

**From:** [Tina Hugg](#)  
**To:** [Melissa Borgesj](#); [Tina Hugg](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Follow-up from PAWG March 5 meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, March 12, 2020 2:22:58 PM

---

Dear Working Group,

Another question has been received. The following is the response to Kathleen Moazed’s email below.

The PAWG’s recommended Suite was written based on PAWG feedback to not define what limited access means yet at Site E3, so that specific limited access options could be studied further during the feasibility study phase.

When the PAWG discussed the six Suites, the PAWG talked about different ways to limit access: offering permit access only, specifying a set number of cars, setting a time frame for access, offering docent-led activities, and providing District-staffed transportation. Instead of settling on one specific type of access, PAWG members discussed generalizing it to “limited access.”

The PNR and Board will be provided the range of limited access options discussed by the PAWG. The PNR Committee and Board may also have other ideas for staff to evaluate during the feasibility study phase.

Thank you.

**Tina Hugg**, PLA, ASLA  
Senior Planner  
[thugg@openspace.org](mailto: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](http://www.openspace.org) | twitter: [@mrosd](#)

---

**From:** Kathleen Moazed [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 12, 2020 12:23 PM  
**To:** Tina Hugg <[thugg@openspace.org](mailto:thugg@openspace.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: Follow-up from PAWG March 5 meeting

EXTERNAL

**Thanks Tina, I drafted this note just before I read your message, but I think it still applies:**

I wanted to once again express my appreciation for the enormous amount of work that you and the rest of the MidPen staff put into the complex task of steering the PAWG to a vote on the issue of public access to the middle portion of the La Honda Creek Open Space Preserve. It was a challenge, to say the least!

As I recall, the PAWG voted to recommend to the PNR a suite of options that included:

- B2/B3 – for equestrian use
- C1/C2 – for equestrian amenities / family, picnic, interpretive amenities
- D - for a small lot with restroom
- E3 - for a small lot with limited access

Since this suite that the PAWG voted on had only the barest of descriptions, I am assuming that the intention was for the PAWG to vote on (and subsequently approve) the options as described in the materials provided to the PAWG on February 6<sup>th</sup>, -- descriptions that we had all been asked to study and that were before us for consideration at the March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Specifically, for E3, those materials described this option as:

E3 – Area by shed below ranger residence

- permit only
- clear access instructions
- minimally improved
- interpretive sign on grazing
- limit # of cars depending on day  
(potentially more permits issued on weekday because less traffic on Highway 84 vs weekend)

Am I correct that this is what the PAWG voted on March 5<sup>th</sup> to approve?

Since there was some confusion among a few of the PAWG members about what was actually voted on, I think it will be very important for the PAWG to be able to review and approve the minutes of the March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, so thank you for providing that. There has been a good deal of talk about this vote in the La Honda community, so it would be great to be able to have some clarity.

Again, thanks for all the incredible work all of you at MidPen have done keep this process moving. As usual, please feel free to share this email with others on the PAWG.

Kathleen

On Wed, Mar 11, 2020 at 6:00 PM Tina Hugg <[thugg@openspace.org](mailto:thugg@openspace.org)> wrote:

Dear Working Group:

We appreciate Barbara Hooper's questions regarding the PAWG's recommended suite of options, March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting summary, and website updates. In addition to preparing the meeting summary and updating the website, we are also synthesizing and organizing information since last August to develop the Planning and Natural Resources (PNR) Committee report, recommendations report,

and appendices. Thank you for your patience.

Below are responses to Barbara's questions.

1. The March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting summary will be prepared using the meeting notes and audio recording and will include the suite of options that the PAWG discussed and voted on to recommend to the PNR Committee. The details and considerations raised by the group will be organized in the site assessment format that the PAWG used for its site assessment work. Since the scope of the PAWG was to evaluate and identify site location options, the development of site-specific parking area layouts will take place after sites are approved by the Board for further study. At this time there are no conceptual site plans for any of the sites, so there is not enough information to specify a particular size for either Site D or E3. When Lou Bordi asked about the number of spaces at Site E3, we provided ranges of 6 to 10 or 10 to 15 spaces, but a conceptual layout in the feasibility study phase will confirm the number of spaces, circulation, etc. Both sites are constrained by existing infrastructure (e.g. driveway, shed), topography, and vegetation, so their size will be limited. For the purposes of illustrating potential uses for sites, we can list the types of limited access that the PAWG discussed. The PNR Committee and Board may also share other ideas for staff to evaluate during the feasibility study phase.
2. The draft March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting summary will be shared with the PAWG prior to the PNR meeting. If a PAWG member identifies errors and omissions, these will be checked with the audio recording and the summary revised if necessary. The District Clerk informed us that with no PAWG meeting currently scheduled, the full Board of Directors would be the official body to confirm the final meeting summary. Directors Hassett and Riffle will be present to discuss the summary with the rest of the Board.
3. We update the website with meeting materials in as timely a manner as possible. As with previous website updates, this includes all meeting materials provided either in advance or at the meeting. Let us know if something is missing from previous meetings.

We appreciate everyone's patience over the next three weeks as we focus on all of these deliverables. Thank you.

**Tina Hugg**, PLA, ASLA

Senior Planner

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

---

**From:** Barbara Hooper [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2020 11:48 AM  
**To:** Tina Hugg <[thugg@openspace.org](mailto:thugg@openspace.org)>; Melissa Borgesi <[mborgesi@openspace.org](mailto:mborgesi@openspace.org)>  
**Cc:** Barbara Hooper [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Follow-up from PAWG March 5 meeting

EXTERNAL

Tina-

Last Thursday's meeting was effective as there was thoughtful feedback from all PAWG members about the suites and proposed elements of the various sites. Thank you for creating the documents and for giving the PAWG specific direction prior to the meeting so that it was productive.

I'm sure you and Melissa are busy writing and compiling information to be included in the report for the PNR Committee. If you have a moment, I hope you can address the following questions:

1. As was displayed in the March 5 meeting, the "suite" the PAWG agreed to recommend and present to the PNR includes the following sites: B2/B3 - equestrian, C1/C2 - equestrian amenities / family, picnic, interpretive amenities, D - small lot with restroom, E3 - small lot with limited access. Will you be sending an e-mail to the PAWG members to confirm the elements of this suite? I think it would be helpful to view the suite in the format MidPen provided in our previous discussions which included details per site and considerations in regards to the project-specific site assessment criterion. Please verify: a) what "small lot" is defined as; ie: how many parking spaces, b) limited access; ie: permit access, docent access or both.
2. When will the March 5 meeting minutes be available? How will the PAWG approve them since we have no other meetings scheduled at this time?
3. Will the PAWG March 5 website be updated to include the additional documents that we received?

Thank you,  
Barbara

--

**Kathleen Moazed**  
[REDACTED]