On Sep 14, 2022, at 4:31 PM, Sara Hinds wrote:

Dear Mrs. Dillard,
Thank you for your email. Whitson Engineers were contracted to conduct a partial boundary survey to confirm the CUSD property line. This survey is unrelated to any past projects, including the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019. As for the “fire access routes” please submit your concerns on this topic to: feedback@carmelumified.org.

With respect to your question concerning CEQA compliance for the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019, CEQA does not require public agencies to follow any specific procedure in approving activities that are exempt under CEQA. In some instances, public agencies will opt to file a Notice of Exemption in order to trigger a shorter statute of limitations period (35-days instead of 180-days), but they are not required to do so. Moreover, there is no requirement that an agency put its exemption decision in writing at any time, but if an agency opts to do so, the CEQA Guidelines expressly provide it cannot occur until after the exempt project is approved. (CEQA Guidelines, s. 15062(a).) As the Baseball Practice Area Improvements was exempt under CEQA, the District properly took action to approve the project, and no further process was required.

Thank you for taking the time to reach out with your question and concerns.

Best,
Sara

On Sep 13, 2022, at 4:20 AM, Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Board Members,

I've removed both Ted and Yvonne from this e-mail.

It's your role as board members to hold Ted and staff accountable to follow appropriate rules and regulations. Will one of you have the courage to ask:

- Is the contract for Whitson Engineers and the Partial Boundary Survey connected to the work that should have been done with Baseball Practice Improvement back in 2019? (see attached)
- Is this work related to concerns regarding Fire Access Routes?
- Why the need for this contract now?

Sara and Karl, you both signed the original Board Resolution in 2019 for the work to be done on the baseball fields. Did anyone think to ask why shouldn't this construction and improvement go through a CEQA process? There isn't even an "unsigned" Notice of Exemption (the messines of the theater and pool lights) for the batting cages. Please note all this lack of follow-up and rigour will unfold and be highly connected to the stadium lights RDEIR and campus Emergency Access Routes.

You can decide what action you want to take at this Wednesday's board meeting, but I'm giving you a heads up that you should not be complicit in continuing to cover-up past sins. Ted is inheriting a mess but instead of sharing the true state of the campus and past construction, the road to cover-up continues.

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 2:45 PM Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ted and Yvonne,

The attached Vendor Contract is on the on the agenda for: Independent Contractor Service Agreements. Can you provide more insights:
- Have the homeowners been notified of the work?
- What is the intent of the potential encroachment?
FYI: Since 2013: Historical Records Carmel High School Parking Situation (at that time Morse Drive)

From: Frances Dillard <f tollard@gmail.com>  
To: Ted Knight <tknight@carmelunified.org>; Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>  
Cc: dillardjohnth@comcast.net  

Sun, Feb 27, 2022 at 7:01 PM PST (GMT-08:00)

Well Karl and Dan,

I went back to all my e-mails from my Yahoo account to see how many years ago the neighbors behind Carmel High School began to officially track our correspondence of parking and traffic violations to CUSD. This e-mail thread started in 2013 and was specifically around Morse Drive (which I solved myself working with the District). Not surprising to see both of your names associated with the challenges and the school’s inability to bring things to closure or resolution to the issues the neighborhood has consistently outlined for almost 10 years.

I’m still baffled on how either of you can support the proposed stadium lights given the community’s history of complaining on the parking, traffic and safety. This all started right after the tragic death of an individual near the high school in 2012. Hope this gives Ted a historical perspective of the community’s frustration and the number of years we’ve been attempting to build trust and outcomes.

Girl, 16, hits pedestrian near Carmel High School; 1 dead

From: John Dillard <j f dillad@yahoo.com>  
Date: October 12, 2014 at 4:14:57 PM PDT  
To: Karl Pallastrini <karl pallastrini@yahoo.com>  
Cc: Frances Dillard <f tollard@yahoo.com>, Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>, Marvin Biasotti <mbiasotti@carmelunified.org>, Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>, Rick Blankmeister <rblankmeister@carmelunified.org>, Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>  
Subject: Re: Carmel High School Parking Situation on Morse Drive  

Hello Karl,

Thank you for responding to Fran’s e-mail. I would like next here to invite Marvin and Rick to meet me one morning on Morse Drive as students begin parking in the neighborhood. It would be enlightening for them to hear from students as to why they park there. I would see this action as a positive first step for the leadership group to understand the problem and honestly demonstrate they will be actively working towards a solution. I can already envision several.

Marvin and Rick, please let me know what morning works for you. I would like to do this prior to the school board meeting on October 29th. Please feel free to call me directly on my cell.

John Dillard

On Oct 12, 2014, at 11:28 AM, Karl Pallastrini <karl pallastrini@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello Mrs. Dillard,

The Board of Education is in receipt of your concern regarding the student parking on Morse Drive. Reading through the history of the correspondence, District Superintendent Marvin Biasotti has responded, and continues to be in the process of responding to the parking issue at Carmel High and the surrounding neighborhood. The solutions to this problem are not simple ones. Continuing with the process of discussion with open
communication will render the best results. The Superintendent will provide regular updates to the Board on the status of your concern.

Best,

Karl Pallastrini, President  CUSD Board of Education

From: Frances Dillard <redderedacted@yahoo.com>
To: Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Marvin Biasotti <m.biasotti@carmelunified.org>; Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>; Rick Blanckmeister <r.blanckmeister@carmelunified.org>; Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>; reddededicated@yahoo.com>
<reddededicated@yahoo.com>; "karlpallastrini@yahoo.com" <karlpallastrini@yahoo.com>; reddededicated@allcarerx.net>
reddededicated@allcarerx.net; “reddededicated@mac.com” <reddededicated@mac.com>; "reddededicated@aol.com" <reddededicated@aol.com>; reddededicated@pebblebeach.com reddededicated@pebblebeach.com

Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2014 11:55 AM
Subject: Re: Carmel High School Parking Situation on Morse Drive

Hello,

I am copying the remaining school board members so that my request for a parking overflow solution doesn't comes as a surprise. I hope we can work together for a proactive plan.

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 10, 2014, at 5:34 PM, Frances Dillard reddededicated@yahoo.com wrote:

Hello Folks,

You are not providing sufficient information or a pro-active enough strategy to convince me you are taking the problem seriously and looking for a long-term solution. With project spends of $23.8 MM, certainly parking allocation was taken into construction planning. I will be asking your offices for better answers and will be making this a priority to push for change now that construction is over. I request:

- Your student/faculty ratio compared to the available parking spaces compared to the number of vehicles registered over the past four years?
- Are all new parking slots on the campus appropriately marked and used? Seems to be lots of “clean vehicle” markings that are not being used? Are you pushing vehicles off-campus?
- Have you conducted a poll as to why students are parking off-campus? I stood there one day and personally asked the students – all responded not enough parking on school grounds.
- Have you conducted a poll or reached out the neighborhood as to whether this is an issue? Beyond what is legal or illegal, are you not accountable to being a good neighbor?

Glad you indicated you are aware students do park along Morse Drive. What do you think is the problem? Do you agree you didn’t plan for enough parking spaces or are you implying the students are lazy and just find it easier to not register and walk up the hill to class? What do you think is the issue so you can come to a better solution.

This group has a choice, work with me offline to find a solution or I become active during school board meetings, media, neighborhood rallies and any next steps required to solve the problem.

Let me know which way you want me to go.
Best
Fran Dillard

Sent from my iPad

On Oct 10, 2014, at 4:39 PM, Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org> wrote:

Hello Ms. Dillard,

We are aware that some students park along Morse Drive, and elsewhere in the neighborhoods around CHS. Last year there was more of a parking challenge on campus due to construction. Several weeks ago I had our campus supervisors place “courtesy notices” on the vehicles parked in the neighborhood, recommending that they register their vehicle and park on campus. We also informed them that they may be at risk of receiving a citation from CHP if they park illegally off campus. As a result we received several new registration requests for parking on campus.

I have spoken with the CHP, who said that unless students are parking near a “no parking” sign or blocking a drive-way, the vehicles are legal to park there. We will continue to encourage our students to park on campus but if you feel that a vehicle is parked illegally, or is blocking your driveway, I would suggest you contact the CHP. For your convenience CHP can be reached at 831-796-2100.

Martin Enriquez
Assistant Principal
831.624.1821 x2788

From: Frances Dillard [mailto:***@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Martin Enriquez; Marvin Biasotti; Dan Paul; Rick Blanckmeister
Cc: Rick Lopez; ***@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Carmel High School Parking Situation on Morse Drive

Hello Folks,

I'm disappointed that I haven't received a response from anyone on this e-mail chain over the last 24 hours. I'm now including Rick Blanckmeister who appears to be in charge of construction planning and should also be accountable for the disastrous neighborhood parking problem created on Morse Drive.

Any immediate response from the group? An acknowledgement that you have received the e-mail would be polite. I will be requesting records for transparency of; number of registered students/teachers for parking spots and number of available parking spots for the past 3 to 5 years over the schools growth in construction and new building additions.

Fran Dillard

On Thursday, October 9, 2014 5:59 PM, Frances Dillard wrote:
Hello Gentlemen,

It has been a year since our last dialogue below regarding the overflow of students parking on the residential streets of Morse Drive. I was promised last year to have patience as you completed construction. In fact, this new school year brings a new meaning to the disaster of overflow parking you have created on our neighborhood streets. It is so baffling there is budget for a new pool, performing arts center, incredible football field and yet, no solution to the parking?

Thoughts before we take next steps on this side?

Fran Dillard

Begin forwarded message:

From: Frances Dillard [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>
Date: May 15, 2013, 4:43:47 PM PDT
To: Martin Enriquez <menriquez@carmelunified.org>, Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org>, "dpaul@carmelunified.org" <dpaul@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Rick Lopez <rlopez@carmelunified.org>, Frances Dillard [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Parking Policy for Carmel High School
Reply-To: Frances Dillard [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>

Hello Gentlemen,

I am adding Dan Paul to this e-mail chain regarding lack of parking at Carmel High School that is causing student overflow on to the residential streets on Morse Drive.

A thank you to Martin who was the only person that returned my call today. I was hoping to hear from Dan today as well. Today was a particularly hellish day on the street. The Sheriff was called to ticket illegally parked cars.

As I mentioned to Martin on the phone - I do believe as leaders you are accountable for creating a lack of parking situation at the High School that is now negatively the neighborhood. I am requesting two things:

1. **Insight into the planning of the new construction on Carmel High School Property**:
   - What was the proposed parking-to-student/faculty ratio? What were the measures taken into consideration during planning?
   - What growth was anticipated? What was short-term/long-term plans to help the neighborhood?
   - Dan - your colleagues on this note seem to imply they are powerless in this process and you are the key to this project planning?

2. **What is the school district doing to put a plan in place to minimize this problem?**
   - I see no active plan - Task Force, policy being discussed or planned?
   - I don't buy the answer "sorry - we can't do anything about this"

Sorry folks, but this is a real problem that requires an action plan (not just an e-mail reply).

Let me know what your next steps.
Hello Ms. Dillard,

I see you have specific questions regarding our parking policy. I've taken the liberty to copy and paste your questions below to ensure that I answer your questions completely:

"My question was, do you have a parking policy for students?  
- are students required to register their cars? 
- is the policy written and communicated in a handbook? 
- does your insurance policy have mandatory requirements that need to be met for student safety? 
- how are you communicating and enforcing policy? 
- were no environmental studies done before construction? What was your plan?"

1. Students are required to register the vehicle if the plan on parking on campus. To register we require a current driver's license, registration and insurance. Students who park off campus are not required to register their vehicle.

2. This policy is communicated to students and parents via handbook and newsletters. Included in the policy are expectations of safe driving and student behavior.

3. I apologize, I'm not sure what you mean by "your insurance". We take great pride of our student driving and parking policies and the enforcement of them. Student safety is our main priority and if you have any information of reckless driving please don't hesitate to let me know.

4. Our driving and parking policies are enforced progressively through written warnings, parking stickers, discipline referrals, suspension of parking privileges, and suspension from school.

Ms. Dillard, I hope I was able to answer your questions. Please let me know if you additional questions.

Martin Enriquaz

-----Original Message-----
From: Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 2:53 PM
To: Frances Dillard
Cc: Rick Lopez; Martin Enriquaz
Subject: RE: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Hello Frances,

I want to be clear that I was empathizing with the problem that you brought to my attention. Simply put, if you say you have a problem because CHS students that are
parking in your neighborhood, then I accept that on face value.

With respect to your statement that "you" (the district) created the problem, I must disagree. As I attempted to explain in my first response, the school currently offers the same number of student parking spots that it has for at least the last 40 years. We were able to offer more spaces for the first eight months of this year, but only due to a temporary circumstance.

Fortunately, the district was able to include plans for nearly enough spots to replace the temporary parking as part of the current construction project. As a result, when the students return in the fall they will have access to more spots than existed in the past.

As for your questions about the student parking policy at CHS, I will defer to the Assistant Principal, Martin Enriquez. Please expect a response from him in the coming days. Thank you.

Marvin Biasotti
Superintendent
CARMEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
P (831) 624-1546 x 2020
F (831) 626-4052
mbiasotti@carmelunified.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Frances Dillard <mailto:****@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 20, 2013 7:50 AM
To: Marvin Biasotti
Cc: Rick Lopez; c********@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Thanks. We appreciate that:
1. You acknowledge there is a problem
2. You created the problem

My question was, do you have a parking policy for students?
- are students required to register their cars?
- is the policy written and communicated in a handbook?
- does your insurance policy have mandatory requirements that need to be met for student safety?
- how are you communicating and enforcing policy?
- were no environmental studies done before construction? What was your plan?

We are not satisfied with how you are handling the situation herein. As leaders, your are required to do more than acknowledge there is a problem. You are accountable for solutions to the community you serve. So, please provide specific responses and your indicated next steps.

We really don't want to rally the neighbors and make this a bigger issue.

Best,
Fran Dillard

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 19, 2013, at 6:42 PM, Marvin Biasotti <Marvin@carmelunified.org> wrote:
Hi Frances,

I apologize for my delay in responding as I've been in meetings for the past two days.

I'll begin by stating that I recognize the problems created by the overflow of student parking into the surrounding neighborhood and wish there was something I could do about it in the near term.

With the onset of constructing the new science wing at CHS, the availability of parking spaces for students has returned to the historical level. I say that because when the construction of the theater began a few years back, a portion of the student lot at the front of the school became unavailable for student use. To compensate for this loss, we directed the displaced students to park on the grass (now dirt) field in front of the gym. When the regular lot was returned to student use, we continued to allow the use of the dirt field for parking, thus resulting in more parking than had been historically available. We knew that this was a temporary situation that would end when construction of the new wing began on the field.

In addition to experiencing the effects of the loss of student parking on the field, you are also likely experiencing more intrusion into your neighborhood because it is spring. As the school year progresses, more students become age-eligible to drive and the demand for parking rises accordingly.

This problem should be mitigated to a large extent when the students return in the fall. This summer we will add approximately 40 new parking spaces to the main lot as part of the building project currently underway. That will return the number of available spots to a level very close to when both the main lot and the dirt lot were available for student parking.

Beyond that, we will do everything we can to include more parking spaces in the final (hopefully) building project at CHS. At this time next year we expect to be proceeding with the rebuilding of the administration building at the front of the campus. We are currently exploring all practicable options for expanding parking as part of that project.

Again, I apologize for the problems created by the overflow of student parking. We truly want to be good neighbors. Please don't hesitate to let me know if you have additional questions or concerns.

Sincerely,
Marvin Biasotti
Superintendent
CARMEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
P (831) 624-1546 x 2020
F (831) 626-4052
mbiasotti@carmelunified.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Frances Dillard [mailto: dilardjohn@adelphia.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Marvin Biasotti
Cc: dilardjoht@yahoo.com
Subject: Parking Policy for Carmel High School

Hello Marvin,
My husband and I are residents/homeowners behind Carmel High School. We'd like to know what is the school's parking policy for the students that park off property? We must admit that with all the recent new buildings going up on school grounds it appears students don't have anywhere to park...leaving a trail of cars down our residential streets. Neighbors are getting restless.

Please let us know of your policy and how are you enforcing?

Best
Fran Dillard

Sent from my iPad
Re: CPRA Request and Appointment to View Emergency Access Routes for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School

From: Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com>  
Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 9:12 AM PST (GMT-08:00)
Cc: Sara Hinds <sahinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallasstrini <kbpallasstrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Board Members,

I am continually puzzled why you stand by Ted Knight and his leadership actions and recommendations. He clearly knew CHS campus (and potentially all other campuses) are in violation of Emergency Access Routes when the vote was going forward for the Final EIR. You all indicated at the Special Meeting that the "decision lies at your feet" - so I'm assuming you are complicit in the cover-up?

The traffic management issues and public safety challenges are current and now. Below is a photo of Carmel High School on Friday, 7:30 PM on 12/16. Parking along that route is a fire lane violation. For all future events, we will be calling the law enforcement for ticketing. In addition, the parking on North Carmel Hills and Morse Drive are not acceptable. We’ll be working with Monterey County to ensure your parking overflow is not allowed as it introduces public safety risk. You should be holding the Superintendent accountable for a Traffic Management Plan for all events (day or night) that overflow into residential streets. We will continue to ask that this topic is put on the agenda for each board meeting.

On Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 8:49 AM Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com> wrote:

TO Ted and Jessica,

I would like to view the Emergency Access Plans for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School on Friday, December 23rd. I will be available all day to come to your offices. Please confirm the window of the appointment.
In previous CPRA request to view the Emergency Access Plans, your response was as follows:

The disclosable records are architectural site plans that cannot be reproduced pursuant to their terms. The District makes these records available for inspection, but not copying. Contact the Chief Communications Officer (contact information at right) to arrange a time to inspect the records at the District Office, located at 4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923.

Please note, I have attached Carmel High School's **failed inspection** from Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

Fire access roads shall be marked with approved signs or markings that state, "NO PARKING--FIRE LANE". Marking shall be maintained in clean, legible condition.

Status: FAIL
Notes: Fire Department staff would like to meet with CHS staff to discuss this item. We require 20' of fire lane access around the entire perimeter of the school. The fire lane curb needs to be painted with two coats of 100% acrylic water based red paint with white lettering, 3" in height and have a minimum of 1/2" stroke that states, "FIRE LANE NO PARKING". To accomplish the 20-foot fire lane, some areas will need the entire width of the roadway dedicated to the fire lane, in those areas, fire lane signs will need to be placed on the side opposite the painted curb (for example, on the fence along the front of the Admin building).

A separate CPRA request will be submitted for all records from July 2022 with any CUSD employee and any member of the Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

For the School Board Members. The Community has been consistent since the first Draft EIR for stadium lights around the required compliance with the Emergency Access Routes. The community went so far as providing you photos of where the CHS is not in compliance. All this was done before your approval of the Final EIR.

    CHS Inspection Date: 10/11/22
    Authorized Date: 11/07/22
    Special Meeting Board Approval of Stadium Improvements: 11/29/22

You were all fully aware that CHS was not in compliance for public safety. The Final EIR blew off the community's direct inquiries with no response and all of you continue to develop activities that attract larger attendance to a campus that is already over-built and has limited capacity to safely manage large crowds. In addition to the CPRA request above, I would like to put the topic of Public Safety, Traffic Management Plan and Emergency Access Routes on the School Board Agenda. I've done this previously but the topic is never put on the agenda.
CPRA Request and Appointment to View Emergency Access Routes for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School

From: Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com>  
To: Jessica Hull <jhull@carmelunified.org>; Ted Knight <tknight@carmelunified.org>  
Cc: Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Mon, Dec 19, 2022 at 8:49 AM PST (GMT-08:00)

TO Ted and Jessica,

I would like to view the Emergency Access Plans for Carmel High School and Carmel Middle School on Friday, December 23rd. I will be available all day to come to your offices. Please confirm the window of the appointment.

In previous CPRA request to view the Emergency Access Plans, your response was as follows:

The disclosable records are architectural site plans that cannot be reproduced pursuant to their terms. The District makes these records available for inspection, but not copying. Contact the Chief Communications Officer (contact information at right) to arrange a time to inspect the records at the District Office, located at 4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923.

Please note, I have attached Carmel High School's failed inspection from Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

Fire access roads shall be marked with approved signs or markings that state, "NO PARKING--FIRE LANE". Marking shall be maintained in clean, legible condition.

Status: FAIL
Notes: Fire Department staff would like to meet with CHS staff to discuss this item. We require 20' of fire lane access around the entire perimeter of the school. The fire lane curb needs to be painted with two coats of 100% acrylic water based red paint with white lettering, 3" in height and have a minimum of 1/2" stroke that states, "FIRE LANE NO PARKING". To accomplish the 20-foot fire lane, some areas will need the entire width of the roadway dedicated to the fire lane, in those areas, fire lane signs will need to be placed on the side opposite the painted curb (for example, on the fence along the front of the Admin building).

A separate CPRA request will be submitted for all records from July 2022 with any CUSD employee and any member of the Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSDA.

For the School Board Members. The Community has been consistent since the first Draft EIR for stadium lights around the required compliance with the Emergency Access Routes. The community went so far as providing you photos of where the CHS is not in compliance. All this was done before your approval of the Final EIR.

CHS Inspection Date: 10/11/22
Authorized Date: 11/07/22
Special Meeting Board Approval of Stadium Improvements: 11/29/22

You were all fully aware that CHS was not in compliance for public safety. The Final EIR blew off the community's direct inquiries with no response and all of you continue to develop activities that attract larger attendance to a campus that is already over-built and has limited capacity to safely manage large crowds. In addition to the CPRA request above, I would like to put the topic of Public Safety, Traffic Management Plan and Emergency Access Routes on the School Board Agenda. I've done this previously but the topic is never put on the agenda.

Attachments

- CHS Failed_InspectionResults_PRA Nov 2022 - Copy.pdf
Aromas Tri-County FPD, Carmel Highlands FPD, Cypress FPD, & Pebble Beach CSD

Occupancy: Carmel High School
Occupancy ID:
Address: 3600 Ocean AVE
          Carmel CA 93923

Inspection Type: Annual
Inspection Date: 10/11/2022        By: [Redacted]
Time In: 08:50                      Time Out: 14:45
Authorized Date: 11/07/2022        By: [Redacted]

Form: Annual School Inspection

Inspection Description:
This inspection form comprises criteria required by Federal, State and local codes or standards to ensure minimum levels of fire and life safety compliance. It applies to all facilities within Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District, Cypress Fire Protection District, and Pebble Beach Community Services District.

Inspection Topics:
Business Information

School Name
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: Carmel High School

School Physical Address
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: 3600 Ocean Avenue, Carmel, CA 93923

School Phone Number
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: [Redacted]

Mailing Address
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: P.O. Box 222780, Carmel, CA 93923

School Representative Name (during inspection)
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: [Redacted]

School Email or Representative Email
Add Remarks
Status: PASS
Notes: [Redacted]
# EMERGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION (after hours responsible parties to be contacted by dispatch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Contact #1 Name (First, Last)</th>
<th>Add Remarks</th>
<th>Status: PASS</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #1 Title: i.e. Teacher, Principal, Caretaker, Secretary, etc.</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes: District Maintenance Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #1 Mailing Address</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes: P.O. Box 222780, Carmel, CA 93923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #1 Phone Number</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Emergency Contact #1 a Key Holder? (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #2 Name (First, Last)</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #2 Title: i.e. Teacher, Principal, Caretaker, Secretary, etc.</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #2 Mailing Address</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes: P.O. Box 222780, Carmel, CA 93923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Contact #2 Phone Number</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Emergency Contact #2 a Key Holder? (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Add Remarks</td>
<td>Status: PASS</td>
<td>Notes: Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. BUILDING EXTERIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Address numbers are at least 4 inches in height and 1/2 inch in stroke, on a contrasting background, visible and easy to read from your fronting street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> FAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> Please post the address numbers (3600) at both entrances off Highway 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. All sides of the building are free from weeds, debris, and combustibles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> FAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> Please clean up the piles of combustibles (trash pile by classroom 31 and trash pile by parking space 57). Consider weed whacking dead vegetation further down the hillside. The requirement is 100’ feet (or to the property line, whichever is closest) of clearance from buildings, which you meet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Has the building has been re-keyed in the last 12 months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> PASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Does the building have a Knox box? If so, have the keys been checked to confirm they provide access to the entire facility by the inspector performing this inspection?

Add Remarks

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:** There are two knox locations. There is a knox by the northern gate and a knox outside the administration building. Each knox box had a full complement of keys. These keys were utilized during the inspection process, and to open the fire lane gate.  
-Unable to open the closet in the Wellness Center.

### 2. ELECTRICAL

A. Temporary wiring is allowed for a period not to exceed 90 days; such wiring is allowed for longer periods for construction, remodeling or repair of buildings or equipment.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

B. Extension cords and flexible cords shall not be used as a substitute for permanent wiring.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

C. Extension cords shall not be affixed to structures, extended through walls, ceilings or floors, or under doors or floor coverings, nor shall such cords be subject to environmental damage or physical impact.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**
D. Multi-plug adaptors, such as cube adapters, un-fused plug strips or other such devices not complying with the California Electrical Code shall be prohibited.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Classroom B - Wellness Center: replace the 3-way plug adapter with a UL approved surge protector.
Classroom 33: replace the plug adapter/extension cord with a UL approved surge protector.

---

E. Relocatable power taps shall be permitted if it is of the grounded type, equipped with over current protection and listed in accordance with UL 1363.

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED

**Notes:**

---

F. Relocatable power taps shall be directly connected to a permanently installed receptacle.

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED

**Notes:**

---

G. Relocatable power tap cords shall not extend through walls, ceilings, floors, under doors or floor coverings, or be subject to environmental or physical damage.

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED

**Notes:**

---

H. Appliance cords and extension cords shall be maintained in good condition without splices, deterioration or damage.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**
I. A working space of not less than 30 inches in width, 36 inches in depth and 78 inches in height shall be provided in front of electrical service equipment. Storage is prohibited within the designated working space. See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** CHS Padre Live-on-Air room in Performing Arts building: panel needs clearance. 
Classroom B - Wellness Center: please label the door that leads to the electrical panel with "electrical". 
Auto shop: the boxes blocking the electrical panel need to be moved. 
Room 13: Fire Alarm Control Panel by Room #13 access is blocked. 
Office by the gym exit: unblock the electrical panel.

J. Open junction boxes and open wiring splices shall be prohibited. Approved covers shall be provided for all switch and electrical outlet boxes. See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

K. Portable electric space heaters shall not be operated within 3 feet of any combustible materials. Portable electric space heaters shall be operated only in locations for which they are listed. See Remarks.  
**Status:**  
**Notes:**
3. STORAGE/HOUSEKEEPING

A. All storage/housekeeping shall be neat and orderly, with storage separated from heating devices by distance or shielding so that ignition cannot occur.

Add Remarks

Status: PASS

Notes: Room 34: Excellent storage job with the chemistry materials kept in enclosed cabinets.
Room 33: Please consider enclosed shelves or a safety bar across the chemicals, in case of an earthquake.
Cafeteria: general housekeeping (cleaning supplies stored on shelves).
Auto shop: chain the Argon gas cylinder to the wall.
Outside Room 2: Please consider enclosed shelves or a safety bar across the chemicals, in case of an earthquake.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Combustible material shall not be stored in boiler rooms, mechanical rooms or electrical equipment rooms.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> FAIL</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> Performing Arts Building Electrical Room: remove the paint containers and store in another location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![](image)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Storage shall be maintained two (2) feet or more below the ceiling in non-sprinklered areas of buildings or a minimum of 18 inches below sprinkler deflectors in sprinklered areas of buildings.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> PASS</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Combustible waste containers larger than 40 gallons shall be constructed of non combustible material or approved combustible material and provided with a lid.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> NOT OBSERVED</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Combustible waste containers larger than 41.5 cubic yards shall not be stored in buildings or placed within 5 feet of combustible walls, openings or combustible roof eave lines.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> NOT OBSERVED</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Materials susceptible to spontaneous ignition, such as oily rags, shall be stored in a listed disposal container. Contents shall be emptied daily.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> PASS</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Electric motors shall be maintained free from excessive accumulations of oil, dirt, waste and debris.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status:</strong> NOT OBSERVED</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. FIRE EXTINGUISHERS

A. Are all fire extinguisher(s) visible, have proper signage and are accessible (not blocked)? Title 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. All extinguishers shall be manually inspected at least monthly by building owner or occupant, or electronically monitored.

Add Remarks

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: need to sign the back of the fire extinguisher card (upstairs of the stage area in the catwalk).
The electrical room on the eastside exterior of the Performing Arts building needs the back of the fire extinguisher card signed.
Classroom B: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom C: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 36: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 34: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 25: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 23: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 22: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 21: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 20: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 19: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 18: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 17: monthly inspection extinguisher cards need signing.
Photolab 16: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 15: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 14: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 13: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 12: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 11: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Classroom 9: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Cafeteria: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
Kitchen: monthly inspection extinguisher card needs signing.
C. Name of fire extinguisher service company.

Add Remarks

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:** A & B Fire Protection & Safety, Inc.

D. Date of fire extinguisher service. Extinguishers shall be subjected to maintenance annually as described in Title 19 CCR.

Add Remarks

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** All extinguishers were serviced on July 11, 2022.  
(Except: extinguisher in the electrical room by the prep room, is expired).

E. Provide one Class 2-A rated fire extinguisher for each 3,000 square feet of light hazard fuel load or one Class 2-A extinguisher for each 1,500 square feet of ordinary hazard fuel load. Travel distance to each extinguisher shall not exceed 75 feet.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**
F. If Class B fuel hazards are present, a Class B rated fire extinguisher shall be provided in accordance with Title 19 Section 569, Table 3.

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED

**Notes:**

---

G. Portable extinguishers shall be securely mounted on brackets or placed in cabinets. Mount the fire extinguisher(s) where they are in a conspicuous location and readily accessible, keeping the top of the extinguisher no higher than five (5) feet and no less than four (4) inches from the ground, Title 19.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: mount on a wall the fire extinguisher that is located on the floor upstairs of the stage area. The electrical room on the eastside exterior of the Performing Arts building needs the fire extinguisher mounted on the wall. Cafeteria: mount on a wall the fire extinguisher on the ground. Room 45: the cabinet wheel sticks, and cabinet is hard to access. Classroom 46: mount on a wall the fire extinguisher.
5. COMMERCIAL HOOD SYSTEM

A. Is your hood system serviced and tagged semi-annually by a licensed contractor?

Add Remarks

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Last serviced February 24, 2022.

B. Per NFPA 96 provide the last service record of cleaning and maintain cleaning the kitchen hood exhaust and duct system by a licensed contractor.

Add Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Last cleaned February 22, 2022.

C. Per NFPA 96 your hood and duct system should be cleaned monthly, quarterly, semi-annually, and annually.

Add Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Semi-annually.
D. Provide and maintain a "K" class fire extinguisher in the commercial kitchen, minimum travel distance shall not exceed 30 feet.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**

---

### 6. FIRE ALARM/FIRE SPRINKLER(S)

**A.** Does the building or suite have a fire sprinkler system? If so, when was the last five (5) year certification completed?

Add Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:** There are two buildings with sprinkler systems. Both are in compliance.

---

**B.** Does the building or suite have a fire alarm system? If so, what is the name and phone number of the monitoring company?

Add Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:** Sentry 831 - 658-6169
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Have the alarm system access codes been verified in the last twelve (12) months?</td>
<td>Add Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Maintain access to and operation of standpipes and sprinkler control valves.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Remove obstructions, decorations, or other items interfering with proper operation of sprinkler system.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Replace damaged, corroded, or painted sprinkler heads.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Provide a sprinkler wrench and spare sprinkler heads, one of each type in use in system.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Identify sprinkler control valves and secure in open position with a breakable lock.</td>
<td>See Remarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Service and tag (by State licensee) automatic fire extinguishing and standpipe systems every five (5) years.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: the 5-year service was completed on February 2022.

K. Service and maintain proper workings of the automatic fire alarm system with current test and contact documentation in the Fire Alarm Panel.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:** Per Gruber, PG&E caused power surges that fried numerous fire alarm system components. CHS is working with PG&E to address and control/prevent these power surges. The non-operational alarm system components were replaced.

Per email dated 11/3/2022 from Jesse Gallagos (Project Manager/Estimator/Sr. Technician Office: 831-424-6459 ext: 311 jesse@johnson-electronics.com) "This email confirms that the Carmel High School Fire Alarm System rolling troubles and alarms have been resolved as of 10/03/22, and the system has been inspected and tested per NFPA 72 chapter 14."
### 7. SIGNS

A. Fire access roads shall be marked with approved signs or markings that state, "NO PARKING--FIRE LANE". Marking shall be maintained in clean, legible condition.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Fire Department staff would like to meet with CHS staff to discuss this item. We require 20' of fire lane access around the entire perimeter of the school. The fire lane curb needs to be painted with two coats of 100% acrylic water based red paint with white lettering, 3" in height and have a minimum of 1/2" stroke that states, "FIRE LANE NO PARKING". To accomplish the 20-foot fire lane, some areas will need the entire width of the roadway dedicated to the fire lane, in those areas, fire lane signs will need to be placed on the side opposite the painted curb (for example, on the fence along the front of the Admin building).

B. If an Emergency Generator is on the premises, warning signs and labels must be posted.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:** There is no automatic emergency generator on the premises.

C. If there is a Solar power system on the premises, warning signs and labels must be posted. (Shutoff identified on breaker panel, electrical conduit labeled every 10 feet with red solar sticker, DC systems label lines in crawl spaces, etc).

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**

D. Electrical vehicle parking and charging station signs and labels.

See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**

### 8. EXITS

A. Egress doors shall be readily operable from the egress side without the use of a key, special knowledge, or effort.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

B. Egress doors shall swing in the direction of egress travel where serving an occupant load of 50 or more persons.

Add Remarks.

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

C. Manually operated flush bolts or surface bolts are not permitted.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Room 18 & Library bathrooms: need to replace the locking bolts with permitted locks.

D. The unlatching of any door or leaf shall not require more than one operation.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**
E. Means of egress shall be illuminated when the building space is occupied.
See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: unable to locate test button on the exit light in foyer. Please ensure the exit sign has back-up power (batteries).  
Exit sign in classroom #26 did not work.  
On the left side of the computer lab the emergency lights did not work.  
Downstairs from the stage, the emergency lights closest to the elevator/lift do not work.  
Classroom 34: the exit sign batteries on the back and front doors, did not work.

---

F. In the event of power supply failure, an emergency electrical system shall automatically illuminate the means of egress in areas that require two or more exits.
See Remarks.

**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**
G. Required exit access, exits and exit discharges shall be continuously maintained and free from obstructions.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: the stage exit route is blocked.
Music Building: unblock the stairwell access to upper rooms.
Classroom 18: exit way needs to be cleared.

---

H. Where two or more exits are required from a room or area exit and exit access doors shall be marked by approved exit signs readily visible from any direction of egress travel.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**

---

I. Exit signs shall be internally or externally illuminated at all times; signs shall be connected to an emergency power system that provides illumination for not less than 90 minutes in case of primary power loss.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** Performing Arts Building: unable to locate test button on the exit light in foyer. Please ensure the exit sign has back-up power (batteries).
Exit sign in classroom #26 did not work.
On the left side of the computer lab the emergency lights did not work.
Please check all the exit signs for battery back up.

---

J. Means of egress shall not pass through kitchens, storage rooms, closets or spaces used for similar purposes, or through rooms subject to locking.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**

---

K. With exceptions, total travel distance to an exit should not exceed 200 feet in a non-sprinklered building and 250 feet in a sprinklered building.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**

---

L. With exceptions, corridors shall not be less than 44 inches in width for an occupant capacity of 50 or more, and 36 inches for an occupant capacity of less than 50.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:**
M. With exceptions, where more than one exit or exit access door is required in a building, there shall be no dead end corridors more than 20 feet in length.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

N. Basements shall have at least one exterior emergency escape and rescue opening such as a window, door, or other device operable from the inside.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

O. New buildings that are included in public schools shall include locks that allow doors to classrooms and any room with occupancy of five (5) or more to be locked from the inside. CFC 1010.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

P. Delayed egress locks are not allowed on doors.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

Q. At least two exits shall be provided where the maximum occupant load exceeds 49.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

9. FIRE SEPARATIONS

A. Remove obstructions and alterations to fire doors and maintain closing and latching devices.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:

B. Remove wedges or any other unapproved means used to hold self-closing doors open.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS
Notes:
C. Maintain fire resistive construction, repair draft stops, holes in ceiling, or fire walls to restore building integrity.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Auto shop: repair the missing/broken ceiling tiles.

10. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A. An operational permit is required to conduct a spraying or dipping operation utilizing flammable or combustible liquids or the application of combustible powders.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**

B. Spraying-finishing operations shall be conducted in a spray room, spray booth or limited spraying space approved for such use.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**

C. Ventilation of spraying areas shall be designed, installed and maintained so that flammable contaminants are diluted in non contaminated air to maintain concentrations in the exhaust airflow below 5% of the contaminants lower flammable level.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** NOT OBSERVED  
**Notes:**
D. Storage in excess of 10 gallons of flammable and combustible liquid used for maintenance and operation shall be in a flammable liquid cabinet.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS  
Notes: Please make sure to keep the flammable liquid cabinet doors closed.

11. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Artwork and teaching materials shall be limited on the walls of corridors to not more than 50 percent of the wall area.

See Remarks.

Status: PASS  
Notes: 

B. Natural cut Christmas trees shall not be displayed except in areas protected by a sprinkler system.

See Remarks.

Status: NOT OBSERVED  
Notes: 

C. The support device that holds the tree upright shall be of a type that is stable and is capable of containing a minimum two day water supply.

See Remarks.

Status: NOT OBSERVED  
Notes: 

D. Natural cut trees shall be removed from the building whenever the needles or leaves fall off readily when a tree branch is shaken or if the needles are brittle and break when bent between the thumb and index finger.

See Remarks.

Status: NOT OBSERVED  
Notes:
E. All drapes, hangings, curtains and other decorative material, including Christmas trees, that would tend to increase the fire and panic hazard shall be made from a non flammable material or shall be treated and maintained in a flame retardant condition with a flame retardant solution approved by the State Fire Marshal. See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:** The stage curtains are State Fire Marshal approved with tags.

---

F. Rooms used for assembly purposes, classroom, dining, drinking, or similar use having an occupant load of 50 or more shall have the occupant load posted near the main exit. See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**

---

G. New public buildings or alterations to existing buildings on an existing public school campus in accordance with CFC 907.2.29.2 and 907.2.29.3 shall be provided with an automatic sprinkler system. See Remarks.  
**Status:** PASS  
**Notes:**
H. Each school shall prepare procedures to be followed in case of fire or other emergency and shall post in each classroom or assembly area a plan showing paths of travel to evacuate and an alternate route. Classrooms shall also have posted instructions to be followed by the teacher.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Classroom 27 is an excellent example of the classroom safety package: exit map, emergency operations booklet, emergency kit, and fire extinguisher.  
- Classroom 35: move emergency operations booklet from small room to the main area where the emergency kit, fire extinguisher and exit map are located.  
- Classroom B: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom C: needs an exit map.  
- Classroom 37: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom 34: needs an emergency operations booklet and exit map.  
- Classroom 33: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom 32: needs an exit map.  
- Classroom 30: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom 22: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom 21: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Photolab Classroom 16: needs an exit map.  
- Classroom 12: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom 43: needs an emergency operations booklet and an exit map.  
- Classroom 48: needs an emergency operations booklet.  
- Classroom A: needs an emergency operations booklet.

I. Fire access roads shall be marked with approved signs or markings that state, "NO PARKING--FIRE LANE". Marking shall be maintained in clean, legible condition.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Please see Item #7A.

J. Fire access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles.

See Remarks.  
**Status:** FAIL  
**Notes:** Please see item #7A.
K. Rooms containing controls for air-conditioning systems, sprinkler risers and valves, or other fire detection, suppression or control elements shall be identified for use of the fire department. Approved signs shall be constructed of durable materials, permanently installed and readily visible.

See Remarks.

**Status:** FAIL

**Notes:** The individual gas shut offs to each building need to be labeled. Please contact [Fire Marshal David Jones](tel:831-333-9903) for more information on sign requirements.

L. Unobstructed access to fire hydrants shall be maintained at all times.

See Remarks.

**Status:** PASS

**Notes:** We need signs next to Fire Department Connections (FDC) that tell us what building the FDC serves.

### Additional Time Spent on Inspection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start Date / Time</th>
<th>End Date / Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td>No Additional time recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Additional Time:** 0 minutes

**Inspection Time:** 355 minutes

**Total Time:** 355 minutes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Result: Passed with Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Please post the numerical address at both entrances of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please remove debris/trash piles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Please replace plug adapters with UL surge protectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Please make sure all electrical panels have clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Please ensure a proper monthly check is completed and the back of the fire extinguisher tags are signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Please service kitchen hood extinguishing system and service (clean) kitchen hood and duct system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please contact our office to discuss the 20' fire lane access, identification, and designation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Please ensure all exit lights on battery back-up are working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Please ensure all classrooms have an emergency operations booklet, a first aid kit, an exit map, and a fire extinguisher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspector Notes: Thank you,

Inspector: 

Closing Notes:
Carmel Highlands Fire Protection District, Cypress Fire Protection District, and Pebble Beach Community Services District thank you for your dedication to fire and life safety.

Inspector: 

Name: [Redacted] 
Rank: Captain 
Mobile Phone(s): [Redacted] 
Email(s): [Redacted] 

Signature ______________________________ Date ________________

Representative Signature: 

Signature ______________________________ Date ________________
To School Board Members,

I received a letter last week notifying me that my name and/or information may be included in responsive documents to a California Public Records Act Request submitted to Carmel Unified School District. While it continues to aggravate many community members that CUSD insists on releasing our information without permission, this particular CPRA (linked below) was informative. The CPRA includes several e-mail from both Karl (image below) and Jon Lyons where they blatantly admit they are aware of CHS’s safety challenges and CUSD’s serious vulnerability around the school’s liability if an injury occurs.

While I was not able to attend the Special Meeting where you approved the Final EIR for the Stadium Improvement Project, I’m glad I missed the circus and your phony show that you did due diligence in thoughtfully examining the community’s questions and CUSD’s non-responses. When my husband circulates OVERT photos that CHS campus in not in compliance of the national DSA Fire and Life Safety Codes and then the board votes approval for a project that will further bring more events, attendees, parking and traffic problems to an overbuilt campus - you are indeed irresponsible and will be held accountable for any injuries. To be clear - adding more parking lots will not solve the issue. You have already overbuilt on a 22-acre campus. Where is your future thinking and vision for the next generation?

Karl - how about follow-through on your threat below? Please bring the topic of safety issues up at the next school board meeting. I’ve tried to put it on the agenda several times and have been ignored. Until you can produce a valid 810 Fire and Life Safety Form for your Emergency Access Routes - you are part of the problem. The community has offered several times to be partners in better outcomes but we are consistently shut down.

You may feel proud you “approved” the school stadium improvements - but at what cost? Public and student safety should be at the core of your mission. I’ve blind copied several members of the community involved in the EIR efforts who tried to provide fair and honest feedback to the process. What a shame you’ve dismissed the opportunity to be good neighbors and continue to bully our way through building out CHS.

2223_27 Mit (Budget) / Request / Initial Response / Responsive Documents

On Fri, Apr 1, 2022 at 4:03 PM Karl Pallastrini <karl@pallastrini@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hello all,

Mike forwarded this concern to me regarding concerns about student driving in the lower lot (Baseball). He has included some additional access issues re/ Ambulance access to the gate at the Practice Facility.

I will focus on the student driving issue. I have brought this up countless times as a concern. Frankly...it has fallen on largely deaf ears. To wit: we have the youngest drivers on campus parking on the lower lot...void of any real experience behind the wheel. According to Coach Kelly and his staff...there are witnessing quite a bit of bad, dangerous driving from the lot after school. Other than the presence of the Coaching staff....there is no supervision provided by CHS.

If true....that can simply not stand. The prospect of injury to drivers, coaches, pedestrian traffic anywhere on school grounds is a LIABILITY that the District does not need to incur. There is a recorded history of my concerns with this issue in the records of BOE meetings, with several superintendents.

I realize that staffing (campus supervisors) may be lacking, but this is an absolute must fix for this Board Member.

I also have read the EIR that indicates that CUSD is fully aware of the parking issue, both on the main and the lower lot. Plans are in our proposal to relieve student / staff parking on a number of levels (planning is well done). Bollards and safety plans for morning pedestrian students are in the plans...but when? The issue of students walking up the driveway, without a designated pedestrian pathway is not on Coach Kelly's list...but it is on mine. Student safety is the priority.

The problem is that the best laid plans of mice and men etc. do not solve the issues that are outlined in Mike's email. I am talking about now....not the future EIR's.

I am hoping that we can get something in place to correct this safety issue (as described) immediately. Otherwise, the only solution as I see it is to put this safety issue on the next regular meeting of the Board of Education.

Karl Pallastrini
Public Comment Submission for Carmel High School Stadium Improvements
SCH# 2021050293

From: <EEDyahoo.com@unyahoo.com> Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 2:15 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

THIS E-MAIL has the second attachment that is referenced below. Please confirm receipt.

Attached is our feedback on the RDEIR for Carmel High School Stadium Improvements SCH# 2021050293. Please confirm receipt.

Below are the hyperlinks located inside the attachment regarding your objective to “Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds.”

- School Vehicular Access and Circulation Study Conestoga High School
- PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION STUDY FOR LA SALLE HIGH SCHOOL
- Glens Falls School District Traffic Circulation Study

CHS has a chronic traffic circulation problem that we believe endangers students, staff and visitors to the campus on a daily basis. Trying to solve this safety problem through additional parking spaces in an already overbuilt campus neither addresses the root cause or solves the long-term problem. You are not taking the responsible steps to address

- Why are you not considering traffic circulation studies similar to the links above?
- Why are you not doing this step or investment of a Vehicular Circulation Study prior to proposing parking lot solutions? Shouldn’t this inform whether your proposed designs will be effective?
- Why not invite the community to be part of the solution process with an on-line survey to diagnose problematic issues that need to be resolved?
- Why not demonstrate community leadership and bring together County Representatives and Residents for working session on acceptable long-term No Parking solutions through signage that is enforceable by law on a daily basis?

We will reply to this e-mail and include a second attachment with further questions and visuals to demonstrate you have missed critical benchmarking in the Environmental Setting regarding emergency access routes, traffic congestion, traffic circulation and fire and emergency vehicle access.

- Why are you not acknowledging or including benchmarking of the existing challenges in traffic circulation?
- Why are you not acknowledging or including benchmarking of the existing parking problems and over-spills the neighboring streets?
- Why aren’t you transparent with your Emergency Access Routes and prioritization of safety?

Attachments
- Master RDEIR Comments, Map and Photos October 2022.pdf
Re: RDEIR Feedback: Pool Parking Lot, Traffic Circulation and Safety

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <j hull@carmelunified.org>)  Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 8:24 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: Bud Get <j hull@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <t arthur@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:54 PM Bud Get <j hull@carmelunified.org> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walkways, etc?

Will you be improving this area as part of traffic circulation?
Is there an erosion issue? How will this parking space connect with the one-way roadway?
RDEIR Comments: August 25, 2022 Carmel High School Stadium Improvements

From: mtn@tools.com
To: Dan Paul <dpaul@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallasstri <kpallasstri@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Carmel Unified School District
Attn: Dan Paul
Chief Operations Officer
4390 Carmel Valley Road
Carmel, CA 93923

cc: Board of Education: Tess Arthur, Sara Hinds, Seaberry Nachbar, Karl Pallasstri, Anne-Marie Rosen

Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 7:28 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

My Comments are principally in response to Section 10.0 - 10.4 NOISE and are based on my assessment of the 2022 RDEIR. They are unique and are not duplicates of potentially similar comments submitted by other concerned citizens of Carmel. All my comments and questions (below in “red” and underscored) should be evaluated and responded to independently in the Final EIR.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS

CUSD TRUSTEES - are you ok with this? Why is this a good Plan? How is it good for the Environment, flora and fauna and generations to come? Do tell me. While reading my Comments think of what Plan Elements will cause Negative Effects - that cannot be mitigated... and others that Constituents are sensitive to and have provided thoughtful and viable Alternatives.

Student and Traffic Safety and increased congestion should be your #1 priority followed closely by protecting and preserving Carmel areas natural environment - flora, fauna, visual (views and Dark Sky) and acoustic. Please keep this in mind while carefully reading and responding to my Comments:

The Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR) released August 25, 2022 is cumbersome (394 pages with a “bonus” 379 page Appendix), grossly incomplete and inconclusive. Many “conclusions” sought by Superintendent Ted Knight, the Board of Trustees and the Carmel Unified School District have been drawn from assumptions and evaluations of other studies and locations (rather than CHS field tests, data assemblage and accurate reporting) and therefore are not relevant to Carmel High School and should not be included in this Proposed Plan. Furthermore, as Trustees, you have stifled public participation by limiting communication from stakeholders to one-way statements, without dialog, direct response or offer of collaboration with your constituents. This has triggered several California Public Records Act requests (CGC SEC. 6252(C) - some directly requested and other communications “assumed” to be a formal CPRA request - costs us taxpayers bear that could have been minimized by open, honest and direct communication. It does no service for The Superintendent CHS Principal and other CUSD Officials to say CPRA requests divert funds away from students. Better would be to say how much unreported or hidden expense will be attributed to this ever expanding boondoggle of a Plan. In particular great effort has been made by The Save Carmel Group (Carmel Area Residents who are parents, professionals, educators and scientists) to provide critical, factual input in person, via email, letter and written reports (see savecarmel.org).

With the release of the Aug 25, 2022 RDEIR it became obvious the Proposed Objectives and Proposed Plan have undergone massive changes from CARMEL HIGH SCHOOL STADIUM LIGHTS (published Aug 10, 2021) to a more encumbered and dismissive CARMEL HIGH SCHOOL STADIUM IMPROVEMENTS - published Aug 25, 2022. Now there is a new project scope with several new surprising elements: demolition, new building construction, grading & road paving and even more lighting - all lacking detail and without published budgets. None of these elements in the RDEIR have previously been advertised, introduced to the public in scoping sessions or discussed with constituents. This alone should trigger a COMPLETE STOP of THE CURRENT PLAN AND PROCESS AND
REQUIRE A COMPLETE START-OVER.

All Plan elements raise additional concerns and frustrations - with specific Sections (identified by page number and description)... result of the process and procedure CUSD has chosen to follow. In my Comments are posed as PROBLEMS, CRITICISMS, QUESTIONS and SOLUTIONS (Mitigations) for your ease of understanding. After Trustees have read, studied and analyzed these formal Comments, I will anticipate and appreciate your written response to each individual Comment and Question.

OVERVIEW

NOISE generated from the Carmel High School Stadium by regularly scheduled daytime Sporting Games & Practices has been tolerated for decades. During daytime, Noise from the CHS Campus and Sports Fields is but one element of the daytime Noise we hear. Installing lights and shifting stadium use to the normally quiet dinner and evening hours will cause Significant Noise Increase during 5:00 pm - 10:00 pm and a host of other problems. Noise Increases during the traditional quiet dinner and evening hours would be disturbing and therefore unacceptable to residents - both neighbors close by and also those well beyond 1 mile and possibly out to 3.5 miles (the arbitrary limit of the Plans “Light Circle”). Many “distant” neighbors have direct sight of CHS Campus and therefore are well within the cone of sound waves emanating from the Campus and Football Stadium. The later has not been measured, analyzed or taken into consideration by CUSD. In addition to Light bleed, increased rush-hour Traffic concerns, Parking Lot and internal roadway limitations, complicated and uncontrollable Shuttle Logistics, Student Safety Issues - the Noise Section is critically flawed and only one of the factors for halting this Plan, FULL STOP.

Furthermore proposed Stadium Lights would enable other after-dark High School uses (up to 144+ sports team practices, plus band & cheer practices, rallies, etc) and with consideration of evening Pool use well over 400 evening uses. Installation of Lights would greatly increase likelihood and number of late afternoon (Winter) and evening use potential (Fall, Winter, early Spring) - for all team sports - with inherent and more undesirable Noise Impacts.

The Civic Center Act allows CHS to lease The Pool, Performing Arts Center and Stadium (plus other CUSD assets) to groups or businesses via www.Facilitron.com - a facility management firm. The District Superintendent has stated in recorded public meetings that leases would not happen, but promises made have not been kept (see below) and no formal written exclusion has been forthcoming. Today Facilitron continues to offer rental of CHS Stadium!

Although noise may not continuously reach the Monterey County maximum noise limit of 85 dBA for outdoor events (held between the hours of 7 am - 10 pm), it can and will reach this threshold and will “spike” past it. Amateur audio recordings of widely used and accepted mobile phone applications calibrated to National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NOISH) Standard have ranged from 80.5 dB to 83.5 dB - when taken over a mile from Campus.

>>>See Photo IMG_2972: 9/17/22 @ 4:05 pm, Location 24980 - 25000 Outlook Dr, 93923, 83.5 for 5M:43S, Max 92.4, Peak 98.8 <<<

Values for recordings at the “fence-line” of the Stadium Field during the recent “Shoe Game” Saturday Sept 17, 2022 regularly went as high as 85 dB and spiked even higher - max at 103 dB and peak 112.6 dB. The higher values were in response to whistle blasts, pep band music and shouts and cheers for significant plays. Air horns are even louder.

>>> See Photo IMG_2957: 9/17/22 @ 2:50 pm, Location: Field Fence, Visitors Side W of Stands, 85.0 for 2M:4S, Max 96.0, Peak 101.0 dBA <<<

See: https://www.co.monterey.ca.us/home/showpublisheddocument/15413/636162035527170000 for Sec 4.10 Monterey County Noise Ordinances

NOISE is “invisible” and challenging to contain… but we all know what we hear. Convincing Trustees to “hear what we hear” has been an impossible task. Of the 5 CUSD Trustees, none have met with constituents (aka “sensitive receptors”) in public places within their neighborhood (aka residential land uses) to experience Noise generated from CHS. Thus far, Noise Mitigations (PA system optimization & maximum loudness limits, berms, barriers, deflectors or absorbers) have not been considered, utilized, tested or integrated into the Plan. At present, a “noise transparent” chain link fence is all that is between the CHS Noise source and us “sensitive receptors” (neighbors & area residents). Noise can travel great distances without containment and effective mitigation.

See: https://www.creativefieldrecording.com/2017/11/01/sound-effects-decibel-level-chart/ for comparable Sound Levels and Noise Induced Hearing Loss to offer reference and perspective. Example: Quiet Office 40 dB; Loud Traffic 85 dB (for every 3 dB above 85 safe exposure time is reduced by half); Loud Sporting Event 105 dB; Ambulance Siren 120 dB; Jet Engine 135 dB. Most folks can relate to these Noise Values.
WIND affects the speed, distance travelled and spread of Noise. Our local prevailing winds are “on-shore” and thus “push” Noise from the CHS Stadium Eastward into residential neighborhoods - which can cause disturbing impacts to residents and property owners - particularly if experienced in traditionally quiet evening hours. Example: if a jet takes off at 200 ft distance sound level 100+ dBA (Appendix B, pg 38 or 40 depending on who’s counting) during the daytime, it is heard along with many other “daytime” noises and is a fraction thereof.  If the same 100+ dBA jet took off (same distance) while you were having a quiet evening meal, it would be the loudest and most prominent noise and therefore have a greater impact to you “the sensitive receptor”. It would also likely be more disturbing. This would also be true for the shift of Saturday football Noise to Friday Night (under the Lights) football Noise - even for those a mile or more away from CHS Stadium. **No measurement, analysis or reporting of actual CHS Stadium Football Game Noise has been performed - why not?** In your answer, don't blame “Covid”.

To better understand, the velocity of the acoustic wave (sound wave) is equal to the speed of the wave (approximately 334.1 Meters per Second) PLUS the speed of the wind in the same direction. For instance, if the wind is moving at 20 mph from the ocean (8.9 m/s), then sound will travel downwind (East) at 351.9 m/s, upwind (West) at 334.1 m/s, and crosswind (North or South) at an average of approximately 343 m/s. The Noise “content” is the same but reaches us “sensitive receptors” at slightly different times, intensities and distances. Given higher velocity noise can travel great distances. This is why a comprehensive Noise Study for any CHS Light or Stadium Improvements Proposal must include geographic locations out to the limit of human perceived Noise Impacts. **Otherwise how could any Impact Report dutifully and comprehensively capture the limit (both level and distance) of acceptable sound travel?** Please tell me why this was not done.

With the “push” of typical weather and prevailing onshore winds from the Pacific, Noise energy and waves from CHS travels far beyond one mile:

>>> See Photo IMG_2978: 9/17/22 @ 4:20 pm, Location: 24790 Outlook Dr, 93923, 80.5 for 9M:10S Max 92.4, Peak 98.8 dBA <<<

**PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

The simplest solution to Noise is “NO CHANGE”. Continue Saturday football games - which are family friendly, relatively “safe” and have a “picnic-like atmosphere” - while enjoying the treasured views of the Santa Lucia Mountains, White Rock Ridge, Rancho San Carlos, Saddle Mountain, Palo Corona Regional Park, Fish Ranch, Carmel Valley and surrounding neighborhoods. What could be better than munching an Impossible Burger, slurping a Wheat Grass Smoothie, cheering for our CHS Team and taking in the sights on a nice Saturday afternoon? This saves well over $4.5M+ (budgeted amount for original Stadium Lighting only) plus ADDITIONAL SIGNIFICANT SPENDING - demolition, construction and installation for newly added projects (the “pork”) - which is not reported in the RDEIR. **Where is this budget hiding?** Please produce the detailed Budget Report and breakdown for each of the added on Project Conditions. These monies can be allocated to better purposes - busses and drivers to solve on-site parking limitations for all events and shuttling of students and athletes to other courts and playing fields for both practice and competition. This includes boys and girls track, baseball, field hockey & soccer - sports proven to be much safer than football. Monies could be used for maintenance of tennis courts and other fields, sports equipment and improved Visiting Team experience and amenities: additional permanent stands, a restroom and satellite snack shack. Monies could also be spent for planting trees, shrubs and bushes with a dual purpose: to buffer sound and contain walkway and security lighting - most evident (and needed) at the Eastern elevation of CHS. Late Start will be a bonus - benefiting all students health. Combined with a new Bell Schedule (many districts have already complied with this State mandate) Late Start will provide for an additional half hour period for sports team participation. **Why hasn't the District and CHS implemented a Late Start plan? Do tell me why our Trustees have not done what many other Districts have and publish a date this will be accomplished. I'd like to know.**

Also plan on (and support) the anticipated passage of Federal H.R. 69 - The Sunshine Protection Act, which will create an “additional hour” of afternoon daylight - for practices, Junior Varsity games and other sports. It’s going to happen, and you, Trustees need to incorporate this into your strategy and actions. By the way, while attending recent Saturday games - there was plenty of football “cheer”, “student spirit” and “family participation evident - from babes-in-arms to entire families including grand parents - both at the PGHS “Shoe Game” Aug 27,2022 and the Home Coming league game against Everett Alvarez, Sept 17, 2022. These games presented a perfect opportunity for sampling and recording Noise data - and would have been basis for science driven decision making rather faulty assumptions contained in the RDEIR. Some families and some family members will miss the proposed Friday night “under the lights” Football games - parent(s) may have to stay home with young children and some elderly folks may choose not to drive “after dark” Students with provisional drivers licenses and other teen drivers who commute a greater distance and won't make it home by 10:00 pm may end up stranded. **I'm sure students and football players have not**
thought of this - have you Trustees? Inform me and them.

For those of you who may not have attended the "Shoe Game" here is snip with a (mostly unobstructed) skyline. Light towers and multiple arrays of LED emitters would compromise this beautiful view. Lots of "cheer", whistles and unusually warm day with bright clear sky.

>>> See Movie MOV_0063: 8/27/22 @ 2:08 pm, Location: Field Fence, NW corner of Stadium <<<

COMMENTS, CRITICISMS, QUESTIONS AND SOLUTIONS

pg 35 Table 2-1 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures
PROBLEM: Mitigation Measure 5-2a * “Lights shall be used for only up to the following number of nighttime events for each of the following Carmel High School sports teams.” … “Practices. All field sports practices shall end by 8:00 pm with lights turned off by 8:30 pm”.  
CRITICISM: No quantification or seasonal calendar is provided for Practice Lighting. This spans the quiet dinner hour.  
QUESTION: Why was the substantial number of days when Practice Lighting will be on until 8:30 pm not included in this RDEIR? Please list all dates, times and number of Stadium and Pool uses that will require light tower arrays turned on. Specify when lower level practice lights and also higher level “competition” lights will be used in your Report and send it to me.  
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Go back and count and include the number of scheduled and/or planned Practice Lighting days and times to be transparent. Please inform me. It’s impossible to draw a conclusion or make meaningful Comment from incomplete facts.

pg 39 Table 2.1 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures
PROBLEM: Impact 10-3 Construction Activities Could Cause a Substantial Temporary Noise Increase (7am to 7pm Mon-Sat). 
CRITICISM: Noise up to 7 pm is disturbing during the traditional quiet dinner and early evening hours. 
QUESTION: Has any Noise Study of a similar construction project adjacent to mature forested “residential land uses” been performed? What are the results? Please share with me. Why not include measurements and some facts (instead of assumptions)? 
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Abandon the Stadium Light installation and Improvements Project and all the construction and Noise producing equipment: bulldozers, graders, chain saws, nail guns, paving machines, etc. Continue with Saturday afternoon football and regular practices that have been tradition for decades.

10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

pg 259 Acoustic Fundamentals
PROBLEM: Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) - averages sound level over 24 hours plus 5 dB. CRITICISM: CNEL average sound levels are merely “base-lines” for comparative purposes. CNEL averages do not include spikes or maximum noise levels (whistles, drums, loud cheers, air horns, band practices etc) at particular time periods. A more appropriate and Accurate Method would be to measure and record ambient sound during the 7am-10pm period and compare this quiet with actual Saturday Football game sound measurements and recordings. 
QUESTION: Why weren’t evening ambient base line measurements compared with actual on-site sports team use during Saturday daytime competitive football league games? Please report actual Noise Level (CNEL) values. I look forward to your answer. 
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Redo and provide actual measurements during typical Saturday 2 pm to 5 pm Stadium Football Games recording and reporting Average, Peak and Maximum Noise and compare to Ambient Noise during hours of 6 pm to 10 pm - the period of my concern. Report the Noise Increase from evening Ambient to evening Football.

pg 259 & 260 Site Inspection and Noise Level Measurements
PROBLEM: Site inspection by WJV Acoustics dated July 6 - 2021. We need a new, comprehensive and applicable inspection, measurements and comprehensive Noise report. 
CRITICISM: Ambient noise level Measurements were conducted April 20 and 21, 2021 and not representative of Noise generated by Fall, Winter and early Spring sports practices and actual interscholastic Football competition.
QUESTION: Why weren't Noise Measurements performed during the “Shoe Game” and also league Football games and other practice and competition times? Relevant Noise Measurements need to be conducted (see above) and Reports published. When will this be done? Please send them to me.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Redo noise level measurements to capture accurate “worst case” noise impacts over a date period consistent with CHS Football season and during actual games and hours. Share the details.

>>> See Photo IMG_2952: 9/17/22 @ 2:45 pm, Location: West Field Fence Line (home team cheering), 76.0 for 6M:39S, Max 101.1, Peak 112.6 dBA <<<

pg 259 & 260 Less Acceptable New Noise

PROBLEM “a new noise would be less acceptable if it exceeds the current ambient noise level.”
CRITICISM: A shift of Noise impacts from day to night time (Saturday Football to Friday night Football as example) must be measured real-time with increased impacts reported relative to the experience of residential “sensitive receptors” - both near and farther away from Carmel High. Noise level measurements (below the horizon, lower than Stadium and strategically positioned within trees and bushes) are not representative.

QUESTION: What is the measured Evening Noise (dBA) base line for typically quiet evening hours (6-10 pm) in each of these areas: along Morse, Flanders Drives and in Carmel Knolls, Rancho Rio Vista and Carmel Views) - particularly in line of sight of the Football Stadium? What is the measured increase for Friday night football games over the Ambient Evening Noise (dBA base line) at these same measurement locations? Trustees - let's do the science and report back to me.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Redo noise level measurements to accurately capture typical quiet evening hours - from 6-10 pm and compare with “worst case” noise impacts - from current Saturday afternoon games. See above. Even when 25-30 feet away from Field Fencing and facing away from Stadium Field and Noise source, Noise Measurements Maxed and Peaked above 85 dBA - more then 75-80 ft away from the playing field and source:

>>> See Photo IMG_2958: 9/17/22 @ 2:52 pm, Location: CHS Tennis Courts, looking South away from Noise Source 70.8 Max 96.0, Peak 101.0 dBA <<<

>>> See also Photo IMG_2954 (Carmel Padres Leach Champions) and IMG_2955 (Tennis Court Hours for the Public) 9/17/22 @ 2:46 pm, Location: CHS Tennis Court (North) entrance gate.

pg 260 - Baseline Noise Conditions

PROBLEM: Baseline Noise was only measured at locations near CHS campus and two surrounding streets - Morse Drive and Flanders Dr.
CRITICISM: Baseline Noise measurements were not taken for “farther afield” locations - such as in quiet residential neighborhoods where CHS Stadium Noise Impacts are typically heard.

QUESTION: Why limit Noise measurement(s) to arbitrary locations close and adjacent to campus perimeter or along nearby streets? What different outcome (for Baseline Noise) would be had by a more comprehensive Report, sampling both near and farther away public areas in neighborhoods? Answer please.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Noise travels far as “pushed” by prevailing on-shore winds. For a comprehensive evaluation of Noise Impacts, several remote locations (some over 1 mile) should be identified, measured, recorded and compared to each individual locations Ambient Noise Levels, noting local Noise Increases. Typical quiet roadside walk Sunday morning after “Shoe Game”. Area residents (aka “sensitive receptors”) and other inhabitants appreciate the environment devoid of external Noise intrusion.

Animals, including Canis Adventurous (shown here) avians, serpientes and even the cute little Red Legged Frogs that abound - all have highly evolved and incredibly sensitive aural receptors. Noise increases during the quiet evening hours (that they're accustomed to) will likely have negative effects disturbing sleep patterns, feeding cycles, reproductive cycles, nesting and burrowing locations and their general well being.

>>> See Photo IMG_2979 9/18/22 @ 10:08 am, Location: Outlook Dr X Pine Hills Dr 93923, 36.5 dBA 18S <<<

10.2 REGULATORY SETTING

pg 261 - 2010 Monterey County General Plan

PROBLEM: “While the school district is not subject to County noise regulation, the County noise standards are utilized as the applicable noise standards for which the project is evaluated against to help determine noise impacts.”
CRITICISM: County noise regulations are general and do not account for construction, expansion projects that increase density of use (additional parking, cars, trips to and from CHS and increased football game attendance) and importantly time shift (from Saturday daytime to Friday nighttime) that result in significant NOISE INCREASES at typically quiet evening
QUESTION: In keeping with the spirit of noise ordinances (not to disturb neighboring “sensitive receptors”) why risk upsetting a significant portion of Carmel areas residents by "adding" noise to otherwise quiet Friday evenings? How will your Plan really affect Carmel Area neighbors? What are the measurements and calculations that quantify these Noise Increases? An answer will be appreciated.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Respect decades of football tradition and Saturday competitions - and limit noise impacts to daytime.

pg 262 Safety Element
PROBLEM: Policy S-7.3 “Development may occur in areas identified as “normally unacceptable” provided effective measures to reduce both the indoor and outdoor noise to acceptable.” CRITICISM: The Stadium is surrounded by open chain-link fence on 3 sides and classroom buildings on 1. There has been no attempt to contain, absorb or deflect back Noise that’s generated at the CHS Stadium. In fact poor choice of aluminum bleachers reflect and project sound (clapping, cheering, PA system, foot stomping, band noise, etc)

QUESTION: Why not treat the Noise Problem at its source? What can be done to reduce Noise production? What amount of Noise bleed could be contained? Have any comparative measurements been performed? Please report the facts to me.

SOLUTIONS / MITIGATION: Enhancements to existing fences (wooden or metal slats) are inexpensive and easy to install; acoustic sound walls (like those surrounding utility equipment) could be built along campus and stadium perimeter; sound blocking and absorbing plants (hedges, bushes, shrubs, trees) could be planted as well. These measures would also help with the “light bleed” from the East elevation of CHS.

pg 262 Acoustical Analysis
PROBLEM Policy S-7.6 “Acoustical analysis shall be part of the environmental review process for projects when:” “a. Noise sensitive receptors are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected noise levels that are “normally unacceptable”…

CRITICISM: No acoustical measurement or analysis has been done at locations where CHS Stadium Noise has been disturbing: ie where the difference of “quiet time” base line Noise (35 dB at public location in my neighborhood - see above and IMG_2944 below) is greatly exceeded by actual measured Saturday "football competition" Noise (83.5 dB, Max 92.4 and Peak 98.8 at public location in my neighborhood).

QUESTION: With constituents eager to collaborate and provide input (over the last 14 months or more) - why were several neighborhoods excluded from sound measurements and analysis of the Noise increase from ambient lows to "Friday night football" highs? How could you improve the Proposed Plan with collaboration and input from Carmel Area residents?

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Ask constituents who report being Impacted, measure from locations representative of the Noise impacts they experience and work with them for a balanced outcome.

>>> See Photo IMG_2944: 9/17/22 @ 9:46 am (before Shoe Game), Location: 25205-25095 Pine Hills Dr 93922 - at roadside bench, 38.4 1M:44S Max 82.7, Peak 85.3 dBA <<<

p263 County of Monterey Noise Ordinance*
SS10.60.030 - Operation of noise-producing devices restricted.

PROBLEM: “At any time of day, it is prohibited within the unincorporated area of the County of Monterey to operate, assist in operating, allow, or cause to be operated any machine, mechanism, device, or contrivance which produces a noise level exceeding eighty-five (85) dBA measured fifty (50) feet therefrom."

CRITICISM: Noise escaping (not presently being contained) from Carmel High School Stadium has exceeded 85 dBA - see photo:

>>> See Photo IMG_2957: 9/17/22 @ 2:50 pm, Location: Field Fence, Visitors Side, 85 for 2M:4S, Max 96.0, Peak 101.0 dBA <<<

QUESTION: Although CUSD / CHS has exempted themselves from following County Noise Ordinances* (this is not neighborly), Noise is not being contained and does bleed “through the fences” and into County neighborhoods. What can be done to encourage CHS to be a better neighbor by reducing noise production at the Stadium in consideration of their very (tolerant) neighbors - both near and farther afield? I’d like to know. SOLUTION / MITIGATION: CUSD and CHS could follow the “spirit” of the Ordinance and reduce and contain Noise Impacts and thereby reduce Impacts to all constituents and area residents.

* p264 See also 2010 Monterey County General Plan and CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) average Noise Level for 24 hr day with 5 dB penalty for Noise levels occurring during evening hours between 7 pm and 10 pm.

p 266 Acoustical analysis is part of environmental review
PROBLEM: Policy S-7.6 Acoustical analysis shall be part of the environmental review process for projects when: “Noise sensitive receptors are proposed in areas exposed to existing or projected noise levels that are ‘normally unacceptable’ or higher.”

CRITICISM: No acoustical analysis was included in RDEIR for (these areas) - see Problem. No Noise Measurements or
Acoustical Analysis has been done for residential land users West of Scenic State Highway 1. QUESTION: Why was an arbitrary decision made to only measure noise immediately adjacent to CHS Campus and adjoining Morse Dr and Flanders Dr locations (which sits well below Stadium level) - but not other areas impacted by Noise? What are the facts and how would this change your Plan? Pray tell.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: As before, identify public locations in neighborhoods (both nearby and remote) impacted by Noise from CHS Stadium football games. Sensitive receptors West of Highway 1 are impacted by “spikes” and Noise “max” as heard over Scenic Highway traffic at public locations. This is also true for remote and ridge top “residential uses” East of CHS and neighborhoods in most directions. Collaboration with constituents would have included these Impact Sites and encouraged measurement and reporting. Be more thorough and transparent.

p 268 Building Codes & Interior Noise
PROBLEM: “Section 1207.4 of the California Building Code states ‘Interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources should not exceed 45 dB in any inhabitable room.’”
CRITICISM: We all live in a mild marine influenced climate. Many of us leave doors and windows open 24 / 7 and enjoy our outdoor spaces - decks, yards and take quiet evening walks. As science dictates, sound travels faster and farther as driven by wind. Historically, prevailing winds in the Carmel area are “on-shore (blowing West to East) and carrying sound along with it. As the CHS Stadium is on a hill (estimated 30-60 ft above surrounding terrain), wind driven Noise travels unimpeded “over” lower surrounding areas (swales, valleys and canyons) and impacts ridge top public spaces, residential dwellings and their “sensitive receptors”. QUESTION: Why is there no mention in Plan to buffer noise generated at CHS Stadium? This would be a smart move. Educate me with the positive steps CUSD could take for Noise reduction and containment and the quantified net result of these steps!
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Enhancements to existing fences (wooden or metal slats) are inexpensive and easy to install; acoustic sound walls (like those surrounding utility equipment) or concrete block walls could be built along campus and stadium perimeter; sound blocking and absorbing plants (hedges, bushes, shrubs, trees) could also be planted with good effect. This would also help contain escaping light and reduce overall Impacts to neighboring and Carmel area residents.

10.3 THRESHOLDS OR STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

pg 269 Significant Impacts
PROBLEM: “Therefore, for purposes of this EIR, a significant noise impact would occur if implementation of the proposed project would result in: Generation of substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project… “
CRITICISM: Noise impact increases affecting “sensitive receptors” in surrounding areas have not been measured, quantified, reported or included in this RDEIR”. QUESTION: Why set arbitrary limits? Why not let science dictate this process? My 8th grade science teacher would not be happy. Please enlighten me (with the science).
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Increase the range and scope of Noise Impact measurements and include them in new DEIR for Discussion, Comment (and hopefully) dialog.

pg 270 Assumptions and Unsupported Conclusions
PROBLEM: “Applying the noise levels measured at the Mineral King Bowl in Visalia - this venue seats 8500 spectators, is in a dry climate, at higher elevation and the surrounding topography is flat!
CRITICISM: Carmel is not Visalia. Extrapolating data from another study and using it for this project is unprofessional and a short-cut to unsupported conclusions. Weather & atmospheric conditions unique to Carmel - including seasonal coastal fog, stiff onshore breezes, topography, flora, fauna, temperature and other variables all affect Noise transmission and impacts perceived by “sensitive receptors”. QUESTION: Why take the short cut, rather than do the work? I’d like CUSD to tell me. Scientific measurement will trump evaluations, estimations and “hope” every time. Please do the science and share your results - for my understanding and further Comment.
SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Take real measurements, during actual CHS Football games at times weather & wind drives Noise Eastward. Determine fence line (close to same elevation as football stadium field) and also line-of-sight sampling locations on ridges and hills surrounding the CHS Campus and farther out. If you can “see it” (homes, mountains, ridges) from the CHS Campus, Noise expanding outward will be heard from “what you see”. Get input from Carmel Area residents and constituents. Report the science.

pg 270 Maximum Noise Levels
PROBLEM: “The worst-case assessment of football game maximum noise levels at nearby residential land uses is between approximately 60 to 70 dB.”
CRITICISM: An assessment is an evaluation or estimation - in short a judgement - not a fact based conclusion… and certainly not comprehensive measurement.
QUESTION: Again why not do the science? It's necessary to thoroughly measure Noise at “nearby residential land uses” and publish a detailed, comprehensive report order to understand Proposed Plan, its merits and also deficiencies and submit Comments. Please send me this report.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Hire a different acoustic engineering firm that will perform comprehensive measurements at public locations in neighborhoods aka residential land uses agreed upon between Trustees and Concerned Constituents. Noise sampling should gather, report and compare average, peak and maximum Noise data for current daytime football games held 2-5 pm with ambient readings for “quieter” hours of 7-10 pm at the same precise locations. Report the Noise Increase for 7-10 pm.

pg 270 Nighttime Stadium Events
PROBLEM: “Therefore, the operational noise increases generated by nighttime stadium events would be less than significant.”
CRITICISM: See above problem. It's not possible to make a conclusion based on assumptions and lack of scientific process. This is a poor reflection on what (should be) taught to our High School students.
QUESTION: Why do CUSD Trustees fail to understand that shifting Noise Impacts from a typical Saturday afternoon (with adjacent highway traffic and other typical noises) to a much quieter Friday evening (fewer Noise sources and lower Ambient Noise) is Significant? Please provide this data to me.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: It’s simple, honor tradition (you are keeping the Padre Mascot, right?) and stay the course with Saturday afternoon games - which the students, parents, staff, teachers, coaches, players and all of us surrounding CHS are used to. Saturday daytime play has plenty of pep and school spirit for all. Better visibility for players and therefore likely lower injury potential (there were five - 5- play stopping, time out, on field, player injuries during the “Shoe Game” - Aug. 27th this year. Was the traditional (non-league) Shoe Game included in your count of football games? This baseline data will help me compare. Answer please.

pg 271 Parking Lot Noise
PROBLEM: “At these distances [100 and 200 ft.], maximum (Lmax) parking lot vehicle movements would be expected to be approximately 54-59 dB at the closest residential land uses to the parking area in the tennis court area…”
CRITICISM: Expectations and approximations are not conclusive and lead to false assumptions. Adding parking lots, increasing number of parking stalls, supporting more auto movement on CHS campus will increase Noise Impacts.
QUESTION: Where’s the science? For realistic Noise Impact measurements, why weren’t actual Peak and Maximum Noise Impacts recorded from existing Parking Lot(s) at typical times when entire parking lots were being emptied at conclusion of a major football game? This is critical to my analysis. Please tell me.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: The previous paragraph mentions “voices, stereo systems, and the opening and closing of car doors and trunk lids.” Add to this the sound of cars starting up, revving their engines (multiplied by the number of cars) plus shouting, cheering, honking, etc. which is typical from an energized post-game crowd. Measure and report this for both CHS Main Parking Lot and also the Bus transfer parking lot at Middle School. Please!

pg 271 Traffic Management Plan (not found)
PROBLEM: “rerouting some traffic to CMS and shuttling attendees to sporting events at the high school stadium, encouraging a reduction in the use of adjacent residential street parking through utilizing alternative modes of transportation and preventing non-residents from accessing certain neighboring streets during high school events and providing supervision to insure a smooth flow of traffic and manage unforeseen disruptions.”
CRITICISM: assumptions: rerouting “some” traffic, encouraging a “reduction”, “alternative” transportation, “preventing” non-residents, providing “supervision”, “manage” unforeseen disruptions). These are all hopes and prayers that amount to nothing more than wishful thinking. This is not a traffic management plan. There is no stated realistic, reliable, consistent mechanism to insure any of these hopes and prayers - and the related Noise they cause - can be achieved.
QUESTION: Why is there no comprehensive Traffic Plan, detailed analysis or solution? Please perform one and publish the results. I'm eager for your detailed response.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Do the work! Noise Impacts must be quantified to be understood. Don’t shift some of the (Noise) Problem to Middle School without gathering Noise measurement facts and including achievable Mitigations in the Proposed Plan - for both CHS and CMS.

pg 330 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (chart)
Impact 10-1 “Project Generated Traffic Would Occasionally Increase Existing Noise Levels”
PROBLEM: Level of Impact for Proposed Project was reported as LTS (Less Than Significant)
CRITICISM: This does not include analysis of the shift of Noise Increases from daytime to previously quiet evening hours - which makes this “Significant” and is not merely “occasionally”. The Noise Impact Increase would be heard consistently during every minute of each Friday nighttime football game and every other nighttime sport or other use of the CHS Stadium and Pool - reported to be over 400 night time uses per year. Noise also will disturb and displace birds, animals, amphibians and Serpentes.
QUESTION: Why weren't Increases in Noise Levels reported in the RDEIR for the time period 6 pm (spectators arriving for
Friday night football) to 10 pm (CHS Parking Lots promised to be cleared)? Please tell me. Without this information it is impossible to understand the proposed Noise Impacts.

**SOLUTION / MITIGATION:** Publish Maximum and Peak Noise Data from most popular and well attended Saturday 2 pm - 6 pm Football games and compare it to ambient Noise Data for typically quiet Friday evening hours 6 pm to 10 pm. Change the Impact to Significant. Use shielding, buffering, dampening materials, planting of bushes, shrubs and trees, fencing, walls and optimize the public address system with maximum volume limitation and low-mounted, high efficiency proximal speakers for a net reduction of sound production, escape and distance travel from CHS.

**Impact 10-2 “Nighttime Stadium Events… Two New Campus Parking Areas…. Traffic Control Measures Would Cause an Occasional Noise Increase”**

**PROBLEM:** Proposed Project, Level of Impact LTS (Less than Significant)

**QUESTION:** More Attendees = More Vehicle Trips = More Parking = More Noise = More Total Impacts (Significant). _Why wasn't Traffic Noise measured, recorded and analyzed during recent Football games to estimate increased Noise Impacts? I'd like to know please._

**CRITICISM:** Disagree with LTS impact. More car, motorcycle, truck noise along with the addition of proposed shuttle bus trips between CMS and CHS equates to MORE VEHICLE NOISE along Scenic State Hwy 1, Carmel Valley Road and connecting roads, streets, drives and lanes plus internal road and parking lots… within previously quiet evening hours.

**SOLUTION / MITIGATION:** Noise Measurements at Peak and Max reading times need to be factored by the increase in vehicles, more auto movement within CHS Campus (equal to the new total number of parking stalls - both existing and new) to estimate Noise Increase during previously quiet evening hours. Actual and relevant Noise data can be recorded at “real” locations (CHS and CMS) and factored by the increase in vehicle trips (to and from CHS; to and from CMS plus bus trips and bus idling to and from CHS). Do the work!

**Impact 10-3 “Construction Activities Could Cause Substantial Temporary Noise Increase”**

**PROBLEM:** CHS is adjacent to residential land uses (on all four sides) and sits on a hill adjoining the historically quiet surrounding Carmel Area and City of Carmel.

**CRITICISM:** Construction Noise Mitigation and Containment would be difficult. In otherwise quiet forested and mature neighborhoods where significant construction, grading projects and road building are not the norm, this would be a Significant Impact with a lengthy duration.

**QUESTION:** _Why is there NO plan or effort to CONTAIN CHS Campus generated NOISE at the school property perimeter… including construction? Please quantify how this would reduce Noise escaping into residential neighborhoods. I am requesting your data._

**SOLUTION / MITIGATION:** Alternatives #1, #2, & #3 avoid all CHS construction noise and are preferred; #4 (CMS) is listed as LTSM / Greater Impact. Show us the science, rather than hoping optimistic construction industry equipment Noise levels applied to CHS’ neighborhood will suffice. Play ball Saturdays. Honor Padre Tradition.

**Impact 10-5 “Existing Neighborhood Noise Associated with Students and Spectators Parking in Surrounding Neighborhoods…”**

**PROBLEM:** Some Parking may be “off” public right-of-ways but Plan would increase concentration of Noise Impacts radiating from elevated CHS property. CHS sits on a hill (overlooking neighboring “residential uses”) - and thus internal traffic and additional parking lot Noise (engines revving, stereos blasting, doors, trunks and tail gates slamming, etc) would be louder and travel farther. Furthermore, legal questions remain concerning deployment of “No Event Parking” signs on public right-of-ways.

**QUESTION:** This might be better for neighbors adjacent to CHS Campus and “under the sound horizon” but increases Noise bleed and reach to more “residential land uses and sensitive receptors” on near and farther out ridges. In particular ridge top properties were purchased by many for their coastal and ocean views, not knowing their property (and its value) may be negatively affected by Pool and Stadium Lights and Increased Noise projection from “the school on the hill”. _Why are there no buffers, deflectors or Noise Containment features listed in Proposed Parking, Construction and Internal Road building Plan? Wouldn't these measures help reduce Noise bleed and projection from Campus? Please tell me why this was entirely omitted and quantify how Noise Containment Plan and features would reduce Noise escaping from CHS._

**CRITICISM:** More Parking gives rise to more car noises. Mitigation measures should include Noise absorbing and containing barriers: plants, bushes, shrubs and trees, improved fencing, berms, and sound enclosing walls. Alternative Transportation should be considered and strongly encouraged (ride the bus, car pool, bike riding, e-bike riding, walking).

**SOLUTION:** Contain the Noise! Also nice to consider alternatives - bus riding incentives, carpooling incentives, (more) bike racks, e-bike charging stations, and physical education fitness credit and rewards for students who choose alternatives to driving to school - but realize none can be assured or required.

---

**pg 374 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ALTERNATIVES / NOISE (all LTS / Less Than Significant, NI / No Impact or LTSM / Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation)**

**Impact 10-1** Project-Generated Traffic Would Occasionally Increase Existing Noise Levels.

**Impact 10-2** Nighttime Stadium Events, Activities Associated with Two New Campus Parking Areas, and Traffic Control Measures Would Cause an Occasional Noise Increase.
Impact 10-3 Construction Activities Could Cause a Substantial Temporary Noise Increase

Impact 10-5 Existing Neighborhood Noise Associated with Students and Spectators Parking in the Surrounding Neighborhoods Would Decrease with Construction of New Parking Areas and Implementation of the Traffic Management Plan

PROBLEMS: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ALTERNATIVES 10-1, 10-3, 10-3 and 10-5 all ignore the “time shift” of noise from afternoons 2:00 pm to 5:30 pm to more sensitive proposed 6:00 pm - 9:30 pm quiet time and continuing until spectators, players, coaches and staff have all departed various Parking Lots in their vehicles (by the hoped for 10 pm).

CRITICISM: Labelling Impact Alternatives as LTS / Less Than Significant, NI / No Impact or LTSM / Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation and avoiding all together affects of time shift from daytime to nighttime is disingenuous.

QUESTION: Why continue to ignore that shifting Noise, Traffic, Parking, Lighting and Safety Impacts to Nighttime increases their effects and creates a bigger problem with increased liability concerns? Is this a strategy to “hide” the facts? Do perform actual Noise Sampling and Recording for both days and time periods (above) and share actual facts. I’m counting on Trustees ordering both for completeness and transparency!

SOLUTION: Recalibrate. Scrap Improvement Plan altogether or Modify Proposal and Plan extensively to continue meeting the traditional needs of student athletes while addressing and resolving concerns of area neighbors and CUSD Constituents - including but not limited to buffering, blocking and containment of noise sources.

10.4 ANALYSIS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES (text)

pg 269 Traffic Noise Impacts on Existing Noise-Sensitive Land

Impact 10-1 Project-Generated Traffic Noise Would Not Increase Existing Noise

PROBLEM: [as stated in Plan] Average number of trips, surveyed vehicle occupancy, anticipated attendance projections, etc grossly distracts from underlying and overwhelming concerns.

CRITICISM: All stated “averages” “anticipated… projections” aside, Traffic Noise Impacts completely overlooks the change of Stadium use time - from day to night and is in no way equal or comparable. Overlooked (or hidden) is the Impact Increase from “no evening and night” games to nighttime “6-7 football games”, 124+ other games and 400+ practices - including boys and girls soccer, lacrosse and field hockey.

QUESTION: Why were the Impact Increases of Traffic Noise on Sensitive Receptors in Residential Land use areas in Proposal and RDEIR not measured? This would be a more accurate comparison and highlight the truth about this change. Tell me when these measurements will be conducted and respond with the data.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: “Therefore project-related increases” of auto trips and number of attendees would be better accommodated during daytime - as they are now. Avoid quiet dinner and evening hour sports events and practices to keep the peace in the greater Carmel Area.

Impact 10-2 Nighttime Stadium Events Would Cause an Occasional Noise Increase

PROBLEM: “The noise levels… cannot be precisely defined”… “no football games held at the stadium or within the surrounding area last year.” “WJV Acoustics therefore reviewed noise level data previously collected for a different high school” [see 10-3 pg 270 above] and included in their Report evaluations and assumptions (not factual data gathered from the Proposed Project site).

CRITICISM / MITIGATION: Nice try. 10-2 needs a do over. This is NOT Less Than Significant. This Assessment and data extracted from another paid study is not Measurement and has no relevance. Carmel Highs unique topography, weather, atmospheric conditions and surrounding flora and fauna render this “Less Than Significant” Impact moot. It is Significant!

QUESTION: Now football is “back in session” at Carmel High, why haven’t the District Trustees instructed the Facilities Director to hire a different contractor to do a Professional Noise Impact Study? This would clear up a lot of ambiguity and false impressions. Please share measurement methodology and data specific to CHS and Carmel Area.

SOLUTION / MITIGATION: Do the work and report actual findings - not interpretations, valuations, assumptions, extrapolations or other mystery pseudo-science.

Impact 10-3 Construction Activities Could Cause a Substantial Temporary Noise Increase

PROBLEM: “Construction activities associated with installation of stadium lights will be limited” and therefore Noise will be Less Than Significant.

CRITICISM: Not so. Construction Noise will be Significant for it’s entire period. 10-3 completely overlooks Noise generated from expanded “construction activities” not detailed in this Section. Omitted are demolition of Tennis Courts (jack hammers); construction of two additional Parking Lots (graders, soil compactors); trimming and / or removal of protected Cypress and Pine Trees (chain saws); grading and paving Internal traffic aisle (cum roadway); driveway widening and improvement; installation of walkways and lighting; grading and construction of 2,400 sq. ft. building and related installations. This major RDEIR Plan Expansion with its Significant amount of Noise should trigger a complete START OVER and NEW BUDGET!
To wit: chain saws, audible safety signal devices, digging equipment, drilling equipment, jackhammers, road grading machines, paving machines, circular saws, percussive nail guns, cranes, material delivery and debris removal trucks, cement trucks, cement pumping equipment, etc. will all contribute to a “chorus” of Construction Activity Noise which (as stated) “will be confined from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm”.

QUESTION: Why were the (above) Noise Sources and Noise Impacts not included in the RDEIR? Please explain and detail the broadened, increased and anticipated Noise from the expanded Proposed Plan and RDEIR. How will this increased Noise Impact Carmel Area Neighbors? Measurements please. What increase of Traffic (construction equipment, material delivery, personnel, etc) to and from Carmel High is anticipated and what increase to overall Noise Levels and Impacts are anticipated? Looking forward to your answers.

SOLUTION: This obvious Noise Impact should have been included in the RDEIR. When construction is greatly expanded, more Noise is generated and needs to be accounted for and reported to constituents. Change of Scope, Project and Plan changes and increased Noise likely will change Impact to Significant.

From Monterey County Building Department and County Noise Ordinance:
“Plainly audible” means any sound that can be detected by a reasonable person of ordinary.

and
“The ordinance…applies to “any machine, mechanism, device, or contrivance” within 2,500 feet of any occupied dwelling unit. The ordinance limits the noise generated to 85 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source.”

Impact 10-4 Construction Activities Could Cause Temporary Excessive Groundborne Vibration (Less Than Significant).

PROBLEM: On or before Aug 25, 2022 when RDEIR was published, no evaluation, consideration or update was given to the above 10-3 and this 10-4 Section - relative to Noise and Vibration sources (vehicles, equipment, tools, safety and signaling devices and their operators) and their Impacts. See Section 10-3 (above).

CRITICISM: Groundborne Vibration (change) was not addressed in the RDEIR. In conjunction with 10-3, Groundborne Vibrations should be reevaluated and this Section rewritten.

QUESTION: Both concurrent and/or sequential construction activities and their individual (or combined) Noise and Vibration profiles for this expanded project need to be addressed and reported. What is the schedule and sequence for Construction Noise and Vibration and what are the Noise and Vibration increases (over ambient)? Values please.

SOLUTION: It’s obvious that 10-4 Vibration needs an update and rewrite, based on current facts which should have been included in the RDEIR release Aug 25, 2022.

APPENDIX I

1. INTRODUCTION

Project Description
PROBLEM: $4.5M Lighting project has grown exponentially into the Stadium Improvement Plan- and without an approved and published Budget - likely tens of times or more.

CRITICISM: What was (1st crack at DEIR) a Stadium Lighting Plan has morphed and multiplied into a complex multi-faceted Construction Plan - a Solution without a Problem… which does not benefit all students (boys and girls) equally.

QUESTION: What was the genesis of this mammoth change? Who came up with all these concepts (not a real Plan)? Now Trustees are contemplating not only FIELD LIGHTING, but construction of TWO NEW PARKING LOTS (one costing the SACRIFICE of our Championship Tennis Teams COURTS), INTERNAL ROADS connecting same with adjoining PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS (dangerous) and a new 2400 SQ. FT. BUILDING! Oh, and replacement of exiting POOL LIGHTS publicly promised (by Superintendent Knight) to be done last Summer as proof that Dark Sky technology will contain light bleed from CHS into surrounding neighborhoods. Sheesh!

SOLUTION: Get back to basics. One step at a time. If the optimum wave of LED lighting is proven healthy for our Students and state-of-the-art emitters satisfactorily direct and contain light bleed within CHS Campus limits… then upgrade the Pool Lights (as promised prerequisite to moving forward with other "improvements". After which surface and prioritize the next perceived "need" and draw a comprehensive plan - based on what's good for Students and surrounding community (rather than assumption, theory or lighting industry rhetoric).

2. THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient Noise Levels in the vicinity…?

PROBLEM: Yes ambient Noise Levels will increase - nearby and out to ridge tops and neighborhoods at higher elevation than CHS Stadium.

CRITICISM: Shift from Day to Night use, particularly Noisy Football games absolutely increases Noise Impacts and will lead to more complaints from us “sensitive receptors”.

QUESTION: What measured increase will the shift of “Noise Impact Time” (from Saturday daytime to Friday evenings) and
longer afternoon - early evening practices have?
SOLUTION: This needs to be researched, measured, quantified and reported.

MONTEREY COUNTY
Policy S-7-2: “Proposed development shall incorporate design elements necessary to minimize noise impacts on surrounding land uses…“

PROBLEM: No physical noise containing or deflecting design elements are part of Proposed Plan.
CRITICISM: Sound barriers: fences, walls, berms, deflectors and absorbers should be used to reduce Noise Escape from CHS.
QUESTION: What Noise containment and buffering features and elements are part of (or need to be included) in this Proposed Plan?
SOLUTION: Quantify and Report features and elements.

GOAL S-7: MAINTAIN A HEALTHY AND QUIET ENVIRONMENT FREE FROM ANNOYING AND HARMFUL SOUNDS

Policy S-7.1: New Noise Sensitive land uses may only be allowed in areas where existing and projected noise levels are “acceptable”... see Table 1 Community Noise Exposure Levels, Monterey County: Sports Arenas, Outdoor Spectator Sports Noise Ranges - Conditionally Acceptable <75 dB; Normally Unacceptable 70+ dB Ldn or CNEL.

PROBLEM: Figure 9, pg 34 states recording for March 22, 2022 Site L-4 w recorded Lmax of 65 to 90 dBA from 14:00 to 15:30 hours.
CRITICISM: Maximum Noise escape from Stadium occurs during Football Games - which would have an even higher recorded Lmax (then above) and Leq. This was not measured at all.

QUESTION: How can this singular Southerly, off hour (no football game) recording justify the maximum Noise (LMax) escaping in all directions from CHS? It can’t.
SOLUTION: More science needed. Preform Noise Measurements along CHS Fence Lines in all directions. Include in FEIR for all to see and Comment on.

Policy S-7-7 … “Noise Hazards Section of the Safety Element

PROBLEM: “Scenic State Highway 1 adjacent to CHS generates noise in excess of 60 dB CNEL.”
CRITICISM: “Roadway Noise in excess of 60 dBA, requires a site and project-specific impact Noise analysis.” Incomplete Acoustic Measurement (selective sampling) needs to be tossed out and comprehensive Measurements performed at agreed upon location and times.

QUESTION: Was this Noise analysis done? Where is the report? Please send it to me.
SOLUTION: Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to sound walls... etc. This should be included in Proposed Plan.


PROBLEM: “At any time of day... it is prohibited... to operate any machine, mechanism, device or contrivance which produces a Noise level exceeding 85 dBA measured 50 ft therefrom.”
CRITICISM: Amateur Noise monitoring using iPhone and Decibel X (NIOSH Standard) application at Stadium fence line (50 ft or more from playing field, home team stands and public address system speakers) has recorded Football Game Noise over 85 dBA

QUESTION: Why hasn’t a professional environmental acoustic engineering firm measured, analyzed and reported Noise levels escaping the Sports Stadium during interscholastic Football game(s) at the fence line surrounding the Stadium? This measurement should be done! Quantifying aggregate Noise 50 ft from its source will suggest containment and mitigation measures.
SOLUTION: This section shall not apply to: Outdoor gatherings... sporting and entertainment events...”CRITICISM: Although County Code Noise standards provides exemptions for certain events, it would be wise to recognize the proximity, terrain, noise sources (which can be controlled) and adopt a “good neighbor” Noise Policy, resulting in a net reduction of Noise escaping from the CHS Campus - well within the County Code.

QUESTION: What consideration have CUSD Trustees given to the benefit of adopting and adhering to a stricter Noise Maximum and Noise Peak Standard to benefit both Students (hearing damage is cumulative) and Constituents - near and far? If not, why not?
SOLUTION: There is the letter of the code... and also its intent (not to disturb neighbors). The suggestions (posed in the question) would go a long way to easing neighbors concerns and be more neighborly.

FEDERAL NOISE STANDARDS

b. Contraction Noise and Vibration
Policy S-7.10: Construction projects shall include the following standard noise protection measures:

**PROBLEM:** "Construction shall occur only during times allowed by ordinance/code unless such limits are waived for public convenience." This means 7:00 am to 7:00 pm

**CRITICISM:** 7:00 am to 7:00 pm includes the "dinner hours" 5:00 pm - 7:00 pm

**QUESTION:** Will CUSD specify that Project Plan Construction Noise will start at 8:00 (better for Students as indicated by Late Start) and halt at 5:00 pm (the end of the "business day" and beginning of the "dinner hours")? I recommend doing so.

**SOLUTION:** This Criticism is focused on the "sensitive hours" - from 7:00 am to 8:00 am and 5:00 pm to 10:00 - when Parking lots are cleared. As part of overall Noise Escape Management, Trustees could order Construction to begin at 8:00 am and halt at 5:00 pm.

3. **SETTING**

**corrections:**

paragraphs 1 & 2: "...within the rural/suburban SCENIC State Route 1 corridor.

paragraph 3: "...placed on the SECOND lowest graded terrace (not the lowest, which would be the baseball field)

**a. Background Noise Level Measurements**

**pp**1 "... existing noise sources associated with various after school activities including sports practices and games...."

**PROBLEM:** In order to understand and evaluate Noise Impacts measurements have to be taken and analyzed.

**CRITICISM:** No measurement, recording or analysis of any CHS “after school activities” have been performed or reported, particularly the biggest Noise Impacts generated from league football games.

**QUESTION:** Why were these Measurements not included in RDEIR? Without them Plan is incomplete and therefore it’s not possible to fully understand or Comment on Proposed Plan.

**SOLUTION:** Get the science done during the 22-23 football season (already 3 home games have been missed). Share the data!

**Comments on Noise Measurements (by site):**

- Site LT-1 (below and East of baseball field) located below the CHS property horizon; microphone shielded by surrounding shrubbery, brush & trees
- Site LT-2 (below and South of Carmel High School Championship Tennis Courts) off Morris Dr, West and below tennis court elevation; trees and shrubs surrounding
- Site LT-3 (below and East of Campus Pool and Parking elevation) off Flanders Dr, in grass, nestled amongst trees
- Site LT-4 (South of Campus Tennis Courts and adjacent to walkway at chain link fence); not sure why this Site was included; primarily sited to measure Highway Noise, not representative of Noise Sampling from CHS Stadium sources.

4. **PROJECT IMPACTS**

**a. Project Traffic Noise Impacts on Existing Noise-Sensitive Land Uses (Less Than Significant)**

**PROBLEM:** Hexagon Traffic Consultants estimated impacts based on a prior contract for another school property including vehicle counts and occupancy - rather than at Carmel High School.

**CRITICISM:** Using “pandemic conditions” as rational for “adopting” data from another school rather than collecting it is weak and speculative. The factoring and manipulation of this data and multiple assumptions should cause this report to be thrown out.

**QUESTION:** This is bad science (or no science at all). Taking this short cut short-changes the process and public. How does this benefit furtherance of this Plan?

**SOLUTION:** For a robust unimpeachable plan, scientific process must be adhered to. Since pandemic, actual observations, measurements and conclusions could have been conducted. Do the science - unique to CHS location with poor ingress and egress, lack of adequate pick up and drop off locations, local surface street and Scenic Highway traffic patterns and daily afternoon congestion.

**b. Noise Impacts from New Parking Areas (Less Than Significant)**

**New Parking Lots**

**PROBLEM:** Again, theoretical concepts and expectations do not lead to conclusive defensible data. In addition to significant noise increases (number of cars, number of occupants, new parking lot locations), new vehicle noises and noise bleed and the shift to Nighttime Football, Pool use and other sports contests will increase cumulative Noise Impacts during otherwise “quiet” evening hours. Add to this nighttime vehicle movement Noise the moving vehicle lights escaping from CHS and shining in all directions towards “residential uses” - both near and far.

**CRITICISM:** Noise measurement, recordation and analysis (for envisioned Parking Lots) is possible with some creative planning.

**QUESTION:** Why have Trustees not ordered measurement of escaping vehicle Noise at the East side (back) of CHS and reverberating along the driveway adjacent to the Performing Arts Center during present peak use times: mornings (when school buses park an idle with flashing lights) and parking lots fill and afternoons when they empty?

**SOLUTION:** Science please.
Traffic Control Measures, Off-Campus Parking, Shuttle Service, Alternative Mode Encouragement, On-Site Amenities, On-Campus Supervision, Parking Management

PROBLEMS: Off Campus parking at Middle School presents a host of additional problems (security, supervision, busing): Visiting Spectators will not know in advance where to park; compliance with encouraged Off-Campus Parking will be low, change away from traditional Pick Up / Drop Off location and protocol and will cause several unintended consequences (parking in residential neighborhoods West of Scenic Highway 1, increased pedestrian traffic along residential streets including Ocean Ave, no safe walkways on either side of State Scenic Highway 1 (drainage ditches), potential for both dangerous pedestrian street and Highway crossings… all after dark. This will also increase Noise and Parking on streets not heretofore a problem and anger additional home owners.

CRITICISMS: Lot of wishful thinking… no realistic Plans or control points. Do we really think CHS Students will be happy about moving their cars, leaving them and riding a shuttle bus from designated parking at Middle School? They gave up riding the bus when they got a car! Narrow internal roadways with adjoining pedestrian walkways, Parking Lot ingress and egress danger and traffic backups (Morris Dr, Ocean Ave, North Carmel Hills Dr and Flanders Dr) will all get worse.

QUESTIONS: What durable Agreements are in place to provide Parking Enforcement? What legal liability and moral responsibility is the Board of Education, our Individual Trustees, Superintendent, Facility Director, Principal, Athletic Director, Coaches and Staff willing to accept for nighttime traffic and pedestrian accidents result of these wishfully concocted concepts? All for Friday Night under the Lights? Pray tell.

SOLUTION: Ahem… Tradition of Padre Football is on Saturdays. Allocate monies for other projects supporting both boys and girls sports, busing to other venues for team events and enhanced programs supporting academic excellence.

c. Noise Impacts from Stadium Events (Less Than Significant)

Football Games (and other stadium events)

PROBLEM: Analysis is not measurement. “noise occurring during nighttime hours (10 pm to 7 am)”; “Noise levels associated with football games… would typically be limited to up to six (6) home games per year. As such noise would occur very infrequently.”

CRITICISM: Mineral King Bowl hocus-pocus is absolutely not relevant. Constituents (CHS’ Neighbors) ARE concerned with NEW and INCREASED Noise Impacts from 5 pm to 10 pm. Mere mentioning of “up to 6 home games” is disingenuous, false and misleading. There is no mention of late practices, other sports or non-sports use after dark that would generate Noise Increases in excess of current Evening Ambient Levels. District does not exclude Facilitron Rental to other schools, businesses or concerns for evening time / nighttime after dark use.

QUESTION: What are the real numbers for: Evening (5 pm on) and Nighttime (after dark) Practices, Meets, Matches, Games and other uses - including Rental? Do the math, publish and report back.

SOLUTION: Again do the science, be transparent and earn our trust… or simply stay the course with near 80 year tradition of Saturday Padre Play and practice schedules that have worked for decades. Cost: Not much. Quit this boondoggle before Trustees spend more tax payer money on Staff and overhead expense, outside Consultants and CPRA requests (contrary to statements made by Superintendent and printed in both general and student newspapers, these requests do not divert funds from Student programs).

d. Noise from Construction (Less Than Significant) & e. Vibration Impacts (LTS)

PROBLEM: “construction Including required demolition activities would likely occur in 2023 between approximately June through October… Construction Noise is typically not considered to be a significant impact if construction is limited to daytime hours… however it is typical to limit construction activities to the hours of (at a minimum) 7:00 am to 7:00 pm.”

CRITICISM: Industry standards for “Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels, dBA” and “Typical Vibration Levels During Construction” are without regard to the unique location, elevation (on a hill) and Noise disbursement and travel to both near and far “residential uses” and “sensitive receptors”.

QUESTION: Without regard to County Noise Ordinances (and their permissible time periods), wouldn’t it be very smart to truncate Construction and its elevated Noise Impacts to the hours of 8:00 am to 5:00 pm? This would be in keeping with the quiet (35-45 dBA) of surrounding and distant neighborhoods and out of respect for us “sensitive receptors” (your Constituents).

SOLUTION: If this Plan has a prayer of moving forward, this would contribute to it!

5. IMPACT SUMMARY - Less Than Significant

PROBLEM: “Project-related increases in traffic noise exposure would not exceed any Monterey County noise standards…” and “…noise levels associated with stadium events (football games), new parking lot areas and stadium storage building would not be expected to result in noise levels exceeding any Monterey County noise level standards or existing (without project) ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses.”

“While some noise associated with the cheering of crowds, band performances and half-time events would expected to be audible during some events at nearby residential land uses, such events would be extremely limited in both duration and frequency. Noise levels associated with evening football games would generally be limited to a few evening hours during each event would typically be limited to up to six (6) home games per year. As such, associated noise would occur very infrequently.”

CRITICISM: This “porked up plan” erroneously “suggests” that football games are the only source of Stadium Noise. This Summary and RDEIR “conveniently” omits mention of other Noise sources and Impacts emanating from late afternoon and
evening practices (for other Team Sports) and wrongly suggests that Noise Impacts would be Less Than Significant.

QUESTIONS:
1. What other deficiencies in Noise Measurement, Recording and Reporting can be rectified?
2. What steps can Trustees take (or order) to be fully transparent in your dealings, thorough in your examination and considerate of close-in and farther-away Carmel area neighbors?
3. What would it take to update analysis and currently weigh viable Alternatives to this RDEIR (there are several - like building a nice Stadium at the East end of CMS Campus)?
4. This Proposal and Plan initially had several deficiencies and omissions (some were rectified). Has it become too complicated, too burdensome and too expensive to “fix” in order to achieve a balanced outcome for both CHS and Neighboring Constituents needs?

SOLUTION: Toss out “selective” and “favorable” Short-Term and Long-Term Noise Reporting. START OVER. Identify, count and include all late afternoon practices, scrimmages, league games and other Noise producing Stadium uses and hire another environmental acoustic engineering firm to monitor Noise Levels and Report Data for same. Emphasis should placed on data comparisons of Ambient (low levels) and Peak and Maximum Noise Levels (high levels) plainly identifying Increases. Although Noise Levels may fall within County Ordinances, be respectful and considerate of Carmel Area Residents. Ask Constituents / Neighbors / Residents for their suggested locations to place Noise Monitoring Equipment surrounding and at the same elevation as CHS and also at a wider distances and at elevated locations (on ridges and line-of-sight positions) adjacent to residential land uses. Residents know our neighborhoods better than hired-out "experts". Sampling and Noise Data Recording should be done during traditionally quiet hours of 5:00 pm - 10:00 pm and also during “maximum noise production hours” (ie well attended Saturday Football games 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm) for realistic comparison.

IF THIS CAN'T BE DONE (as well as fixing all the other short comings, errors and deficiencies of this RDEIR), ABANDON THE PLAN. START AFRESH WITH HELP AND SUPPORT FROM YOUR COMMUNITY!

Sincerely,
Larry Arthur
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Re: RDEIR Feedback: Project Site Photos (Problematic Containers and Cheap No Parking Signs)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>)
To: Bud Get (sent via <j hull@carmelunified.org>)
Cc: <shind s@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kp allastrini@carmelunified.org>; <trthur@carmelunified.org>

Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 8:23 AM PDT (GMT-07.00)

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:48 PM Bud Get (sent via <j hull@carmelunified.org>) wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the pool area.
Will you be removing the gate access?
Will you be installing permanent No Parking Signs?
What is in those containers?
How long have those containers been there?
Are they safe? How many containers are you removing and keeping as part of this project?
The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient's authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:43 PM Bud Get <bud.get@k12.org> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only and right up against the bleachers

Questions:
- Will you have ADA Parking?
- Are current parking spaces behind the pool approved for the Emergency Access Route?
- The new parking spaces look like they will be on a grade? Is there erosion here? It looks very close to residential property line - have you captured air pollution data and potential>
Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:51 PM Bud Get <bgett@gmail.com> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?
The campus seems to have a lot of old trailers, rusted containers and not well maintained.
Why are athletic improvements being prioritized versus campus improvements for all the students?
What is this building? Will it be removed? Is this safe now?

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:39 PM Bud Get [redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only and right up against the bleachers

Questions:
- Why are cars constantly parked here? They aren't official parking spaces?
- Is this the road that will be used to access the new 35 parking spaces?
- Is this safe to encourage traffic on such a narrow road with no marking and right on-top of the bleachers?
- Why don't you have pedestrian walk-ways? How will people who use the new parking spaces safely walk on to the campus?
The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Re: RDEIR Feedback: Project Photos (Snack Shack and Roadway Safety)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>)
To: Bud Get <b_get_2012@gmail.com>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:35 PM Bud Get <b_get_2012@gmail.com> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only showing an illegally parked car right up agains the snack shack.

Questions:
- Why aren't there additional safety markings in this area? Aren't any red markings, curbs or safety signs required?
- If you are going to encourage more traffic down this road, how will you make the snack shack safe?
- Wasn't improving the snack shack part of the Facilities Master Plan?
- Isn't the snack shack part of the athletic improvements?
attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Re:

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <j hull@carmelunified.org>) Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 8:22 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: Bud Get <bget123@gmail.com>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:31 PM Bud Get <bget123@gmail.com> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited? Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only

Questions:
- Why are cars constantly parked right behind the bleachers? Can you confirm that it is in violation of the fire lane?
- If you Figure 3-6 indicates this is Emergency Access Only, shouldn’t you have markings that indicate “No Parking”? What about red curbs?
- Will you be using this roadway to access the new parking lot for 35 spaces? Is that safe?
- Do you have any current Emergency Access Routes for this whole section?
- Are the edges of the bleachers right on top of the road? Is that safe? How will you increase safety measures if you are growing traffic on this road?
- Wouldn’t new parking spaces actually make traffic circulation worse in this area?
- Is it safe to put the proposed viewing platform right where parking is being built?
The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:21 PM Bud Get was the subject of a message from you. You asked:

Why are you providing limited visual views and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

Below is the project site of where the proposed 18 foot Road would intersect with existing parking lot

Questions:
- Is Figure 3-6 your intended final traffic circulation? It's unclear if it's current and/or proposed?
- Why do you have a red arrow indicating that traffic will be going through this gate to access the new parking lot? Is that accurate?
- We see a faculty/bus/emergency access only and yet are you proposing this is how students/faculty access the new 35 parking spaces in the new lot?
- How are students/faculty/visitors accessing the parking spaces surrounding the swimming pool? Don't they also drive through this Emergency Access? Does that violate Emergency Access Route?
- How often is this gate open and closed? What are the hours? How far back is the "No Parking" from this gate? There are cars and events constantly blocking this gate. Is that allowed?
- Will this be the main roadway for students/staff/visitors to access the new parking lot?
- Why don't you combine Figure 3-6 with Parking Spaces and Circulation with Figure 4-1 Overall Site Plan for clear visibility of how new proposed parking lots will look like with traffic circulation for safety?
Re: RDEIR Feedback: Project Site Photos (Intersection of Highway 1 and proposed Roadway)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>) Sun, Oct 9, 2022 at 8:22 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: Bud Get <__________@gmail.com>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 6:57 PM Bud Get <__________@gmail.com> wrote:

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing limited view of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

Below is the project site of where the proposed 18 foot Road would intersect with existing parking lot

Questions:
- How do you propose having this safe with the top of the proposed road is at the intersection with cueing for Scenic Highway 1 and your back-entrance? Can you provide another layer of detail so we can understand the safety aspect?
- Is this section in fire violation now? Why do you have those orange markings temporary markings? Will you have permanent markings? What will they be?
- How will you prevent further back-up on Scenic Highway 1 on school drop-off and pick-up days?
- Where will the current bus stop re-locate?
- What is in this shed?
- Will that red curb remaining? Is that a Fire Lane? How will emergency vehicle be able to pass?
The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient's authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
RDEIR Feedback: Pool Parking Lot, Traffic Circulation and Safety

From: Bua Get <bual@gmail.com>
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <pallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:53 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walkways, etc?

Will you be improving this area as part of traffic circulation?
Is there an erosion issue? How will this parking space connect with the one-way roadway?
RDEIR Feedback: Campus Condition Surrounding the New Parking Lots and Traffic Circulation Concerns

From: Bud Get <b@gmail.com>  Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:51 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>
     <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?
The campus seems to have a lot of old trailers, rusted containers and not well maintained.
Why are athletic improvements being prioritized verus campus improvements for all the students?
What is this building? Will it be removed? Is this safe now?
RDEIR Feedback: Project Site Photos (Problematic Containers and Cheap No Parking Signs)

From: Bud Get [redacted] @gmail.com
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:47 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the pool area.
Will you be removing the gate access?
Will you be installing permanent No Parking Signs?
What is in those containers?
How long have those containers been there?
Are they safe? How many containers are you removing and keeping as part of this project?
Why are your Project Site photos limited? Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only and right up against the bleachers.

Questions:
- Will you have ADA Parking?
- Are current parking spaces behind the pool approved for the Emergency Access Route?
- The new parking spaces look like they will be on a grade? Is there erosion here? It looks very close to residential property line - have you captured air pollution data and potential?"
Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only and right up against the bleachers

Questions:
- Why are cars constantly parked here? They aren't official parking spaces?
- Is this the road that will be used to access the new 35 parking spaces?
- Is this safe to encourage traffic on such a narrow road with no marking and right on-top of the bleachers?
- Why don't you have pedestrian walk-ways? How will people who use the new parking spaces safely walk on to the campus?
RDEIR Feedback: Project Photos (Snack Shack and Roadway Safety)

From: Bud Get <bud.get@gmail.com>
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:35 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only showing an illegally parked car right up against the snack shack.

Questions:
- Why aren't there additional safety markings in this area? Aren't any red markings, curbs or safety signs required?
- If you are going to encourage more traffic down this road, how will you make the snack shack safe?
- Wasn't improving the snack shack part of the Facilities Master Plan?
- Isn't the snack shack part of the athletic improvements?
Why are your Project Site photos limited?
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

This photo is of the area right behind the Ex Gate marked Faculty/Bus/Emergency Access Only

Questions:
- Why are cars constantly parked right behind the bleachers? Can you confirm that it is in violation of the fire lane?
- If you Figure 3-6 indicates this is Emergency Access Only, should’t you have markings that indicate "No Parking"? What about red curbs?
- Will you be using this roadway to access the new parking lot for 35 spaces? Is that safe?
- Do you have any current Emergency Access Routes for this whole section?
- Are the edges of the bleachers right on top of the road? Is that safe? How will you increase safety measures if you are growing traffic on this road?
- Wouldn’t new parking spaces actually make traffic circulation worse in this area?
- Is it safe to put the proposed viewing platform right where parking is being built?
RDEIR Feedback: Project Site Photos with

From: Bud Get <budder Роm@gmail.com>
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 7:21 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)

Why are your Project Site photos limited?  
Why are you providing a limited visual view and photos of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

Below is the project site of where the proposed 18 foot Road would intersect with existing parking lot

Questions:
- Is Figure 3-6 your intended final traffic circulation? It’s unclear if it’s current and/or proposed?  
- Why do you have a red arrow indicating that traffic will be going through this gate to access the new parking lot? Is that accurate?  
- We see a faculty/bus/emergency access only and yet are you proposing this is how students/faculty access the new 35 parking spaces in the new lot?  
- How are students/faculty/visitors accessing the parking spaces surrounding the swimming pool? Don’t they also drive through this Emergency Access? Does that violate Emergency Access Route?  
- How often is this gate open and closed? What are the hours? How far back is the "No Parking" from this gate? There are cars and events constantly blocking this gate. Is that allowed?  
- Will this be the main roadway for students/staff/visitors to access the new parking lot?  
- Why don’t you combine Figure 3-6 with Parking Spaces and Circulation with Figure 4-1 Overall Site Plan for clear visibility of how new proposed parking lots will look like with traffic circulation for safety?
RDEIR Feedback: Project Site Photos (Intersection of Highway 1 and proposed Roadway)

From: Bud Get [redacted]@gmail.com>                   Fri, Oct 7, 2022 at 6:56 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>

Why are your Project Site photos limited? Why are you providing limited view of parking, traffic circulation, emergency access routes, fire lanes, pedestrian walk-ways, etc?

If your objective is to Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds, provide current benchmarking and proposed.

Below is the project site of where the proposed 18 foot Road would intersect with existing parking lot

Questions:
- How do you propose having this safe with the top of the proposed road is at the intersection with cueing for Scenic Highway 1 and your back-entrance? Can you provide another layer of detail so we can understand the safety aspect?
- Is this section in fire violation now? Why do you have those orange markings temporary markings? Will you have permanent markings? What will they be?
- How will you prevent further back-up on Scenic Highway 1 on school drop-off and pick-up days?
- Where will the current bus stop re-locate?
- What is in this shed?
- Will that red curb remaining? Is that a Fire Lane? How will emergency vehicle be able to pass?
Re: RDEIR: Regulated Trees and Impact of Ripping Out Tennis Courts for 18 Foot Road

Thu, Oct 6, 2022 at 8:16 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>)
To: Bud Get <bud.get@gmail.com>
Cc: <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <arozen@carmelunified.org>; <kpallasirini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; <christopher.bjornstad@dot.ca.gov>; <info-d5@dot.ca.gov>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Wed, Oct 5, 2022 at 7:17 PM Bud Get <bud.get@gmail.com> wrote:

PROBLEM You state On Page 214: Regulated Trees

The new 18-foot drive aisle along the west end of the football field and the tennis courts could potentially impact a row of mature Monterey cypress trees (Hesperocyparis macrocarpa) growing along the western boundary of the campus, adjacent to State Route 1. Several of these trees lean to the east over the proposed route, and can be seen on the aerial photograph in Figure 7-1, Habitat Map. A mature coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) with exposed roots located immediately east of the proposed drive aisle, could also potentially be impacted by the addition of this drive aisle. The proposed new parking stalls at the existing tennis courts could also potentially impact two mature coast live oaks, depending upon the amount of grading necessary.

The proposed new parking stalls east of the swimming pool could also potentially impact the mature Monterey pine (Pinus radiata) and several coast live oak trees growing on the hillside. However, it appears that there is adequate buffer space between the trees and the new parking in this area.

Copying CalTrans because it impacts Scenic Highway 1 and Corridor Program

Questions and Comments:
- This is a new scope of work that will be impacting "regulated trees" Why wasn't this included in the Scoping Session? Why wasn't this included in the NOP? Why should this trigger a complete STOP and restart of the whole project?
- Your headline admits that the trees are regulated - can you provide the reference how they are regulated? What protects them? What are the zoning, ordinances, policies that regulate them?
- How are you at risk of violating those regulations?
- What agency regulates the trees? Can you provide citations, guidelines, etc?
- Can you provide specific measurements on where do these trees sit on the boundary line? Are they on CUSD property? Are they on County Property? Is it combo?
- Can you provide a clear map with each tree and show the boundary of where each tree sits?
- Does the regulation fall under Local Plans and Regulations? Monterey County General Plan? Greater Monterey Peninsula Area Plan? Monterey County Ordinance?
- Are you working in good faith and transparency?
- Can you be specific of the risks against which regulations?
- Which agency would regulate which trees?
- What would be the mitigation measure to protect them?

- You use the word "appears" - how irresponsible is that for referencing regulated trees? These are iconic protected trees critical to Scenic Highway 1. Why take a risk? DON'T APPROVE!
- Can you be more specific than the word "Appears"? What you trying to say? How would the harm happen?
- Can you provide marking and visual connection to each tree you describe that is in jeopardy?
- You state: A mature coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) with exposed roots located immediately east of the proposed drive aisle, could also potentially be impacted by the addition of this drive aisle. Can you mark which one this is on a map? Who's boundary line does it sit on?
- You state: The proposed new parking stalls at the existing tennis courts could also potentially impact two mature coast live oaks, depending upon the amount of grading necessary.
Can you mark which one these are on a map? Who's boundary line they sit on?
What activity could potentially harm them?
You indicate this depends upon the amount of grading necessary - so what is that grading number? What would be the impact if you need that grading number?

- It sounds like ripping out the tennis courts for new parking is not a good idea for several factors (traffic circulation, emergency access routes, risk of harming regulated trees, violating Scenic Highway 1 Corridor Program) so why continue the evaluation?
- Can't you assess moving parking requirements to other locations like the parking up the green open areas of the amphitheater and where the current parking is?
- Why don't we see real measurements and specs to this design?
- Where are the actual measurements from the trees to any proposed roadways?
- Where are the exact measurements of all this to Scenic Drive? You provide a basic yellow outline on a map but NO real measurements, actual feet, etc
- Can you be specific to zoning requirements of 100 feet set-back to Scenic Drive?
- Wouldn't removing the trees no longer qualify the highway as protected? Who is the agency that could speak on this?
- Can you be specific about the count of the trees in this section? How many trees are there in that zone? and what is there height, width?
- If the regulated trees get harmed, doesn't that increase the light pollution of the stadium lights to Scenic Highway 1?
- What is the amount of grading necessary?
- How are we to give feedback in concept stage? This should not be in the scope if not stable design.

**Regulated Trees (Can you provide a simple number? Is that too complicated)? What is the total?)**
The new 18-foot drive aisle along the west end of the football field and the tennis courts could potentially impact
- a row of mature Monterey cypress trees (Hesperocyparis macrocarpa) growing along the western boundary of the campus, adjacent to State Route 1. (HOW MANY EXACTLY)?
- A mature coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia) with exposed roots located immediately east of the proposed drive aisle, could also potentially be impacted by the addition of this drive aisle.

- The proposed new parking stalls at the existing tennis courts could also potentially impact two mature coast live oaks, depending upon the amount of grading necessary.
- The proposed new parking stalls east of the swimming pool could also potentially impact the mature Monterey pine (Pinus radiata)
- several coast live oak trees growing on the hillslope.

However, it appears that there is adequate buffer space between the trees and the new parking in this area.
Existing paved pedestrian path looking south from western edge of stadium track

Existing paved pedestrian path looking north from tennis courts
TO:  Superintendent Ted Knight
VIA:  feedback@carmelunified.org

Carmel Unified School District,
Attn: Dan Paul, Chief Operations Officer
4380 Carmel Valley Road, Carmel, CA 93923

We have serious concerns regarding your Environmental Impact Report. You are legally required to provide a complete and factual response to each of our listed comments, question and concerns.

Show us the full impact of the light pollution on our treasured views and night skies.
• Why limit the map to only a 3.5-mile radius on page 127/RDEIR? Show the truth of the light spill. Where is zero?
• Install story poles/balloons allowing people to see the height of the light poles and the visual impact during the day.

Don’t shrink the assessment study area to a narrow swath immediately adjacent to the high school.
• Include all areas of the impact from Carmel-by-the-Sea, Carmel Valley, Jack’s Peak, Carmel Highlands, Point Lobos, Palo Corona, Mission Trails and Santa Lucia Preserve.
• All impacted geographies should be in Environmental Settings with details of impacts across all areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, transportation and parking, soils, erosion and water quality. Please include in the cumulative impacts as well.

Stop the surprises. This RDEIR includes significant NEW expanded construction projects.
• Re-start community engagement with a legally required Scoping Session.
• There are no details to any of the new plans. Concepts are unstable; thus we can’t provide feedback.
• We say NO to the 18-foot roadway, new parking lots and monstrous viewing platform.

Inspire our next generation with long-term solutions versus short-term band-aids. Assess CMS as viable solution.
• CHS: 22-acres, land-locked campus, 968 students/staff, 276 parking spaces.
• CMS: 60-acres permitting safe and responsible planning with 400 parking spaces now!
  • Since its purchase in 1963, Carmel Middle School’s site was always intended for the future Carmel High School (reference article in Carmel Pine Cone, January 10, 1963)
  • In 2018, CUSD acquired an additional 8.23-acre parcel adjacent to Carmel Middle School
  • The 2019 CUSD Facilities Master Plan already visualizes the potential of SIX (6) athletic fields with lights.
  • Dust off the Facilities Master Plan and develop a responsible phased long-term growth approach.

Work with residents to protect their residential streets with permanent long-term No Parking Signs.
• The proposed Mitigation Measure 11-4 of a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) does NOT shift the environmental impact to “less than significant”. It is a short-term “encroachment permit” fix for limited nighttime football games.
• Don’t create a Public Nuisance (Penal Code 372 & 373a PC) as residents won’t be able to park on their own streets because of “No Event Parking” signs.

Show us the existing and proposed Emergency Access Routes. Are our kids safe?
• 810 Fire and Life Safety forms have never been filed with DSA on any of your construction projects.
• From the Performing Art Center, Swimming Pool, Science Wing to the batting cages at baseball field, we can’t find any record of a CEQA process or signed and filed Notice of Exemption for the public to engage in the details.

You fail to identify noise during events as a significant impact despite evidence to the contrary?
• Identify mitigation measures such as; Noise shielding (Acoustiblok fencing), distributed multi-zone PA system and a policy to prohibit all noise makers, e.g. air horns, megaphones, etc

You don’t disclose why you aren’t repairing tennis courts. Save demolition dollars and fix them.
• Tennis Students drive far with the Vehicles Miles Travelled and deserve on-campus courts. Easy Fix!
Provide full and consistent disclosure on how many practices and games the light will be on.
• Appendix I: VMT Assessment (6 football games), Mitigation Measure 5-2a: (44 games)
• BUT the truth is on page 103 with up to 400 practices and 124 games.
• Include the full impact of all the practices/games in all inputs: VMT, GHG, Energy – it’s part of the cumulative impact.

Fast-track the adoption of “Late Start”, a CA State Law benefitting all students.
• Focus on implementing Late Start by purchasing more buses and hiring more drivers.
• Please include all the workstreams you promised during special sessions.
• Separate out this workstream. It’s not a construction project and not part of the 4.2 Project Characteristics.

Parking Capacity and Emergency Access will remain a "Significant" Environmental Impact without viable mitigation:
• Parking: Currently not enough parking (276 spaces) for 866 enrolled students, 102 daytime faculty and staff (including kitchen staff) and five nighttime staff (page 65).
• Even with RDEIR proposed new parking spaces (total of 387), the CA Education recommended planning guidelines: 50% of students = parking spaces so minimum should be 433 parking spaces.
• Bleachers: Current bleacher capacity is 1,081 (page 57) and yet Appendix K indicates they could absorb more than 2,000 attendees? Where is the Emergency Access Routes?

Figure 7-1: Habitat Map visually outlines which regulated/protected trees are in jeopardy.
• RDEIR states that it "appears" to have adequate buffer space between the trees and new parking lot but they provide NO details, specs or measurements.
• Provide a clear map indicating all specs, designs and exact boundary lines of Scenic Highway 1, protected trees and any proposed roadways or parking lots.

Accurate facts on the Environmental Setting of the existing traffic, parking and safety issues at CHS are not disclosed:
• Why hasn’t CHS already implemented what is on Page 18 of Appendix K: Traffic Management Plan:
  The school would like to coordinate with the County and nearby neighbors of the school to consider the implementation of potential traffic safety measures that would benefit all street users. These include, but are not limited to ideas such as:
  • Updating required school area warning signage
  • Consider posted speed reductions down to 15 MPH in school areas
  • Calming traffic through use of pavement markings and/or speed reduction measures, which could potentially include additional speed humps
  • Exploring additional stop sign controls at intersection
• We request that CUSD establish a baseline of a "Safe Routes to School Assessment" that acknowledges school enrollment boundary with a focus on infrastructure improvements, enforcement, tools and safety education and incentives for safe travel. This should be done immediately and outside of the RDEIR. It’s basic safety.

Mitigation Measure 11-4: The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is a superficial, flawed, short-term fix with the potential to cause residential nuisance problem:
• Execution of TMP requires an "Encroachment Permit" granted by Monterey County. CUSD is not in control. No guarantees the County will or should consistently give permission on requested dates.
• No valid methodology or basis for establishing anticipated attendees (lack of ticket sale data across all games including soccer, football and/or baseball).
• No valid base for vehicle occurrence: data comes from one homecoming football game on a Friday night, with lights, at Mitty High School in San Jose, CA (no context of how school compares to CHS, # students, campus size, etc).
• All off-campus parking, shuttle service and alternative mode of services are not enforceable (voluntary). The TMP provides little detail of how they would "advertise, communicate, reward or encourage".
• Parking Management is identified only for the residents surrounding the east side of CHS, not the west side where the overflow will now find relief and cause problems.
Response to the RDEIR by Susan Miller

I am responding to the overall approach, objectives and alternatives considered in the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement Report (RDEIR).

School officials are proposing to spend $4.5 million dollars on stadium lights and associated projects for football practices and Friday night games. School officials keep stressing they want what’s best for students.

Excuse me?

We ALL want what’s best for students. We just happen to differ on “what’s best” and WHICH students will benefit.

The huge outlay proposed in the RDEIR supposedly will benefit the small number of male students who play football. Some students say Friday night games will bolster school spirit.

There is no suggestion in the RDEIR that playing football at Carmel High School will lead to college recruitment and scholarships.

Meanwhile, the RDEIR says nothing about the danger of concussions to football players that lead to later brain damage as adults. It is silent even on the difficulty of getting ambulance crews into the parking area next to the stadium.

As public awareness of the danger of football concussions grows, a recent New York Times article (Oct. 1, 2022) noted that “more parents are pushing their sons into soccer and baseball. Scholastic football programs have shrunk and even shuttered.”

Consider the risk of life-altering brain damage so that spectators can enjoy football games: Is this really “what’s best for students”?

There is nothing in the RDEIR to suggest other ways in which school spirit might be enhanced. How about supporting and celebrating all the OTHER sports—female and male—that are much less likely to lead to concussions? How about celebrating all the OTHER artistic and intellectual activities in which Carmel students excel?

Have students, parents and faculty been polled on what OTHER programs and services they would like funded, such as more Advanced Placement classes, more counseling, more faculty, or other extracurricular activities?

There is nothing in the RDEIR to analyze alternative uses of the $4.5 million. The school’s mock trial team is headed for the national championships is Chicago. That is, if they can raise enough money for...
travel, hotel and other expenses. They have turned to the community for help. I’ve given them a large donation and urged my neighbors to do the same. Practicing and preparing for mock trial competitions develops skills in thinking, reasoning, public speaking, and leadership. All of these skills enhance students’ abilities to gain admission to—and do well in—top colleges. Carmel’s mock trial teams make the nationals year after year. Why is no money set aside in the school district budget to pay for these expenses?

Is this an example “what’s best for students”?

School officials have been misleading, dismissive and duplicitous in statements to the community. Supt. Ted Knight convened a “listening session” in December to hear from residents.

Neighbors complained about:

--Light pollution, which will put four 80-foot spotlights between the ocean views and thousands of homes stretching from Point Lobos to Jack’s Peak, including Carmel Highlands, Carmel Valley, Palo Corona, Carmel Views, Rancho Rio Vista and Carmel Knolls. Residents west of Highway 1 will also be affected by light pollution from these poles. (See page 127, RDEIR.)

--Frequency of light pollution. There could be up to 400 practices for 124 soccer and football games, NOT just the “six” football games frequently mentioned by supporters of the lights. (See page 103, RDEIR.)

--Traffic from 1,500 spectators backed up onto Highway 1 during Friday rush hour. (See page 104, RDEIR.)

--Lack of emergency access routes for games, noise pollution, and safety of students and spectators who will be parked on unlit, narrow streets adjacent to the school. (No mention of these concerns in RDEIR.)

--Destruction of Monterey cypress and pine trees adjacent to Highway 1, a designated California Scenic Highway. (See page 199, RDEIR.)

Knight said all these comments would be taken into account as the board moved forward. He responded to criticisms and questions about the intensity of proposed stadium lights—and the existing swimming pool lights—by saying that the swimming pool lights would be converted to “dark sky” lights over the summer of 2022. He implied this change would be a good way for residents to compare current lights with a “dark sky” version. Now, the RDEIR has delayed “dark sky” pool lighting until football stadium lights are installed. Residents’ frequent requests for “story poles” mounted with lights (to indicate how high and bright the stadium lights would be) have been ignored. Two days after the “listening
session” Knight was quoted in the student newspaper saying that he hoped something could be worked out to partially satisfy residents’ concerns. However, he assured the students, in the end, the district would do whatever the students wanted.

Fundamentally, the RDEIR does not accurately justify why stadium lights are necessary. School officials have blamed the new state law that mandates a later start for high school students so they can get more sleep. They say the district can’t manage a busing schedule without ending school so late in the afternoon that lights are necessary for evening athletic practices. They admit this schedule would require picking up elementary students an hour earlier. However, the link to late start doesn’t hold up.

Numerous residents have provided school schedules that include the current seven-period day AND late start AND still conclude in plenty of time for athletic practices in the daylight. However, if the district wants to keep elementary student busing on the current schedule, the district could simply purchase more buses and hire more bus drivers. Surely that would be considerably less expensive than $4.5 million.

At this point, considering the many other alternatives to boosting school spirit and athlete safety, and the very workable alternatives to providing a late start schedule, the stadium lights and associated projects amount to a solution to no real problem.
You state one of your objectives is: Improve on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access, campus security and safety, ADA access, and student, staff, and visitor access within the Carmel High School campus grounds;

Questions on Mitigation Measures:
- Can you provide the current state of on-campus traffic circulation, fire and emergency vehicle access?
- How would your proposals specifically improve current conditions?
- How are you defining on-campus traffic circulation? Is that different than parking needs?
- Is the above location, the gate entrance of the baseball field violating any encroachment permits? What is the width of the entrance? What are the fire and emergency access limitations? Seems dangerous?
- Why is the baseball field not part of the definition of "improving" athletic fields?
- This photo shows the narrow opening at the top where cars are parked and pedestrian is being challenged.
- Your new scope of work should very little details or specs how this section would be impacted.
- Where would the Emergency Access Route be?
- Our neighbors provided us photos of your work being done on possible encroachments. Can you update us why this is being done and the status?
- Our neighborhood was shocked on the noise coming from the batting cages you installed without telling us - what are you planning that we should be aware of?
The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Re: RDEIR Feedback: Scenic Highway 1 (Protected Clarity of Proposed Parking Lot / Protected Trees and Protected Scenic Highway 1)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>)
To: Bud Get <bud.get@bigmail.com>
Cc: <christopher.bjornstad@dot.ca.gov>; <info-d5@dot.ca.gov>; <shinds@carmelunified.org>; <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Wed, Oct 5, 2022 at 6:49 AM Bud Get <bud.get@bigmail.com> wrote:

This is feedback regarding: Revised Draft EIR Carmel High School Stadium Improvements SCH# 2021050293
August 24, 2022
Also, copied on this e-mail is CalTrans and lead Christopher Bjornstad who signed the Notice of Preparation Letter.

While the RDEIR acknowledges that Scenic Highway 1 is Protected by Corridor Program, it provides no clarity if they are violating any terms and/or the work they are doing to uphold the guidelines of the Corridor Program.

Questions:
- Do you have a boundary survey of how close CHS is to Scenic Highway 1?
- What is a visual map of the Corridor Program outlined to CHS Campus?
For each of your proposed projects, where do they sit in comparison to Scenic Highway 1 vs. High School Property?
- Do the protected tree-lines sit on the boundary of CHS and/or Scenic Highway 1?
- Your proposed new parking lot with POLES and Lights (from ripped out tennis courts) can be seen from Scenic Highway 1. Are you violating any terms?
- Are you violating any terms of how close our project is to Scenic Highway 1? Wasn't 100 feet set-back a requirement? Are you violating this?
- Will you be conducting a Visual Impact Assessment to the requirement of the guidelines for Scenic Highway 1? Will they be visual simulations or photo simulations? Will those be submitted to Caltrans? Who will they be sent to at Caltrans?
- How will you determine if you are violating guidelines?
- The Caltrans letter from Chris indicates the process for encroachment Permit. Doesn't the new proposed parking lot ripping out tennis courts sit on Caltran's right of way? What is the next step and timeline if you have permission to do this? Without permission, the Final EIR can't be approved?
- Can you provide all specs from this project? Where is the Emergency Access Routes?

The RDEIR does not provide details of how close the protected trees, Scenic Highway 1 and proposed new parking lot (ripped out tennis court will be).

This photo shows the specific connections to Scenic Highway 1, Protected Trees and the proposed new parking lot as a result of the ripped out tennis courts.

5. Please be aware that if any future work is completed in the State’s right-of-way it will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans and must be done to our engineering and environmental standards, and at no cost to the State. The conditions of approval and the requirements for the encroachment permit are issued at the sole discretion of the Permits Office, and nothing in this letter shall be implied as limiting those future conditions and requirements. For more information regarding the encroachment permit process, please visit our Encroachment Permit Website at: https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-5/district-5-programs/d5-encroachment-permits.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed project. If you have any questions, or need further clarification on items discussed above, please contact me at (805) 835-6543 or at Christopher.Bjornstad@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Christopher Bjornstad
Associate Transportation Planner
District 5 Development Review

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability."

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.
Re: CUSD reopening plans

From: Sullivan, Ryan (CIV) [email]@nps.edu>
To: Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>
Cc: Karl Pallasstrini <kpallasstrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>; Ryan Peterson <rpetersen@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Trisha Dells <tdells@carmelunified.org>

Fri, Feb 19, 2021 at 6:57 AM PST (GMT-08:00)

Dear Sara,

It is my understanding that the CUSD reopening plan uses a 6 feet distancing rule between students (see page 18 of 156 in the attachment). To my knowledge, the safety plan was completed prior to the newly released CDC guidelines. In addition, the California state guidelines specify that a minimum 4 feet distancing rule is mandatory for reopening schools in this state. It is my understanding that the California guidelines leave it up to us if we want to open for hybrid or full-time instruction for the elementary schools as long as we abide by the 4 feet rule and we are under the 25 cases per 100,000 threshold (see page 21 in the CA guidelines attachment). The guidelines do not require a 6 feet distancing measure and it is my understanding that they put the 4 feet rule into place so school districts would have the option for reopening full-time.

For areas with low case rates (such as our own), the newly released CDC guidelines provide very specific recommendations for when we should be in hybrid or full-time instruction. They state that areas with fewer than 50 per 100,000 cases should have their elementary schools open full-time. The only time the 6 feet rule becomes mandatory for elementary schools is when cases are at a level above 50 per 100,000 (see page 2 and footnote 3 in the CDC document attachment).

It does not appear that our reopening plans are in sync with either the general literature (here, here, here, here) or guidelines provided by the top health officials in the United States. It is also unclear why we are using a more stringent distancing measure than dictated by the guidelines. Using a higher distancing measure requires us to have fewer children in the classroom, and from what I can tell, won’t allow our children to be in school full-time.

It is clear we are choosing to go against the guidance provided by the CDC. In addition, we are also choosing to meet a higher distancing threshold as dictated by the California guidelines. It is unclear to me what threshold requirements our district would need to meet in order for our elementary students to be in session full-time. I have two specific questions that would help me to better understand what is going on (see below).

1. Has the district studied if they could reopen full-time instruction for the elementary children if we choose to use the 4 feet rule instead of 6 feet (which is not required)? If yes, what was the determination? If no, I think it would be beneficial to do so for planning purposes going forward.

2. How low do the cases have to be in order for the School Board to support reopening for full-time instruction? As you are aware, the CDC threshold says fewer than 50 per 100,000. If you disagree with this guidance, then I think you owe it to the parents of this district to state specifically when you would support fully reopening and at what case levels.

Thank you,
Ryan

-----

Ryan Sullivan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Economics
Naval Postgraduate School
699 Dyer Road, Monterey, CA 93943
Work Phone: (831) 656-2811

[webpage]@nps.edu

From: Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2021 10:50 AM
To: Sullivan, Ryan (CIV) [email]@nps.edu>
Cc: Karl Pallasstrini <kpallasstrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>; Ryan Peterson
Dear Dr. Sullivan,

Thank you for your email.

As you noted, the District is planning to move forward with reopening under the California state guidelines early next month. While that guidance will no longer prevent the District from reopening (once adjusted case rates remain at 25 or less per 100,000 for five consecutive days), other provisions of that guidance document, the In-Person Instruction Framework, and other guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health will continue to regulate some aspects of the manner in which the District operates.

As the Framework notes, its direction applies to all public and private schools operating in California and schools must comply with orders and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and relevant local health departments. In contrast, the CDC guidelines are not mandatory and, in any event, the more restrictive requirements would apply. As the California Department of Public Health: “K-12 Schools Reopening Framework and Guidance Q&A” explains: “Under the operative executive orders and 2020-21 Budget Act, schools must comply with orders and guidance issued by the California Department of Public Health and relevant local public health departments. Schools may comply with guidance from other federal, state, local, and non-governmental sources, to the extent those guidelines are consistent with state and local public health directives, but in all cases where local or non-governmental sources may issue guidance that is less restrictive, this state guidance shall supersede.”

While a portion of the Framework addresses when schools may reopen, the large majority of the document addresses how districts must operate in-person instruction once they are able to open. While the Framework does not dictate whether a district operates in a hybrid or fully in-person model, it does impose other requirements which can determine whether a district may operate in a fully in-person model. Specifically, the Framework states: “Maximize space between seating and desks. Distance teacher and other staff desks at least 6 feet away from student and other staff desks. Distance student chairs at least 6 feet away from one another, except where 6 feet of distance is not possible after a good-faith effort has been made…. Under no circumstances should distance between student chairs be less than 4 feet.” This is similar, although more prescriptive than the CDC guidelines which require “physical distancing of 6 feet or more to the greatest extent possible.” However, as the Framework is binding on the District, it is required to follow the Framework’s requirements in reopening.

In preparing for reopening, District staff determined the maximum capacity of the classrooms given these distancing requirements. This indicated that it would not be possible to have all students on-campus (excluding those who may opt-out) while maintaining the distancing set forth in the Framework. This led the District to plan for a hybrid model where the number of students in classrooms at any one time would not exceed the capacity under this guidance.

Thus, while the CDC guidelines may suggest that districts return to full in-person instruction where possible, given the current directives of the Framework and the capacity of District classrooms, the District determined that the only way in which in-person instruction could be offered to all District students who seek in-person instruction would be through a hybrid instruction model.

I hope this addresses your initial questions, and if you have further questions about the hybrid model please don’t hesitate to reach out to Mr. Peterson.

Thank you,
Sara
From: "Sullivan, Ryan (CIV)" <nps.edu>
Date: February 16, 2021 at 6:38:53 AM PST
To: shinds@carmelunified.org
Cc: snachbar@carmelunified.org, kpallastrini@carmelunified.org, arosen@carmelunified.org, Trisha Dells <tdellis@carmelunified.org>, Ryan Peterson <rpeterson@carmelunified.org>
Subject: CUSD reopening plans

Dear CUSD President Hinds,

As a concerned parent of [REDacted] I am writing for clarification on our plan to reopen the elementary schools in our district. It is my understanding that we are planning to push ahead with opening the elementary schools in hybrid mode in March. Along these lines, we are following the California state guidelines which require our area to meet the 25 per 100,000 cases threshold before doing so (as well as some other requirements, see the attachment). To my knowledge, once we are under the 25 cases threshold, then it is at our discretion for how (hybrid or full-time) we choose to open the elementary schools in our district.

I am aware of any guidance which states that we have to go with the hybrid option. All of the literature that I am aware of indicates we should be opening for full-time instruction with the type of case counts we are seeing in our district. In addition, the new CDC guidelines (see the attachment) recommends elementary schools in districts with low case totals (cases fewer than 50 cases per 100,000) should be open for full-time in-person instruction.

Am I missing something here? Is there some kind of guidance from the state of California which states we should be opening under the hybrid option? If yes, would you please send me a link or pdf of those guidelines? If no, would you mind letting me know why we are choosing to go against the guidance provided by the CDC?

Thank you,
Ryan

Ryan Sullivan, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Economics
Naval Postgraduate School
699 Dyer Road, Monterey, CA 93943
Work Phone: (831) 656-2811
Cell Phone: [REDACTED]

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient's authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice
Attachments

- CA_guidance.pdf
- CDC_guidelines.pdf
- CUSD_safety_plan.pdf
RDEIR: Providing Public Comment on

PROBLEM:
RDEIR Transportation Impact 11-4. has accurately been captured as: An Increase in Event Attendance Could Result in Inadequate Parking During Limited Nighttime Events with Potential Emergency Access Issues

The Mitigation Measure 11-4. The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) does NOT shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a superficial, flawed short-term fix for a handful of limited nighttime football games. The proposed TMP creates confusion in law enforcement between event attendees vs. residential parking, causes a nuisance in residential parking limiting our our streets. Most importantly, the RDEIR doesn't acknowledge or address the existing chronic problem of inadequate parking and the lack of transparency for existing Emergency Access Routes. This problem currently plagues the CHS campus and surrounding environment on a daily basis.

I am providing this e-mail thread and photos as evidence the proposed TMP doesn't even work during the weekend, daytime-events much less introducing the complexity of execution at night.

PHOTOS Demonstrate:
- Lack of plan for on-campus traffic circulation with vehicles parking in front of "No Idling / No Parking" blocking Emergency Access Routes.
- Ticket booth blocking front entrance where the only Emergency Vehicle would have access.
- Conflict of "No Event Parking Signs" with residential cars - how can enforcement tell the difference?
- Cars parked on private property at the corner of Highway 1 / Morse Drive creating safety issues.

Proposed Mitigation Measures:
- Drop temporary TMP plans that can't be legally enforced or upheld.
- Work with residents within 1 mile radius on BOTH Sides of Highway 1 to proactively pull together Supervisor Mary Adams and Monterey Public Works for a long-term "No Parking Resident Only" Solution.
- Implement this effort as sign of trust BEFORE attempting to approve stadium lights. You have more than 10 years of chronic traffic, congestion, circulation issues, parking and safety challenges to address.
- Prove you are a trusted community member that cares about long-term solutions.

HISTORICAL THREAD OF FEEDBACK TO CUSD with Board Members All Aware of the Safety Issues

On Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 12:45 PM wrote:
Hello Jonathan,

Yes, I did see you hustling today to help with the traffic and parking at today's game. However, you forgot to notify the neighbors of the "No Event Parking" signs. How is law enforcement supposed to tell the difference between attendees and residents? What if one of the residents was having a kid's birthday party and needed the street parking for a party?

Also, I keep emphasizing safety, safety, safety - not sure why this is not a priority for anyone on this e-mail? Your "ticket stands" are blocking the only access for emergency vehicles. You may want to re-think that. If a child was injured today - you are jeopardizing life safety.

I have alot more notes that I will submit in very detailed form for the DREIR - there is no way you can move to less than significant impact even with mitigating measures. You are a land-locked campus that did not properly plan for growth. As the first DEIR stated: Nighttime Events with SIGNIFICANT: Potential Emergency Access Issues

I hope the students won the game despite the adults not taking safety as a serious topic.

On Wed, Sep 7, 2022 at 10:10 AM wrote:
Jonathan,
Congrats on the Padres win at the Shoe Game. As many of the residents noted last night, school spirit seems high and winning games are possible without stadium lights. Please clarify the one statement you made last night: you believe that the "No Event" parking mitigation attempt was successful? Please expand on those key points so that the board can be properly informed. This is one of the "feeders" into the RDEIR. What we witnessed:

- You did not properly notify the California Highway Patrol or the broader Monterey Sheriff's Office.
- Folks did indeed park on Morse Drive and it was complete chaos on who should be ticketed and why. (one photo attached - the neighborhood has large file videos if you want us to send)
- The Monterey County Sheriff on duty only ticketed half the cars: Section 22504 - Stopping, parking, or standing upon highway in unincorporated area
- People departing the game were angry half the cars were ticked and half were not "Why me - Why not him"
- When the California Highway Patrol arrived, they clearly communicated they were unaware of any "No Event Parking" plan.
- CHP pointed to the conflicting unapproved "No Event Parking" signs you put up right under the real legal signs (complete conflict with each other and one being "fake and unenforceable" (Photo attached)
- The residents were conflicted. How are you supposed to tell the difference from resident to event participant?
- You completely ignored the other side of Highway 1. So, everyone jammed those residential streets and unsafe crossings were happening from Hatton street (no sidewalks) to Ocean Ave to try and get to the cross-light.

If all the above was happening at night - oh my - please don't tell me that wouldn't be a safety disaster. Please also remember, there is a new crop of students every year. This is not something that is perfected and you've got it down pat. CUSD has no jurisdiction on the surrounding streets of CHS. You kindly remind us you have no jurisdiction when it works to your convenience.

Speaking of which, you've indicated that the neighborhood needs to work more closely with law enforcement to enforce the signs that are already in place. You've pointed to the fact the SRO (that you pay for) is empowered to write tickets - especially near North Carmel Hills. In speaking with the SRO, he confirmed - he is off the clock by 3 PM when the afternoon pick-up chaos begins.

Please be truthful in the facts less the School Board Members walk away that your traffic mitigation plan was a success.

Attachments

- 10_1Football Game Circualation.jpg
- 10_1 Fire Lane Block.jpg
- 10_1 CHS Football 1 intersection with Morse.jpg
- 10_1 CHS Football Game.jpg
- No Parking vs Residents.jpg
- Sign Conflict on September 17th at Noon Game Event Signs.JPG
- Ticket Stand Blocking Emergency Access on September 17th at Noon.JPG
Hello Board Members,

I've removed both Ted and Yvonne from this e-mail.

It's your role as board members to hold Ted and staff accountable to follow appropriate rules and regulations. Will one of you have the courage to ask:

- Is the contract for Whitson Engineers and the Partial Boundary Survey connected to the work that should have been done with Baseball Practice Improvement back in 2019? (see attached)
- Is this work related to concerns regarding Fire Access Routes?
- Why the need for this contract now?

Sara and Karl, you both signed the original Board Resolution in 2019 for the work to be done on the baseball fields. Did anyone think to ask why shouldn't this construction and improvement go through a CEQA process? There isn't even an "unsigned" Notice of Exemption (the messiness of the theater and pool lights) for the batting cages. Please note all this lack of follow-up and rigour will unfold and be highly connected to the stadium lights RDEIR and campus Emergency Access Routes.

You can decide what action you want to take at this Wednesday's board meeting, but I'm giving you a heads up that you should not be complicit in continuing to cover-up past sins. Ted is inheriting a mess but instead of sharing the true state of the campus and past construction, the road to cover-up continues.

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 2:45 PM Frances Dillard <reddered@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ted and Yvonne,

The attached Vendor Contract is on the agenda for: Independent Contractor Service Agreements. Can you provide more insights:

- Have the homeowners been notified of the work?
- What is the intent of the potential encroachment?

Attachments

- 2223_19 Responsive Documents Baseball.pdf
PROBLEM:
Attached photos indicate that on campus circulation is a challenge even during the day games. Both School Buses were stopped and parked for more than 15 minutes in exits and/or fire lanes that impeded Emergency Vehicle Access.
The proposed Traffic Management Plan as part of the Proposed Mitigation Measure under Transportation is not executable to the root challenges of the improving campus circulation as one of your stated objectives.

Mitigation Measure:
- Solve the on-campus main parking lot circulation challenges.
- Provide current and proposed Emergency Access Routes.
- It's time to revisit the Facilities Master Plan and identify where is the safe location for future growth. CMS is that location. Stop overbuilding and stop attracting further activities that will be further problematic at night - high risk for injury.
- Revise TMP to a legally upheld permanent residential solution - not short-term for a handful of games. This is a constant every-day traffic circulation and congestion challenge that speaks to the identified (PAGE 40) An Increase in Event Attendance Could Result in Inadequate Parking During Limited Nighttime Events with Potential Emergency Access Issues.
Including one more photo of intersection of Scenic Highway 1 and residential street of Morse. This would be unsafe at Night.

Please provide Emergency Access Plans - current and with proposed changes.

On Oct 1, 2022, at 2:32 PM, Frances Dillard <reddette@gmail.com> wrote:

PROBLEM:
RDEIR Transportation Impact 11-4. has accurately been captured as: An Increase in Event Attendance Could Result in Inadequate Parking During Limited Nighttime Events with Potential Emergency Access Issues

The Mitigation Measure 11-4. The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) does NOT shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a superficial, flawed short-term fix for a handful of limited nighttime football games. The proposed TMP creates confusion in law enforcement between event attendees vs. residential parking, causes a nuisance in residential parking limiting our our streets. Most importantly, the RDEIR doesn't acknowledge or address the existing chronic problem of inadequate parking and the lack of transparency for existing Emergency Access Routes. This problem currently plagues the CHS campus and surrounding environment on a daily basis.

I am providing this e-mail thread and photos as evidence the proposed TMP doesn't even work during the weekend, day-time-events much less introducing the complexity of execution at night.

PHOTOS Demonstrate:
- Lack of plan for on-campus traffic circulation with vehicles parking in front of "No Idling / No Parking" blocking Emergency Access Routes.
- Ticket booth blocking front entrance where the only Emergency Vehicle would have access.
- Conflict of "No Event Parking Signs" with residential cars - how can enforcement tell the difference?
- Cars parked on private property at the corner of Highway 1 / Morse Drive creating safety issues.
Proposed Mitigation Measures:

- Drop temporary TMP plans that can't be legally enforced or upheld.
- Work with residents within 1 mile radius on BOTH Sides of Highway 1 to proactively pull together Supervisor Mary Adams and Monterey Public Works for a long-term "No Parking Resident Only" Solution.
- Implement this effort as sign of trust BEFORE attempting to approve stadium lights. You have more than 10 years of chronic traffic, congestion, circulation issues, parking and safety challenges to address.
- Prove you are a trusted community member that cares about long-term solutions.

HISTORICAL THREAD OF FEEDBACK TO CUSD with Board Members All Aware of the Safety Issues

On Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 12:45 PM wrote:
Hello Jonathan,

Yes, I did see you hustling today to help with the traffic and parking at today's game. However, you forgot to notify the neighbors of the "No Event Parking" signs. How is law enforcement supposed to tell the difference between attendees and residents? What if one of the residents was having a kid's birthday party and needed the street parking for a party?

Also, I keep emphasizing safety, safety, safety - not sure why this is not a priority for anyone on this e-mail? Your "ticket stands" are blocking the only access for emergency vehicles. You may want to re-think that. If a child was injured today - you are jeopardizing life safety.

I have alot more notes that I will submit in very detailed form for the DREIR - there is no way you can move to less than significant impact even with mitigating measures. You are a land-locked campus that did not properly plan for growth. As the first DEIR stated: Nighttime Events with SIGNIFICANT: Potential Emergency Access Issues

I hope the students won the game despite the adults not taking safety as a serious topic.

On Wed, Sep 7, 2022 at 10:10 AM wrote:
Jonathan,

Congrats on the Padres win at the Shoe Game. As many of the residents noted last night, school spirit seems high and winning games are possible without stadium lights. Please clarify the one statement you made last night: you believe that the "No Event" parking mitigation attempt was successful? Please expand on those key points so that the board can be properly informed. This is one of the "feeders" into the RDEIR What we witnessed:

- You did not properly notify the California Highway Patrol or the broader Monterey Sheriff's Office.
- Folks did indeed park on Morse Drive and it was complete chaos on who should be ticketed and why. (one photo attached - the neighborhood has large file videos if you want us to send)
- The Monterey County Sheriff on duty only ticketed half the cars: Section 22504 - Stopping, parking, or standing upon highway in unincorporated area
- People departing the game were angry half the cars were ticked and half were not "Why me - Why not him"
- When the California Highway Patrol arrived, they clearly communicated they were unaware of any "No Event Parking" plan.
- CHP pointed to the conflicting unapproved "No Event Parking" signs you put up right under the real legal signs (complete conflict with each other and one being "fake and unenforceable" (Photo attached)
- The residents were conflicted. How are you supposed to tell the difference from resident to event participant?
- You completely ignored the other side of Highway 1. So, everyone jammed those residential streets and unsafe crossings were happening from Hatton street (no sidewalks) to Ocean Ave to try and get to the cross-light.

If all the above was happening at night - oh my - please don't tell me that wouldn't be a safety disaster. Please also remember, there is a new crop of students every year. This is not something that is perfected and you've got it down pat. CUSD has no jurisdiction on the surrounding streets of CHS. You kindly remind us you have no jurisdiction when it works to your convenience.

Speaking of which, you've indicated that the neighborhood needs to work more closely with law enforcement to enforce the signs that are already in place. You've pointed to the fact the SRO (that you pay for) is empowered to write tickets - especially near North Carmel Hills. In speaking with the SRO, he confirmed - he is off the clock by 3 PM when the afternoon pick-up chaos begins.

Please be truthful in the facts less the School Board Members walk away that your traffic mitigation plan was a success.
Attachments

- Bus in Fire Lane.jpg
- Bus Parked in front of Entry Way for more than 15 minutes.jpg
Hello Board Members,

I've removed both Ted and Yvonne from this e-mail.

It's your role as board members to hold Ted and staff accountable to follow appropriate rules and regulations. Will one of you have the courage to ask:

- Is the contract for Whitson Engineers and the Partial Boundary Survey connected to the work that should have been done with Baseball Practice Improvement back in 2019? (see attached)
- Is this work related to concerns regarding Fire Access Routes?
- Why the need for this contract now?

Sara and Karl, you both signed the original Board Resolution in 2019 for the work to be done on the baseball fields. Did anyone think to ask why shouldn't this construction and improvement go through a CEQA process? There isn't even an "unsigning" Notice of Exemption (the messiness of the theater and pool lights) for the batting cages. Please note all this lack of follow-up and rigour will unfold and be highly connected to the stadium lights RDEIR and campus Emergency Access Routes.

You can decide what action you want to take at this Wednesday's board meeting, but I'm giving you a heads up that you should not be complicit in continuing to cover-up past sins. Ted is inheriting a mess but instead of sharing the true state of the campus and past construction, the road to cover-up continues.

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 2:45 PM Frances Dillard <frances.dillard@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ted and Yvonne,

The attached Vendor Contract is on the on the agenda for: Independent Contractor Service Agreements. Can you provide more insights:

- Have the homeowners been notified of the work?
- What is the intent of the potential encroachment?

Attachments

- 2223_19 Responsive Documents Baseball.pdf
Dear Mrs. Dillard,

Thank you for your email. Whitson Engineers were contracted to conduct a partial boundary survey to confirm the CUSD property line. This survey is unrelated to any past projects, including the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019. As for the “fire access routes” please submit your concerns on this topic to: feedback@carmelunified.org.

With respect to your question concerning CEQA compliance for the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019, CEQA does not require public agencies to follow any specific procedure in approving activities that are exempt under CEQA. In some instances, public agencies will opt to file a Notice of Exemption in order to trigger a shorter statute of limitations period (35-days instead of 180-days), but they are not required to do so. Moreover, there is no requirement that an agency put its exemption decision in writing at any time, but if an agency opts to do so, the CEQA Guidelines expressly provide it cannot occur until after the exempt project is approved. (CEQA Guidelines, s. 15062(a).) As the Baseball Practice Area Improvements was exempt under CEQA, the District properly took action to approve the project, and no further process was required.

Thank you for taking the time to reach out with your question and concerns.

Best,
Sara

On Sep 13, 2022, at 4:20 AM, Frances Dillard <redd@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Board Members,

I've removed both Ted and Yvonne from this e-mail.

It's your role as board members to hold Ted and staff accountable to follow appropriate rules and regulations. Will one of you have the courage to ask:

- Is the contract for Whitson Engineers and the Partial Boundary Survey connected to the work that should have been done with Baseball Practice Improvement back in 2019? (see attached)
- Is this work related to concerns regarding Fire Access Routes?
- Why the need for this contract now?

Sara and Karl, you both signed the original Board Resolution in 2019 for the work to be done on the baseball fields. Did anyone think to ask why shouldn't this construction and improvement go through a CEQA process? There isn't even an "unsigned" Notice of Exemption (the messines of the theater and pool lights) for the batting cages. Please note all this lack of follow-up and rigour will unfold and be highly connected to the stadium lights RDEIR and campus Emergency Access Routes.
You can decide what action you want to take at this Wednesday's board meeting, but I'm giving you a heads up that you should not be complicit in continuing to cover-up past sins. Ted is inheriting a mess but instead of sharing the true state of the campus and past construction, the road to cover-up continues.

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 2:45 PM Frances Dillard <[redacted]@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ted and Yvonne,

The attached Vendor Contract is on the on the agenda for: Independent Contractor Service Agreements. Can you provide more insights:

- Have the homeowners been notified of the work?
- What is the intent of the potential encroachment?

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice

Attachments

- 2223_19 Responsive Documents Baseball.pdf
Re: More Information Requested: Whitson Engineers (On the Board Agenda Tonight)

From: Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>  
To: Frances Dillard - ecommerce@gmail.com  
Cc: Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>

Mrs. Dillard,
My apologies for the typo on the feedback email address. It should read: feedback@carmelunified.org

Sorry for any confusion,
Sara

On Sep 14, 2022, at 4:31 PM, Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org> wrote:

Dear Mrs. Dillard,
Thank you for your email. Whitson Engineers were contracted to conduct a partial boundary survey to confirm the CUSD property line. This survey is unrelated to any past projects, including the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019. As for the “fire access routes” please submit your concerns on this topic to: feedback@carmelunified.org.

With respect to your question concerning CEQA compliance for the Baseball Practice Area Improvements in 2019, CEQA does not require public agencies to follow any specific procedure in approving activities that are exempt under CEQA. In some instances, public agencies will opt to file a Notice of Exemption in order to trigger a shorter statute of limitations period (35-days instead of 180-days), but they are not required to do so. Moreover, there is no requirement that an agency put its exemption decision in writing at any time, but if an agency opts to do so, the CEQA Guidelines expressly provide it cannot occur until after the exempt project is approved. (CEQA Guidelines, s. 15062(a).) As the Baseball Practice Area Improvements was exempt under CEQA, the District properly took action to approve the project, and no further process was required.

Thank you for taking the time to reach out with your question and concerns.

Best,
Sara

On Sep 13, 2022, at 4:20 AM, Frances Dillard <ecommerce@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Board Members,

I’ve removed both Ted and Yvonne from this e-mail.

It’s your role as board members to hold Ted and staff accountable to follow appropriate rules and regulations. Will one of you have the courage to ask:
- Is the contract for Whitson Engineers and the Partial Boundary Survey connected to the work that should have been done with Baseball Practice Improvement back in 2019? (see attached)
- Is this work related to concerns regarding Fire Access Routes?
- Why the need for this contract now?

Sara and Karl, you both signed the original Board Resolution in 2019 for the work to be done on the baseball fields. Did anyone think to ask why shouldn't this construction and improvement go through a CEQA process? There isn't even an "unsigned" Notice of Exemption (the messines of the theater and pool lights) for the batting cages. Please note all this lack of follow-up and rigour will unfold and be highly connected to the stadium lights RDEIR and campus Emergency Access Routes.

You can decide what action you want to take at this Wednesday's board meeting, but I'm giving you a heads up that you should not be complicate in continuing to cover-up past sins. Ted is inheriting a mess but instead of sharing the true state of the campus and past construction, the road to cover-up continues.

On Mon, Sep 12, 2022 at 2:45 PM Frances Dillard <frANCES.DILLARD @gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ted and Yvonne,

The attached Vendor Contract is on the on the agenda for: Independent Contractor Service Agreements. Can you provide more insights:

- Have the homeowners been notified of the work?
- What is the intent of the potential encroachment?

The information contained in this email may be personal and confidential and is intended only for the recipients named above (and any of the recipient’s authorized designees). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient of this message or of any attachments to the message, you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, including any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original message. Thank you.

Link to CUSD Nondiscrimination Notice

Attachments

- 2223_19 Responsive Documents Baseball.pdf
Hello Yvonne and Kendall,

During a School Board Meeting in June, you requested the approval of an independent contract service agreement with Dannis Wolver Kelley for legal services for FY 2022-23. The attachment indicates all contracts must be approved by the Board of Education.

- Regular Meeting | 06/08/2022 - 05:00 PM
- Prepared By: Kendall Perkins, Assistant to the Chief Business Official
- Approved for Submission to the Board: Yvonne Perez, Chief Business Official
- Recommended Motion: Approve the Independent Contractor Service Agreement with Dannis Wolver Kelley for legal services for Fiscal Year 2022-23.
- Financial Impact: General Fund: $400,000.00

What is/was the status of this approval? Given the Superintendent is very clear on a media front that CPRA requests are wasting taxpayers dollars and diverting funds from students (which is inaccurate - CUSD is independently choosing to have their legal team review documents that should be free and readily available to the public), we'd like to know the exact details of payments to Dannis Wolver Kelly. What is the exact amount the Superintendent keeps referring to?

- What were the payments to DWK for 2019-2021?
- What are the payments to DWK for YTD 2022?
- What are statements (Including costs) of work that the school board has approved for 2022-2023?

For the School Board Members,
- You appear to have continued confidence that the Superintendent is making sound fiscal decisions, so we should assume have approved all legal fees past and future for Dannis Wolver Kelley given the Board of Education must approve all contracts?
- We should assume you will continue to take responsibility for the legal expenses associated with the proposed stadium lights as you believe that is the best use of the school district's funds?
- We assume you are aware you are paying for DWK to "redact" CPRA requests that should be free and available to the public?
- We assume you are aware that MPUSD has recently lost a lawsuit, where the district tried to hide information from such requests: CASE No 20CV002707: May 2022 Motion for awarding Attorney fees and costs Under the California Public Records Act.

The community is clearly signalling to the Board that we are questioning your judgement on the school district's prioritization of where to budgetary funds are being spent. It's your role to hold accountability. If you take the funds spent on EMC for EIR ($300 MM) and add legal fees - you are close to $1 MM and haven't even broken ground on any construction. I can also assure you as we read the RDEIR, the gaps are so significant and sloppy - it will be an ever ending black hole to try and pull any real facts together (especially on the front of emergency access routes).

Attachments
Re: RDEIR: Providing Public Comment on

Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 8:19 AM PDT (GMT-07:00)

From: CUSD Feedback <feedback@carmelunified.org> (sent via <jhull@carmelunified.org>)
To: [Redacted]@gmail.com
Cc: Seaberry Nachbar <snachbar@carmelunified.org>; Anne-Marie Rosen <arosen@carmelunified.org>; Sara Hinds <shinds@carmelunified.org>; Tess Arthur <tarthur@carmelunified.org>; Karl Pallastrini <kpallastrini@carmelunified.org>; Jonathan Lyons <jlyons@carmelunified.org>

Thank you. Your feedback has been received.

-Carmel Unified School District

On Sat, Oct 1, 2022 at 2:43 PM [Redacted]@gmail.com wrote:

Including one more photo of intersection of Scenic Highway 1 and residential street of Morse. This would be unsafe at Night.

Please provide Emergency Access Plans - current and with proposed changes.

On Oct 1, 2022, at 2:32 PM, Frances Dillard <[Redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

PROBLEM:
RDEIR Transportation Impact 11-4. has accurately been captured as: An Increase in Event Attendance Could Result in Inadequate Parking During Limited Nighttime Events with Potential Emergency Access Issues
The Mitigation Measure 11-4. The proposed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) *does NOT* shift the environmental impact to "less than significant". It is a superficial, flawed short-term fix for a handful of limited nighttime football games. The proposed TMP creates confusion in law enforcement between event attendees vs. residential parking, causes a nuisance in residential parking limiting our streets. Most importantly, the RDEIR doesn't acknowledge or address the existing chronic problem of inadequate parking and the lack of transparency for existing Emergency Access Routes. This problem currently plagues the CHS campus and surrounding environment on a daily basis.

I am providing this e-mail thread and photos as evidence the proposed TMP doesn't even work during the weekend, day-time-events much less introducing the complexity of execution at night.

**PHOTOS Demonstrate:**
- Lack of plan for on-campus traffic circulation with vehicles parking in front of "No Idling / No Parking" blocking Emergency Access Routes.
- Ticket booth blocking front entrance where the only Emergency Vehicle would have access.
- Conflict of "No Event Parking Signs" with residential cars - how can enforcement tell the difference?
- Cars parked on private property at the corner of Highway 1 / Morse Drive creating safety issues.

**Proposed Mitigation Measures:**
- Drop temporary TMP plans that can't be legally enforced or upheld.
- Work with residents within 1 mile radius on BOTH Sides of Highway 1 to proactively pull together Supervisor Mary Adams and Monterey Public Works for a long-term "No Parking Resident Only" Solution.
- Implement this effort as sign of trust BEFORE attempting to approve stadium lights. You have more than 10 years of chronic traffic, congestion, circulation issues, parking and safety challenges to address.
- Prove you are a trusted community member that cares about long-term solutions.

**HISTORICAL THREAD OF FEEDBACK TO CUSD with Board Members All Aware of the Safety Issues**

On Sat, Sep 17, 2022 at 12:45 PM wrote:
Hello Jonathan,

Yes, I did see you hustling today to help with the traffic and parking at today's game. However, you forgot to notify the neighbors of the "No Event Parking" signs. How is law enforcement supposed to tell the difference between attendees and residents? What if one of the residents was having a kid's birthday party and needed the street parking for a party?

Also, I keep emphasizing safety, safety, safety - not sure why this is not a priority for anyone on this e-mail? Your "ticket stands" are blocking the only access for emergency vehicles. You may want to re-think that. If a child was injured today - you are jeopardizing life safety.

I have alot more notes that I will submit in very detailed form for the DREIR - there is no way you can move to less than significant impact even with mitigating measures. You are a land-locked campus that did not properly plan for growth. As the first DEIR stated: Nighttime Events with SIGNIFICANT: Potential Emergency Access Issues

I hope the students won the game despite the adults not taking safety as a serious topic.

On Wed, Sep 7, 2022 at 10:10 AM wrote:
Jonathan,

Congrats on the Padres win at the Shoe Game. As many of the residents noted last night, school spirit seems high and winning games are possible without stadium lights. Please clarify the one statement you made last night: you believe that the "No Event" parking mitigation attempt was successful? Please expand on those key points so that the board can be properly informed. This is one of the "feeders" into the RDEIR. What we witnessed:

- You did not properly notify the California Highway Patrol or the broader Monterey Sheriff's Office.
- Folks did indeed park on Morse Drive and it was complete chaos on who should be ticketed and why. (one photo attached - the neighborhood has large file videos if you want us to send)
- The Monterey County Sheriff on duty only ticketed half the cars: Section 22504 - Stopping, parking, or standing upon highway in unincorporated area
- People departing the game were angry half the cars were ticked and half were not "Why me - Why not him"
- When the California Highway Patrol arrived, they clearly communicated they were unaware of any "No Event Parking" plan.
- CHP pointed to the conflicting unapproved "No Event Parking" signs you put up right under the real legal signs (complete conflict with each other and one being "fake and unenforceable" (Photo attached)
- The residents were conflicted. How are you supposed to tell the difference from resident to event participant?
- You completely ignored the other side of Highway 1. So, everyone jammed those residential streets and unsafe crossings were happening from Hatton street (no sidewalks) to Ocean Ave to try and get to the cross-light.
If all the above was happening at night - oh my - please don't tell me that wouldn't be a safety disaster. Please also remember, there is a new crop of students every year. This is not something that is perfected and you've got it down pat. CUSD has no jurisdiction on the surrounding streets of CHS. You kindly remind us you have no jurisdiction when it works to your convenience.

Speaking of which, you've indicated that the neighborhood needs to work more closely with law enforcement to enforce the signs that are already in place. You've pointed to the fact the SRO (that you pay for) is empowered to write tickets - especially near North Carmel Hills. In speaking with the SRO, he confirmed - he is off the clock by 3 PM when the afternoon pick-up chaos begins.

Please be truthful in the facts less the School Board Members walk away that your traffic mitigation plan was a success.