



Midpeninsula Regional
Open Space District

R-24-29
March 12, 2024

AGENDA ITEM 3

AGENDA ITEM

Updates to Board Policy 5.02 – *Good Neighbor Policy*

GENERAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

Review input from neighbors and forward a recommendation to the full Board of Directors to adopt the proposed updates to Board Policy 5.02 – *Good Neighbor Policy* to clarify language and reflect current best practices.

SUMMARY

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (District) is committed to building and maintaining good relationships with all of its neighbors. The Board of Directors (Board) Policy 5.02 – *Good Neighbor Policy* – was first established in 1988 to provide guidelines and principles for ensuring good relationships between the District and its neighbors. For the purposes of this policy, neighbors are defined as residents and property owners located adjacent or close to a District preserve who may be affected by maintenance or visitor activities on the preserves. After experiencing pandemic disruptions and addressing other communications priorities, the District began an update to the Good Neighbor Policy in March 2023 starting with an initial review of the policy update implementation plan by the Legislative, Funding and Public Affairs Committee (LFPAC). The District continued the policy update work by completing an internal review of the policy language and soliciting input from neighbors. Based on the results of this work, the General Manager recommends forwarding the proposed policy updates (see Attachment 1) for Board consideration to further clarify the language and update the information to reflect current best practices and recent public input.

DISCUSSION

Originally enacted in 1988, the Good Neighbor Policy demonstrates the District's commitment to building and maintaining good relationships with all of its neighbors. The policy defines neighbors as residents and property owners located adjacent or close to a District preserve who may be affected by maintenance or visitor activities on the preserves. Note: the District maintains a separate Public Notification Policy (Board Policy 1.09) with notification and outreach procedures that pertain to the broader public, including larger community groups and neighborhoods that do not fall under the definition of a neighbor. The Good Neighbor Policy focuses on adjacent neighbors given the specific interests, concerns, and more direct effects that apply to residents who live in close proximity to preserves, trailheads, and parking areas.

With Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) approval of the District's Coastside Protection Program in 2004, the District's boundary expanded to include coastal San Mateo

County from the southern boundary of the city of Pacifica to the Santa Cruz County line. A specific condition of the LAFCo-approved Service Plan required the District to amend its Good Neighbor Policy to include the key Service Plan policies, guidelines and implementation actions that relate to the protection of privacy on adjoining private lands and public involvement in both policy development and the use and management decision-making process for District preserves. The latest proposed updates to the Good Neighbor Policy continue to meet these LAFCo requirements.

Internal Staff Review

A staff review of the Good Neighbor Policy first took place at the beginning of 2020 before the policy update process was put on hold due to the pandemic and other communications priorities. The internal staff review process was reinitiated in March 2023 after receiving LFPAC support for the proposed policy update implementation plan. The policy was sent to 26 staff members from Planning, Natural Resources, Visitors Services, Land and Facilities, Real Property, Public Affairs and Administrative Services departments to review the policy language for gaps and inconsistencies with current practice, as well as emerging issues, including:

- Diversity/Equity/Inclusion goals
- Public outreach gaps
- Post-COVID adjustments, such as hybrid and remote meetings
- Legal considerations
- Integration with other District policies

Staff review resulted in minor adjustments for clarity and to reflect current best practices as part of the first iteration of the draft policy update.

First Draft of the Proposed Policy Updates

The first iteration of the draft policy update focused on the District's commitments to building and supporting good relationships with its neighbors while balancing its objectives and remaining consistent with other relevant policy guidelines, including the Basic Policy. These proposed changes included:

- Removal of Policy Provision 9
 - Policy Provision 9 addresses public involvement in the development of a District Basic Policy for the Coastsides, which is currently being conducted by the General Manager's Office in a separate review process. As this provision is already being carried out, it is no longer necessary to identify as an action item in the Good Neighbor Policy.
- New District staff liaison under Policy Provision 10
- Updates to public meeting and outreach methods under Policy Provisions 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13 and Section 3
- Adjustment to the frequency in reviewing/updating the Good Neighbor Policy from annually to at least once every two years under Policy Provision 12
- Minor edits to wording, including integration of more inclusive and expansive language
- Text formatting

In August 2023, LFPAC reviewed and approved this first draft of the proposed policy updates and directed staff to begin public engagement.

Public Engagement

Staff began public engagement efforts to solicit feedback from neighbors and neighborhood groups in September 2023. A public survey was posted on the website in late September and remained open to public comment for 9 weeks until November 26, 2023. Staff conducted multiple public input opportunities, including:

- Project website with links to the draft policy and public survey, along with instructions that hard copies and public comment cards were available at the Administrative Office and field offices
- A virtual community meeting on November 14, 2023 via Zoom
- 3,149 postcards sent on October 16, 2023 to neighbors, neighborhood associations and tenants within 500 feet of a preserve boundary informing them of the open survey and community meeting
- Presentations to interested local homeowner associations, South Skyline Association and King's Mountain Association

Staff collected 42 responses to the survey, which walked participants through the proposed changes to each provision and requested feedback on each section as well as overall feedback on the policy as a whole. Survey participants expressed their interest in seeing the new Good Neighbor Policy updates prioritize the following issues:

Area of Interest	% of Participants
Neighbor relations , e.g., how the District seeks input from neighbors on proposed decisions; how the District engages with local organizations and other government bodies when necessary to ensure neighbor concerns are addressed.	60%
Public notifications and participation , e.g., how the District informs neighbors when something is happening on District-managed lands near them; how the District seeks input from local community members.	57%
Notification of land use and management , e.g., how the District manages open space lands to protect natural resources; how the District balances controlling nonnative vegetation and wildlife while minimizing impacts to native plants and animals; how the District strives to preserve viewsheds; how the District implements other resource management policies.	50%
Protection of privacy on adjoining private lands , e.g., how the District respects the rights of neighboring properties; how the District makes decisions about public access.	40%
Public representation , e.g., how neighbors can contact their elected ward representative; how neighbors can contact District staff; how neighbors can contact an ombudsperson when staff has been unable to assist with their concern.	24%
Policy development , e.g., how often this policy is reviewed; how policies are communicated.	17%
Diversity/Equity/Inclusion , e.g., how the District promotes the fair treatment and full participation of all neighbors.	14%
Something else	12%

Of the 14 questions that outlined the proposed changes to each provision in the public survey, 6 questions received a 90% or more 'yes' approval rating or 'no opinion on this change', 6

questions received an 85-89% ‘yes’ approval rating or ‘no opinion on this change’, and 2 questions received an 80-84% ‘yes’ approval rating or ‘no opinion on this change’.

Participants were given the opportunity to provide additional comments after each question and at the end of the survey. Key takeaways from the survey comments and input from the South Skyline Association and King’s Mountain Association meetings include the following:

- Desire for a staff liaison to address neighbor safety concerns such as fire, emergency evacuation, road and tree maintenance.
- Addition of a provision regarding the District’s commitment to maintaining its properties and boundary lines.
- Inclusion of neighborhood organizations in notifications processes.
- More and early communication on major preserve changes between the District and its neighbors.
- Concerns around safety during emergencies, including what the District is doing to prevent potential events.
- Concerns around how best to be heard by the District during key decision-making processes.

The District also received other comments not relevant to the Good Neighbor Policy. This input is recorded in Attachment 2 and includes comments pertaining to a desire for broad E-bike use of District trails, a desire to not expand and/or limit public access to District lands, challenges in obtaining permits for agricultural infrastructure improvements, the need for adequate parking to meet visitor demands and avoid impacts to neighborhoods roads, a desire to see expanded defensible space and fuel treatment work on District lands, a desire to see increased levels of effort on land management and natural resource stewardship work, and a desire for expanded dog access for neighbors.

The full results of the public outreach survey, including comments, are found in Attachment 2.

Final Draft of Proposed Policy Updates

After collection and analysis of the public engagement feedback, staff incorporated the following additions and changes into the draft policy update:

Feedback	Response
Desire for a staff liaison to address neighbor safety concerns such as fire, emergency evacuation, road and tree maintenance.	Name the Area Superintendents as liaisons in the policy and prominently provide their contract information in the public facing brochure/website.
Addition of a provision regarding the District’s commitment to maintaining its properties and boundary lines.	Identify and refer to the specific District policies that fulfill this need, including the Wildland Fire Resiliency Program and related website. Include invitation to participate in the District’s Defensible Space Permit Program and prominently provide this

	information in the public facing brochure/website.
Inclusion of neighborhood organizations in notifications processes.	Add ‘neighborhood organizations’ to the outreach and notification provisions in the policy. Refer also to the District’s notification policy (Board Policy 1.09).
More and early communication on major preserve changes between the District and its neighbors.	Add text in Provision 2 to hold neighborhood workshops or conduct other outreach prior to any major changes in use in the preserves. Refer also to the District’s notification policy (Board Policy 1.09).
Concerns around safety during emergencies, including what the District is doing to prevent potential events.	Provide a reference to the Wildland Fire Resiliency Program and website. Ensure Area Superintendent contact information is prominently accessible in the public facing brochure/website.
Concerns around how best to be heard by the District during key decision-making processes.	Explain steps on how to submit a board comment form, email comments via info@openspace.org , and/or request Ombudsperson involvement. Ensure staff liaison contacts (Area Superintendents and Conservation Grazing Manager) are prominently accessible.

The final draft (Attachment 1) incorporates the suggested changes from the public engagement process along with the original draft policy proposed in August 2023. Text boxes have been added to Attachment 1 to explain the proposed changes to the policy language. These text boxes are meant to be temporary and would be removed in the final Board-adopted copy.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

PRIOR BOARD AND COMMITTEE REVIEW

On March 28, 2023, LFPAC reviewed and expressed concurrence on the implementation plan to update the Good Neighbor Policy, which includes considerations for internal and external stakeholder review and public input ([R-23-37](#), [minutes](#)).

On August 29, 2023, LFPAC reviewed and approved the draft Good Neighbor Policy language and directed staff to begin the public outreach feedback process ([R-23-97](#), [minutes](#)).

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public notice was provided as required by the Brown Act.

CEQA COMPLIANCE

No compliance is required as this action is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

NEXT STEPS

If supported by LFPAC, the General Manager will direct staff to proceed with presenting the final draft of the Good Neighbor Policy to the full Board.

Attachment(s)

1. Board Policy 5.02 - Good Neighbor Policy – Redline Draft
2. Public Engagement Survey Results

Responsible Department Head:

Stefan Jaskulak, Chief Financial Officer/Acting Public Affairs Manager

Prepared by:

Natalie Jolly, Public Affairs Specialist II

Contact person:

Natalie Jolly, Public Affairs Specialist II

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

Board Policy Manual

Good Neighbor Policy	Policy 5.02 Chapter 5 – Historical/Cultural
Effective Date: 10/26/88	Revised Date:
Prior Versions: 10/26/88, 8/14/96, 9/26/07, 11/13/13	

Introduction

The Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (District) is committed to building and maintaining good relationships with all its *neighbors*¹. To demonstrate this commitment, the District’s Board of Directors adopted a Good Neighbor Policy in 1988.

~~Since the last revision to the District’s Good Neighbor Policy in 1996, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) approved the District’s Coastside Protection Program, in 2004, and expanded~~ In 2004, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) approved the District’s Coastside Protection Program, expanding the District’s boundary to include coastal San Mateo County from the southern boundary of the city of Pacifica to the Santa Cruz County line. This geographic area is called the *Coastside Protection Area*². In conjunction with LAFCo’s approval, the Board of Directors adopted a *Service Plan*³ for the Coastside Protection Program, which outlines the preservation and management services that will be provided by the District in the Coastside Protection Area. A specific condition of the LAFCo-approved Service Plan required the District to amend its Good Neighbor Policy to include the key Service Plan policies, guidelines and implementation actions which relate to the enjoyment of privacy on adjoining private lands and public involvement in policy development, as well as in the use and management decision-making process. This policy consists of ~~13~~ 12 policy provisions, which also meet the requirements of the Service Plan for the Coastside Protection Program and implement the specific LAFCo condition which the District’s Board adopted by Resolution No. 04-12 on May 26, 2004.

Minor edits to wording for accuracy, since the most recent revision to the policy (these latest revisions) no longer coincides with LAFCO approval of the Coastside Protection Program.

One provision has been removed since it no longer applies.

In Section 1 on the following pages ~~each of the 13 Service Plan and LAFCo provisions,~~

¹ Neighbor – Residents and property owners located adjacent or close to a District preserve who may be affected by maintenance or visitor activities on the preserves.

² Coastside Protection Area – Please see a map on the last page. The area extends from the southern border of the City of Pacifica southerly to the San Mateo/Santa Cruz County line and westerly from the existing District preserves along Hwy 35 (Skyline Blvd.).

³ Service Plan – The District’s plan for the Coastside Protection Program on the San Mateo County coast, which outlines preservation and management services that will be provided by the District.

each of the 12 policy provisions (shown in *italics*) includes an implementation guideline (shown in **bold**), which describes how the District will carry out each provision. ~~and which in some cases supplements the provision. (While the Good Neighbor Policy provisions apply District wide, some provisions were designated by LAFCo to apply to the coastside only. Where this is the case, the term "Coastside Protection Area only" has been added to the relevant implementation guide).~~ Unless specified otherwise, each Good Neighbor Policy provision applies Districtwide; only those that apply to the Coastside Protection Area are noted using the term "Coastside Protection Area only." ~~In addition,~~ Sections 2 and 3 of this policy ~~have a number of provisions~~ include additional provisions specific to (1) Land Purchase, Planning and Management and (2) Public Information, Education, and Outreach that are based on input given to the District by neighbors during a series of public meetings throughout the District.

Minor edits to wording, including integration of more inclusive and expansive language.

Purpose

The purpose of the Good Neighbor Policy is to establish guidelines and principles for ensuring good relationships between the District and its neighbors. In both the day-to-day conduct and in the long-range planning for public open space preserves, the District will make every effort to cooperate with neighbors, to take into account their perspectives, address their concerns, and engage and involve them in the process of making decisions regarding the public preserves.

~~GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY~~

Section 1: Public Participation and Privacy

Many of the provisions in this section discuss public participation and notification and explain how the District will provide opportunities for neighbors to participate in decisions which may affect neighboring private lands and how the District will seek to notify them of these opportunities. To the District, being a good neighbor is a public-private partnership.

Policy Provision 1

*The District shall institute appropriate forms of representation so that the District planning and decision-making **includes the input of all communities who share similar interests.** ~~R~~elating to the Coastside Protection Area, **this includes the input of Coastside residents.***

~~Implementation Guidelines 1~~

The District's Board of Directors voted on November 9, 2004 to approve a final redistricting plan and expand District Wards 6 and 7 to represent about 30,000 constituents in the Coastside Protection Area. In addition, the Board will

Minor edits to wording, including integration of more inclusive and expansive language.

publicly review District Ward boundaries after each official United States census and redistrict as necessary.

Policy Provision 2

The District shall establish advisory committees, neighborhood workshops, task forces or work groups as needed to develop or review specific policies or plans.

Implementation Guidelines 2

When planning for large-scale or complex projects, public input is particularly valuable. Advisory committees, task forces or work groups can help assist the District in developing specific policies or plans. The Board will take the lead in creating these groups and welcomes suggestions by the community on when and how to best form them. For major preserve public use changes anticipated to impact neighbors, the District will hold a workshop or outreach directly to preserve neighbors to address questions or concerns and establish clear lines of communication. Workshops with neighbors and the general public are a good way to discuss items of a controversial nature or significant changes in land-use or planning.

Language added from public outreach feedback to address the need for the District to come to the neighbors first before implementing major preserve changes.

Policy Provision 3

(Coastside Protection Area only)

To ensure that local viewpoints are considered in all significant District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastside Protection Area, the District shall consult with local elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations within the Coastside Protection Area including, but not limited to the Midcoast Community Council, Pescadero Municipal Advisory Council, Half Moon Bay City Council and their elected bodies.

Implementation Guidelines 3

The District will establish a database of elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations it will consult with on all significant planning and decision-making. Such consultations may occur through public notifications of meetings and workshops, written questionnaires or requests for comments.

Minor edits to more fully reflect current practice.

Minor edits to wording, including integration of more inclusive and expansive language.

Policy Provision 4

To further ensure recommendations representing local involvement are considered in District planning and decision-making relating to the Coastside Protection Area, the District shall directly notify community-interest groups, nonprofit land trusts, elected officials, neighborhood associations and other interested organizations about District Board meetings or other public meetings that involve subjects relating to the District's activities within the Coastside Protection Area of interest.

Language added to address public survey feedback to add neighborhoods organizations to outreach.

This includes notification to Coastside interest groups relating to the District’s activities within the Coastside Protection Area.

Implementation Guidelines 4

Participation by local citizens is of critical importance to the District. Therefore, the District will encourage citizen involvement by notifying neighboring property owners, neighborhood ~~associations~~ **organizations** and interested individuals of upcoming Board meetings, special meetings, or workshops as established in the District’s Public Notification Policy. The District ~~shall~~ **will** also use other methods of notification to provide opportunities for public input such as announcements required by law, press releases, the District’s **website**, e-mail, local newspapers, local bulletin boards, articles, print ads, **social media** and special mailings to interested individuals **or surrounding property owners/residents. Notifications are sent at a minimum 72 hours in advance of a meeting to each recipient. Efforts will be made to notify the public a minimum of one week in advance of a public meeting for agenda items of high public interest or that include action items of high significance to the community. For single-subject meetings of the full Board of Directors, or for meetings of standing Board committees for which the agendas are set well in advance, notices will be sent out to the public at least two weeks before the meetings, if possible.**

Edits to reflect current practice and/or requirements regarding public meeting notifications and outreach methods.

Policy Provision 5

In addition to adopted and legally required noticing, the District shall notify owners of contiguous properties about public meetings where property acquisitions ~~in the Coastside Protection Area~~ or any significant use or improvements proposed on District-owned lands ~~in the Coastside Protection Area~~ are considered that may affect adjacent neighbors. This includes notification to neighbors within the Coastside Protection Area.

Minor edits to wording, including integration of more inclusive and expansive language.

Implementation Guideline 5

For meetings where land purchases or land management agreements are being considered, the District will notify owners of adjacent properties and other affected neighbors **and neighborhood associations** in the vicinity (e.g., within the watershed or road corridor) of a proposed purchase or agreement.

Language added to address public survey feedback to add neighborhoods organizations to outreach.

The District will also notify owners of adjacent properties and other affected neighbors in the vicinity (e.g., within the watershed or road corridor) of District preserves when significant changes in use or improvements – those that have a potentially major effect on the area – are proposed on District-owned lands.

The District will send initial notifications via the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) using county-provided property ownership data. Initial notifications will request that interested recipients who would like to continue receiving future

Edits to reflect current practice regarding public meeting notifications and outreach methods.

notifications of the same subject matter contact the District to be added to the interested parties list. Email addresses will be requested to expedite and simplify future notifications. However, notifications sent by USPS will be provided if specifically requested by a member of the public.

Policy Provision 6

(Coastside Protection Area only)

*Because each land use management plan, policy update, acquisition project and significant capital improvement project is subject to full review by the District Board (Page 23 of Service Plan), meetings of the District Board and/or subcommittees on such matters concerning Coastside Protection Area territory shall be held in the Coastside Protection Area. **Holding at least one subcommittee and/or Board meeting in the Coastside Protection Area will satisfy this provision.***

Additional wording added for clarity.

~~Implementation Guideline 6~~

The Board of Directors and/or Board committees will hold at least one public meetings in the affected area of the District when they consider master plans and/or significant policies – which are those policies that could have a major or important effect on the area. In addition, most meetings held in the Board Chambers at the Administrative Office are held as hybrid meetings to allow virtual participation. For all meetings, the Board accepts written public comments from individuals, including those who are not able to attend the meeting.

Edits to reflect current practice and/or policies regarding public meetings.

Policy Provision 7

The District shall provide private property signs where appropriate and provide trail users information regarding private property boundaries and prohibit trespass to minimize public/private use conflicts and trespassing. The District shall clearly sign trails adjacent to active agriculture and provide trail users with information regarding property boundaries to minimize trespassing and conflicts with agricultural users.

~~Implementation Guideline 7~~

The District will install private property signs, where appropriate, and provide trail users with preserve maps and other information to help identify private property boundaries and help protect the privacy of District neighbors. To further inform trail users, where appropriate, the District will also post signs along trails adjacent to active agricultural land.

Policy Provision 8

(Coastside Protection Area only)

The following measures will be included in every future Use and Management Plan for parcels within the Coastside Protection Area:

- a. *In areas where trail routes are immediately adjacent to private property, fencing shall be employed as necessary to deter users from leaving the trail. Specific fence, gate and crossing designs will be determined in consultation with adjacent affected property owner(s) at the Use and Management Plan stage.*
- b. *All new trails/facilities ~~shall~~ will be sited away from the edges of new preserves to the greatest extent possible. All new trails/facilities will be designed to preserve existing vegetation within new preserves and at the property lines so that views of land uses in adjacent residential properties would be minimized.*
- c. *Trails shall be sited a minimum distance of 300 feet from occupied dwellings unless site-specific circumstances make this infeasible. Where a 300-foot setback is not feasible, trails shall be set back a minimum distance of 50 feet. Potential noise and privacy impacts must be evaluated for any subsequent District action and shall be reduced by berms, fencing, landscaping, and other feasible and compatible means, if necessary.*

Implementation Guideline 8

The District will consider neighbors’ concerns including the desire for privacy on properties that adjoin District lands, and assist with the prevention of unintentional trespass by preserve visitors through the following:

- i. **Evaluating potential noise and privacy impacts when planning trails and facilities adjacent to private property. Reducing potential noise or privacy impacts with berms, fencing, landscaping, and other feasible and compatible means, if possible.**
- ii. **Carefully conducting District business (such as performing maintenance or installing fencing) to avoid encroachment on adjacent private property. If a neighbor believes that the District is encroaching on adjacent private property, ~~he or she~~ they should notify the District as soon as possible.**
- iii. **Site new trails and facilities away from private property boundaries, to the extent possible, and design trails to preserve existing vegetation and to minimize views of adjacent residential properties’ land uses. An effort will be made to site new trails 300 feet from occupied dwellings on neighboring properties, to the extent feasible. If infeasible, the District will seek to maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet. Fencing or visual screens may be used by the District to prevent trespassing in rare cases when trails are located directly adjacent to private property.**

Policy Provision 9

~~(Coastside Protection Area only)~~

Policy Provision 9 addresses public involvement in the development of a District Basic Policy for the Coastside, which is currently being conducted by the General Manager’s Office in a separate review process. (Continued next page.)

~~Upon completion of the annexation process and with public involvement through local groups, the District shall conduct public hearings to develop its Basic Policies for the Coastsides Protection Area. These hearings shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: public participation; resource management; public access; recreational use; public safety; cultural resources; agricultural and timber production; interagency relationships; and public information.~~

As this provision is already being carried out, it is not longer necessary to identify it as an action item in the Good Neighbor Policy.

Implementation Guideline 9

~~Individuals, local groups and organizations will be consulted through a process that will involve public meetings and offer ample other opportunities, such as e-mail, to provide input concerning the development of Basic Policies specific to the Coastsides Protection Area.~~

Policy Provision 10 9

~~{Coastsides Protection Area only}~~

~~As noted in 6 above, the Board of Directors will hold public meetings in the Coastsides Protection Area, as necessary, when policy changes specifically affect the coast all proposed Coastsides Protection Area policies shall be considered by the full Board of Directors at public meetings held in the Coastsides Protection Area.~~

Removal of provision since already addressed in provision 6.

Implementation Guideline 10

~~The Board of Directors will hold public meetings in the Coastsides Protection Area, as necessary, when policy changes specifically affect the coast.~~

Policy Provision 9 10

~~{Coastsides Protection Area only}~~

~~A District staff liaisons will be assigned to the Coastsides Protection Area to work with local residents, property owners, government, and interest groups in developing recommendations to the District Board of Directors.~~

Implementation Guideline 11

~~The District's Planning Manager is the primary staff liaison to work with local residents, property owners, local elected officials, government agencies, and neighborhood and other interest groups in developing recommendations for the District's Board of Directors. When the Coastsides Protection Area was first integrated into the District, the Real Property Manager served as the primary liaison between local residents and the Board. Today, for agricultural topics, including leases and tenant communications, the Conservation Grazing Program Manager is the District's liaison and point of contact. The Skyline and Foothills Area superintendents serve as staff liaisons to address neighbor~~

Updated language regarding new District liaisons for specific topics.

Language added to clarify the different modes of public communication.

safety concerns such as fire, emergency evacuation, and road and tree maintenance. For other topics (public access projects, habitat restoration projects, grant opportunities, etc.), several senior staff members act as liaisons, working with local residents, property owners, local elected officials, government agencies, and neighborhood and other interest groups in developing recommendations for the Board and will be identified in future project-by-project notifications. In addition, the District has multiple means for residents to convey their concerns to the District and the Board: via phone, e-mail, public meeting comments or comments directly to their elected Board representative. Up-to-date contact information for staff liaisons and public communications are available in the Good Neighbor brochure.

Policy Provision 10~~1~~

The Legislative, ~~Finance~~Funding, and Public Affairs Committee, a Standing Committee of the Board, shall ~~at an annual public meeting~~ review the Good Neighbor Policy and its implementation and effectiveness *at least once every three years*. The Good Neighbor Policy shall be amended as necessary to ensure the best possible relationship between the District and its neighbors.

Adjustment to the frequency in reviewing/updating the Good Neighbor Policy from annually to at least once every three years.

~~Implementation Guideline 12~~

The District will review the Good Neighbor Policy **annually at least once every three years** at a public meeting of the District’s Legislative, Funding and Public Affairs Committee, ~~the location of which will be rotated among different sites in the District~~ **held in the Board Chambers at the Administrative Office as hybrid meetings to allow virtual participation**, to ensure its continued effectiveness and implementation. Based on input from the public, the Board will amend the Policy, as necessary, to ensure the best possible relationship between the District and its neighbors. Throughout the year, the District will also gather information and suggestions that neighbors provide to staff in person or send in via the **website**, e-mail or regular mail.

Edits to reflect current practice and/or policies regarding public meetings.

Policy Provision 11~~2~~

The District shall maintain a Good Neighbor Brochure and shall update it regularly and distribute it to property owners with land adjoining *newly formed* District Preserves (*new neighbors*) and otherwise make it available to other existing neighbors. The Brochure shall contain the following information:

- Emergency contact information for District and other agencies by nature of emergency (fire, flooding, medical, illegal activity, abandoned vehicles, etc.)
- District contact information for Conservation Grazing Program Manager, Skyline and Foothills Area superintendents as staff liaisons to neighbors.
- District contact for resource management (weed abatement, feral animal

- control, restoration and re-vegetation, etc.)*
- *District contact for fire and hazard prevention (fuel management, information regarding fire-safe practices, **defensible space**, fallen or hazardous trees, etc.)*
- *District contact for conflicts between neighbors and **pP** Preserve visitors (trespass, parking, noise, etc.)*
- *District contact for general questions regarding use and management of **pP** Preserves*
- *How to make a suggestion or file a complaint regarding use and management of District **pP** Preserves or the District's operation in general (phone, write, e-mail, in person)*
 - *Contact information for Ombudsperson*
 - *Management and Board of Directors contact information*
 - *Website **and email mailbox***
 - *Office hours and location*
 - *Board meeting dates and times*
- *Copy of the Good Neighbor Policies*

Minor updates to reflect new current practice and new topics of interest.

Implementation Guideline 13

The District will **maintain develop** and periodically update a Board-approved Good Neighbor Brochure, which will include all the items listed under Policy Provision **123** above, among others. At the **scheduled annual** public meeting to review the Good Neighbor policy, input on the brochure will also be solicited and the Board will be fully informed of constituents' recommendations. The Brochure will be made available to neighbors **as a hard copy and via the District's website.**

Minor updates to reflect new current practice.

Section 2: Land Purchase, Planning and Management

The District will encourage neighbors to provide input in the following ways:

1. For potential new land purchases or land transfers and management agreements, the District will notify adjoining property owners of Board and Board Committee meetings where issues such as access to the new property and changes to existing land uses will be discussed. For significant or **Coastside Protection Area** ~~coastside~~ purchases, the Real Property Committee will conduct public on-site meetings, which may occur on weekends.
2. The District will evaluate access to newly acquired land by neighbors on a case-by-case basis to ensure public safety and determine whether access is compatible with District ordinances and low-impact recreation. To the extent feasible **and in accordance with District policies**, the District will consider continuing access through a permit system managed by the District.

3. In managing District preserves, to the extent possible, the District will follow Board-adopted Resource Management Policies, which include but are not limited to:
 - a. Control nonnative vegetation and wildlife animals and initiate cooperative efforts with neighbors to control non-natives vegetation and wildlife on lands adjacent to District preserves using integrated pest management (IPM) as outlined in the District’s IPM Program.
 - b. Minimize the impact on native plants and animals when removing invasives by following the best management practices as outlined by the District’s IPM Program.
 - c. Consider neighbors’ desire to preserve the natural landscape viewshed.
 - d. Cooperate with local and state fire officials on emergency response and fire prevention.
 - ~~e. Implement its resource management policies.~~

4. The District appoints the Skyline and Foothills Area superintendents as staff liaisons to address neighbor safety concerns such as fire, emergency evacuation, and road and tree maintenance.

Minor edits to better capture District policy areas of interest.

Language added from public outreach survey feedback to appoint staff liaisons for neighbor concerns.

Section 3: Public Information, Education and Outreach

District staff will provide information to educate neighbors about the District, its mission, events and activities. Interaction with neighbors through outreach is one way to provide services to them. The following provisions will guide the District’s public education and outreach to neighbors:

1. Following close of escrow of land purchased, the District will acquaint new neighbors with policies and ordinances by providing each adjacent property owner with a letter of introduction, ~~and a copy~~ of the District’s ~~Basic Policies~~ and Good Neighbor Policy brochures and District ordinances.

2. Generally represent the District in the community by attending local community meetings and contacting neighbors and neighborhood organizations on relevant issues, as appropriate.

3. Provide information through a variety of means, such as the District’s website ~~Web site~~, social media, e-mail, ~~quarterly~~ newsletters, and signboards, among others. Encourage neighbors to opt-in to receive specific interested party notifications.

4. Make reasonable efforts to address and resolve situations that may arise between neighbors and the District. The District may also respond to specific neighborhood concerns by holding office and/or site meetings, as needed.

5. The Board has appointed an ~~Oe~~mbudsperson(s) to assist the public with their

Language added to address public survey feedback to add neighborhoods organizations to outreach.

Updates to public meeting and outreach methods.

interactions with the District and **when staff has been unable to successfully address constituent concerns** to facilitate the resolution of conflicts. The Ombudsperson works independently and objectively to assist in maintaining positive relations with District residents and neighbors. Contact information for the ombudsperson is listed in the Good Neighbor brochure **and on the District website.**

Other Relevant District Policies

Below is a list of specific policies approved by the Board of Directors that provide additional direction on many aspects of District business and complement the Good Neighbor Policy:

1. The existing Basic Policy provides public information about the mission, purpose, strategic direction, and major elements of the District's operations.
2. The Public Notification Policy ensures that reasonable and timely efforts are made to notify surrounding landowners and interested members of the public of District activities.
3. Land Acquisition Policies and Procedures offer information about land purchases. This also includes the restrictive policy under which the District may use eminent domain to purchase private land at fair market value. Eminent domain in the Coastside Protection area has been permanently removed as a District power by California state law under an agreement with the San Mateo County Farm Bureau.
4. Resource Management Policies establish techniques to restore the natural environment and define the practices to protect and manage resources including managing vegetation, encouraging native plants, controlling non-native plants and animals, agricultural practices, and use of fire as a land management tool.
5. Use and Management Planning Process is a public process to develop use and management policies for District lands to protect the natural environment and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education.
- ~~6. The District is developing an Encroachment Policy. This policy will educate District neighbors and users of open space areas about activities that are not allowed on District land, or allowed only by permit. The policy's goal is to protect public lands from encroachment. Examples of encroachments are a fence or trail that has been placed on District lands without permission.~~
6. The policies for Road Maintenance Agreements describe the parameters under which the District will enter into road agreements, including cost-sharing and

Language is out of date.

other arrangements.

~~In the near future the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District will develop or amend a number of public policies and policy documents. For example, the District's Public Notification Policy and its Basic Policy will both be revised and a set of Basic Policies will be developed for the San Mateo County coastside.~~

Legal Note

The purpose of this Policy is to promote good relationships with the District's neighbors by providing guidance to the District and to the public on how to best build and maintain positive relationships. This Policy represents the District's commitment to the principles contained in it. Government agencies like the District are subject to many legal requirements in carrying out its mission. It's not the purpose of this Policy to adopt new legal requirements but rather to supplement what the law already requires with a set of additional standards to which the District is publicly committed. No action taken by the District will be invalid merely for a failure to comply with this Policy.

Removing unnecessary temporal language. Also, the District is the process of updating the Basic Policy at this time.

**Good Neighbor
Public Engagement Survey Results**

1. Which category of items are you most interested in the Good Neighbor Policy addressing?

Neighbor relations , e.g., how we seek input from neighbors on proposed decisions; how we engage with local organizations and other local government bodies when necessary to ensure we are addressing neighbor concerns.	25/42=60%
Public notifications and participation , e.g., how we tell you when something is happening on Midpen-managed lands near you; how we seek input from local community members.	24/42=57%
Land use and management , e.g., how we manage open space lands to protect natural resources; how we balance controlling nonnative vegetation and wildlife while minimizing impacts to native plants and animals; how we strive to preserve viewsheds; how we implement other resource management policies.	21/42=50%
Protection of privacy on adjoining private lands , e.g., how we respect the rights of neighboring properties; how we make decisions about public access.	17/42=40%
Public representation , e.g., how to contact your elected ward representative; how to contact District staff; how to contact an ombudsperson when staff has been unable to assist with your concern.	10/42=24%
Policy development , e.g., how often this policy is reviewed; how policies are communicated.	7/42= 17%
Diversity/Equity/Inclusion , e.g., how we promote the fair treatment and full participation of all neighbors.	6/42 = 14%
Something else? Please explain in the question 2 comment box.	5/42= 12%

If you answered "other" above, please explain:

- Midpen is a terrible neighbor who has hundreds of miles in trails and thousands of acres of land and they refuse to share any of that with the public on ebikes except for a very very very limited portion of their land. I live next door to Midpen and they are my worst neighbor.
- In the neighbor relations category there needs to be more direct involvement with neighbor concerns and that needs to be part of the document. For example, fixing roads, fire abatement procedures near neighbors homes, allowing access through gates (keys, codes) in case of evacuations, having a policy of cutting/limbing open space trees that are threatening neighbors structures. Currently the policy is all about neighbors can help Midpen get your projects approved. There is nothing about how you can be a good neighbor to the folks bordering open space. Having plans for the above, or at least a point person who can make immediate decisions to help neighbors would be invaluable.
- allow eMTBs on the trails like many other counties do
- As a neighbor to open space I am less interested in future planning than I am in ongoing maintenance and addressing problems that arise, especially concerning fire issues. Nothing in the good neighbor policy seems to address issues like fuel load, emergency evacuation routes through open space lands, theft in parking lots, or issues of that nature. Don't get me wrong - I love Open Space!
- To end the expansion of public access to these delicate areas. Not only is it unhealthy for the land in question, but it drastically reduces the quality of life for all those neighboring these areas. Of note is

the increased traffic congestions & accidents, litter, fires, missing persons, and public safety in general. We need to protect our environment where we live, and have invested in. We already pay much more than others with our Scenic Highway Classifications, and Code restrictions. Please, let's not invite failure & ruin.

- Parking and entrance and exits to trails. The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered.
- The policy mainly addresses planning and another aspect of being a good neighbor, which involves ongoing issues that come up, such as gate access in emergency evacuations, fuel load because of wildfires, tree maintenance, car thefts and items of that nature.

2. The Introduction section sets forth the purpose of the policy and provides context regarding the policy development and resulting structure of the policy document. Substantive proposed changes to the introduction section include clarifying which policy provisions apply across the District and which apply only to the Coastside Protection Area. Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	18
No	8
No opinion on this change	18

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- This is a difficult to follow questionnaire. Why not just ask people what would make you a better neighbor to them.
- With more close in lands being donated/turned over to Midpen, you should emphasis protecting all adjacent private properties to assure that Midpen's development does not impact the neighbors, like preventing parking in private streets to access Midpen lands, use of private trails adjacent to Midpen lands, and limiting access by erecting physical gates and barriers to protect private adjacent properties.
- I am not a coastside resident, but I want to be informed as to changes there as well as inland.
- The major needs of your neighbors are: fire abatement, emergency access to roads for evacuation, road maintenance, and protection of homes that border open space (ie trees down, land slides). Most of this document is notifying the public of what open space is doing/wanting and soliciting our feedback for what open space is wanting. There needs to be some thought into how Midpen can be a good neighbor, not how we can be good neighbors. The document reads like the latter.
- Section 5 states that after an initial USPS notification, residents are required to opt in to get future communications. This should be revised to "opt out". It is very easy to miss the USPS postcards and it should be assumed that neighbors want and need the information unless they indicate that they do not.
- The area is gaining in "over crowded" issues. As mentioned above, litter, fire, public safety ,and traffic safety are of huge consequence. We need to dissuade public use in this delicate environment. On top of this, we are practically inviting the poisoning of local reserviors with increased public use.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

3. Section 1 of the policy covers 12 policy provisions (noted in italics) that meet the requirements of the Coastsides Protection Area Service Plan and an implementation guideline (noted in bold) for each that describes how the District will carry out that provision. Minor edits to Policy Provision 1, noted in red below, integrate more inclusive and expansive language:

The District shall institute appropriate forms of representation so that the District planning and decision-making includes the input of all communities who share similar interests. Relating to the Coastsides Protection Area, this includes the input of Coastsides residents.

There are no proposed changes to Provision 2, which declares the District will establish advisory committees, task forces or work groups as needed.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	25
No	5
No opinion on this change	12

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- Why only Coastsides residents, what about Peninsula residents adjacent to Midpen Peninsula lands?
- I am a rancher on the coast. All we have is breeding stock cattle. In the drought our stock ponds almost went dry. I applied to drill an ag well for the cattle. I still haven't gotten a permit. The regulation attempts to limit development make plain old cattle business almost impossible. We need the cooperation of OpenSpace to help us keep our spaces open and functioning. None of us want a coastsides of unkept weeds and fire hazards.
- We need to recognize the banning of public use to more of these areas.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that requires a coordinated consensus from start to finish.
- It meets the needs assuming that the input does not require huge barriers to entry. For example, even the meeting that was offered on Nov. 14 wouldn't post the Zoom link until an hour before the meeting and then you have to go to the MidPen website to even find the link. Although this isn't necessarily meant to be a hurdle, it sure does not feel very inclusive or neighborly.

4. Section 1, Provision 3 sets forth how the District will consult with local elected officials, government agencies and government-sponsored organizations within the Coastside Protection Area. A proposed change to the implementation guideline, noted below in red, includes additional methods of consultation:

*The District will establish a database of elected officials, government agencies, and government-sponsored organizations it will consult with on all significant planning and decision-making. Such consultations may occur through **public notifications of meetings and workshops**, written questionnaires or requests for comments.*

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	29
No	6
No opinion on this change	7

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- who has access to the data base
- You need to add in HOAs into the consultation process, they are state of California regulated bodies and speak for their property owners.
- you need to work with local agriculture not just government agencies that are sometimes part of the problem
- We need a way to get immediate and thoughtful decisions about things like trees, cutting vegetation, mowing roads, key access to gates.
- please learn how to build a survey. I answered "yes" so this conditional text field is not needed.
- Because they are changes of the worse. Scientists, not politicians should be consulted here.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.
- Yes, but see notes above about how to make the meetings and workshops easier to access. We do appreciate the outreach to different communities and the MidPen responsiveness to attend local association meetings.

5. Section 1, Provision 4 outlines how the District notifies nongovernmental groups of items of interest regarding District planning and decision-making. The proposed edit to the policy, noted in red below, removes Coastside-specific language to expand the policy provision to cover the entire District:

*To further ensure recommendations representing local involvement are considered in District planning and decision-making, the District shall directly notify community-interest groups, nonprofit land trusts, elected officials, and other interested organizations about District Board meetings or other public meetings that involve subjects **of interest. This includes notification to Coastside interest groups relating to the District's activities within the Coastside Protection Area.***

A proposed change to the implementation guideline for this provision expands the communication methods used to match current practices and to commit to a minimum advance notice, as noted in red below:

Participation by local citizens is of critical importance to the District. Therefore, the District will encourage citizen involvement by notifying neighboring property owners, neighborhood organizations and interested individuals of upcoming Board meetings, special meetings, or workshops as established in the District's Public Notification Policy. The District **will** also use other methods of notification to provide opportunities for public input such as announcements required by law, press releases, the District's **website**, e-mail, local newspapers, local bulletin boards, articles, print ads, **social media** and special mailings to interested individuals **or surrounding property owners/residents. Notifications are sent at a minimum 72 hours in advance of a meeting to each recipient.** Efforts will be made to notify the public a minimum of one week in advance of a public meeting **for agenda items of high public interest or that include action items of high significance to the community.**

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	31
No	6
No opinion on this change	5

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- could be better
- Please specifically add in HOAs into the notification and consultation process, they are state of California regulated bodies and speak for their property owners.
- one week? are you kidding me. we need to plan ahead a month of more.
- See above....
- please learn how to build a survey. I answered "yes" so this conditional text field is not needed.

- Issues related to fire risk and wildfire mitigation should be disseminated beyond adjacent property owners to include entire neighborhoods or towns that are potentially at risk for fire in a mid-pen open space.
- 72 hours and 1 week are not very long lead times for 'high significance' action items, I suggest a two week lead time to the public, and notification time. Then a 48 hour in advance reminder for the interested individuals and surrounding property owners/residents.
- Just like any & most all politically motivated changes, they are usually in motion by the time the public is notified. A strict ban on access and use of this land will permanently avoid further damage.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

6. Section 1, Provision 5 outlines the additional measures the District will take to notify owners of contiguous properties about public meetings where property acquisitions or any significant use or improvements proposed on District-owned lands are considered. A proposed edit to the policy removes Coastside-specific language to expand the policy provision to cover the entire District. The addition to the implementation guideline, noted in red below, updates the current practice of using email notifications:

The District will send initial notifications via the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) using county-provided property ownership data. Initial notifications will request that interested recipients who would like to continue receiving future notifications of the same subject matter contact the District to be added to the interested parties list. Email addresses will be requested to expedite and simplify future notifications. However, notifications sent by USPS will be provided if specifically requested by a member of the public.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	33
No	6
No opinion on this change	3

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- Again, you need to add in HOAs as only notifying adjacent property owners will miss HOA association land, that is not an individual property owners, but the HOA holds the property for the owners and its Board will need to be notified..
- ou need to give much more time an warning than those outlined. and you need to proactively contact near by, not just adjacent, landowners
- The USPS is an unreliable carrier.
- please learn how to build a survey. I answered "yes" so this conditional text field is not needed.
- Section 5 states that after an initial USPS notification, neighbors are required to opt-in to receive further communications. This should be revised to opt-out. The little USPS postcards are very easy to miss and it should be assumed that neighbors want this information unless they indicate otherwise. Let’s operate transparently.
- This is all a waste. See the above solutions to curtail all of this turmoil.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

7. A proposed change to Section 1, Policy Provision 6, noted in red below, clarifies the District's commitment to hold at least one subcommittee and/or Board meeting on the Coastsides when land use management plans, policy updates, acquisitions or significant capital improvement projects in the Coastsides Protection Area are considered:

*Because each land use management plan, policy update, acquisition project and significant capital improvement project is subject to full review by the District Board (Page 23 of Service Plan), meetings of the District Board and/or subcommittees on such matters concerning Coastsides Protection Area territory shall be held in the Coastsides Protection Area. **Holding at least one subcommittee and/or Board meeting in the Coastsides Protection Area will satisfy this provision.***

A proposed change to the implementation guideline reflects the current practice of holding hybrid meetings, as noted in red below:

The Board of Directors and/or Board committees will hold public meetings in the affected area of the District when they consider master plans and/or significant policies – which are those policies that could have a major or important effect on the area. **In addition, most meetings held in the Board Chambers at the Administrative Office are held as hybrid meetings to allow virtual participation. For all meetings, the Board accepts written public comments from individuals, including those who are not able to attend the meeting.**

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	26
No	4
No opinion on this change	12

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- One meeting and sub committee meeting? come on. you need to come to the coast and have meetings here much more often.
- what is a 'significant capital improvement'. Is there money for maintenance of land. Seems like there is little to nothing done to maintain the properties and that threatens the neighbors (ie cutting vegetation back near homes and maintaining access roads for exit in emergencies).
- please learn how to build a survey. I answered "no opinion" so this conditional text field is not needed.
- See above. It doesn't matter how or when YOU decide to inform us of your plans to ruin our environment. Simply prohibit any & all public access to these areas. It is only a massive waste of money, and ruins the area, and invites problems with too much human traffic in all aspects.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties

will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

8. There are no changes proposed for Section 1, Provision 7 regarding private property boundaries; and no substantive changes proposed for Provision 8 regarding measures for planning trails in the Coastside Protection Area. The deletion of Provision 9, which addressed public involvement in the development of a District Basic Policy for the Coastside, is proposed because it is underway as a separate update to the Basic Policies and no longer needs to be included in the Good Neighbor Policy.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	20
No	2
No opinion on this change	20

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- Property boundaries should also consider signs regarding parking in neighborhood areas. Adequate parking needs to be provided at open space areas.
- how can we say YES or NO to Provision 9 when its not listed here?
- shaking my head at the stupidity of this conditional field. Seriously
- See previous responses.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

9. The next provision in Section 1 is renumbered from Provision 10 to Provision 9 to reflect the deletion mentioned above. It reiterates the commitment to hold meetings in the Coastsides Protection Area with the clarification of language noted in red below and the deletion of repetitive implementation guideline:

As noted in 6 above, the Board of Directors will hold public meetings in the Coastsides Protection Area, as necessary, when policy changes specifically affect the coast.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	24
No	4
No opinion on this change	14

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- Why just Coast lands and not peninsula lands too?
- Even residents not living on the coast should be informed and invited to these meetings.
- How are smaller decisions made?
- oh, also not happy that the survey keeps popping up an additional question after answering the last. You are moving the goalpost. Again, get someone who knows how to build a simple survey.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.
- Coastsiders may have a different perspective.

10. Section 1, Provision 11, regarding staff liaison assignments is unchanged other than renumbering it to 10 to reflect the noted deletion. Changes to the accompanying implementation guideline, noted in red below, are proposed to provide clarity and modes of public communication:

When the Coastside Protection Area was first integrated into the District, the Real Property Manager served as the primary liaison between local residents and the Board. Today, for agricultural topics, including leases and tenant communications, the Conservation Grazing Program Manager is the District’s liaison and point of contact. For other topics (public access projects, habitat restoration projects, grant opportunities, etc.), several senior staff members act as liaisons, working with local residents, property owners, local elected officials, government agencies, and neighborhood and other interest groups in developing recommendations for the Board. In addition, the District has multiple means for residents to convey their concerns to the District and the Board: via phone, e-mail, public meeting comments or comments directly to their elected Board representative.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	22
No	7
No opinion on this change	13

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- Again add in HOAs
- The liaison needs to be more present and needs to have power to make small changes (like cutting trees that affect neighbors structure). It's hard to get anything done if we have to go to board meetings to get approval for projects. If there is a liaison that can make these decisions, then the neighbors would love to speak with them, interact with them, have their phone numbers/emails.
- This should be expanded to note where a member of the public can find the appropriate liaison information.
- Playing god to this land is NOT the answer.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.
- It does meet my neighbor's needs if I can easily find out who I am supposed to reach out to as opposed to a generic email.

11. A proposed change to Section 1, Provision 12 rennumbers the provision to 11 and adjusts the frequency of reviewing the Good Neighbor Policy from annually to at least once every two years. A change to the implementation guideline allows the gathering of information and suggestions online via the website in addition to email or regular mail.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	26
No	3
No opinion on this change	13

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- I'd keep it annually
- NO, limiting the frequency only exposed the corruption that is being hidden. A permanent ban of the use of these lands would expel any & all of this corruption, and power mongering.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

12. Section 1, Provision 13, now renumbered to 12, commits the District to maintaining the Good Neighbor Policy and other relevant policy information in a brochure that is available to District neighbors. To better reflect modern communication practices and topics of interest, the proposed changes to the policy provision and implementation guideline clarify that the brochure will be distributed to neighbors of newly formed preserves and made available to other existing neighbors. It also adds a defensible space contact to the list of information to be contained in the brochure.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	31
No	5
No opinion on this change	6

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- In the world today, please add in that Midpen will make the "brochure" in downloadable format too, we don't need more paper send around, as an idea, just state it's available in your newsletter or emails and let interested parties request a paper copy.
- I would like to see the defensible space contact and I would like to see MidPen do more with defensible space. Again, maintenance is important and needs to be priority.
- Producing brochures seems like a poor use of time and energy. A letter with specific details and actions is more likely to be read. Brochures are usually vague and general.
- See above
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.
- Defensible space is a huge issue.

13. Section 2 of the policy encourages neighbors to provide input on District land purchase, planning and management. Proposed substantive changes to this section include clarification of the intent to follow other District policies when considering allowing neighbors to access newly acquired land and to update the language regarding resource management policies, as noted in red below:

In managing District preserves, to the extent possible, the District will follow Board adopted Resource Management Policies, which include but are not limited to:

- a. Control vegetation and wildlife and initiate cooperative efforts with neighbors to control non-native vegetation and wildlife on lands adjacent to District preserves using integrated pest management (IPM) as outlined in the District's IPM Program.*
- b. Minimize the impact on native plants and animals when removing invasives by following the best management practices as outlined by the District's IPM Program.*
- c. Consider neighbors' desire to preserve the natural landscape viewshed.*
- d. Cooperate with local and state fire officials on emergency response and fire prevention.*

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	30
No	8
No opinion on this change	4

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- I would like a provision regarding providing adequate parking for the area. Busy days should not necessitate people parking all over the road and on neighbor streets.
- add e. Minimize all access to adjacent lands by Midpen visitors to Midpen lands, unless adjacent lands are county, state or federally owned and access is already granted to the public.
- There need to be provisions for maintaining preserves in a fire-safe way. We can do all we want to our property bordering Teague, but since the preserve is a total nightmare in terms of combustible fuel, there's little hope for our homes if the wind is coming from Teague's direction. It's a fire waiting to happen and emails to your office have been unanswered.
- Not just cooperate with local officials - actually come up with a plan yourself. I want to see that plan.
- There needs to be a much more proactive stance with regard to emergency response and fire prevention, 'cooperation' is not enough. Just as there are specific comments re: IPM, there should be specific guidelines in place for fire prevention, defensible space, fuel load reduction and emergency response.
- Just the very mention of the "managing district" and "Board adopted Resource Management Policies" in control of vegetation and wildlife are not acceptable. Again, playing god here is not your job. Prohibit the use of these areas, and let nature take its' course.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to

neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

- How do we make sure that MidPen is actually mainting the openspace vs just purchasing it. There is so much to be done.

14. Section 3 of the policy outlines the District's commitment to provide information to educate neighbors about the District, its mission, events and activities. Proposed changes include updates to reflect current practices and modern communication channels, as noted in red below:

*1. Following close of escrow of land purchased, the District will acquaint new neighbors with policies and ordinances by providing each adjacent property owner with a letter of introduction, **copies of the District's Basic Policies and Good Neighbor Policy brochures and District ordinances.***

*3. Provide information through a variety of means, such as the District's **website, social media, e-mail, newsletters, and signboards, among others. Encourage neighbors to opt-in to receive specific interested party notifications.***

*5. The Board has appointed an **Ombudsperson(s)** to assist the public with their interactions with the District and **when staff has been unable to successfully address constituent concerns to facilitate the resolution of conflicts. The Ombudsperson works independently and objectively to assist in maintaining positive relations with District residents and neighbors. Contact information for the ombudsperson is listed in the Good Neighbor brochure and on the District website.***

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	30
No	3
No opinion on this change	9

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- I've lived bordering Teague for 23 years and don't recall a single reach-out from your office until this survey--so, the effort has been sorely lacking to date.
- So you will "provide information"? The only information needed is the relief that these lands will not be used by the public.
- The word "consider" is taken very lightly and the neighbors have no recall if their input is not implemented. This document needs to include how actions of Mid-Pen that are of great concern to neighbors will be actually be addressed and not just considered. Only owners of adjacent properties will be notified of actions, when increased use policies impact the entire King's Mountain community. Parking and trail use, including crossing Skyline is very impactful and has not been adequately resolved. Most of the issues are said to be another agency's issue. This is not acceptable when Mid-Pen starts a project that require a coordinated consensus from start to finish.

15. The final section lists Other Relevant District Policies that complement the Good Neighbor Policy. Proposed changes removes outdated language regarding an encroachment policy and plans to review other policies.

Do these changes accurately reflect your needs as a Midpen neighbor?

Yes	21
No	2
No opinion on this change	19

If this proposed change does not meet your needs as a neighbor, why not? What would meet your needs?

Comments:

- allow ebikes
- How can I answer Other Relevant District Policies when its not listed?
- no opinion
- We need more help from you. While I appreciate the soliciting input for your projects, you need to be more proactive in being a good neighbor. Currently, there are blocks to even getting escape routes in the event of an emergency. We all have wire cutters to get through the gate. Be better to have keys or a code - that is just one example. You need to help with the access roads for emergency. It would protect you as well, because I can imagine a scenario were there is an emergency and your roads are blocked and people get hurt because of it.
- Policies, changes, and encroachment are all back talk. It appears that you are only trying to justify your job with this useless organization.

16. If there are additional comments you would like to provide, please enter them here.

- Why do you need name and email.
- As a reside of Brittan Heights Condominium Association in San Carlos, adjacent to Pulgas Ridge Open Space Preserve, one of my primary concerns is fire prevention and suppression within the Preserve. The entire area of San Carlos above Alameda de las Pulgas is designated as a high risk fire area, making fire prevention/suppression essential.
- More openness to making arrangements with neighbors for limited on-leash dog access to preserves (perhaps with an annual paid neighbor permit?) - e.g. access to a short piece of the School Road area of Long Ridge would enable a five mile loop mostly on Portola Heights private land which is currently not possible because LR causes a break.
- The fact that you needed to download the Policy from your website to acculturate answer these questions, makes the survey suspect (like Q29.
- No
- See above about the need to maintain preserves so they are not just open spaces full of kindling ready to spark the next fire.
- I would love to have a liaison who really works with the neighbors to keep us safe. It makes no sense for me to spend money fire abating if open space does nothing.
- I started skipping questions because the survey continued to get longer but each additional question was "required". Ugh
- Thank you for the opportunity for feedback and your presentation to the KMA. While there were some vigorous ideas voiced by another KM resident about fire and tree "danger" from the preserves, I would like to share that my husband and I do NOT feel this way. We love and value the natural ecosystems and trees that surround our property (the Purisima Creek preserve borders three sides of our house). We do NOT wish for the OSP to undertake cutting, trimming, and natural habitat alteration. We do not live in fear of the trees. While there are risks being in a natural environment (anywhere on the planet), we consider it our responsibility on our own property to maintain proper construction and defensible space. I wanted to share our perspective with you so there was not a distortion in the OSP perception of community views. It is our hope that you can focus on maintaining and expanding the natural, vibrant ecosystems in our area -- not altering them as a reaction to the fire fear that has affected some in CA.
- The Good Neighbor policy really needs to include fire response, fuel load reduction and emergency evacuation guidelines and clear policies which outline appropriate and those needed management practices, frequency, timing, etc. These should be put in place in existing open space as owned by Mid Pen and should be required to be included in any new acquisition plan.
- Please stop the attraction of the masses to our delicate areas.
- Thank the public affairs division for offering and presenting to our local community. Over the years, it does feel like everything requires further studies and more funds for consultants, maybe that is just a govt agency.