



Midpeninsula Regional
Open Space District

**La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study
Public Access Working Group Meeting**

**Administrative Office
330 Distel Circle
Los Altos, CA 94022**

**March 5, 2020
6:30 PM – 9:30 PM**

MEETING SUMMARY

ROLL CALL

Chair Barbara Hooper called the meeting of the La Honda Public Access Working Group (PAWG) to order at 6:35 p.m.

PAWG Members Present (✓) or Absent (✗):

Board Directors	✓ Curt Riffle, Ward 4 ✓ Larry Hassett, Ward 6
La Honda area representatives	✗ Ari Delay ✓ Karl Lusebrink ✓ Kathleen Moazed
Ward stakeholders	✓ Ward 1: Melany Moore ✓ Ward 2: Art Heinrich ✓ Ward 3: Willie Wool ✗ Ward 4: Sandy Sommer ✓ Ward 5: Andie Reed ✓ Ward 6: Lou Bordi ✓ Ward 6: Barbara Hooper ✓ Ward 7: Denise Phillips

District Staff Present:

- ✓ Ana Ruiz, General Manager
- ✓ Susanna Chan, Assistant General Manager
- ✓ Jane Mark, Planning Manager
- ✓ Melissa Borgesi, Planner I
- ✓ Tina Hugg, Senior Planner
- ✓ Chris Barresi, Supervising Ranger

✓ Luke Mulhall, Planning Administrative Assistant

✓ Renée Fitzsimons, Interpretation & Education Program Manager

MIG Consultants: Lou Hexter, Ana Padilla

WELCOME/AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Hooper called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

Meeting Facilitator Lou Hexter reviewed the objectives and agenda for the evening and provided an overview of the February meeting’s discussion, which captured members’ levels of support for the various site locations and initiated the creation of project option suites.

Senior Planner Tina Hugg reviewed the PAWG’s role and goal for the day, noting the PAWG would discuss and decide later in the meeting if they were ready to forward a recommendation to the Planning and Natural Resources Committee (PNR) given the absences of PAWG members Sandy Sommer and, unexpectedly, Ari Delay. Mr. Hexter reviewed the project background and the PAWG’s work since the group started.

PUBLIC COMMENT -1

Nancy Cole, a Los Gatos resident, appreciated the work the PAWG and the District did to develop the Preserve for everyone’s interests. She commented she would like the group to consider allowing dogs at the Preserve, stating dog owners were underrepresented users. Ms. Cole requested including a toilet facility at trailheads in the recommendation.

James Eckman, a Mountain View resident, thanked the group for its work. He stated that after reviewing materials, he would like access to the middle area of the Preserve with low-clearance vehicles, and he was looking forward to one or more parking areas along Highway 84 to be able to hike in the area and to appreciate nature.

Jan Staats, a Sunnyvale resident, shared that she hiked to the upper La Honda vista point and wanted to be able to experience the upper and middle section of the Preserve more. She expressed hope that the PAWG would find a way to make the middle area of the Preserve accessible to avid hikers like herself.

Sharon Dooley, a La Honda resident, thanked the PAWG, District staff, and the public who attended the field trips. She expressed concern that the District had presented three sample suites of options but these suites had not considered the PAWG’s scores or comments that the group had just shared.

WORKING GROUP BUSINESS

Chair Hooper asked for a motion to approve the February 6, 2020, meeting summary. Melany Moore made a motion to approve the meeting summary and Vice Chair Denise Phillips seconded. The PAWG approved the February 6, 2020 meeting summary.

Approval of February 6, 2020 PAWG Meeting Summary	Ayes (9) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool
--	--

	Noes (0) Abstentions (0) Absent (1) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle
--	--

Mr. Hexter introduced Renée Fitzsimons, the program manager of the District’s Interpretation and Education Program to provide background related to the PAWG’s interest in incorporating docent and education programming at the sites.

Ms. Fitzsimons reported the District’s docent programs started in 1977 to enrich the preserve and park experience and to build a relationship with nature. She reported the District had three programs: Docent Naturalist, in which docents developed themes and topics for guiding a group at various preserves; Nature Center Docents, who currently served about 3,400 visitors each year at the David C. Daniels Nature Center in Skyline Ridge Open Space Preserve; and Outdoor Education Docents, through which schools could arrange 3rd to 5th grade school field trips to the Daniels Nature Center. The District seeks to preserve nature while also offering public access with docent-led activities to provide enriched experiences for the public. Docent-led activities are provided in open areas of preserves, as well as, on a case-by-case basis, in closed areas as one option to phase in public access.

Kathleen Moazed asked if there was docent programming for those interested in ranching history.

Ms. Fitzsimons confirmed this and reported these docents would receive specialized training to understand the area’s ranching history.

Vice Chair Phillips asked if the District provided transportation to docent-led events.

Ms. Fitzsimons explained that this was not the model followed and visitors are expected to transport themselves or meet somewhere and caravan to the preserves.

Karl Lusebrink asked how long it took to schedule and coordinate a docent for a special request.

Ms. Fitzsimons reported the District typically requires at least three weeks’ notice.

Chair Hooper asked if docents decided where they went or were assigned to programs or if staff or the Board could request tours of areas that were not open.

Ms. Fitzsimons answered docents typically develop their own program based on their availability and interests, which also depending on the area and time of year.

After the discussion with Ms. Fitzsimons, Mr. Hexter recapped the meeting discussion from February 6th. He reviewed the ten sites under consideration:

- Site A – Event Center
- Site B1 – Sears Ranch Road Parking Area – Expansion of existing lot
- Site B2 – Sears Ranch Road Parking Area – Site west of existing parking area
- Site B3 – Preserve gate LH15
- Site C1 – Sears Ranch Road – Former residence area (1 mile from the existing lot)
- Site C2 – Sears Ranch Road – Cattle corral at former residence area (1 mile from the existing lot)

- Site D – Preserve gate LH07 (West access gate)
- Site E1 – Red Barn – Area behind and west of Ranger residence
- Site E2 – Red Barn – Area northwest and downhill from Red Barn
- Site E3 – Red Barn – Area by shed below Ranger residence

Mr. Hexter shared a summary table showing how the PAWG previously voted on each site during its February 6, 2020 meeting. A vote of 1 and 2 was considered in support of a proposal, a vote of 3 and 4 was considered neutral and therefore willing to accept the proposal, and a vote of 5 and 6 was considered not supportive. Based on the vote, he reminded the group that they had unanimously eliminated Site E2 because it was too intrusive to the viewshed from the Red Barn. Ms. Hugg reported that Site A had been already identified as a standalone public access project that would go through a comprehensive planning process in the future.

PAWG Member	A	B1	B2	B3	C1	C2	D	E1	E2	E3
Bordi	2	6	1	1	5	1	3	6	6	6
Delay	1	5	2	6	3	1	5	6	6	6
Heinrich	6	3	3	2	5	5	1	6	6	4
Hooper	1	5	1	6	5	5	6	6	6	6
Lusebrink	1	2	3	2	6	6	4	3	6	3
Moazed	3	1	3	1	1	1	5	6	6	6
Moore	2	4	1	4	1	1	5	6	6	5
Phillips	3	2	3	3	6	6	3	2	6	2
Reed	2	3	5	2	6	6	1	6	5	1
Sommer	5	5	3	3	2	2	1	4	6	2
Wool	6	5	4	3	6	6	3	6	6	1
# of 1-4 scores	8	6	10	9	4	5	7	3	0	6
# of 5-6 scores	3	5	1	2	7	6	4	8	11	5

Mr. Hexter reminded the PAWG that a PAWG member proposed a new site during the February 6, 2020 meeting: Site E4 – Red Barn – North of and adjacent to the ranger residence. The PAWG discussed their observations of Site E4.

Ms. Moazed stated her opposition to all of the Red Barn sites based on concerns regarding traffic safety in the area. She said that aesthetic and safety concerns were critical considerations, and while Site E4 addressed the community’s aesthetic concerns, it did not address safety concerns.

Ms. Moore agreed and described her attempt to visit the site earlier in the day, when a delivery truck in the small driveway prevented her from being able to drive into the site. She expressed concerns about the small driveway not being a safe access point from Highway 84.

Vice Chair Phillips agreed that there were safety concerns, but that the PAWG’s charge was to propose sites to be brought into the feasibility study phase. She spoke in support of the site due to its access to the middle of the Preserve and in support of studying safety issues for the site in the feasibility study phase.

Willie Wool commented regarding the view of the site from a vista point in the northern upper area of the Preserve.

Chair Hooper agreed with Ms. Moazed and Ms. Moore, stating she did not support the site because of access issues from Highway 84 and because access was too intrusive to the Red Barn.

Mr. Lusebrink stated Site E4 may be less visible than Site E1 from the vista point in the northern area of the Preserve. He felt that the slope of the area could make building in the area difficult but felt it had potential for addressing aesthetic concerns. Mr. Lusebrink stated he supported Site E4 similarly to the other E sites, but he supported Site E4 more than Sites E1 and E3 because it was less obtrusive. Mr. Lusebrink acknowledged that there had been a great deal of input and concern about the access safety from Highway 84 and was curious to know what traffic engineers would propose to make it safe.

Andie Reed stated her support for Site E3, which could not be seen. She felt Site E4 encroached into the rolling pasture, and Sites E1 and E4 were intrusive to the ranger living in the residence.

Director Curt Riffle agreed with Vice Chair Phillips, Ms. Reed, and Mr. Lusebrink on the site's potential and stated if the PAWG recommended the site, it should do so with the understanding that safety concerns need to be addressed. Director Riffle agreed that Sites E1 and E4 were exposed.

Lou Bordi commented the PAWG's first priority was safety. He stated the original site plans developed for the prior Red Barn project with a new driveway location were safer than the current proposal to use the existing driveways.

Director Larry Hassett stated Site E3 warrants serious consideration. By limiting the parking lot capacity at Site E3, either by the size of the lot or through permit access, it would result in fewer trips in and out of the site. He agreed with Ms. Moazed's statement that aesthetics and safety are critical considerations and Site E3 addresses the aesthetic issue and should be evaluated in regards safety considerations. Director Hassett stated some type of access at the Red Barn should be considered and reminded the group that no other site met the goal of providing access to the middle area of the Preserve as the Red Barn area sites can.

Vice Chair Phillips commented the Red Barn area is the site closest to the closed middle area of the Preserve. She observed that hiking six to eight miles to this location would not be feasible for all visitors and some visitors would like a short nature walk.

Ms. Moazed inquired regarding how the comments and votes of the absent PAWG members would be accounted for. She felt these PAWG members should have an opportunity to weigh in on the suites of options.

Chair Hooper felt the meeting would be a discussion of the suites of options but not a vote for a recommendation to forward to the PNR.

A couple PAWG members asked whether the two absent members could vote later as they had previously done on the sites.

General Manager Ana Ruiz responded the PAWG's previous votes on the sites and sample suites of options provided input into the overall discussion. However, the PAWG was now considering voting on a formal recommendation to the PNR, and only PAWG members present at a publicly noticed meeting can record their vote.

Ms. Hugg explained the PAWG could decide later in the meeting whether to move the vote on a recommendation to a future meeting. She added that the group would be further informed if they finished discussing the suites of options that were prepared for the meeting.

The PAWG voted on Site E4 using the same 1 to 6 scale used in previous meetings.

PAWG Member	E4
Bordi	6
Delay	Absent
Heinrich	4
Hooper	6
Lusebrink	4
Moazed	6
Moore	6
Phillips	2
Reed	4
Sommer	Absent
Wool	3
# of 1-4 scores	5
# of 5-6 scores	4

Mr. Hexter summarized the PAWG’s comments on the other options and iterations presented during the February 6, 2020 meeting. The group reviewed and submitted observations as homework for the March 5th meeting on how well implementing the other options and iterations at each site met the project goals and objectives. The PAWG found some sites able to accommodate different uses (equestrian, dog access, family/picnic, interpretive amenities) and limited access options (permit or docent-led activities) better than others.

PUBLIC COMMENT - 2

Joel Gartland, a Bay Area Ridge Trail (Ridge Trail) representative and volunteer, commented on the importance of access to multi-use trails for regional trail connectivity and stated the Ridge Trail Council is there to support the effort.

Lynette Vega, a La Honda resident, said she attended the February 6, 2020 PAWG meeting, and a number of community members were shocked that options at the Red Barn continue to be considered. Ms. Vega reminded the group of the District’s mission to preserve nature and stated that putting a parking lot so close to the Red Barn would conflict with the goal of protecting and preserving rural character. She stated traffic safety would be an issue with access at Red Barn. Finally, Ms. Vega thanked the PAWG for their work and hoped the group would make the right choice.

WORKING GROUP BUSINESS

Ms. Hugg and Mr. Hexter explained the PAWG should confirm the type of recommendation to send to the PNR. In past PAWG meetings, the PAWG discussed the difficulty of trying to incorporate all project objectives into one location, which led to the suggestion of distributing the uses and facilities across

several locations. Ms. Hugg explained the PAWG would need to formally vote to decide if their recommendation would come in the form of a suite of options rather than a single option.

Chair Hooper asked for a motion to recommend a suite of options instead of a single site to the PNR to consider for the future feasibility study phase.

Ms. Wool made a motion to approve the recommendation of a suite to the PNR and Ms. Reed seconded the motion. The PAWG approved the motion as follows.

Approval to provide a suite of options approach to the PNR recommendation.	Ayes (9) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Noes (0) Abstentions (0) Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hasset, Curt Riffle
---	---

Ms. Hugg provided an overview of six potential suites and explained that any sites added or removed by the PAWG from a suite would essentially form a new suite. The three sample suites presented at the February 6, 2020 meeting were examples of how to potentially combine sites and options and were meant to illicit reaction and discussion from the PAWG and inspire creation of new suites. Of the six suites, three new suites were suggested by two PAWG members.

The PAWG discussed how to discuss and rate the suites and observed that there were many possible iterations. PAWG members suggested forwarding the most highly rated sites as a suite. Vice Chair Phillips suggested completing the discussion of the suites provided to the PAWG for the meeting.

Ms. Reed felt the PAWG could talk about what sites or uses to switch out of the suites, which are a framework to start from.

Ms. Hugg reminded the group it would be important to review the project goals and seek a suite of options that met those goals. Chair Hooper suggested discussing the six suites to give the group a better idea of the options.

Mr. Hexter explained the report being sent to the PNR would identify the suites having majority support, and the PAWG’s votes for individual sites, site use and suites. He added the PAWG’s vote does not have to be unanimous.

Vice Chair Phillips reminded the group that all materials would be packaged and provided to the PNR and Board.

Art Heinrich suggested generalizing the descriptions to show intent, such as “limited access” rather than permit parking only or docent-led only.

The PAWG discussed the various suites as described below.

Suite 1 included:

- Site D – Gate LH07, small lot with restroom
- Site B1 – Existing Sears Ranch lot, expansion for equestrian parking
- Site E3 – Red Barn shed area below ranger residence, permit only and limited number of cars depending on weekend or weekday

Ms. Wool supported Suite 1 but suggested removing Site B1 in favor of Sites B2 and B3 to better account for equestrian needs.

Director Riffle spoke in favor of the suite and thought the limited access to Site E3 during the week was an innovative approach.

Ms. Moazed spoke against having two access points off Highway 84 for Sites D and E3. She mentioned that while she did not like any of the E sites, she preferred Site E3 over the others.

Chair Hooper agreed with Ms. Moazed that having two access points in an unsafe area was a problem. Ms. Hooper did not have confidence that the general public would follow directions for accessing the site safely. Chair Hooper stated that due to traffic concerns, she could not support any of the suites that included Site D or any of the E sites without the condition that access was limited through docent-led activities using District-provided transportation. She referred to traffic and safety data, the PAWG's site tour experience, and community feedback related to traffic safety concerns.

Mr. Bordi did not support Suite 1. He stated that while Sears Ranch Road needed an equestrian lot, Site B1 at the top of the ridge was not visually appealing for that use.

Mr. Heinrich liked the suite, as it is the only one to offer public access to the closed middle area of the Preserve but would only support it if traffic engineers could solve the safety issues. He supported advancing the suite to the PNR.

Director Hassett agreed with Mr. Heinrich and added that some public access in the vicinity of the Red Barn is needed. Director Hassett commented that limiting the number of vehicles going into the site to just docent-led activities might be viewed as equivalent to denying access. He suggested reducing the number of parking spaces to a manageable number and reminded the PAWG that thousands of people were taxpayers who paid for this land. Director Hassett referred to El Corte de Madera Creek and Skyline Ridge Open Space Preserves as example types of access that were provided under similar constraints. Director Hassett felt a recommendation provided to the Board without any access to the Red Barn site would likely not be well received.

Ms. Reed agreed with Director Hassett but preferred Site B3 to B1 to provide better access for equestrians. Ms. Reed asked if Site A would be a separate study.

Ms. Hugg reported Site A would be part of a separate site planning effort, and the District would need a use permit from the County of San Mateo to change or increase use at the site. Ms. Hugg explained the PAWG could still share with the PNR their support for further developing the Event Center in the future.

Suite 2 included:

- Site D – Gate LH07, permit lot with no restroom
- Site B2 – Area west of existing Sears Ranch lot, equestrian parking

- Site E1 – Red Barn area behind ranger residence, docent-led activity only

Ms. Moore stated she preferred Suite 2 over Suite 1 but would like to include Site E3 instead of Site E1 although she remained concerned about safe public access.

Mr. Bordi thought Site B2 would be better suited for equestrian access and did not want to limit the expansion of Site B1 to equestrians only. Mr. Bordi observed Site D in Suite 2 no longer includes a restroom, unlike Suite 1.

Vice Chair Phillips did not think Suite 2 was as favorable an option, especially for equestrians. Vice Chair Phillips preferred Site E3 to Site E1 and thought weekday permits at the E sites seemed exclusionary and suggested phasing in people would be a better approach. Vice Chair Phillips suggested Site D should include a restroom.

Suite 3 included:

- Site C1 – Sears Ranch interior, former residence area, gravel lot
- Site B3 – Gate LH15, equestrian parking
- Site E3 – Red Barn shed area below ranger residence, permit only and limited number on cars depending on weekend or weekday

Mr. Hexter described Suite 3 to the group and suggested the PAWG vote to determine if there was a preference to include Site E3 instead of Sites E1 and E4 in all the options.

<p>Approval to use Site E3 as a preferred site in a suite over Site E1.</p>	<p>Ayes - E3 (7) – Art Heinrich, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Noes – E1 (1) – Barbara Hooper Abstentions/Neutral (1) – Lou Bordi Absent (1) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle</p>
--	---

<p>Approval to use Site E3 as a preferred site in a suite over Site E4.</p>	<p>Ayes – E3 (5) – Karl Lusebrink, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Noes – E4 (1) – Barbara Hooper Abstentions/Neutral (3) – Art Heinrich, Kathleen Moazed, Lou Bordi Absent (1) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle</p>
--	---

The PAWG voted whether to suggest equestrian access at Site B1 and the majority voted against it.

<p>Approval of equestrian uses at Site B1</p>	<p>Ayes (0) Noes (9) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Abstentions (0)</p>
--	--

	Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle
--	---

The PAWG voted whether to have equestrian access at Site B2 and the majority voted in favor.

Approval of equestrian uses at Site B2	Ayes (9) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Noes (0) Abstentions (0) Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle
---	--

The PAWG voted whether to have equestrian access at Site B3. The majority voted not to have equestrians at Site B3 with four in the minority. The PAWG members not in favor of equestrian access at Site B3 stated its proximity and potential impact to the La Honda Elementary School were their main considerations.

Approval of equestrian uses at Site B3	Ayes (4) – Art Heinrich, Karl Lusebrink, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips Noes (5) – Lou Bordi, Barbara Hooper, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Willie Wool Abstentions (0) Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle
---	---

Ms. Moore stated the La Honda Elementary School students should be the priority for Site B3, and the District should be a good neighbor by putting the lot elsewhere.

Since the group was closely divided regarding Site B3, the PAWG agreed there were possibilities for the site; however, the school would need to be consulted.

Mr. Bordi stated a gravel lot at Site C1 would require extensive grading and stated his preference for equestrian use at Site C2, as it is tucked away and would not require a great deal of grading. Mr. Bordi stated either of the C sites had potential, but Site C2 would be a better location for a picnic area and interpretive center with vehicle access. Mr. Bordi asked Director Riffle, as an equestrian, his opinion on which site would be better for equestrians.

Director Riffle answered the B and C sites would not be an issue for horse trailer access but raised a concern that hikers may not appreciate sharing trailers on the road in the Preserve.

Vice Chair Phillips stated that she did not like the C locations because they do not provide access to the closed middle portion of the Preserve or the Red Barn, which is one of the objectives for the project.

Mr. Lusebrink pointed out that the C locations could introduce conflicts with the grazing and cattle management. He preferred to not pave a road to the C sites. Mr. Lusebrink also felt there was not a big payoff to paving a mile-long path in the Preserve or changing how the grazing operation was managed and suggested other sites be considered for ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessible facilities.

Ms. Wool stated she preferred Site C2 over Site C1 and expansion here could be considered after more people discovered the beauty of the Preserve and visitor use increased. She added that upper La Honda would become more appealing, and Site C2 could provide access in the future.

Director Hassett stated the idea of having a shared access road in the middle of the Preserve was not typical for the District, and maintenance and patrol of the location would be challenging so far from the highway.

Mr. Heinrich suggested Suite 3 should be a fall back to Suite 1 and 2, so that in case the B sites were infeasible, the C sites could be an alternative.

Ms. Hugg invited Supervising Ranger Chris Barresi to speak to the concerns about access through the C sites and public safety.

Mr. Barresi stated a mile-long road would be difficult to patrol as there would be no visibility from a public road and would be challenging to clear in the evening. He added it would be more difficult to reach an interior lot quickly, there would be higher risk for speeding and accidents, and cars and pedestrians sharing the road could be problematic.

Ms. Reed reminded the group this space is a preserve and building a mile-long road with fencing on both sides through it conflicts with the project goal to design elements that reflect a rural character.

Due to the discussion around the C sites, the PAWG voted on whether they wanted to include either site in a suite. The majority voted not to include Sites C1 or C2 in a suite. If a C site were forwarded to PNR, Director Hassett suggested the PAWG include their concerns regarding maintenance and patrol of the one-mile long road to the parking lot and recommend further evaluation by staff.

<p>Approval of including Sites C1 and/or C2 in a Suite.</p>	<p>Ayes (4) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore Noes (5) – Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Abstentions (0) Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle</p>
--	--

Mr. Hexter reviewed Suite 4, which was developed by Ms. Sommers.

Suite 4 included:

- Site A – Event Center, parking lot and trailhead
- Site B3 – Gate LH15, permit equestrian parking lot
- Site C1 or C2 – Sears Ranch interior, parking lot and trailhead as a central staging hub for Preserve
- Site D – Gate LH07, small parking lot with restroom and trailhead, potential staging for Bay Area Ridge Trail
- Site E3 – Red Barn shed area below ranger residence, phased approach – initially limited access and pending traffic calming or safety improvements, explore potential expansion

Ms. Moore stated she preferred this suite over the others and suggested replacing Site B3 with Site B2 based on PAWG discussions from earlier in the meeting. She stated a small lot at Site D has great potential because the location has a wide shoulder along the highway.

Vice Chair Phillips thought Suite 4 was similar to Suite 1 when changes were made based on the PAWG's votes earlier in the meeting and when Site A was set aside as a standalone project. She observed Suite 4 includes the C sites, and the PAWG had voted to not include the C sites in a suite.

Mr. Bordi stated Site B3 should not be permit only for equestrians but should be open for the general public.

Ms. Moazed stated that she preferred including either of the C sites as an alternative to any of the E sites at the Red Barn but had concerns about introducing an access road into the Preserve.

Mr. Heinrich was concerned that Site E3 was proposed in Suite 4 as having long-term full public access, which had already been considered during the prior Red Barn project.

Mr. Lusebrink reminded the group that for the feasibility study phase, the discussion had been to include a small lot in the Red Barn area that would have minimal impact on parking and traffic generation as opposed to full access.

At the end of the PAWG's discussion of Suite 4, Ms. Hugg observed that the previous discussions and voting were establishing a new suite based on the group's preferences. This "hybrid" set of the PAWG's preferred sites were combining into Suite 7: Site D LH07, Site B2 or B3 Sears Ranch Road, and Site E3 Red Barn shed area below the Ranger Residence.

Mr. Hexter reviewed Suite 5, which was developed by Chair Hooper.

Suite 5 included:

- Site A – Event Center, parking lot and trailhead for multi-use access
- Site B1 or B2 – Expansion of Sears Ranch lot or area west of existing Sears Ranch lot, equestrian and multi-use access
- Site D – Gate LH07, minimal improvements, docent-led hikes with District-provided transportation
- Site E1 or E4 – Red Barn area behind ranger residence or Red Barn area adjacent and north of ranger residence, minimal improvements, docent-led hikes with District-provided transportation

Vice Chair Phillips observed the PAWG discussed limited access at the E sites rather than specifying it be only permitted or docent-led hikes.

Mr. Heinrich observed that Suite 5 was a variation of Suite 2 if Site E3 replaced Sites E1 or E4 as the PAWG had voted earlier.

Mr. Bordi supported limiting the number of people accessing the Red Barn area and asked for more specific numbers of people and cars that would be allowed in the permit only lot.

Vice Chair Philips reminded the group that specific questions would be answered in the feasibility study phase and the PAWG's focus was recommending which sites to forward to the PNR.

Suite 6 included near-term options, suggested by Chair Hooper, for the PAWG to consider forwarding to the PNR. These options could potentially be implemented while the longer-term feasibility study and site planning work were under way. Some proposed near-term solutions included:

- Site E1 – Offer docent-led hikes with District-provided transportation
- Existing Red Barn Pull Out on Highway 84 – Provide interpretive information on the site and information on how to access the Preserve at Sears Ranch Road
- Site A – Offer permit access to hikers in addition to equestrians or docent-led hikes
- Site B1 – Offer docent-led or permit hiking north from Site C1 on existing road towards Red Barn
- General – Prioritize projects related to trail access from Allen Road vista point and Sears Ranch Road area to Red Barn

Chair Hooper observed that two years had passed since the June 12, 2018 meeting when the prior Red Barn site planning process was put on hold, and given the amount of time the process could take, the PAWG and District could consider these near-term options to introduce public access more quickly while longer-term solutions were pursued.

Mr. Lusebrink supported quicker results but thought near-term options might be out of the PAWG's scope of work.

Director Hassett acknowledged that during the next 10 to 15 years, additional opportunities for different access points and trail directions may develop.

Ms. Hugg confirmed the PAWG's scope was to find a long-term solution for public access and staging areas in the Preserve but stated the interim solutions could be incorporated into the report to the PNR. However, Site A would need to be removed, because the current San Mateo County use permit does not allow an increase in uses at the site.

Mr. Hexter reviewed the PAWG's key takeaways of the sites and suites to that point in the meeting. For Site D, the PAWG supported a small lot and restroom. For Site B2 or B3, they proposed equestrian parking. For Site E3, the PAWG preferred limited access. Though the PAWG had earlier preferred to not include Sites C1 and C2 in a suite, the group suggested including limited improvements at the C sites focused on equestrian-, interpretive- or family-oriented amenities, such as a horse water trough and picnic area.

The PAWG discussed the various sites and suites. Ms. Reed asked about the possibility of prioritizing the suites. Mr. Lusebrink asked whether access at the E sites would be needed if Site D was found to be feasible or vice versa. Mr. Bordi suggested that instead of grouping sites into a suite, each member could state their favorite site, and the group would then discuss what amenities to provide at each location. Ms. Moore referred to Director Hassett's comment earlier in the meeting that the PAWG should consider access in the vicinity of the Red Barn in order to satisfy the project objectives. Chair Hooper reminded the group that the PAWG would provide a recommendation to the PNR, and a recommendation would then go to the Board, which would not necessarily have to grant approval, so the PAWG's role is not to provide specific details for every site.

Mr. Hexter invited the PAWG to review the emerging Suite 7 and refine the sites within the suite to best represent their perspectives.

Suite 7 included:

- Site B2 or B3 – equestrian parking
- Sites C1 and C2 – equestrian-, family/picnic-, or interpretive-oriented amenities; should not be staging areas
- Site D – small parking lot with restroom
- Site E3 – small parking lot with limited access

The PAWG discussed that Site B2 or B3 could be suitable for equestrian parking, and Sites C1 and C2 should not be a staging area but could be used for equestrian-, family/picnic-, or interpretive-oriented amenities. The PAWG agreed Site D could support a small lot with a restroom, and limited access and a small lot at Site E3 would be preferred for the Red Barn area. The group discussed how to define limited access at Site E3, and Ms. Hugg reminded the group that specifics such as type of limited access and lot size and capacity would be part of the feasibility study phase. Ms. Hugg added that Site E3’s physical constraints would limit the size to a small lot.

Director Hassett observed that the PAWG’s discussion provided District staff with a good understanding of the PAWG’s view of limited access at the Red Barn area when the project moved into the feasibility study. Vice Chair Phillips added that the Board liaisons would be able to share the PAWG’s perspective with the full Board when the recommendation reaches the Board.

Ms. Hooper expressed concerns about overflow parking along Highway 84 at Site D if the lot were fully open rather than only providing limited access. Vice Chair Phillips observed that even with a permit only lot, people might still park along Highway 84.

Mr. Hexter suggested the PAWG vote on Suite 7 to register their level of support or reservation on the composition of the suite.

PAWG Member	Suite 7
Bordi	3
Delay	Absent
Heinrich	2
Hooper	5
Lusebrink	2
Moazed	5
Moore	1
Phillips	2
Reed	1
Sommer	Absent
Wool	1
# of 1-4 scores	7
# of 5-6 scores	2

Ms. Moazed stated she wanted to register her continued opposition to the suite because it includes a Red Barn site but did not think the PAWG needed to continue discussing it.

Mr. Hexter reminded the group of the absence of Mr. Delay and Ms. Sommer and observed that if they had been in opposition, there would still be a majority in favor of Suite 7. Mr. Hexter reminded the group that the PNR will receive the PAWG's recommendation and determine whether to forward it to the full Board or request more information from the PAWG. Mr. Hexter described the steps to prepare a report for the PNR and explained the role of the Chair and Vice Chair in preparing the report and attending the PNR meeting to present the work of the PAWG.

Ms. Hugg observed that with the results of the PAWG's vote, 7 votes supportive to 2 votes not supportive, there is sufficient support to move Suite 7 forward, even with two PAWG members absent. Ms. Hugg asked if this suite was what the PAWG wanted to forward to the PNR, or did the PAWG need more information or further discussion that would change their votes.

Vice Chair Phillips asked whether the group was being asked to decide if they were recommending the suite to the PNR.

Ms. Hugg confirmed and reminded the PAWG that at the start of the meeting, it was announced that Mr. Delay could no longer attend due to the triggering of the City of San Bruno's Emergency Operation Center in response to the COVID-19 virus outbreak, and the PAWG would vote at the end of the meeting on whether to advance a recommendation with Mr. Delay and Ms. Sommer absent.

Ms. Hugg observed that through the PAWG's discussions that evening, the PAWG had removed some sites from their consideration and formed a suite with the remaining sites. She asked if the PAWG felt additional information was needed to change the current suite or if the PAWG wanted to take an official vote on it.

Chair Hooper acknowledged the Brown Act precludes Mr. Delay and Ms. Sommer from voting after the meeting but asked whether they could at least provide what their votes would have been, and that information be given to the PNR in the PAWG's report.

Ms. Hugg stated Mr. Delay and Ms. Sommer would be able to email written comments to the Chair, Vice Chair, or the District, and those comments would be provided to the PNR.

Ms. Hooper felt that it was important to hear from the entire PAWG and observed that both absent members had spent a great deal of time on the effort.

Ms. Wool asked how the PNR report would be reviewed by the PAWG.

Ms. Hugg confirmed the Chair and Vice Chair would assist with preparing and reviewing the report.

Ms. Wool commented that she was confident that the District, Chair Hooper and Vice Chair Phillips would capture the PAWG's comments and conditions.

Ms. Hugg added that PAWG members would also be able to submit comments to the PNR about the report before the PNR meeting.

Chair Hooper called for a motion to confirm that the PAWG’s prior vote on Suite 7 was the PAWG’s official vote to forward a recommendation to the PNR.

Ms. Wool made a motion to approve Suite 7 (reflecting the prior 7 to 2 vote conducted earlier in the meeting) as the PAWG’s recommendation to the PNR; Ms. Reed seconded.

Approval of sharing Suite 7’s reflecting their 7 to 2 as a recommendation to the PNR	Ayes (9) – Lou Bordi, Art Heinrich, Barbara Hooper, Karl Lusebrink, Kathleen Moazed, Melany Moore, Andie Reed, Denise Phillips, Willie Wool Noes (0) Abstentions (0) Absent (2) – Ari Delay, Sandy Sommer Non-Voting (2) – Larry Hassett, Curt Riffle
---	--

Mr. Hexter stated the project team will work with the Chair and Vice Chair to prepare the final recommendation report and to present it to the PNR on April 21. He said that the PAWG had a tentative meeting date scheduled for May 14 to respond to any potential questions from the PNR that require the PAWG to reconvene and address.

Vice Chair Phillips thanked the PAWG and the District for the time and effort and felt that this process was a wonderful manifestation of the District’s good neighbor policy.

The District team expressed their appreciation for the PAWG members’ hard work and passion for the project and looked forward to reconvening the group for a celebratory gathering.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hooper adjourned the meeting of the La Honda Public Access Work Group at 10:00 pm.

Tina Hugg, PLA, ASLA
Senior Planner