

**From:** [Midpen Public Comment Form](#)  
**To:** [Jennifer Woodworth](#); [Tina Hugg](#); [Melissa Borges](#); [web](#)  
**Subject:** I want my comment to be <strong>read into the record</strong> during the board meeting. (250 word limit) - July 28 - Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting -  
**Date:** Monday, July 27, 2020 1:10:33 PM

---

**EXTERNAL**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Meeting Date *                                   | July 28 – Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting                              |
| Is this a comment about a specific board item? * | Yes   |
| Agenda Item Number *                             | 1   |
| Subject *  | PAWG Recommendations  |
| Please check one: *                              | In Favor  |
| Name *   | Karl Lusebrink  |
| City of Residence *                              | La Honda  |
| Email *  |        |
| Select a Choice *                                | I want my comment to be read into the record during the board meeting. (250 word limit) |

**Comments to be read into the record \***

OS PNR comment

The PAWG suggests that a mix of various uses and sites offers the best chance for meeting MROSD’s goals for improving access to La Honda Creek open space preserve. Each of five sites shows potential for careful, low–impact development of parking and/or amenities to support visitors, as detailed in the Recommendations Report to the PNR. Designs the PNR subsequently recommends putting forward into the feasibility process should respect the elements of the La Honda Creek Master Plan Vision Statement and PAWG project goals, particularly science–based habitat protection, preservation of cultural and historical assets like the Red Barn, minimal rangeland view–shed disruption, and the preserve’s connections with the community. PAWG recommendations additionally emphasize public safety, especially the hazards of traffic on Highway 84.

I’m grateful for being able to learn about and participate in the Planning process as a member of PAWG. I hope a thorough and unbiased assessment of the feasibility of our recommendations will produce the data MROSD needs to inform decisions on safe and sustainable improvements to the preserve’s public access.

---

**From:** [Midpen Public Comment Form](#)  
**To:** [Jennifer Woodworth](#); [Tina Hugg](#); [Melissa Borgesi](#); [web](#)  
**Subject:** I am submitting a comment to be provided to the board of directors. (no limit) - July 28 - Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting -  
**Date:** Monday, July 27, 2020 3:56:12 PM

---

EXTERNAL

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Meeting Date *                                      | July 28 – Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting  |
| Is this a comment about a specific board item? *    | Yes   |
| Agenda Item Number *                                | 3   |
| Subject *   | PAWG Recommendation, La Honda Creek OSP   |
| Please check one: *                                 | In Favor  |
| Name *  | Sandra Sommer   |
| City of Residence *                                 | Mountain View   |
| Email *   | <a href="mailto:sandysommer@dslextreame.com">sandysommer@dslextreame.com</a>  |
| Select a Choice *                                   | I am submitting a comment to be provided to the board of directors. (no limit)  |
| Comments to be provided to the board of directors * | See uploaded file   |
| File upload   |  <a href="#">sandy sommer comment letter.pdf</a><br>57.46 KB · PDF |

Re: Item 3, July 28<sup>th</sup> Planning and Natural Resources Committee Meeting

Dear Directors Kishimoto, Holman and Kersteen-Tucker,

Thank you for this opportunity to share my comments regarding the La Honda Public Access Working Group Recommendations. I greatly appreciate MidPen's efforts to sponsor an open and fair process involving residents from each District Ward.

Although I could not attend the March 5, 2020 Public Access Working Group meeting, I support the group's consensus and would like to echo the recommendation as described in the staff report, to advance a suite of options at sites B2 & 3, C1 & 2, D, and E3 to the feasibility study phase. In particular, I would like to highlight the importance of including options that would address future access to the Bay Area Ridge Trail, namely Sites D and E3.

While I share some of the concerns that others PAWG members have voiced, I believe it is time to move forward so that the details can begin to be considered in consultation with technical experts.

Finally, I have general concern about limited access trailheads. While limited access may be suitable as a near-term measure or in extremely constrained situations, the approach reduces equity and is less inclusive of a diverse cross section of visitors, by design. I'm not sure that it is a good long-term policy to add more permanently limited access points to this beautiful, valuable preserve.

Regards,

Sandy Sommer  
Public Access Working Group Member  
Ward 4