

**Minutes of CVCA Board of Directors Meeting
March 23, 2017**

In response to growing community interest in Monterey County's plans to repair, replace and expand guardrails in Carmel Views, the CVCA Board of Directors convened an open meeting of interested residents on March 23, 2017. Facilitated by Liz Chornesky, former Board President, the meeting was intended to surface and discuss residents' perspectives, knowledge and preferences about guardrails in Carmel Views, and to inform the Board's formal input to the County on behalf of the Association.

The meeting was well-attended, particularly from local neighborhoods most acutely concerned with guardrail issues: Outlook Drive and Pine Hills Drive. Residents provided important perspectives and concrete recommendations on the location, sequencing and design of planned and future guardrail projects in Carmel Views.

Liz Chornesky prepared the attached summary of the meeting. The Board submitted the summary to the County on April 6, 2017.

Prepared by:
Charlie Wahle, CVCA Secretary

Meeting of the Carmel Views Community Association Board
March 23, 2017

On March 23, the CVCA Board convened a meeting to:

- Surface and share ideas and opinions from interested members of the community related to the repair and construction of guardrails in Carmel Views; and
- Inform the CVCA Board's deliberations as they craft input to the County that represents the best interests of the community as a whole.

Liz Chornesky, a former member of the CVCA Board, served as a neutral facilitator to ensure the process was balanced, transparent and fair, and that it provided an opportunity for all interested community members to participate and share their views. Liz developed the following summary based on more detailed notes developed during the meeting.

Summary Findings & Observations

1. Attendance and engagement in the meeting was high. The more than 25 people who participated brought a diversity of perspectives. The discussion was lively, respectful, and highly constructive.
2. The group came to consensus that "safety first" should be the primary driver of decisions about guardrail repair and construction. At the same time, the group also agreed that construction of guardrails immediately adjacent to private property should be avoided wherever possible, unless it is clearly justified by a documented and significant safety hazard. This "risk-based" approach to guardrail design will minimize the potential harmful impacts of guardrails on people's access to their property, safety in walking from parked cars to residences or along the roadside, and curb appeal.
3. Taking a "risk-based" approach to the guardrail design more generally would reduce the overall footprint of guardrails in our community. This could have benefits for overall community walkability. It also could make it possible to allocate the limited funding available for guardrails to those projects that provide the greatest benefit in terms of traffic hazard reduction.
4. Aesthetic considerations in the choice of guardrail materials were a major topic of discussion. Opinions were mixed about the acceptability of the style and materials – galvanized steel with wood posts – used for the guardrail on Outlook Drive adjacent to the bench. This is the style adopted by the County in the current plan for Carmel Views guardrails.

5. According to information brought to the meeting by Larry Arthur, of Pine Hills Drive, two additional designs might be possible in addition to galvanized steel. One uses steel beams that have been treated chemically so that they have a dark or “rusty” color. The other uses wood-faced beams, backed by steel. Although any style installed by the County would need to meet safety requirements, the 3 styles – galvanized, treated steel, and wood-faced steel – will vary in cost, with the wood-faced style costing the most.
6. People’s opinions about aesthetics considerations generally appeared to reflect where they live. Many of the people from Outlook Drive felt the utilitarian steel guardrails were acceptable, although, all else being equal (in terms of safety and maintenance), they would prefer the treated steel option. Conversely, several people from Pine Hills Drive strongly objected to steel and expressed a desire to explore other options, with a clear preference for wood-faced guardrails.
7. Because the County has limited funding for the guardrails, the style choice could potentially affect where and how many guardrails are installed or repaired in Carmel Views. A more expensive style could mean fewer guardrails, at least in the short-term with existing funding. At present, however, we have very little information about whether or how the County might deal with such tradeoffs, how they might make these decisions, or the extent to which CVCA or its members can influence the County’s choice.
8. The meeting participants overwhelmingly agreed about the sequencing of the four guardrail projects that have been identified for Carmel Views (see summary table on page 3). They recommended initially installing and repairing guardrails on in two locations, upper and lower Outlook Drive, where the safety needs are urgent and fewer concerns arise about aesthetics, length, or adjacency to private property. Guardrails on Pine Hills Drive could be addressed in a second phase, allowing a more extended consultation with the County about style, length, and placement – all of which are sources of significant concern to some residents on that street.

Results from the Sequencing Exercise at the March 23 Meeting

Meeting participants were each asked to sequence four different guardrail projects in Carmel Views, according to which they believe should be tackled 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th. Responses from the group are tallied in the table below. Almost all participants agreed that the two projects on Outlook drive should be undertaken first and second (blue circle) and the two projects on Pine Hills Drive should be undertaken third and fourth (green circle).

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	Don't do
Upper Pine Hills	0	2	8	12	0
Lower Pine Hills	0	0	7	8	0
Upper Outlook	15	4	1	0	0
Lower Outlook	7	14	0	0	0