



Midpeninsula Regional  
Open Space District

**MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT  
PLANNING AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

Administrative Office  
5050 El Camino Real  
Los Altos, CA 94022

**Tuesday, September 10, 2024**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker called the meeting of the Planning and Natural Resources Committee to order at 2:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members present: Craig Gleason, Karen Holman, Zoe Kersteen-Tucker

Members absent: None

Staff present: General Manager Ana Ruiz, General Counsel Hilary Stevenson, Assistant General Manager Susanna Chan, Assistant General Manager Brian Malone, District Clerk/Assistant to the General Manager Maria Soria, Executive Assistant/Deputy District Clerk Shaylynn Nelson, Planner III Tyler Smith, Senior Planner Gretchen Laustsen, Planning Manager Jane Mark

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**Motion:** Director Holman moved, and Director Gleason seconded the motion to adopt the agenda.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: 3-0-0**

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

District Clerk Maria Soria reported there were no public speakers for this item.

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**1. Select Committee Chair for 2024 Calendar Year**

Director Gleason nominated Director Kersteen-Tucker to serve as the Committee Chair for calendar year 2024.

Director Kersteen-Tucker accepted the nomination.

Public comment opened at 2:04 p.m.

Ms. Soria reported there were no public speakers for this item.

Public comment closed at 2:04 p.m.

**Motion:** Director Gleason moved, and Director Holman seconded the motion to select Director Kersteen-Tucker as Committee Chair for Calendar Year 2024.

## **2. Approve the December 12, 2023 Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting Minutes**

Public comment opened at 2:04 p.m.

Ms. Soria reported there were no public speakers for this item.

Public comment closed at 2:04 p.m.

Director Holman asked to implement a standard practice of presenting committee minutes for approval by either the end of the year or after the last meeting of the committee.

General Manager Ana Ruiz stated she would consult with the District Clerk to identify the best methodology, essentially presenting minutes by the end of the year.

**Motion:** Director Gleason moved, and Director Holman seconded the motion to approve the December 12, 2023 Planning and Natural Resources Committee meeting minutes.

**ROLL CALL VOTE: 3-0-0**

## **3. Shuttle and Parking Management Concepts for Purisima Creek Redwoods Open Space Preserve (R-24-111)**

General Manager Ana Ruiz provided opening comments regarding multimodal strategies and solutions to address parking demands at different preserves. She stated that part of the issue at Purisima Creek Redwoods Open Space Preserve (Purisima, Preserve) is the terrain and the difficulty in providing sufficient parking space within the Preserve itself. The District recently purchased a property that enables the District to develop and pursue a larger parking area that will assist in the goals for access to nature. However, the public will continue to be motivated to park at the Purisima Road trailhead due to its quick access to the redwood forest. One solution has been identified to address the limited parking availability at one of the most popular trailhead entrances by shuttling people to the trailhead entrance. Staff will present details of various alternatives for this potential solution, the implementation steps, and the estimated costs. The Committee's feedback will enable staff to refine options before they are presented to the full Board.

Planner III Tyler Smith introduced Senior Planner Gretchen Laustsen and Parametrix consultants Pete Ruscitti, Jennifer Shriber, and Samantha Erickson. He reviewed the project background and explained the study was pursued to better manage visitation, improve the visitor experience, and increase greener modes of travel. The study recommended high and secondary transportation demand management (TDM) strategies to implement at the Preserve.

Mr. Ruscitti provided an overview of the shuttle concepts and explained the proposed level of service, the service delivery model, considerations for staffing and shuttle vehicles and estimated costs. Parametrix looked at two potential shuttle concepts: Concept 1) core service and Concept 2) expanded service area. The goal with Concept 1 is to connect the Purisima Creek trailhead to the Verde Road parking area and deliver core shuttle service with maximum efficiency. Concept 2 represents the potential to expand the shuttle to serve more destinations and meet more needs, but the costs rapidly increase once the project deviates from core services and may result in additional shuttles. Concept 2 is likely only feasible with the cooperation of partners to help with the funding and some of the operation. He suggested Concept 2 could also be considered later if Concept 1 is successful and there is high demand.

Mr. Ruscitti explained the three service delivery model options, which are: 1) private operator, 2) directly operating in-house, and 3) utilizing SamTrans as an operator. He explained a private operator is recommended as the best near-term option due to efficiency, quality, and flexibility but it does carry a high cost. A private operator would also provide the necessary staff to operate the shuttle. Mr. Ruscitti reviewed the startup costs in years 1-3 and the shuttle pilot operation costs, which are expected to occur in years 4-6. He stated the estimated six-year program cost total is between \$2,462,400 - \$3,666,200 with the assumption of private operator costs.

Director Gleason inquired if the departure times are fixed or if the shuttles rotate on their own schedule.

Mr. Ruscitti stated the times would likely be fixed with 15- or 30-minute frequencies, but in times of high demand the shuttles could run more frequently. He explained increasing the shuttle frequency would necessitate more vehicles and drivers. Running a shuttle every 15 minutes works out well for having one to two shuttles with perhaps a third as a spare. The costs increase quickly if more shuttles are added.

Director Holman asked if there has been outreach to neighbors along Purisima.

Mr. Smith stated outreach has not been done as part of this project since it is in the feasibility stage but would be done as the project progresses.

Ms. Laustsen confirmed that outreach has not occurred for this project but there was outreach for the development of the Purisima Creek Multimodal Access Study and the Purisima-to-the-Sea feasibility study. There was quite a bit of engagement with residents along Purisima Creek Road to ask for feedback about all of these components to the projects, including a potential shuttle between Verde Road and the Purisima Road Trailhead.

Ms. Ruiz stated the District has had difficulties with regards to roadside parking along Purisima Creek Road and has received numerous comments from neighbors. The District has also held meetings with neighbors and has been working on closing certain sections of the roadside where

there is not enough space for parking and safe passage. The shuttle program would alleviate the roadside parking issues, which have been constant for a long time.

Director Holman asked if the shuttles could accommodate backpacks and other items which patrons may bring.

Mr. Ruscitti confirmed the shuttle capacity could accommodate patrons' items. He noted the District would need to negotiate the allowance of dogs and bikes on the shuttles if the District chooses an external operator for the shuttle program.

Ms. Laustsen stated there would be ADA allowances for dogs and e-bikes and the shuttles would have capacity for wheelchairs and standard mountain bikes.

Director Holman noted the dollar discrepancy between the visitor demand and visitor experience tables does not appear to represent the service differences. For example, in the table which emphasizes the visitor experience, the row for fall/spring has a service frequency of 30 minutes instead of 15, which seems more consistent with emphasizing instead the visitor demand. She questioned why the cost for fall/spring would be more expensive for the visitor experience route when the service frequency is 30 minutes and the visitor demand route has 15-minute shuttle frequency 3 days a week, which should make it more expensive. She asked what is intended by emphasizing visitor demand versus visitor experience.

Mr. Ruscitti explained visitor demand reflects being able to transport the number of patrons over the course of the day with a shuttle arriving every 30 minutes. Visitor experience is focused on reducing wait time.

Ms. Erickson stated Parametrix was basing the frequency need off the current daily data but if they receive additional information about spikes in visitation throughout the day, it could better inform when additional service would be desired. The service would still remain reliable with 15- or 30-minute shuttle service, but the user wait time may increase if there is an influx of riders at the same time that exceeds the capacity of one shuttle.

Director Holman inquired if the shuttles could be visually customized to represent the District.

Mr. Ruscitti returned to the comment regarding the visitor demand and experience tables and explained the cost is not solely reflective of the service frequency but also how many buses would need to be on the road to meet the service frequency and the number of days per week the shuttles would operate at a given frequency.

Director Holman said the explanation does not resolve her question since fall/spring for each table reflects 7 days of shuttle operation.

Mr. Ruscitti responded that Parametrix will verify the math and consider different ways to present the information, so it is clear during the Board presentation.

Director Holman inquired about the staff costs on page 4 of the report and remarked the costs seemed high.

Mr. Ruscitti replied to Director Holman's question regarding the appearance of the shuttles that the District would be able to brand the vehicles and the cost would be factored into the contract with a private operator. He explained there may be vehicles in a shuttle rotation without the branding if the District increased service and exceeded the number of contracted shuttles.

Mr. Smith responded to Director Holman's question about staff costs that a management analyst, an administrative assistant, and a public affairs specialist would be needed to provide ongoing support once the shuttle program has been implemented. The rates reflected include escalation and the staff time would begin one year prior to the shuttle program operation.

Ms. Ruiz inquired if the total cost written in the report represents 3 years.

Mr. Smith clarified the total cost represents 3 years of program operation and one year of shuttle startup.

Director Holman suggested adding context to the column title that the total costs represents four years of operating costs.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker emphasized the District would benefit from providing an exceptional shuttle experience at the start since riders may not otherwise be willing to give it a second chance. She recommended highlighting that concept in the Board report.

Mr. Smith responded that it is possible that there will be high demand for the shuttle service and one solution is to negotiate modified service with a private contractor early in the process to foster positive visitor experience.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker suggested that the District do everything it can to meet demand so the first flush of people is well served, allowing for potential adjustments to service if demand decreased. She would like this concept further explored in the presentation to the full Board. She expressed interest in learning more about the degree to which staff has checked in with neighbors, particularly along Verde Road, where there are agricultural operations with big vehicles whose mobility could be impacted by the shuttles, especially during harvest time. She suggested talking to the operators to ensure they are comfortable with the plan. She questioned that a one-way shuttle trip would take 15 minutes and advised double-checking the numbers to ensure they reflect what the District can actually perform. She noted Concept 2 offered no stops south of Verde Road and inquired if consideration had been given to people from Pescadero or other southern stops.

Mr. Ruscitti replied options for southern areas were not explored since the feedback received indicated that the interest was for stops in the northern areas. He explained it is possible to look at additional areas but cautioned costs increase quickly.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker explained as the District expands diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, it should be mindful of the large farm working community in the area. She suggested reaching out to Puente to see if there is interest in Pescadero.

Mr. Ruscitti concurred with Chair Kersteen-Tucker's point of ensuring a good initial visitor experience and noted it requires a big investment from the start. He explained one way to ensure

a successful launch is to allocate a substantial marketing budget to promote the shuttle. The marketing could include an online campaign, signage, or information on the website.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said she would appreciate seeing a rollout budget, which would demonstrate to the Board the costs of front loading the project to ensure a successful launch which will likely save the District money in the long run. She noted the County's project was unsuccessful because it was poorly marketed, and people were not interested in giving it a second chance.

Mr. Ruscitti noted that a major barrier in transit in general is that people do not have information and the process seems intimidating and a hassle. He stated marketing does have a high cost but advances the user satisfaction.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker inquired if a stop will be added for the Cowell-Purisima trailhead since the parking lot frequently gets backed up on weekends.

Mr. Ruscitti stated it is possible, but adding a third stop begins to spread service thinly and may result in increased travel time or the need for another shuttle and driver. Adding a stop also introduces reliability issues. Cowell-Purisima is likely the easiest, lowest cost extra stop to add but it will increase costs.

Ms. Erickson stated they spoke with SamTrans about potentially expanding their ride plus service and there is potential to stop at Cowell-Purisima. She explained any of the shuttles could accommodate moving southbound but cautioned there may be safety issues with northbound traffic. She noted it is a small lot but there is space as long as cars are not parked there.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker explained the District is investing time and resources into making the trail connection and advised looking into a shuttle option.

Director Gleason inquired if the District has hourly data of the Preserve visitation.

Mr. Smith stated the District does have visitor counter data but it only provides daily data. Staff can explore if obtaining hourly data is an option but there may be limitations with the vendor. One possibility is to get hourly data by observing in-person.

Mr. Ruscitti suggested another option in the absence of the data is to assume that 20% of the daily visitation occurs during peak hours.

Director Gleason inquired if the District parking lot would no longer be available for general parking after the implementation of the shuttle.

Mr. Smith confirmed that parking at the Purisima Creek Road parking area and roadside parking would need to be restricted in order for the shuttle program to be successful since it would help enable the shuttle to maneuver in the parking lot and also incentivize the shuttle program.

Director Gleason requested clarification if restricting parking effectively means zero general parking spots.

Mr. Smith confirmed and added the District would need a strong public education campaign with clear signage for parking restrictions if the shuttle only operated on weekends.

Mr. Ruscitti added that parking enforcement would be important for reducing parking impacts along the road and to ensure the shuttle can turn around in the parking lot. A ranger would need to respond quickly if a car parks in the lot and prevents the shuttle from turning around or else the operation could grind to a halt. Signage would also be important.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker asked if the District is planning on launching an app for the shuttle.

Mr. Ruscitti stated ideally the shuttle would be simple enough to not need an app since it should operate on a routine schedule and an app adds extra complexity. He said there could be an app or webpage to educate people on the shuttle.

Ms. Erickson shared the District can take advantage of third party apps, such as Transit, to communicate late running shuttles and for users to obtain live information.

Director Holman inquired about the practicality of operating based on daylight hours since daylight hours fluctuate.

Ms. Erickson explained the District can be flexible with scheduling shuttle service, but it comes at a cost. The District could add a shuttle service if it believes it will lose visitors because there was not a final shuttle at a certain time, but she advised there is a benefit to having fixed hours during a season so visitors are not confused when the final shuttle leaves on a given day.

Mr. Ruscitti stated the District could expand service hours to 15 or 16 hours during the summer.

Director Holman suggested less hours during the summer to avoid disturbing the habitat.

Ms. Erickson stated she did consider the habitat when recommending the proposed service hours.

Ms. Shriber continued the presentation and stated that the three parking program concepts consist of reservation parking, real-time parking information, and carpool/vanpool parking. She remarked that enforcement and education is key to the successful implementation for all three concepts. She stated these strategies are not being recommended for the near term but rather towards the mid to long term or when parking shortages are being consistently observed in the expanded North Ridge parking lot as well as the new Verde Road parking lot. She explained reservations could be made online, over the phone, or potentially at a kiosk as walk-ups. One option is to require reservations during peak periods. A percentage of the lot could be designated as reservation-only parking but would require manual enforcement by District staff. The reservation would be linked to the license plate to enable enforcement. Some agencies implement a nominal reservation fee to encourage people to appear for their reservation. Ms. Shriber explained that while reservation parking has both high benefits and high costs, it is the most effective parking strategy for managing transportation demand. She reviewed the real-time parking information concept, which would use sensors to track the number of available spots in the North Ridge and Verde Road parking lots. The sensors are typically installed at the entryway and exit to the parking area, but some systems put a sensor at each parking stall, which is approximately 3.5 times as expensive, but has not been found to be substantially more accurate. The information obtained from the sensors could then be relayed to a website or app with real

time parking counts to improve the user experience. Ms. Shriber explained there are moderate benefits and low to moderate costs associated with implementing real-time parking information. Given the success at Rancho San Antonio Open Space Preserve and the relatively low costs, this strategy may be worth pursuing in coordination with other parking area projects. She continued to review the carpool/vanpool parking concept, which would designate parking stalls for carpools and vanpools. The number of stalls could be adjusted based on usage data. This parking concept would require enforcement, and it is recommended to have a staff person in place to verify that the vehicles have a certain number of people before a vehicle is allowed to park in the designated carpool area. Carpool/vanpool parking has moderate benefits, but given the high number of visitors already traveling in groups, it may have limited practicality. The parking concept also has high costs given the frequent staff presence and consistent enforcement, which would be needed. Ms. Shriber explained Parametrix believes real-time parking information is the most promising option.

Director Holman expressed interest in the appearance of the parking lots after implementing the parking concepts and suggested adding visuals for the Board presentation.

Mr. Smith stated they could take pictures of the parking lot at Rancho San Antonio Open Space Preserve to provide visuals for the Board presentation.

Director Holman inquired how feasible it would be to enlist volunteers to help manage the reservation program.

Assistant General Manager Brian Malone referred to the experience of ranger aides at Rancho San Antonio and noted enforcement positions receive many complaints from users, and it is best to leave enforcement to paid staff versus volunteers.

Director Gleason inquired if the reservation fee could be refundable so only no-shows would pay.

Mr. Smith explained the District would have to pay the booking platform fees and then pay the refund fees, so it may not be feasible.

Mr. Ruscitti stated an equity program is an option to provide a subsidy. The District would need to verify whether people appeared to ensure no-show costs were appropriately charged.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker expressed support for the real-time parking information concept, which would be beneficial for visitors coming from the coast or bay side. She inquired if the number of carpool and ADA spaces available could be conveyed in the real-time parking information.

Mr. Smith responded that if the carpool and ADA parking spaces were separated, it would be possible, but it becomes too complicated if different types of parking stalls are in the same area.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said the information would be helpful, particularly if it had extensibility into the future for reservations.

Mr. Ruscitti explained the carpool area would either need to be separated from general parking to accurately track carpool availability or it would need to have sensors at each parking stall. He noted the issue with separated parking is that it is difficult to extend the carpool-only sections



due to sensor placement. A sensor at each parking stall would provide more granular data but would require more capital improvements and is high impact.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker asked if the sensor could be moved to expand the carpool section.

Mr. Ruscitti responded that the sensor could be moved, but it is not capable of detecting how many people are in the car. If a lot had both carpool and general parking, the sensor also would be unable to determine whether vehicles parked in the carpool or general stalls.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker expanded on her question that if there were a second sensor that monitors vehicles going in and out of a separate area, not necessarily a separate lot, the sensor could be moved in the future if additional carpool stalls were needed.

Mr. Ruscitti responded it is theoretically possible, but it can become complicated, and he does not want to over-promise the granularity of the data that can be provided.

Mr. Smith lastly reviewed the next steps and stated that the team will continue to build out implementation details for the TDM programs and incorporate the Committee's feedback to develop a final report. He asked whether the Committee wants to see additional information in the Board report in relation to the limited span of a shuttle service and constraints (question 1C) or initial greater shuttle capacity to anticipate early demand (1D), if there are any specific success criteria that the Committee would like to include, and any thoughts on considering collecting fees to better manage the parking reservation system.

Public comment opened at 4:00 p.m.

Ms. Soria reported there were no public speakers for this item.

Public comment closed at 4:00 p.m.

Director Gleason expressed optimism for the program and agreed with Director Kersteen-Tucker regarding the importance of focusing on a strong visitor experience from the start. He emphasized his preference is not to underinvest in a way that may degrade the quality of the program. He preferred not to have any fees for the shuttle and advocated to have a reasonable way to have a no net parking fee, acknowledging that this may present some complications. He supported engaging a private operator or a potential relationship with SamTrans, rather than the District developing its own capability. Furthermore, he agreed to defer expensive parking management strategies and recommended including only the capacity meter. He expressed appreciation for Director Holman's suggestions regarding the shuttle's appearance and proposed incorporating interpretive elements to enrich the visitor experience while awaiting or riding the shuttle and suggested involving the docents in that process.

Director Holman commented that she is not enthusiastic about changing the District's policy and charging a fare and suggested having a collection box but does not know how much incentive people would have to donate. She expressed that while the District is looking to provide access for public enjoyment it should also be ecologically sensitive. Furthermore, she commented that she is sensitive of whether the public will be supportive of spending the amount of money on this type of program. While the Muir Woods shuttle and parking reservation system is well known, it is in an urban setting, unlike the District, so a visitor's understanding of the District's shuttle and

parking reservation system may be different. She noted while there could be a deposit for no-shows to parking reservations, many people go to the preserves because they are low to no cost. She questioned whether a \$3 fee would deter no-shows and what the appropriate amount would be, since \$20 might discourage no-shows but may be too high for some people, potentially excluding those who might otherwise want to visit. She asked if this has been studied.

Mr. Ruscitti stated that part of the deterrent to no-shows is the cost, but it is also about the administrative process of making an online reservation, creating an account, and committing time that plays a significant role in ensuring people attend. In their case studies research, parking fees are generally either \$3, \$5, or \$10 at the most, which generally deters no-shows.

Director Holman inquired if staff asked the Committee to evaluate a more limited span of shuttle service because it is undetermined that the demand would justify the lead times and frequency.

Mr. Smith explained staff is requesting feedback because it is unknown whether the Committee's or Board of Directors' preference is for a large program that supports user experience or a smaller program that meets visitor demand.

Director Holman suggested that when this item is presented to the Board it would be helpful to add how many people are expected to go to Purisima. She expressed concern about the potential impact of increasing visitor numbers at Purisima. She questioned whether the public will still want to go with the increased number of people attending, whether they will question the District's decision, and what the impact will be to the Preserve. She suggested that more analysis is needed as well to consider how the public will react.

Director Holman commented in reference to questions 1(C) and (D) that it would be worth looking at a SamTrans partnership. Although working with a larger company could offer efficiencies, including cost efficiencies, smaller companies might provide more flexibility and possibly better service.

Director Holman pointed out that success criteria can be a two-edged sword. She emphasized the need to consider how many people are expected to go Purisima and whether the Preserve can accommodate the increased number. Additionally, she raised the concern about the impact of a shuttle passing by every 15 minutes. She suggested one success criteria could be the satisfaction of the residents on Purisima Creek Road as well as tracking how many people ride the shuttle.

Ms. Ruiz advised the consultants to consider different scenarios while evaluating the number of people entering the Preserve as a result of the shuttle. In one scenario, the limitation would be based on parking availability, which effectively controls both the ingress and egress and therefore influencing the shuttle use. In another scenario, there needs to be consideration for the people who park elsewhere and will be picked up at other shuttle stops to access Purisima. The team will need to take into consideration the different scenarios and scenario constraints to calculate the number of visitors, as opposed to calculating how many total people can sit in the shuttle and come in every 15 minutes.

Mr. Ruscitti agreed that additional data will improve the estimate for number of visitors to the Preserve, but advised it is difficult to foresee shuttle ridership. The team can make a lot of assumptions and come up with a number, but the best data comes from assuming the current number of visitors to the Preserve, plus some due to the availability of the shuttle or because of

natural growth. As the District adds more parking and a shuttle service, the best approach is to look at current data and adjust to what is learned, instead of trying to predict what might happen.

Director Holman noted that 10 hours in the winter seems to be a lot and asked to relook at this timeframe. She also inquired what happens in terms of a contract with the operator when it is too wet and unsafe for people to go into the Preserve.

Mr. Ruscitti stated that their assumption was using the daylight hours and trying to conform with the hours of the actual Preserve.

Director Holman pointed out that it gets dark quickly in the woods, and there is a difference between staying at the Preserve until sunset and catching the last shuttle at sunset. She emphasized the need for clear communication to ensure that no one is left behind.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker suggested staff consider what triggers would indicate it is time for the Board to consider implementing shuttle reservations, parking reservations and fare considerations. She noted that she would not want it to be like Muir Woods when at the last minute they implemented all of the amenities.

Mr. Ruscitti explained that in the transit industry, a common best practice is to consider adding capacity when usage reaches around 80%. The District is currently investing in additional parking to accommodate near-term demand. When the lot consistently becomes 80% - 90% full, it can be a signal to open more capacity or start implementing the systems that limit demand.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker requested that this information be added to the staff report for the Board's consideration. She highlighted Director Holman's concern about the Preserve's carrying capacity and being so effective at facilitating visitation that the Preserve becomes overcrowded and is no longer enjoyable. She emphasized that this is an issue for the Board to consider.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker expressed preference to go all-in to ensure a robust system, rather than starting with a smaller, limited shuttle service that may not be effective. Additionally, she would not favor a partnership with SamTrans due to their numerous constraints and limited budget. In her view, a private partner would offer greater flexibility free from the bureaucratic limitations that SamTrans faces. When it comes to specific success criteria, she suggested looking at repeat riders or people using it every weekend, and if they are finding it enjoyable. Also, if the shuttle effectively moves people to the Preserve in a comfortable way, and whether the service helps reduce the parking challenges. Furthermore, she would like to monitor public opinion not just amongst visitors but the larger community as Director Holman noted on Purisima Creek Road. As part of the marketing strategy, she suggested incorporating surveys or other methods to monitor user satisfaction to understanding how well the service is meeting the needs of its users. She mentioned the District is not to the point of needing to collect fees, but staff can consider what events would trigger the Board to begin considering implementing fees.

Director Holman asked if the intensity of the proposed plan would be supported by the Verde and Skyline parking lots.

Director Kersteen-Tucker advised for the final report to the Board to include a refresher of the proposed parking at Verde and Skyline in terms of additional capacity.

Mr. Malone provided background that lower Purisima previously had more than 100 cars parked along the roadway, which the District restricted not because of impacts to the Preserve, but due to the effects to the roadway. The Preserve could accommodate additional visitors from Verde and Skyline lots as it previously has done.

No formal Committee action required.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Kersteen-Tucker adjourned the meeting of the Planning and Natural Resources Committee at 4:25 p.m.

Shaylynn Nelson, Deputy District Clerk  
Maria Soria, District Clerk