Hello Ted,

Bubbling this email thread back up to the top of your inbox. While there are many follow-ups and promises coming out of the Listening Session, we’d like closure on two before the holidays:

1). Copy of the notification sent to parents and students that beginning in the new year you are closing the back gate off of Flanders to the high school. We are hoping students have been notified not to trespass private property for access to CHS.

2). Copy of the MOU you indicated you received from the District on parking enforcement.

Given these should have been completed according to your promise, I’m assuming it will be easy to forward copies so I can share the progress with the residents for a more restful holiday. Let’s continue to build trust and credibility on resolving the current issues we’ve agreed upon are problems for the residents surrounding the school.

Best,
Fran Dillard

On Dec 12, 2021, at 10:48 PM, Frances Dillard wrote:

Hi Ted and Tricia,

Residents are confused on the below. Please let us know if we are following proper protocol for prompt follow-ups:

December 15th Board Agenda:
- Does not reflect the Draft EIR update you indicated would be provided to the Board Members per the Listening Session on December 8th.
- Will it be included or not?

Separately I requested (through the form) for the following topic to be included in the next Board Agenda. It is confusing if the current traffic/parking problems are being managed as separate items of the Draft EIR or as combined solutions to the stadium lights. Either way, we’d like the following information to be shared at the next meeting:

- The neighborhood surrounding the school would like to receive a copy of the notice informing students that on January 4th the gate will be locked from Flanders Dr. and that will no longer allow access to the school.
- There is no evidence this alone will change long-term behavior from the students. Thus, time is needed to see if this is a viable solution. It should not negate CUSD efforts to continue working with District 5 Supervisor Mary Adams for traffic and safety controls to legally address a current long-term solution.
- Residents would like more information and transparency on the details of the proposal for a traffic study/management plan that was outlined here. Who are the agencies, what are the requirements, under what conditions, etc. Many of the suggestions such “temporary no parking areas that will be displayed during events” are ambiguous requirements and provide unclear accountability for enforcement, etc.
The current student/faculty parking situation has not been fully elaborated upon in documentation available to us. Before demolition of tennis courts and construction might begin on the addition of 60-80 new parking spots, we'd like more clarity. This probably constitutes a new construction project of substantial scale, requiring full project approval processes. Since new parking alternatives were not well-addressed in the DEIR, is this part of the mitigation plan for the proposed stadium lights? If so, it thus appears to be a piecemeal approach to accomplish that project. It's unclear if this suggestion is for current or future concerns. So where is the supporting analysis? We'd like to see a comprehensive plan with specifics of how traffic flow and parking will be addressed. We maintain a “No Stadium Lights” stance, believing (as we think you also realize) that CHS has built out its capacity. Any plans that would attract more traffic and parking exacerbate current safety problems in general, and for emergency vehicles, etc.

We'd like a copy of the MOU the district has received with County and State allowing limited law enforcement by our school resource officer(s), etc. to issue tickets surrounding the school. The district is also incorporating off-duty law enforcement officers for proposed night events. When might this be shared?