

THE BASS LAKE BULLETIN

The Voice of the Bass Lake Community
<http://basslakeaction.org>

THE BASS LAKE ACTION COMMITTEE

The Bass Lake Action Committee was formed by a group of concerned property owners in the Bass Lake Area and incorporated in 2003 as Non-profit organization, a 501(C)(4) corporation.

Our Mission Statement:

To provide a voice for Bass Lake homeowners in dealing with the county and other community agencies.
To keep homeowners informed about issues and meetings.



image credit - El Dorado County

COUNTY SETTLES LONG-RUNNING AUSTIN LITIGATION

El Dorado County reaches \$14.7 million agreement in mitigation fee case

By John Davey

After nearly a decade of legal proceedings, **El Dorado County** has reached a settlement in the long-running case of *Thomas and Helen Austin vs. El Dorado County*, bringing closure to a complex dispute over traffic-impact fees collected under California's **Mitigation Fee Act**.

(continued on page 2)



AUSTIN LITIGATION *(con't)*

Background

The lawsuit, filed by the Austins, challenged whether the County complied with state law when it collected and retained traffic-impact fees between 2015 and 2016. The Mitigation Fee Act requires local agencies to make periodic findings—known as “five-year nexus reports”—showing how collected fees are used to fund projects that offset the impacts of new development.

In this case, the court found that El Dorado County did not make certain required findings in time, triggering a refund obligation for a 22-month period of collections.

County officials emphasized that the funds had, in fact, been used for their intended purpose—transportation improvements—but the court ruled that **procedural compliance** was still required.

“Despite being provided proof that all fees were being utilized for the purposes for which they were collected... the court ordered the County to refund Traffic Impact Fees that were collected over an approximately 22-month period,” the County noted in its statement.

Settlement Details

On October 8, 2025 the **Board of Supervisors** approved a settlement agreement totaling **\$14,769,601**.

- **\$9.5 million** will be refunded to eligible property owners on a prorated basis.
- **\$5.2 million** will cover the Austins’ legal fees and costs.
- **\$50,000** will be paid directly to the Austins as a stipend, since they are not eligible for refunds themselves.

The County’s statement noted that the agreement “reduces refund exposure by approximately 50 percent” compared with potential outcomes had the case continued in court.

“While this case was hard fought over the years, the County, through its defense of the case, was able to reduce its fee refund exposure by approximately 50 percent.”

— El Dorado County statement

County Officials Respond

Members of the Board expressed mixed feelings about the outcome.

(continued on page 3)

AUSTIN LITIGATION *(con't)*

Supervisor **Brian Veerkamp** said “The County remains disappointed in the outcome of this litigation.”

However, he emphasized the ongoing importance of the traffic-impact fee (TIF) program. “The TIF program enabled and is currently enabling the construction of important transportation infrastructure in the County by ensuring that new development pays its fair share of the cost.”

Supervisor **Lori Parlin** added “The Austins’ lawsuit and the court’s ruling will affect the County’s ability to meet the General Plan’s goals and to deliver the infrastructure that is critical to the well-being of the County.”

What Happens Next

The Board will soon determine how refunds will be distributed to eligible property owners. Options under consideration include:

- Direct payments;
- Temporary suspension of future fee collections;
- Fee credits toward future projects; or
- A combination of these approaches.

Once a method is approved, the County will identify eligible recipients and begin the refund process. Officials estimate this process could take **seven months or more** to complete.

Why It Matters

This settlement concludes one of the most significant local government legal battles in recent memory—one that shaped how California counties interpret the Mitigation Fee Act.

“Most of the legal issues raised in this case were novel issues that required the courts to interpret the intent behind the Mitigation Fee Act,” the County explained.

The outcome underscores the need for strict compliance with procedural requirements when collecting and retaining development-related fees. It also sets a precedent likely to influence how other California jurisdictions manage their own impact-fee programs.

For Local Property Owners

If you paid traffic-impact fees during the affected period (approximately 2015–2016), you may be eligible for a refund. The County will release more details once the refund process is finalized. Updates will be posted

(continued on page 4)

AUSTIN LITIGATION *(con't)*

through the **El Dorado County Planning & Building Department** and official County announcements.

For now, the community can take away one clear message: after years of uncertainty, the Austin litigation has been resolved—and the County can now move forward with renewed focus on maintaining and improving local infrastructure.

Sources:

[El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Press Release, October 8, 2025](#)

California Court of Appeal opinion in *Austin v. County of El Dorado* (C088409)

[Village Life October 13, 2025 Reporting by Noel Stack](#)

EDH CSD DIRECTOR CANDIDATES DISCUSS ISSUES AT FORUM

Two community members share their visions for El Dorado Hills' future

By John Davey

At a recent Candidate forum, the two candidates for the **El Dorado Hills Community Services District (EDH CSD)** Board of Directors seat—**Wayne Lowrey** and **Gary Kinghorn**—shared their views on leadership, fiscal management, and community priorities.

The discussion offered voters a side-by-side look at two distinct approaches to public service.

Candidate: Wayne Lowrey

Wayne Lowrey brings decades of experience within the EDH CSD organization and a long record of community involvement. A former **General Manager of the EDH CSD** and a **two-term past Board member**, Lowrey emphasized his deep institutional knowledge of district operations, budgeting, and park management.

He noted that his prior work gives him “a practical understanding of what it takes to balance policy goals with operational realities.” Lowrey said his experience managing budgets, capital projects, and maintenance cycles would help the district maintain efficiency and accountability.

“Having served both as a director and later as general manager, I understand how decisions made in the boardroom translate to the services people experience every day,” Lowrey said.

Lowrey also highlighted his long history of volunteerism in El Dorado Hills—supporting local youth sports, community events, and neighborhood committees—as part of his broader

(continued on page 5)

EDH CSD CANDIDATES

(con't)

commitment to civic engagement.

His priorities, he said, include maintaining strong financial stewardship, ensuring responsible growth, and protecting the community's parks and open spaces for future generations.

Candidate: Gary Kinghorn

Gary Kinghorn presented himself as a community watchdog and reform-minded candidate. A former **member of the El Dorado County Grand Jury**, Kinghorn said that experience sharpened his skills in oversight and accountability.

"Serving on the Grand Jury teaches you to ask tough questions about transparency, efficiency, and how taxpayer money is being used," Kinghorn said.

Kinghorn also participated in the recent effort to place a recall of three sitting EDH CSD directors on the ballot, citing concerns over transparency and responsiveness. He said the experience deepened his understanding of resident frustrations and reinforced his belief in stronger communication between the district and the public.

At the forum, Kinghorn emphasized creating more opportunities for public input, conducting performance reviews of programs, and aligning growth with infrastructure capacity. He said he wants the district "to reflect community priorities—not just administrative processes."

Key Themes from the Forum

Service and Infrastructure: Both candidates stressed the importance of maintaining high-quality community services amid growth. Lowrey emphasized continuity and operational know-how, while Kinghorn focused on transparency and citizen oversight.

Fiscal Responsibility: Lowrey pointed to his familiarity with the district's budgeting process and long-term planning. Kinghorn called for deeper review of expenditures and broader community involvement in financial decisions.

Governance and Accountability: Kinghorn's background in oversight contrasted with Lowrey's hands-on management perspective. Each candidate offered a different approach on how best to ensure efficiency and accountability in district governance.

(continued on page 6)

EDH CSD CANDIDATES

(con't)

CANDIDATES AT A GLANCE

Candidate	Background	Focus Areas
Wayne Lowrey	• Former General Manager, EDH CSD • Two-term EDH CSD Board Member • Long-time community volunteer	• Institutional continuity • Fiscal management • Preserving parks & recreation services
Gary Kinghorn	• Former El Dorado County Grand Jury Member • Participant in recent recall effort • Community advocate for transparency	• Oversight & accountability • Expanded public engagement • Growth & infrastructure balance

click image to enlarge

The election to fill the vacant EDH CSD Board seat will take place during the **November 4, 2025 special election**. Both candidates have pledged to focus on maintaining community quality of life and improving communication with residents.

As both candidates noted during the forum, informed community involvement is key to a healthy and responsive CSD.

Sources:

[League of Women Voters El Dorado County, and Foothill 7TV](#)

[Village Life October 1, 2025 Reporting by Noel Stack](#)

CALIFORNIA'S RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

By John Davey

The popularity of e-bikes and e-scooters has soared, offering a fun and convenient way to get around. However, with this rise in popularity comes a crucial need to understand the rules, especially when it comes to our younger riders. California has specific laws governing these electric-powered vehicles, as well as mini bikes and go-carts, designed to ensure safety and order on our roads and paths.

What's Legal and Illegal for Kids to Ride?

California law classifies e-bikes into three distinct categories, each with different operational rules:

- **Class 1 Electric Bicycle:** An e-bike equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the e-bike reaches 20 mph.
- **Legal for Kids (16+):** Can be operated by individuals 16 years or older.
- **Legal for Kids (Under 16):** Can be operated by individuals under 16 if they meet the helmet requirements (see below).

(continued on page 7)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

- **Class 1 Electric Bicycle:** An e-bike equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the e-bike reaches 20 mph.
- **Legal for Kids (16+):** Can be operated by individuals 16 years or older.
- **Legal for Kids (Under 16):** Can be operated by individuals under 16 if they meet the helmet requirements (see below).
 - **Class 2 Electric Bicycle:** An e-bike equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the e-bike, and that is not capable of providing assistance when the e-bike reaches 20 mph.
- **Legal for Kids (16+):** Can be operated by individuals 16 years or older.
- **Legal for Kids (Under 16):** Can be operated by individuals under 16 if they meet the helmet requirements (see below).
 - **Class 3 Electric Bicycle:** An e-bike equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the e-bike reaches 28 mph. The e-bike must also be equipped with a speedometer.

- **Legal for Kids (16+):** Can be operated by individuals 16 years or older with a helmet.
- **Illegal for Kids (Under 16):** Riders must be 16 years or older.

E-Scooters: Electric scooters generally fall under similar regulations to bicycles, but with specific age restrictions for public road use.

- **Legal for Kids (16+):** Can be operated by individuals 16 years or older with a helmet.
- **Illegal for Kids (Under 16):** Riders must be 16 years or older to operate on public streets, bikeways, or any other public path.

Mini Bikes & Go-Carts: These vehicles are generally **illegal** for operation by children on public roads, sidewalks, or public property. They are often classified as off-highway vehicles and are restricted to private property.

- **Illegal on Public Roads/Paths:** Mini bikes and go-carts do not meet the safety and equipment standards for street-legal vehicles.

Classifications of E-Bikes Illegal on Public Roads/Paths

Any electric bicycle that exceeds the speed or motor wattage limits for Class 1, 2, or 3 e-bikes is not considered an

(continued on page 8)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

"electric bicycle" under California law. These vehicles may be classified as mopeds, motor-driven cycles, or even motorcycles, depending on their specifications.

- **Illegal on Public Roads/Paths (unless registered and licensed appropriately):** E-bikes that can exceed 28 mph with motor assistance, or have motors over 750 watts, typically fall into this category. They are restricted to private property or require motorcycle licensing and registration if they meet those classifications.

What Requires a Motorcycle License?

Vehicles that are classified as "motor-driven cycles" or "motorcycles" – essentially anything with an engine (gas or electric) that provides primary propulsion and exceeds certain speed/power thresholds, and isn't a street-legal scooter or moped – will require a motorcycle license (M1 or M2 endorsement) to operate on public roads. This includes some higher-powered electric vehicles that go beyond the e-bike classifications.

What Requires a Driver's License?

A standard Class C driver's license is required for operating any motorized vehicle on public roads that is not classified as a motorcycle and is not an e-bike, e-scooter, or moped that falls under specific exemptions. For the vehicles discussed here, once they exceed e-bike/e-scooter classifications and don't meet motorcycle criteria, they might fall into categories that would require a standard driver's license.

Helmet Requirements

California has strict helmet laws for electric vehicles:

- **E-Bikes:**
 - **Under 18:** All riders and passengers under 18 years old on any class of e-bike **must** wear a properly fitted bicycle helmet.
 - **Class 3 E-Bikes (18+):** Riders 18 years and older on Class 3 e-bikes **must** wear a properly fitted bicycle helmet.
 - **Class 1 & 2 E-Bikes (18+):** Riders 18 years and older on Class 1 and 2 e-bikes are **not** legally required to wear a helmet, though it is highly recommended for safety.
- **E-Scooters:** All riders and passengers of electric scooters, regardless of age, **must** wear a properly fitted bicycle helmet.

(continued on page 9)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

- **Mini Bikes & Go-Carts:** If these are operated on private property where allowed, helmet use is strongly recommended. If any are somehow deemed street-legal, motorcycle helmet laws would apply.

Insurance Requirements

- **E-Bikes & E-Scooters:** Generally, there are **no mandatory liability insurance requirements** for operating standard e-bikes (Class 1, 2, 3) or e-scooters in California. However, it's highly advisable to check with your home insurance provider, as some policies may offer coverage for personal injury or property damage caused while operating these vehicles. Specialized e-bike/e-scooter insurance policies are also becoming available.
- **Mini Bikes & Go-Carts:** Since these are largely restricted to private property, there are no specific public road insurance requirements. However, if used on private property, the property owner's liability insurance may come into play if an accident occurs.

Legal and Financial Exposure for Parents

Parents can face significant legal and financial consequences if their child operates an e-bike, e-scooter, mini

bike, or go-cart illegally or causes an accident.

- **Negligent Entrustment:** Parents could be held liable if they allow their child to operate a vehicle for which they are not legally permitted or capable, and that child subsequently causes injury or damage.
- **Parental Liability for Minors:** California law (e.g., Civil Code § 1714.1) can hold parents liable for damages caused by the willful misconduct of a minor, up to a certain monetary limit.
- **Medical Costs:** Without adequate insurance, parents could be responsible for substantial medical bills if their child is injured or injures another party.
- **Property Damage:** Parents may be financially responsible for any property damage caused by their child's actions.

Where is it Legal/Illegal to Ride?

E-Bikes (Class 1, 2, 3) & E-Scooters:

- **Legal:**
 - **Bike Lanes:** Generally permitted in designated bicycle lanes on public roads.
 - **Bike Paths:** Class 1 and 2 e-bikes are generally allowed on shared-use bike paths. Class 3 e-bikes may be restricted on some paths; always look for signage.

(continued on page 10)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

- **Public Roads:** Allowed on public roads where bicycles are permitted.
- **Illegal:**
- **Sidewalks:** Generally illegal to operate e-bikes and e-scooters on sidewalks.
- **Walking Paths:** Many public walking paths, especially those in parks or residential areas, prohibit motorized vehicles including e-bikes and e-scooters. **Always look for posted signs** by local ordinances.
- **Private Property (No Trespassing):** Operating any vehicle on private property without permission is trespassing and illegal.
- **Designated "No Motorized Vehicles" Areas:** Respect all signage prohibiting electric or motorized vehicles.

Mini Bikes & Go-Carts:

- **Legal:** Primarily on private property with the owner's permission. Some designated off-highway vehicle parks may permit them.
- **Illegal:** Public roads, sidewalks, bike paths, walking paths, parks, and any other public property not specifically designated for their use.

Injury Rates for Kids on E-Bikes and E-Scooters

The rise in popularity of e-bikes and e-scooters has unfortunately been accompanied by an increase in related injuries, particularly among children. Studies have shown:

- **Higher Speeds, Greater Impact:** The increased speed capabilities of e-bikes and e-scooters mean that crashes can result in more severe injuries compared to traditional bicycles.
- **Common Injuries:** Head injuries (often due to lack of helmet use), fractures, lacerations, and concussions are frequently reported.
- **Pedestrian Collisions:** Collisions with pedestrians are also a concern, especially when these vehicles are operated illegally on sidewalks or walking paths.
- **Lack of Experience/Training:** Many young riders may lack the experience, judgment, and traffic safety knowledge necessary to safely operate these faster, heavier vehicles.

Here are specific examples of where e-bikes and e-scooters are generally **NOT allowed** in the El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park areas, based on state law and common local park/trail rules:

(continued on page 11)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

1. Sidewalks (State Law/General CSD Rule)

- **The Rule:** California Vehicle Code generally prohibits the operation of motorized scooters (e-scooters) on sidewalks. This rule is widely enforced in local areas to protect pedestrians.
- **The Practice:** You should assume it is **illegal** to ride an e-bike or e-scooter on **any sidewalk** in El Dorado Hills or Cameron Park, unless a local sign explicitly permits it (which is rare).

2. Pedestrian/Walking Paths & Wilderness Areas (CSD/County/Forest Rules)

This is the most critical area where local rules restrict use, especially for e-bikes and all e-scooters.

- **General Trails:** In parks managed by the El Dorado Hills CSD, Cameron Park CSD, or El Dorado County, look for signage. Many **unpaved multi-use trails** or those designed primarily for hiking or equestrian use will prohibit motorized vehicles, which includes e-bikes and e-scooters (even though Class 1 and 2 e-bikes are legally closer to bicycles, local agencies often restrict them).

- *Example:* If a trail sign says "No Motorized Vehicles," it includes e-bikes, e-scooters, mini bikes, and go-carts.



*EDH CSD Recreation Trail Signage
image credit - John Davey*

- **Cameron Park CSD Trails:** The Cameron Park Trail System rules often prohibit motorized vehicles except on roadways and parking areas. You should assume e-bikes and e-scooters are generally **prohibited** on the dedicated dirt or walking trails in Cameron Park CSD property.
- **El Dorado Hills CSD:** Local CSDs often follow the State Parks' lead, which generally:

(continued on page 12)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

- **Prohibits** Class 2 and Class 3 e-bikes on most Class I (paved, shared-use, separated) trails unless specified.
- **Prohibits** all e-scooters on unpaved trails.
- **Eldorado National Forest:** While they permit Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes on motorized trails and roads, they **prohibit all vehicles (including bikes/e-bikes)** within designated **Wilderness Areas**.

3. Playground, Splash Pad, and Athletic Field Areas (CSD Rules)

- **The Rule:** The El Dorado Hills CSD Park Rules explicitly state that **no skateboards, skates of any type, razor scooters, bicycles, motorcycles, or mopeds** are allowed within the **spray ground or playground areas**. While e-scooters aren't always explicitly listed by name, a motorized device is prohibited in these high-pedestrian-traffic, safety-sensitive zones.
- **The Practice:** Do not ride or operate an e-bike or e-scooter in or around the immediate vicinity of playgrounds, splash pads, sports courts (like tennis courts), or athletic fields.

4. Class 3 E-Bikes on Certain Paths (State/Local Ordinance)

- **The Rule:** California Vehicle Code allows local authorities to restrict **Class 3 e-bikes** (up to 28 mph, 16+ riders only) from **Class I bikeways** (paths fully separated from a road) if an ordinance is passed.
- **The Practice:** Even if a paved trail is great for regular bikes, Class 3 e-bikes may be restricted due to their higher speed. **Always check signage** on long, paved, shared-use paths.

5. Private Property (General Law)

- **The Rule:** Operating any vehicle, motorized or otherwise, on private property that is clearly marked with "**NO TRESPASSING**" or is fenced/gated is **illegal**.
- **The Practice:** This is particularly relevant for children on e-bikes and e-scooters who might cut through neighborhood yards, open spaces, or business parking lots. Respect all private property boundaries and signage.

In summary, the safest bet for children riding e-bikes and e-scooters in El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park is to assume they are only allowed in the following places:

1. **Public Streets/Roadways** where the speed limit is 25 MPH or less (and the rider is 16+ with a permit/license for e-scooters).

(continued on page 13)

RULES FOR KIDS ON E-BIKES & SCOOTERS

(con't)

2. **Designated Bike Lanes (Class II)** adjacent to streets.
3. **Paved, Multi-Use Paths** where clear signage permits the specific class of e-bike (Class 1 and 2 are usually okay; Class 3 is often restricted).

When in doubt, always look for posted signage, slow down, and walk the device if necessary to prioritize pedestrian & vehicle safety.

EDH CSD TRUNK-OR-TREAT & SCARECROW CONTEST

El Dorado Hills Community Services District

[This family-friendly event is open to the public.](#) Bring your family, dress up in your best costumes, and collect candy from dozens of decorated trunks in the CSD Pavilion parking lot (1021 Harvard Way El Dorado Hills) on Friday October 24th 4:30P-7:00P. While you're there, be sure to check out the scarecrows on display next to the parking lot and vote for your favorite. Winners will be announced at the end of the event. Scarecrows will be on display beginning October 15th, and voting

opens that day as well. Stop by anytime to view them and cast your vote. No registration is required to attend Trunk or Treat or to participate in voting.

COUNTY APPROVES CONTINUING JPA AGREEMENT

Supervisors question \$55,000 contribution to regional Connector project

By John Davey

The El Dorado County Board of Supervisors voted to continue the County's participation in the [Capital SouthEast Connector Joint Powers Authority \(JPA\)](#), approving an annual contribution of approximately **\$55,000** toward the regional transportation project.

The decision followed a discussion that balanced fiscal oversight concerns with the County's ongoing role in a multi-jurisdictional infrastructure effort.

Questions About Value and Oversight

During the meeting, several supervisors asked for clarification on the County's annual payment to the Connector JPA. The agenda item

(continued on page 14)

JPA AGREEMENT *(con't)*

sparked discussion about the purpose and benefits of the contribution.

“ Since 95% of this is not within El Dorado County, has there been discussion about maybe who pays what?”

District 5 Supervisor Brooke Laine

County staff explained that the funds cover the County’s share of administrative and operational costs associated with the JPA, which coordinates planning and outreach for the **SouthEast Connector Project**—a long-term regional roadway linking Elk Grove to El Dorado Hills.

Staff emphasized that continuing participation preserves the County’s voting authority and influence in regional transportation decisions.

A staff report noted the funding “ensures the County’s continued representation and coordination with other regional partners on key transportation initiatives.”

The JPA’s Role

Representatives from the Connector JPA said the member contributions help sustain project momentum and planning activities across multiple counties and cities.

“This funding allows us to keep momentum moving forward on the Connector and maintain cooperative progress among member jurisdictions,”

*Derrek Minema
Capital Southeast Connector Joint
Powers Authority Executive
Director*

The JPA oversees project coordination among **Sacramento County, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Folsom, and El Dorado County**—each of which contributes proportionally to the authority’s operating costs.

Fiscal and Governance Concerns

Supervisors raised broader questions about accountability and the reporting of the JPA’s progress. Some noted they would like to see more regular updates on the project’s schedule, budget, and measurable benefits to El Dorado County residents.

Others expressed concern about potential cost inequities between participating agencies or whether the County’s share would increase in future years.

Despite these concerns, the Board

(continued on page 15)

JPA AGREEMENT (con't)

ultimately voted to approve the County’s continued participation, citing the value of maintaining a voice in regional infrastructure discussions.

What’s Next for the Connector

The Capital SouthEast Connector JPA will continue planning and coordination for the next phases of the roadway, including environmental review and design work.

County staff indicated they expect to provide additional updates at future Board meetings to improve transparency and accountability around project milestones.

Residents interested in following developments can review future Board of Supervisors agendas or visit the Connector JPA website for project updates and meeting materials.

AT A GLANCE: THE CONNECTOR JPA	
Topic	Details
Project Name	Capital SouthEast Connector
Member Agencies	El Dorado County, Sacramento County, City of Folsom, City of Rancho Cordova, City of Elk Grove
Annual County Contribution	~\$55,000
Purpose	Regional transportation corridor linking Elk Grove to El Dorado Hills
Next Steps	Continued planning, coordination, and reporting to member agencies

Click image to enlarge

Sources:

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes and Recording [Mountain Democrat October 1, 2025 Reporting by Eric Jaramishian](#)

EL DORADO HILLS
COMMUNITY SERVICES
DISTRICT HONORS BREAST
CANCER AWARENESS MONTH
WITH OCTOBER THEME: “IN
THIS COMMUNITY, NOBODY
FIGHTS ALONE”
EDH CSD Press Release

EL DORADO HILLS, CA September 30, 2025 – The El Dorado Hills Community Services District (CSD) is turning pink for October’s Breast Cancer Awareness month. Through special events, education and fundraising efforts, the CSD will shine a light on the importance of awareness, early detection, advocacy and funding for research and cures.

CSD Board Director, Heidi Hannaman, was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2024. “I received a diagnosis nobody ever wants, but far too many women receive. One in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer. My story is not unique. We need to do more as a society to support research and find cures, and that starts with sharing stories and creating awareness.

According to the [American Cancer Society Statistics](#), in 2025, around 316,950 new cases of invasive breast cancer will be diagnosed in women. About 59,080 new cases of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) will be diagnosed, and tragically, about 42,170 women will die from breast cancer.

Hannaman further reflected, “My doctors told me there are only four things I can control with this disease: 1. Stress, 2. Nutrition, 3. Sleep and 4. Exercise. As a Community Services District responsible for recreation, we have the ability to help women with exercise and recreation, and it is my hope this event will get people out moving.”

(continued on page 16)

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH *(con't)*

"We must continue to push for cures, raise money for research, and educate women, as early diagnosis saves lives," continued Hannaman. "I have too many friends, loved ones and women I've never met that must fight for their lives. I am committed to this cause and through my work on the Board, am thrilled to work with staff to honor the survivors and family members who have been through this terrible disease. **In this community, no one fights alone.**"

The CSD, with Director Hannaman, has chosen local charity, [Albie Aware Breast Cancer Foundation](#), whose mission is to provide life-saving breast cancer testing, prevention, education, advocacy and compassionate support. This charity was formed in honor of Alberta "Albie" Carson, who lost her battle with breast cancer in 2002. Albie's husband, Doug, founded Albie Aware Breast Cancer Foundation in 2004 to honor his wife and offer hope to others.

"I found yoga to be a healing practice for me to stay fit, help with breathing, and improve my overall health during this time, and am thrilled to invite and join our community for a special session of outdoor yoga in the park, honoring our survivors and family members – and anyone who wants to join us," said Director Hannaman. "I want to especially thank Yoga Six and Albie Aware for partnering with us for this very special event."

The CSD has partnered with [Yoga Six El Dorado Hills](#) to lead "Yoga for A Cause" on Saturday, October 25, 2025 at 9:00am at **Windsor Point Park located at 4005 Windsor Point Place in El Dorado Hills.**

[Register for this free event](#) and search "[Yoga for A Cause](#)."



Yoga for a Cause

In honor of Breast Cancer Awareness Month, the CSD is partnering with YogaSix and the Albie Aware Breast Cancer Foundation to offer a gentle, all-levels slow flow yoga session. We will be accepting donations that will directly support Albie Aware. Don't forget to bring your yoga mat and water bottle



OCTOBER LOCAL MEETING RECORDINGS

By John Davey

Recordings of local meetings in El Dorado Hills and El Dorado County in October 2025.

El Dorado Hills Area Planning Advisory Committee Meetings:
Typically the second Wednesday of each Month

October 22th Meeting

https://www.youtube.com/live/xTekV_Kc-2A

El Dorado Hills Community Services District Board of Directors Meetings:

Second Thursday of each month

October 9th Regular Meeting

<https://basslakeaction.net/edhcsd-10-9-25>

El Dorado Irrigation District Board

EID Meetings, Agendas, Minutes -

<https://www.eid.org/about-us/board-of-directors/meetings-agendas-and-minutes>

EID Recorded Meetings on EID

YouTube Channel -

www.EID.org/YouTube



OR VISIT:

<https://basslakeaction.net/SUBSCRIBE>

BLAC BOARD MEETING



The next quarterly meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for Monday November 10th at 7PM. Members will receive the Agenda & Meeting location details via email invitation. All Members are encouraged to attend.

The BLAC Annual meeting & Holiday Party is scheduled for Dec 6th.

For more information about meetings and membership, please contact President John Davey at 530-676-2657, or email basslakemembers@gmail.com.

Bass Lake Area Residents can also visit our online membership form at <https://basslakeaction.net/members>