



SPECIAL AND REGULAR MEETING

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

Wednesday, October 9, 2024

*The Board of Directors conducted this meeting in accordance with
California Government Code section 54953.*

DRAFT MINUTES

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MIDPENINSULA
REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT – CLOSED SESSION**

President MacNiven called the special meeting of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jed Cyr, Craig Gleason, Zoe Kersteen-Tucker, Yoriko Kishimoto, Margaret MacNiven, and Curt Riffle

Members Absent: Karen Holman

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, Real Property Manager Allen Ishibashi, Sr. Real Property Agent Kelly Hyland, and Real Property Agent I Jasmine Leong

President MacNiven announced that the public has the opportunity to comment on the agenda, and the opportunity to listen to this meeting through the internet or via telephone. This information can be found on the meeting agenda, which was physically posted at the District's Administrative Office, and on the District website.

1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS (Government Code Section 54956.8)

Property: San Mateo County APNs: 066-093-080, 066-093-090, 066-093-100, 066-093-160, 066-093-170, 066-093-250, 066-093-260

Agency Negotiator: Allen Ishibashi, Real Property Manager

Negotiating Party: Mike Hayes, Rabo Bank Agri-Finance

Under Negotiation: Purchase Terms

2. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS (Government Code Section 54956.8)

Property: San Mateo County APNs: 080-360-010

Agency Negotiator: Kelly Hyland, Sr. Real Property Agent and Jasmine Leong, Real Property Agent I

Negotiating Party: Gary Loebner, Trustee

Under Negotiation: Purchase Terms

Public comment opened at 5:00 p.m.

District Clerk/Assistant to the General Manager Maria Soria reported no public comments were submitted for the closed session.

Public comment closed at 5:00 p.m.

The Board convened into closed session.

ADJOURNMENT

President MacNiven adjourned the special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District at 6:40 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

President MacNiven called the regular meeting of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jed Cyr, Craig Gleason, Karen Holman, Zoe Kersteen-Tucker, Yoriko Kishimoto, Margaret MacNiven, and Curt Riffle

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: General Manager Ana Ruiz, General Counsel Hilary Stevenson, Assistant General Manager Susanna Chan, Assistant General Manager Brian Malone, Chief Financial Officer/Director of Administrative Services Stefan Jaskulak, District Clerk/Assistant to the General Manager Maria Soria, Executive Assistant/Deputy District Clerk Stephanie Gross, Planning Manager Jane Mark, Planner III Galli Basson, and Land & Facilities Manager Brandon Stewart

President MacNiven announced that the public has the opportunity to comment on the agenda, and the opportunity to listen to this meeting through the internet or via telephone. This information can be found on the meeting agenda, which was physically posted at the District's Administrative Office, and on the District's website.

REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION

President MacNiven reported the Board met in closed session, and no reportable action was taken.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Public comment opened at 7:02 p.m.

Julie Weston representing Crown Castle commented that they have a ground lease for a cell tower on District property and is looking to speak with the correct person at the District regarding the long-term use of that property as their lease expires in a year.

Ms. Weston was referred to Land & Facilities Manager Brandon Stewart.

Public comment closed at 7:03 p.m.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

Swearing in of Measure AA Bond Oversight Committee Members

Ms. Soria administered the Oath of Office to the four Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) members that were appointed on September 25, 2024 for a four-year term.

- Bruce Tolley
- Paul Betlem
- Brian Cilker
- Brooks Esser

Director MacNiven and Director Riffle congratulated and thanked the BOC members.

Introduction of Staff

- Robert Morrison, IT Technician I

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

ROLL CALL VOTE: 7-0-0

CONSENT CALENDAR

Public comment opened at 7:10 p.m.

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

Public comment closed at 7:10 p.m.

Motion: Director Cry moved, and Director Gleason seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

ROLL CALL VOTE: 7-0-0

1. **Approve the September 25, 2024 Board meeting minutes**
2. **Approve Claims Report**

BOARD BUSINESS

3. Skyline Field Office Project – Site Selection Criteria (R-24-121)

Planner III Galli Basson reported that she will be presenting on the Skyline Field Office (SFO) Project and acknowledged Planner II Tyler Smith and Senior Planner Tina Hugg who also have been working on the project. She then presented Land & Facilities Manager Brandon Stewart.

Mr. Stewart continued the presentation by providing background information, noting that the project began in January 2023, and a Needs Assessment Report was presented to the Board in October of 2023. The report highlighted that the current SFO does not meet current or future staff and operational needs. He explained that while various operational factors impact the site's overall functionality, his primary focus is fostering a cultural connection within his department. With his team spread across a large region and multiple offices, communication has been a challenge. Mr. Stewart made it clear that this is not a criticism of the SFO management, who have done an excellent job in meeting District goals. However, as the District continues to grow within that region, existing condition will worsen. His concern extends beyond the flow of operations or storage of equipment and would like to ensure that there is a space where staff can share information, knowledge, communicate on projects, share resources, and collaborate.

Ms. Basson continued the presentation and reviewed the 11 project goals approved by the Board at the October 11, 2023 regular meeting. She stated that large, flat sites that are relatively disturbed are hard to find in the Skyline region and that staff has identified three potential site options. Option 1: the existing Skyline Field Office, Option 2: a portion of Skyline Ridge Open Space Preserve parking area, and Option 3: the Sherill site, which contains a portion of the Skyline Christmas Tree Farm. None of the three sites is a clear preferred choice, as each site has its challenges, tradeoffs, and opportunities. To be as objective as possible, it is important to develop criteria and weights based on priorities, before evaluating each of the three sites. Staff will look at the three sites in detail, including their pros and cons, and will return to the Board in January 2025 with the results of the evaluation. She then continued to provide information of why each site was selected and described the proposed site evaluation criteria.

Ms. Basson requested Board input and confirmation on the proposed scoring criteria and weighting factors for each scoring category. She acknowledged that some categories may be more important to the mission and project goals relative to others. Each category is assigned a factor weight of 1 or 2, with 2 having higher importance. The categories are: Category 1 (Function and Workplace Culture) with a proposed weight of 2. Category 2 (Organization, Adjacencies, and Circulation) with a proposed weight of 2. Category 3 (Site Character and

Public Interface) with a proposed weight of 1. Category 4 (Resiliency and Sustainability) with a proposed weight of 1. Category 5 (Planning) with a proposed weight of 1. Category 6 (Cost) Cost is not factored the same as the other categories, therefore, staff will provide a rough estimate for each site in January. She then went into detail on each of the categories and stated that these represent site criteria, not design criteria. Additionally, she explained scoring will be calculated by each category being assigned a score between 1-3, then multiplied by a weight, for a final score, which will be totaled across all categories. Although all categories are important, categories #1 and #2 are deemed higher for both staff and District operations. Due to none of the sites appearing to meet all the criteria, it is crucial to prioritize these key categories. Fundamentally, the site needs to function for staff in order for the project to be successful.

Ms. Basson outlined the next steps, which include incorporating Board feedback for evaluating the three sites and returning to the Board tentatively on January 22, 2025 to present the results of the rapid assessment, site evaluation, and scores for each of the three sites, with findings and recommendations. At that time, the Board will also select a site to move forward into the conceptual design phase.

President MacNiven asked what the conditions are for the scenic highway on Skyline.

Ms. Basson explained that while the regulations differ between Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, they are not very specific. There are no set distance requirements; the focus is on avoiding visual impacts to the scenic corridor.

President MacNiven expressed that the viewshed is very important. She inquired how many additional staff are projected by the FOSM over the next 10 years to be at the SFO.

Ms. Basson stated that the FOSM does not differentiate between the Skyline and Foothills area.

Mr. Stewart stated that they are considering not only how this site will accommodate current staffing, but also the future Coastal Area Office (CAO). The plan is for a 70/30 split, with 70% of the staff housed at the SFO and about 30% housed at the CAO. This is driven by the maintenance need of properties within those regions. He approximated between 40 to 42 additional staff for the department will be added.

President MacNiven commented that she would like to see the exact numbers.

Mr. Stewart clarified that the staff number only includes the Land & Facilities department and does not account for the Visitor Services or Natural Resources departments, which are also looking to expand.

Ms. Basson stated that 25 additional positions will be added to the Land & Facilities department and 30 to the Visitor Services department, for a total of 55 additional positions. She also believes that Natural Resources department will add 1 or 2 additional positions.

Director Gleason commented that Category 3, Site Character & Public Interface, appears to combine two aspects: natural resources and public perception, both of which he believes are important. He asked if there had been any discussion about separating these two elements or adjusting the weight.

Ms. Basson said that the two were kept together because they both focus on minimizing impacts, either to people or to the natural resources.

Director Riffle asked for clarity on the reason for not including cost as the ranking item.

Ms. Basson stated that although cost is of high importance to the Board, it was difficult to rank, so the decision was made to separate cost, as this factor is specifically a Board policy decision. Nonetheless, cost will be included as part of the evaluation.

Director Kersteen-Tucker inquired if it would be difficult to change the weight on Category 4, Resiliency & Sustainability to reflect the priority for long-term sustainability. She believes it should be given a higher weight of 2.

Ms. Basson stated that this category would be easier to adjust compared to the other categories, as it is more subjective.

Director Kishimoto commented that she had also marked Category 4, Resiliency & Sustainability as being weighted higher at a 2 as wildland fire resiliency and water are basic needs.

Director Holman asked about potential disturbances to the Christmas Tree Farm related to one of the site options.

Ms. Basson stated that the Christmas Tree Farm is under a 20-year lease with a 10-year option to renew, and there would be an impact to the operations. However, the specific impacts are not known yet nor whether the site would be feasible. This option was added late in the process, and the impacts have not been fully discussed.

Director Holman asked why Category 3, Site Character & Public Interface, was only weighted at a 1 as opposed to a 2.

Ms. Basson explained that none of the sites meet all the criteria. She emphasized that while the District is seeking to avoid impacts to open space, there must be a way to evaluate the sites and to differentiate what the highest priorities are, recognizing that there will need to be certain trade-offs, regardless of which site option is selected. Moreover, if a site cannot support essential functions, it will not work for staff, even if it minimizes certain impacts. The proposed higher-ranked criteria are central to making the project functional, safe, efficient, and capable of accommodating future growth.

Director Holman asked, while not ideal, could some functions be separated off to different sites.

Ms. Basson mentioned that separation may become necessary, but the goal is to determine if any of the three sites could meet all or most of the project requirements. If none fully meets the needs, trade-offs related to multiple sites would need to be considered.

Ms. Ruiz stated that the facility is intended to last for the next 30 to 40 years plus and will play a central role in shaping the workplace culture. She suggested considering what that means for the

future, including how people will connect, communicate, and coordinate. These aspects are critical for maintaining efficient and effective operations, and the facility's design should support these cultural goals and needs.

Mr. Stewart stated that they considered whether the existing SFO site could serve as the main hub for operations, with satellite storage locations for equipment, materials, and supplies. This approach could be an option as they evaluate the site criteria. However, as they calculated driving distances for transporting equipment, they found that frequent trips cut into productivity and efficiency and do not effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The goal is trying to identify a site that meets most of the criteria that has been determined through the Needs Assessment and through the employee surveys and engagement process.

Director Holman asked if the District is doing too much at only one site as opposed to having two sites considering the projected staff will be at 100, along with all the equipment. She expressed concern about the impacts and optics to the community.

Mr. Stewart stated that is why it is important to have a few of the categories weighted as 2 to help narrow the process. The process also involves assessing whether the goals outlined for each location are achievable, and if not, determining how to pivot to make compromises.

Director Gleason asked whether there had been any consideration of separating the Visitor Services department from the Land & Facilities department.

Ms. Basson responded that this was addressed in the Needs Assessment Report and in subsequent conversations with both departments. She stated that while administrative office staff can connect virtually, field staff benefit from face-to-face interaction in their daily work, and separating the departments could lead to siloing.

Public comment opened at 8:03 p.m.

Donna Duca expressed her concern about the potential impact on her family's Christmas Tree Farm, stating that she was devastated by the possibility of losing more land. She explained that when her father started the farm in 1963, they had 123 acres and are now down to 63 acres. If she continues to lose land, she will no longer have a viable business. Ms. Duca noted that it would be a financial impact on her and many of her customers would be heartbroken. She shared that her farm is especially popular with older visitors, who enjoy picnicking and spending time with family on the farm, she commented that the land being considered is ideal because it is flatter, making it easier for her customers who are not agile and cannot walk the hills. She noted that she will write a letter with more clarity to the Board and is available to discuss the impacts to her business and customers. She thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

Public comment closed at 8:06 p.m.

President MacNiven commented that the report was well written and shared that she was not concerned with the category weighting, whether at a 1 or a 2. However, she expressed opposition to site Option 2 and concerns that Option 3 would impact the Christmas Tree Farm, which she described as an institution during Christmas time. She highlighted that the Skyline Circle parking

lot is well maintained, spacious, and it is not cluttered with cars, adding that it would be a shame to consider placing a building there. She noted that the parking lot is not heavily used, but those that do use it are attached to that parking lot, and any development would affect the scenic highway. Additionally, she raised concern about the impact the Skyline parking lot lights would have on the scenic highway. She encouraged staff to revisit the current site, believing it is a good location that deserves further consideration.

Director Holman commented that while she may not be as passionate about the parking lot as President MacNiven, she appreciated her concerns, particularly regarding lighting, which she noted as a significant impact, stating that many communities are adopting dark skies programs due to the impacts of lighting. Reflecting on the Christmas Tree Farm, she noted it would be very disruptive for the enterprise. She revisited the idea of considering two field office sites instead of one, recognizing the difficulty in finding such sites but also acknowledging the economy of scale in placing 100 people in one single location. She questioned whether two smaller offices might still allow for the necessary staff interaction and collaboration without creating silos. She suggested exploring other ways to foster connectivity, such as through programs, opportunities, or events. Additionally, she raised concerns about impacts to habitat and migration routes. She questioned potential CEQA issues and whether mitigation will be needed, and that avoiding such issues has not been prioritized.

Director Riffle clarified that the Board's role was to provide feedback on the proposed selection criteria for evaluating the sites, not to make a selection. He expressed satisfaction with the criteria staff developed, noting that it was based on input from those who would be using the facility. He commented that this is an operational facility, aimed at enabling staff to be as effective as possible. He places significant weight on feedback from Mr. Stewart and the employees and expressed support for the proposed criteria. He advocated for proceeding with the scoring process, with critiques to follow once the results are available.

Director Kersteen-Tucker reiterated that the Board's role tonight is to select the site selection criteria, and she felt comfortable moving the process forward. She offered a counterpoint to Director Holman's concerns about Site Character & Public Interface and expressed confidence that staff and the project will be mindful of all considerations, no matter what the Board ultimately chooses, but recognized that other operational needs may be rising in importance, warranting additional weight.

Director Kersteen-Tucker inquired about the potential impact on the Christmas Tree Farm. She asked whether, if the site were ultimately selected, there could be a way to accommodate the farm, possibly providing additional space, and requested that this information be included in the subsequent report for the Board to consider.

Assistant General Manager Brian Malone stated that if that site were to be selected, there would be an impact. He explained that under the current timetable, a buyout provision exists for the trees, which would involve a monetary buyout if the District took over the site before the expiration of the first 10-year term. He stated that after a full evaluation, staff would provide more information about potential impacts when they return with their findings in January.

Director Kersteen-Tucker requested for staff to return to the Board in January and delineate ways in which the Christmas Tree Farm could be accommodated.

Mr. Malone responded hypothetically if that site was selected and if Ms. Ducca wanted to continue, staff can renegotiate the agreement to look at the profitability of the site on a reduced scale, and that there would be options to work together to make the site more feasible.

Director Kishimoto expressed that her preference is to raise Category 4, Resiliency & Sustainability to a weight of 2, and that there are items in Category 3, Site, Character & Public Interface that are important to her, and asked if there was a way to raise the weight on the criteria.

Ms. Basson stated that it would be hard to raise items within the categories.

Director Kishimoto commented that while she understands the importance of staff functions, ultimately it is the Board's responsibility to speak on behalf of the public. She acknowledged that not everything can be prioritized as important.

Ms. Basson explained that she could work with the team to figure out a solution, as she did not have one at the moment.

Director Kishimoto suggested defining what are the must haves. She also suggested to incorporate the issue of the Christmas Tree Farm and added it under the Category 5, Planning and a point that talks about the impact on existing businesses.

Director Holman agreed with Director Kishimoto on the Board's role. She acknowledged that the direction to staff was to identify criteria, which they did. She commented that it is the Board's job from both a policy and land implementation level, to evaluate the proposed site selections. She explained it would be inefficient and arduous on staff to proceed with unnecessary work on a site if she personally could not support the location. While she understands the proposed motion, she believes it is appropriate for the Board to provide feedback on the location at this stage.

President MacNiven suggested weighting Category 3, Site, Character & Public Interface at 1.5.

Director Gleason inquired what criteria or circumstances would prompt a reevaluation or consideration of alternative options, rather than committing to a single site.

Ms. Basson responded that if the project goals cannot be met or the Board expresses discomfort with any of the proposed sites, the Board could prompt a reevaluation. She noted that the team has already explored other potential sites in the region, and these are the only viable options. In such a case, then a discussion can be had about splitting the project.

Ms. Basson asked if the Board wanted to change any of the weights on the selection criteria.

Planning Manager Jane Mark suggested that the Board review the criteria and identify which are essential and the remaining criteria tiers can be weighted at a 1 or 2.

Director Kersteen-Tucker expressed her concern about pulling the must haves from the criteria, and whether this approach would destroy the internal consistency of what was developed by the staff. While she is not rejecting the idea, she felt it was important to allow staff to proceed with their work and suggested that the Board then evaluate what staff presents when they return.

Director Riffle stated that this is a good enough structure to move forward for staff to subsequently bring back data on the three sites.

Ms. Basson suggested that having specific information for the Board to react to for each site would be more effective and seeing all the data together would provide clarity. Furthermore, she noted that the Board retains the discretion to choose not to go with the highest-ranked option.

Director Riffle expressed his support for this idea, noting that since they are only evaluating three sites, the proposed structure is sufficient. He emphasized the importance of bringing back the data to analyze and assess each site thoroughly. He mentioned that if any aspects do not align with the needs of the Christmas Tree Farm, he would feel more comfortable making a decision at that point.

Director Kishimoto sought clarification on whether the Board was not adopting the weights at this time, implying that they would have the opportunity to adjust the weights when the data comes back.

Director Riffe expressed it appears that all categories currently have the same weight.

Ms. Basson stated that staff can weigh the categories and then the Board can use this as a data point to inform their final decisions.

Director Gleason commented that he believes staff put significant effort into developing the weights for the criteria. He suggested maintaining them as they are. He acknowledged that some Directors have different opinions on those weights, however, the Board will have an opportunity to discuss the results and make the appropriate site selection in January.

Motion: Director Gleason moved, and Director Riffle seconded the motion to confirm the proposed site selection criteria that will be used to evaluate, score, and rank facility sites for the Skyline Field Office project.

Director Kishimoto asked if the categories will be weighted.

Director Kersteen-Tucker commented that the Board will proceed with what staff has laid out and then the Board can recalibrate, if necessary.

Director Gleason commented that his intent is to see the outcomes of staff's weighted recommendations. He acknowledged that the Board has differing opinions and that they might not reach a consensus on the best weighting.

Mr. Stewart stated that the Board will have full latitude to debate the data once it is presented. He emphasized the need for a multiplier to distinguish differences between the two sites, explaining that if everything is considered equal, it will be challenging to rank the options.

Director Holman expressed concern about the challenge for staff to present results based on the current criteria weight, despite disagreement among Board members, and the resulting difficulty of the Board proposing adjustments to criteria weight during the next meeting.

Ms. Basson stated that having the data will make the evaluation easier. There may be clear distinctions between the sites or similarities. Prioritizing the core functions of the SFO will help determine whether each site meets operational needs. Ultimately, it is the Board discretion to reject any options they find unsuitable.

ROLL CALL VOTE: 5-2-0 (Directors Holman and Kishimoto opposing)

President MacNiven called for a recess at 8:46 p.m.

President MacNiven reconvened the meeting at 8:52 p.m. All Board members were present.

4. Informational Presentation on the Hawthorns Historic Complex Lower Barn Partnership Feasibility Work (R-24-122)

Ms. Basson provided the presentation on the Hawthorns Historic Complex Lower Barn Partnership Feasibility Work. She acknowledged Planner III Erica Strohmeier, Senior Planner Tina Hugg, and Senior Real Property Agent Kelly Hyland who are also on the project team. She provided a detailed description of the 79-acre Hawthorns Area property, which is a part of Windy Hill Open Space Preserve. The Historic Complex is approximately 13 acres located on the southwest portion of the property and includes seven structures dating back to the 1800s. Due to the unique cultural resources, planning for the use and management of the Historic Complex is separate from the Hawthorns Area planning process.

Ms. Basson reported that the Board formed an Ad Hoc Committee to explore long-term use and management options of the Historic Complex. In Spring of 2024, the District was made aware of an unanticipated partnership opportunity to adaptively rehabilitate and re-use the Lower Barn as a programming space for adults with developmental disabilities and delays. As a result, the focus was shifted to explore the feasibility of the Lower Barn Partnership project. She continued to review the nine goals for the Historic Complex and went into detail about the Historic Complex partnership opportunity. Additionally, she shared the results of the high-level feasibility analysis for the potential partnership opportunity. Lastly, she reviewed the next steps, which are for staff to continue to work with the Ad Hoc Committee on the proposed partnership terms. The project will be presented to the Town of Portola Valley Planning Commission on October 23, and then return to the Board at a December meeting with feedback from the Town, final feasibility results, and more details on the proposed partnership. Staff will also seek a Board decision in January 2025 on whether to move forward with the Lower Barn partnership opportunity and if so, to include the project in the annual Capital Improvement Action Plan (CIAP). If added to the CIAP, the District would conduct community engagement in Spring of 2025.

Director Kersteen-Tucker expressed hope that the project's success would create momentum to rehabilitate the mansion.

Director Kishimoto also shared her appreciation and excitement about developing a programming space for adults with developmental disabilities and delays.

Director Riffle remarked he is on the Ad Hoc Committee and complimented the Whites for making this opportunity available. In addition, he complimented Ms. Basson for her idea to pivot mid-project to shift the focus to an area of interest given the new partnership opportunity rather than pursuing all four buildings, which would have taken significantly longer.

Public comment opened at 9:05 p.m.

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

Public comment closed at 9:05 p.m.

No Board action required.

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS

A. Committee Reports

Director Gleason reported the Bear Creek Stables Ad Hoc Committee met on October 1, noting that the committee is ramping up their engagement to present a proposal to the Board on November 20. Also, that another committee meeting is scheduled on October 11.

Director Riffle reported that the Board Appointee Evaluation Committee (BAE) held a meeting on October 1 and reported that they fulfilled their role in discussions with the appointees and the process continues.

B. Staff Reports

Ms. Ruiz reported that October is a month of celebration and events. Staff and Directors have attended the September 29 Green Foothills Nature's Inspiration Event, and the October 4 Guardians of Nature Benefit. The San Jose Conservation Corps will be holding an event on October 11 and the District's Volunteer Recognition Event will be held on October 12.

C. Director Reports

Director Kersteen-Tucker reported that she attended the October 4 Guardians of Nature event and the October 5 San Mateo Resource Conservation District All You Seed is Love Annual Benefit. She also expressed her appreciation for the District's sponsorships distributed through the communities in the last month.

Director Riffle reported that he attended the September 29 Green Foothills Nature's Inspiration Event, and the October 4 Guardians of Nature Benefit. He attended two Spotlight training sessions - one at Coyote Valley with Peninsula Open Space Trust, Santa Clara Open Space Authority and the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Agency and the other was held at Byrne Preserve located in Santa Cruz County. Additionally, he attended three Bear Creek Ad Hoc committees, including the Working Group meetings that he is leading.

Director Riffle commented that one action item recommended by the BAE is the formalization of the internal auditor role held by the District Controller. The BAE would lead this effort along

with the Controller. However, he pointed out that the Board has not formally charged the BAE with this task and asked for clarification on how to proceed if this is something the Board would like the BAE to undertake.

General Counsel Hilary Stevenson stated that according to Board Policy on standing committees, the Board has the ability to refer an item to a standing committee. The item should be placed on a Board agenda, and the Board can then vote to refer it to the BAE. She suggested that the Board President work with the General Manager to schedule this for a future agenda, allowing the Board to vote on whether the BAE should proceed with the work. If approved, the BAE could begin its work and bring the results back to the Board at a later date.

Director Riffle noted that there would be two key steps for the proposed action. First, is to clarify the goals and purpose of the internal auditor position, and the second, how to incorporate this role into the overall position plan.

President MacNiven attained consensus from the Board to agendize the item on a future agenda.

Director Kishimoto attended the October 2 Santa Clara LAFCO meeting and inquired if the District has a representative on the San Mateo LAFCO.

Ms. Stevenson reported that LAFCO laws only allow Special Districts to only serve within its home county, which is Santa Clara County for the District.

Director Cyr reported that he attended the Green Foothills Nature's Inspiration Event and the Guardians of Nature Benefit.

Director Holman reported that she attended the Green Foothills Nature's Inspiration Event.

ADJOURNMENT

President MacNiven adjourned the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Maria Soria, MMC
District Clerk