

From: [Tina Hugg](#)
Cc: [Melissa Borgesj](#); [Tina Hugg](#)
Subject: RE: PAWG - Please read - Homework for March 5th
Date: Thursday, February 20, 2020 4:54:38 PM

Dear Karl:

Thank you for your email about site E4 (the area north and adjacent to the ranger residence at the Red Barn site) and the other Red Barn site options. We are sharing answers to your questions with the entire Working Group as they pertain to the overall process and next steps.

To make sure that we are all on the same page with District terminology, we would like to first explain how the words “recommend” and “approve” technically convey different and specific meanings to District staff. To clarify, the PAWG is advisory to the PNR, so the Working Group will *recommend* (rather than approve) sites or options to the PNR for review and recommendation. The PNR will then *recommend* what sites or options to advance to the full Board for review and approval. The Board is the decision-making body that will *approve* what sites or options move into the feasibility study phase.

So, if a site, whether at the Red Barn area or elsewhere, receives the PAWG’s recommendation, the PNR’s recommendation, and the Board’s approval, that site would move into the feasibility study phase. The District project team would then need to develop enough parameters about the parking area and its expected use to be able to evaluate overall feasibility including safety, so we would hire a design team with qualified engineers to develop a conceptual parking layout and trailhead based on the site’s characteristics (access points, shape, topography, existing vegetation, etc.). Its size and type of expected use, e.g. permit lot, would inform the traffic engineer’s work in calculating the anticipated number of trips per day, analyzing existing conditions with proposed conditions, and suggesting design changes to improve access and safety. If safe access cannot be achieved, the site would be considered infeasible. However, remember that there are other factors that could also render a site infeasible, e.g. no viable connection to the rest of the trail system, excessive grading, costly infrastructure requirements, etc. Refer to the [site assessment criteria](#) (page 4) that were passed out in September.

The feasibility study phase would go through a public process where findings from technical analyses and evaluations would be shared with the PNR at public meetings as the PNR considers the viability of an option or options. Only after feasibility is established would a project move forward in the planning and design process which would include environmental review (California Environmental Quality Act), which is also a public process, and more detailed technical design and engineering. Permitting, bidding, and construction follow later.

Thank you.

Tina Hugg, PLA, ASLA
Senior Planner
thugg@openspace.org
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022
P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485
www.openspace.org | twitter: [@mrostd](https://twitter.com/mrostd)

From: Karl Lusebrink <>
Sent: Friday, February 14, 2020 4:36 PM
To: Tina Hugg <thugg@openspace.org>
Cc: Melissa Borgesi <mborgesi@openspace.org>
Subject: Re: PAWG - Please read - Homework for March 5th

EXTERNAL

Hi Tina.

Thanks for getting the group a chance to visit E4 if they're interested. When we first went together to E1 it seemed like E4 could be considered part of the same site, but later discussion emphasized the hilltop area of E1 being visible from trails. When I went back and visited with the Ranger I realized the drive to E4 wouldn't need to come very near the house and that the lower area near the trees has different traits than E1 on the hilltop. Visibility-wise it's better but the sloped surface is challenging.

But before designing a lot, if any of the E sites gets PAWG approval I guess the feasibility study will do analysis of speed, accidents, and traffic calming options and then determine whether the two current driveways may be sufficient for light volume permit use vs. the need for a new driveway. Because if you determine all driveway options are too risky there's no point in engineering a parking lot. Is that how it works?

Have a good weekend.
Karl

On Feb 14, 2020, at 8:34 AM, Tina Hugg <thugg@openspace.org> wrote:

Karl:

Thank you for your homework and suggested site. I noticed E4 on our first site tour. I had categorized it with the ranger residence area since it is so close by and we would have probably added the area to the ranger residence option if it advanced into the feasibility study phase. However, we can call out E4 as a separate option to distinguish it. If the grading worked out, the position lower down from the driveway and house could potentially provide a visual and physical barrier between the residence and parking area as well as from the rest of the Preserve.

We will think about how to share this with the PAWG ahead of the March 5th meeting.

Tina

Tina Hugg, PLA, ASLA

Senior Planner

thugg@openspace.org

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022

P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

www.openspace.org | twitter: [@mrosd](https://twitter.com/mrosd)

From: Karl Lusebrink <>

Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 9:02 PM

To: Tina Hugg <thugg@openspace.org>

Subject: Re: PAWG - Please read - Homework for March 5th

EXTERNAL

Here is the homework assignment, Table of agreement with specified site use possibilities. The way I ranked level of support for Permit use is similar to how I'd rank each new site overall, as my comments show.

On it I referred to an alternative to E1, so I included a separate page proposing the alternative with a diagram. It's the area just north of E1, which I tried to describe in the meeting when the projector quit, and Lou asked if I was proposing a new site "E4". I am. Please tell me if anything is unclear.

I'll assess the sample suites of solutions before the meeting, too.

Thanks, Karl

On Fri, Feb 7, 2020 at 4:26 PM Tina Hugg <thugg@openspace.org> wrote:

Dear Working Group,

Chair Hooper and Vice-Chair Phillips request that everyone please be prepared for the March 5th meeting by reading the materials from the February 6th meeting and other meeting materials ahead of time to make the March 5th meeting as productive as possible. <https://www.openspace.org/about-us/meetings/pawg-20200206>

In addition, the Chair, Vice Chair and Project Team have modified the homework for next time. They would like you to review the attached table of Other Options and Iterations and score the uses suggested at each location. **Please use the attached Word file to provide your scores to Melissa and me by Monday, February 17th.**

- Type in a number (1 through 6) to indicate your level of support for each suggestion. See the Decision Making Process/Gradients of Agreement document attached.
- Add ideas to make options more appealing in the row named PAWG Member Comments.

The goal is to discuss and arrive at sites, options/iterations, or combinations of sites and options/iterations to forward to the Planning and Natural Resources Committee.

Thank you for all of your hard work.

Tina Hugg, PLA, ASLA

Senior Planner

thugg@openspace.org

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022

P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

www.openspace.org | twitter: [@mrostd](https://twitter.com/mrostd)