



## Other Options and Iterations – Level of Support Scores March 5, 2020

As homework from their February 6, 2020 meeting, voting members of the PAWG were asked to provide scores to indicate their level of support for Other Options and Iterations, which are organized by site. These other options and iterations offer different ways to provide access and meet project goals such as providing permit only access, holding docent-led activities, or spreading out amenities or uses over multiple locations rather than locating them all at one site.

Per the PAWG’s Rules and Procedures, scores 1 – 4 indicate support while scores 5 – 6 indicate no support. A majority is reached when at least 6 of the 11 voting members either support or do not support an option. These are highlighted in the table as gray cells.

The options and iterations include:

- Permit access only
- Docent-led activities
- Distribution of uses
  - Education/interpretation
  - Family/picnic
  - Restrooms
  - Equestrian access
  - Dog access

The sites under consideration are:

- A. Event Center
- B1. Sears Ranch Road Parking Area – Expansion of Existing Lot
- B2. Sears Ranch Road Parking Area – Site West of Existing Parking Area
- B3. Preserve Gate LH15
- C1. Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area (1 mile from the existing lot)
- C2. Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral – Former Residence Area (1 mile from the existing lot)
- D. Preserve Gate LH07 (West Access Gate)
- E1. Red Barn – Area Behind Ranger Residence
- E2. Red Barn – Area West and Down Slope from Red Barn
- E3. Red Barn – Shed Area below Ranger Residence
- E4. Red Barn – Area North and Adjacent to Ranger Residence

Following is a summary table indicating the majority support or no support status for each Option and Iteration when compared to each Site. This is followed by tables showing scores for each site and by PAWG members’ score sheets.

**Level of Support Summary for Other Options and Iterations**

<b>Option or Iteration</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B1</b>	<b>B2</b>	<b>B3</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>C2</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E1</b>	<b>E2</b>	<b>E3</b>	<b>E4</b>
Permit only	✓				✗	✗	✓			✓	
Docent led hikes	✓						✓	✗	✗	✓	
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/ Interpretation</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Distribution of Use: <i>Picnic/family</i>	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓			
Distribution of Use: <i>Restrooms</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				
Distribution of Use: <i>Equestrian</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			✗	✗		✗	
Distribution of Use: <i>Dog access</i>	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	

Legend:

- ✓ Majority supportive
- ✗ Majority not supportive

Blank indicates that options was not applicable or there was insufficient data

<b>A – Event Center</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	1	1	1		1	1	4
<b>Heinrich</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
<b>Lusebrink</b>	1	4	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Moazed</b>	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
<b>Moore</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Phillips</b>	2	2	1	3	1	1	6
<b>Reed</b>	3	1	1	3	1	1	3
<b>Sommer</b>	1	1	4	3	3	1	2
<b>Wool</b>	6*						
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	9	9	9	8	9	9	8
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	2	2	3	2	2	2

\* Willie Wool voted 1 on permits but stated in her comments that it is "too far away." The District changed her score to 6 to be consistent with her other responses and notified her.

<b>B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	4		3		1	5	1
<b>Heinrich</b>			1	1	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>			1	3	1	3	1
<b>Lusebrink</b>	1	5	2	3	1	1	1
<b>Moazed</b>			1	1	1	2	2
<b>Moore</b>			1	1	6	6	1
<b>Phillips</b>		2	2	2	1	1	1
<b>Reed</b>			4	4		3	1
<b>Sommer</b>			4	4	1	4	2
<b>Wool</b>	6	6	3	6	3	3	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	2	1	10	8	8	8	9
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	1	2	0	1	1	2	1
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	8	8	1	2	2	1	1

<b>B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	2		3		1	3	4
<b>Heinrich</b>			1	1	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>			1	3	1	1	1
<b>Lusebrink</b>	5	5	5	5	1	4	3
<b>Moazed</b>			1	1	1	1	2
<b>Moore</b>	1			1	6	1	1
<b>Phillips</b>		2	2	2	1	2	1
<b>Reed</b>			4	5		5	1
<b>Sommer</b>			4	3	1	3	2
<b>Wool</b>	6	6	3	4	3	1	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	2	1	8	7	8	9	9
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	2	2	1	2	1	1	1
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	7	8	2	2	2	1	1

<b>B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Preserve Gate LH15</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	5		4		1	6	6
<b>Heinrich</b>	1		1	1	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	6		6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	3	5	4	5	1	1	1
<b>Moazed</b>	2		1	3	1	1	2
<b>Moore</b>	6		6	6		6	6
<b>Phillips</b>	2	2	3	3	1	2	1
<b>Reed</b>	6		4	5		3	1
<b>Sommer</b>	1		4	6	1	1	2
<b>Wool</b>	6	6	3	6	3	1	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	5	1	8	3	7	7	6
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	5	2	2	6	1	3	4
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	8	1	2	3	1	1

<b>C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	2		1		6	2	4
<b>Heinrich</b>	4		2	1	1	4	1
<b>Hooper</b>	5		1	3	1	6	1
<b>Lusebrink</b>	6	5	3	4	4	5	5
<b>Moazed</b>	3		1	1	1	3	2
<b>Moore</b>	1		1	1	6	1	1
<b>Phillips</b>	6	4	3	6	1	6	1
<b>Reed</b>	6		6	6		6	1
<b>Sommer</b>	5		1	1	1	6	2
<b>Wool</b>	6	6	3	3	3	1	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	4	1	9	7	7	5	8
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	6	2	1	2	2	5	2
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	8	1	2	2	1	1

<b>C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	1		2		6	2	1
<b>Heinrich</b>	4		2	1	1	4	1
<b>Hooper</b>	5		1	3	1	6	1
<b>Lusebrink</b>	5	5	3	4	5	5	5
<b>Moazed</b>	3		1	1	1	3	2
<b>Moore</b>	1		1	1	6	1	1
<b>Phillips</b>	6	4	3	6	1	6	1
<b>Reed</b>	6		6	6		6	1
<b>Sommer</b>	5		1	1	1	6	2
<b>Wool</b>	6	6	3	3	3	1	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	4	1	9	7	6	5	8
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	6	2	1	2	3	5	2
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	8	1	2	2	1	1

<b>D Preserve Gate LH07</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	5	1	1		1	6	1
<b>Heinrich</b>	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	6	5	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	1	4	1	2	1	6	5
<b>Moazed</b>	5	5	3	4	3	6	2
<b>Moore</b>	4	1	1	1	1	6	4
<b>Phillips</b>	3	2	3	3	2	6	
<b>Reed</b>	3	1	3	4	1	6	1
<b>Sommer</b>	1	1	1	1	1	6	6
<b>Wool</b>	1	2	3	1	1	6	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	7	8	9	8	9	1	5
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	3	2	1	1	1	9	4
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	1	1	2	1	1	2

<b>E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	6	5	1		1	6	1
<b>Heinrich</b>	4	2	2	4	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	3	5	2	4	6	6	2
<b>Moazed</b>	6	6	3	6		6	2
<b>Moore</b>	6	5	4	4		6	1
<b>Phillips</b>	1	1	1	1		6	1
<b>Reed</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Sommer</b>	5	5	4	3	1	5	6
<b>Wool</b>	1	2	3	1	1	6	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	4	3	8	6	4	1	6
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	6	7	2	3	3	9	4
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	2	2	2	3	4	2	2

<b>E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	6	5	1		1	6	1
<b>Heinrich</b>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	6	6	5	6	6	6	6
<b>Moazed</b>	6	6	3	6	3		2
<b>Moore</b>		6					
<b>Phillips</b>							
<b>Reed</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Sommer*</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Wool</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	1	1	3	1	3	1	3
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	6	7	4	5	4	5	4
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	4	3	4	5	4	4	4

\* Sandy Sommer voted 1 to indicate support for removing E2 from consideration, so the District changed her scores to 6 to represent her intention and notified her.

<b>E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	6	5	1		1	6	1
<b>Heinrich</b>	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
<b>Hooper</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	2	4	1	2	6	6	2
<b>Moazed</b>	6	6	3	6		6	2
<b>Moore</b>	6	5	4	3		6	1
<b>Phillips</b>	1	1	1	1		6	1
<b>Reed</b>	1	1	3	1	5	6	4
<b>Sommer</b>	1	1	1	2	1	5	6
<b>Wool</b>	1	2	3	1	1	6	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	6	6	9	7	4	1	7
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	4	4	1	2	3	9	3
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	1	1	1	2	4	1	1

<b>E4 Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence</b>							
	<b>Permit</b>	<b>Docent</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Picnic</b>	<b>Restrooms</b>	<b>Equestrian</b>	<b>Dog</b>
<b>Bordi</b> <i>(No Submission)</i>							
<b>Delay</b>	5	6	4	3	4	6	4
<b>Heinrich</b>							
<b>Hooper</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>Lusebrink</b>	1	1	2	3		5	5
<b>Moazed</b>	6	5	4	4	4	6	6
<b>Moore</b>	5	1	1	1	1	6	1
<b>Phillips</b>	1	1	1	1		6	1
<b>Reed</b>	3	3	3	3	6	6	6
<b>Sommer</b>	3	3	3	3	6*	6	6
<b>Wool</b>	3	3	2	5	3	6	6
<b># of 1-4 scores</b>	5	6	8	7	4	0	3
<b># of 5-6 scores</b>	4	3	1	2	3	9	6
<b>Blank, N/A, or 0</b>	2	2	2	2	4	2	2

\* Sandy Sommer voted 1 on the restroom use but indicated that she is supportive of no restroom at this site due to the existing driveway. The District changed her score to 6 to represent her intention and notified her.





## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### Other Options and Iterations per Site (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Best solution for Equestrian use</b>	<b>This site provides an opportunity for access to the preserve but is visually not appealing</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for core access to the preserve and visually screens any parking from view</b>	<b>This site does not provide adequate access based on its size</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for core access to the preserve. This would be a great area for an interpretive location.</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for core access to the preserve and visually screens any parking from view</b>	<b>Current site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>				
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Great opportunity for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Some potential for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Great opportunity for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Not much value for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Great area for views with an interpretive signage</b>	<b>Great area for views with an interpretive signage</b>	<b>Some potential for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Some potential for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Some potential for education and interpretive signage</b>	<b>Great area for views with an interpretive signage</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</b>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>										
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Restrooms</b>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>									
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for access to the preserve and visually screens any parking from view</b>	<b>This site does not meet needs for an equestrian access to the preserve</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for access to the preserve and visually screens any parking from view</b>	<b>This site does not meet needs for an equestrian access to the preserve</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for core access to the preserve</b>	<b>This site provides a great opportunity for core access to the preserve and visually screens any parking from view</b>	<b>Current site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



### La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

#### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020 ---ART'S RESPONSE 2/9/2020

#### Other Options and Iterations per Site

(updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</b>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Restrooms</b>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Equestrian</b>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use: Dog access</b>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### Other Options and Iterations per Site (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Andie Reed

General support:	1	2	4	2	6	6	1	6	6	1
Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	3	n/a	n/a	6	6	6	3	6	6	1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Updated A should be open to horses and hikers without permit.	n/a	n/a	Could be built - as needed - if autos & equestrian use increases; should be open as is current lot	Fencing on 2 sides of road and around parking lot so users can drive into preserve defeats rural and agricultural use. Permits wouldn't help.	Fencing on 2 sides of road and around parking lot so users can drive into preserve defeats rural and agricultural use. Permits wouldn't help.	Should be open to hikers w/o permits; wide shoulder E of current gate as entry to 25-car lot; bathrooms.	Infringes on existing resident, which should be respected; better options available if we're going into "E" choices	Too impactful to area around Red Barn; cars too close and viewable from 84 (driving in and out)	Great access for trailheads for central area; see but not impact Red Barn. OK to require permits because of auto safety and desire to limit impacts

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Permit not needed</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>Great entry to central area</b>	<b>Too intrusive to resident ranger &amp; family</b>	<b>Same as above</b>	<b>Good use for docent-led, limits impacts</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Lots of existing 2bldgs. and space; provides access to LHC trails and views</b>	<b>Already serves purpose w/signs and boards; expansion use for auto overflow</b>	<b>Already has signs/boards</b>	<b>Already has signs/boards; staging area only and overflow</b>	<b>Doesn't improve access to central area enough to override impacts to nature and rural flavor; inefficient and starkly intrusive</b>	<b>Doesn't improve access to central area enough to override impacts to nature and rural flavor; inefficient and starkly intrusive</b>	<b>Map and signage only</b>	<b>Same as above</b>	<b>Same as above</b>	<b>Signage and trailhead directions, maybe some boards</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</b>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Only needs to be suitable for staging, unless interpretive</b>	<b>Already serves best purpose</b>	<b>If needed for further overflow and horses, then</b>	<b>Staging area for hikers, bikers, horses</b>	<b>Picnic-ers can hike to this area and enjoy the views and quiet</b>	<b>Picnic-ers can hike to this area and enjoy the views and quiet</b>	<b>See it more as parking, trailheads, interpretive</b>	<b>Same as above</b>	<b>Same as above</b>	<b>Permits will limit numbers, picnic potential to view and enjoy Red</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



	center built, then add picnic facilities		could be set up for picnic		country atmosphere without building road fencing and parking lot	country atmosphere without building road fencing and parking lot	signage, bathrooms			Barn and rural corrals and views
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Existing bldgs. and previous use as rodeo grounds make it ideal to provide facilities.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Would serve D and E3 and hike-throughs coming from A and B to Upper LHC	Same as above	Same as above	Not enough space; hikers can access LH07 facilities
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Lots of space and already designed for horses	Expansion should be for cars only	Could be set up for equestrian and overflow, if need arises in future	Could be used for limited equestrian and for overflow parking	Not worth building out the road and parking lot for horse access (better choices available)	Not worth building out the road and parking lot for horse access (better choices available)	Too dicey	Same as above	Same as above	Too dangerous turn-off of 84 and not enough space
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	On-leash only to allow hiking with dog	TBD; dogs on leash should be acceptable, but further study of	TBD; dogs on leash should be acceptable, but further study of	TBD; dogs on leash should be acceptable, but further study of	Dogs on leach can access this area by walking	Dogs on leach can access this area by walking	TBD if dogs allowed in entire LHC preserve; now it is mixed	Same as above.	Same as above	TBD. Need to consider ranger's pets; this is their residence.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

		agricultural impacts (cows)	agricultural impacts (cows)	agricultural impacts (cows)			(upper is OK, lower is not)			
--	--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	--	--	-----------------------------	--	--	--

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



**La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study**  
**Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020**

**Other Options and Iterations per Site**  
**(updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)**  
**Barbara Hooper**

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)	1	N/A	N/A	6	5	5	6	6	6	6
PAWG Member Comments	<u>See Note 1. below.</u>			Not in favor due to close proximity to school.	Concerns about constructing new vehicle access road into preserve.	Concerns about constructing new vehicle access road into preserve.	Traffic and public safety concerns. Environmental impact concerns of adding parking and trails.	Traffic and public safety concerns. <u>See Note 2 below.</u>		Traffic and public safety concerns. Adding a parking lot would not reflect the rural character of the site and Red Barn. Parking would be visible from Highway 84 and would detract from the open scenic vistas which are currently enjoyed at the Red Barn pullout.

**Gradients of Agreement**

1: I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. 2: I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. 3: I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. 4: I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. 5: I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. 6: I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<u>See Note 1 below.</u>						Traffic and public safety concerns. Environmental impact concerns of adding parking and trails. I may be in favor of this option if visitors of Docent-led hikes arrived in MROSD vehicles. <u>See Note 2. below.</u>	Traffic and public safety concerns. I may be in favor of this option if visitors of Docent-led hikes arrived in MROSD vehicles.		See comments above.
<i>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</i>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>								In favor of interpretive signage for hikers accessing area from Sears Ranch Road and Allen Road trails.		
<i>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</i>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<u>See Note 3 below.</u>	<u>See Note 3 below.</u>	<u>See Note 3 below.</u>		<u>See Note 3 below.</u>	<u>See Note 3 below.</u>				

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>			<b>In favor, if new lot is dirt, not asphalt.</b>		<b>Prefer B2. Concerns about constructing new vehicle access road into area.</b>	<b>Prefer B2. Concerns about constructing new vehicle access road into area.</b>				
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										

**Notes:**

1. **Event Center:** It would be excellent to have Permit Parking for **hikers** added to this location as it is a 1.1 mile (2.2 mile RT) hike for visitors to see a spectacular view of the ocean if they follow the road that equestrians currently have access to. As was noted in the MROSD Permit Parking Information, December 12, 2019, permits for the Event Center access were only issued 10 times. If Permit Parking for **hikers** could not be added immediately, perhaps it could be set-up for a Permit parking “pilot” location and MROSD could get feedback from hikers about the access and the trail.
2. The only **relatively safe** ingress and egress access to LH07 and LH06 (the driveway to behind the Ranger Residence) on Highway 84 was demonstrated in our MidPen site tours on October 19, 2019 and November 16, 2019. It seems highly unlikely that visitors arriving to the areas for Docent-led hikes or Permit parking only would be as careful as the MidPen drivers who took the time to drive to Alice’s Restaurant at Skyline Blvd. to safely enter the driveways and then exited to the west to return us to La Honda.
  - a. For each of those sites, **safe access** is:
    - i. When heading WEST on Highway 84, ENTER the driveway by making a right-hand turn.
    - ii. EXIT the driveway, by making a right-hand turn to *continue* heading west on Highway 84.
  - b. It is NOT safe to:
    - i. ENTER the driveway when heading EAST on Highway 84; a vehicle would need to make a left-hand turn, cross the double yellow line, and cross traffic heading west.
    - ii. EXIT the driveway to head EAST on Highway 84; a vehicle would need to make a left-hand turn, cross the double yellow line, and cross traffic heading west.
3. I need to understand more about MROSD’s policies for picnic/family options throughout the district preserves.
4. I support *general expansion* of Event Center access (in addition to the Permit Parking currently available for equestrians -- and hikers as suggested in Note 1) only if ingress and egress are safe based on further traffic studies.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### Other Options and Iterations per Site (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6) Type response in cells.</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Agree about removal from consideration</b>	<b>1</b>

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i> <i>Type response in cells.</i>	<i>This site has great potential for access to hikers and bikers as well as equestrian. Hopefully the master plan can be changed to accommodate opening up access to more users here.</i>	n/a	n/a	Seems like a good, less invasive alternative to B2 assuming proximity to school is not an issue.	I believe developing a site 1 mile further into to the preserve and just 1 mile beyond existing facilities is an inappropriate use of Midpen's resources.	See comments to the left.	This site could be a small permit only site with few facilities given size constraints. With adequate screening it would be nearly hidden from Hwy 84. Any idea how many spaces this lot might be?	Permit only access would limit the traffic turning off of Hwy 84.		Permit only access would limit the traffic turning off of Hwy 84.
Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i> <i>Type response in cells.</i>	2	2	2	2	4	4	2	1		1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i> <i>Type response in cells.</i>	This may be a good solution given there is plenty of parking to accommodate more people at once.	While the site is already open, it's a nice gathering place with a restroom and plenty of parking for larger groups, so docent led hikes could be a nice addition to this site. All docent led hikes are not only in permit only areas, are they? It could be another way to incorporate education/interpretation	See comments to the left.	See comments to the left.	Docent led hikes could certainly start from this area, but I think it makes more sense to have them start at the existing lot (B1).	See comments to the left	Given the close proximity to the redwood grove down by the creek, this site could be an opportunity to teach about other ecosystems with the Preserve.	There is a lot going on here – the Red Barn, the bats, grazing, the gateway to the rest of the preserve, so it will be a popular site. It makes sense to offer docent led hikes here to educate visitors.		There is a lot going on here – the Red Barn, the bats, grazing, the gateway to the rest of the preserve, so it will be a popular site. It makes sense to offer docent led hikes here to educate visitors.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

		<b>without having to add physical components.</b>								
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Since the grazing operation is so front and center here it seems like a great fit to educate Mipen visitors about grazing operations and Midpen’s relationship to ranchers.	see comments above. Could add signage to bolster what is already there, too. Perhaps signage along the trail as it heads out from the parking area?	With the expansion of the parking area, there is more potential to incorporate signage . Also, if some picnic tables are included those could be used as an informal gathering place for docent led hikes.	I’m not sure a connection to the school is viable given how careful schools are about granting access during the school day. Perhaps special education events on the weekend might work? Meet there prior to heading out on a docent led hike?	I think there is potential to have signage here at the trail crossroads to educate visitors about the Preserve. It would be low profile and have minimal impact on views and the immediate surrounding area.	See comments to the left	Not much room, though some signs around the perimeter of the parking area could educate visitors about the redwood trees down the hill.	Given how much there is at this location, it makes sense to offer up some kind of education or interpretive info, whether that is via signage or docent led hikes. A gathering area would be great, but the size of the area may be a constraint.		Given how much there is at this location, it makes sense to offer up some kind of education or interpretive info, whether that is via signage or docent led hikes. A gathering area would be great, but the size of the area may be a constraint.
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Doesn’t seem like the most scenic place for a picnic,	Strategic placement of a few picnic tables near the parking area could be	See comments to the left.	If this location gets developed, I’d prefer to see			It’s a small site so it should be a	Picnic tables overlooking the view would be a		Picnic tables overlooking the view would be a

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



	but there is plenty of space to work to incorporate picnic tables.	used by families/groups heading out for a hike. Though, there is not trash pick-up there, is there? That could be an issue. Would need to have signage about pack in pack out.		any picnic tables placed on the uphill side of the new parking area and further away from the school.			small footprint.	great addition to this site.		great addition to this site. There is the added benefit of shade under the trees here as well.
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>			
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	Given the existing buildings and development there, placing a bathroom there seems like it would not be that big of a challenge and would be a great asset at the south end of the Preserve.						Given the size of the site, it seems like a restroom might be hard to put in but it would be nice to have a restroom nearer to the center portion of the preserve since it is not an option anywhere closer to the red barn.	Really unfortunate as a restroom here would be ideal.		Really unfortunate as a restroom here would be ideal.
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	1	1	2	2	6	6	6	6		6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>		I love the idea of expanding the current lot to accommodate horse trailers. It makes use of the existing facilities and has safe access for vehicles pulling horse trailers off of Hwy 84.	Have a dedicated equestrian parking area that could be gravel instead of asphalt. Perhaps if the Preserve balloons in popularity this area could also accommodate overflow parking if the existing lot is full.	See comments to the left.			Given the challenges of turning off Hwy 84, there should not be equestrian access here.	Unsafe for long horse trailers to enter/exit Hwy 84		Unsafe for long horse trailers to enter/exit Hwy 84
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6	1	1	1	1	1		1		1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	As long as this site is equestrian only, there should be no dog access. If it opens up to hiking, then I'd hope they'd consider amending the master plan. I've read Midpen's dog policies, and am fine with on-leash access. Why is access allowed at Upper but not Lower? Is that due	I've read Midpen's dog policies, and am fine with on-leash access. Why is access allowed at Upper but not Lower? Is that due to the grazing operations?	I've read Midpen's dog policies, and am fine with on-leash access. Why is access allowed at Upper but not Lower? Is that due to the grazing operations?	See comments to the left. I assume this is not currently in the LHMP as there is no lot here. If this lot gets developed, could this be considered (like site B2)?	I've read Midpen's dog policies, and am fine with on-leash access. Why is access allowed at Upper but not Lower? Is that due to the grazing operations?	I've read Midpen's dog policies, and am fine with on-leash access. Why is access allowed at Upper but not Lower? Is that due to the grazing operations?	See comments to the left. I assume this is not currently in the LHMP as there is no lot here. If this lot gets developed, could this be considered (like site B2)?	See comments to the left.		See comments to the left.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

	to the grazing operations?									
--	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

**La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study**  
**Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020**

**Other Options and Iterations per Site**  
 (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only  <i>...and general support of the site as a parking area</i>	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I support a multi-use plan.</b>	<b>Separate horses from cars with fenced unpaved trailer parking area.</b>	<b>No parking in view of barn &amp; pond. May be OK far to left, off side road.</b>	<b>Only if it's better for horses than B1 expansion.</b>	<b>Keep Harrington as trail, not drive. C1 &amp; C2 visible from higher trails. Park at B1.</b>	<b>Prefer walking 1 mile. Possibility if D&amp;E sites fail feasibility.</b>	<b>Small lot, only if drive is safe on highway curve. <u>If D is OK, may not need E sites.</u></b>	<b><u>E1 only if not D, E4 or E3.</u> E1 is prominent in views from trails. Prefer lower terrain to the north (E4).</b>	<b>In view from highway.</b>	<b><u>E3 only if not D or E4.</u> OK if E4 proves unfeasible, but partly in view from highway pullout. Add foliage screen.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Perhaps in addition to limited open Permits</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>Perhaps in addition to limited open Permits</b>	<b>Perhaps in addition to limited open Permits</b>	<b>omit</b>	<b>Perhaps in addition to limited open Permits</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Space for various facilities</b>	<b>More signs, kiosk or small room possible</b>	<b>No intrusion in view of barn &amp; pond. May be OK far to left, off side road.</b>	<b>Equestrian only lot. Signs, kiosk possible</b>	<b>Signs, kiosk or small room</b>	<b>Signs, kiosk or small room</b>	<b>Signs, kiosk or small room possible</b>	<b>Maybe signs if trail goes here</b>	<b>Maybe signs if trail goes here</b>	<b>Signs, kiosk or small room possible</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</b>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Space for various facilities</b>	<b>Prefer a less exposed area</b>	<b>White barn area preferred</b>	<b>Equestrian only lot.</b>	<b>Concern of trash. Prefer a less exposed area.</b>	<b>Concern of trash brought in, not carried out</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>Prefer a less exposed area</b>	<b>omit</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Restrooms</b>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>open</b>	<b>Pump truck access concern</b>	<b>Pump truck access concern</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>no</b>	<b>omit</b>	<b>no</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Made for it</b>	<b>Separate horses from cars</b>	<b>OK far to left, off side road.</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>Not vehicles</b>	<b>Not vehicles</b>	<b>Unsafe for slow trucks</b>	<b>Unsafe for slow trucks</b>	<b>omit</b>	<b>Unsafe for slow trucks</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>Walk in, Not vehicles</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>Walk in, Not vehicles</b>	<b>Walk in, Not vehicles</b>	<b>Concern about creek wildlife</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>	<b>omit</b>	<b>Good possibility</b>

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### Other Options and Iterations per Site (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	n/a	n/a	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b><i>While not the prettiest spot and further from the central part of the Preserve, this site is already well developed.</i></b>				<b>Concerned that it may be too disruptive to have large horse trailers traveling along this now quiet road/path</b>	<b>Concerned that it may be too disruptive to have large horse trailers traveling along this now quiet road/path</b>	<b>Even more limited use via permits is dangerous along this stretch of Hwy 84, though moderately less so than at the Red Barn site.</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe.</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe</b>

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Some traffic signage would need to be added to make drivers aware of access points</b>						<b>Public access at this site is dangerous, but less so than at the Red Barn site.</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe</b>	<b>No public access at this stretch of Hwy 84 can be considered safe</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>							<b>While I remain opposed to use of this site for any public access, if the PAWG decides to move forward, I see no problem in adding signage</b>	<b>While I remain opposed to use of this site for any public access, if the PAWG decides to move forward, I see no problem in adding signage</b>	<b>While I remain opposed to use of this site for any public access, if the PAWG decides to move forward, I see no problem in adding signage</b>	<b>While I remain opposed to use of this site for any public access, if the PAWG decides to move forward, I see no problem in adding signage</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</b>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>				<b>Not a great picnic spot compared to the other options</b>			<b>If PAWG decides to move forward with this site, picnicing is OK, though may be a little noisy due to proximity to hwy 84.</b>	<b>I do not want to encourage use of this site for larger groups</b>	<b>I do not want to encourage use of this site for larger groups</b>	<b>I do not want to encourage use of this site for larger groups</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>n/a</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>										
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>		<b>May be too visible, compared to other sites nearby</b>			<b>I have some concern about how disruptive it may be to have large horse trailers moving along this road, but if we mean just horses, than I support it with a rating of "1"</b>	<b>I have some concern about how disruptive it may be to have large horse trailers moving along this road, but if we mean just horses, than I support it with a rating of "1"</b>	<b>Dangerous spot for large trailers to be accessing Hwy 84</b>	<b>Very dangerous area for large trailers to be entering and exiting Hwy 84</b>		<b>Very dangerous area for large trailers to be entering and exiting Hwy 84</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>		I have some concern about dogs being a bother to the cattle	I have some concern about dogs being a bother to the cattle	I have some concern about dogs being a bother to the cattle						

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### Other Options and Iterations per Site

(updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)	Type response in cells <b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	Thank goodness!	<b>6</b>
PAWG M	Type response in cells	I am not a fan of Permit lots. It	or have the time to plan trips to the	In my view, making the new lots						

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>		<b>seems to favor those people who are 'retired'</b>	<b>Preserves. I appreciate having the option for people to make spontaneous stops &amp; enjoy the Preserve (s).</b>	<b>Permit only is very exclusionary and not in keeping with the Districts Mission Statement to serve all taxpayers (including those who work full time &amp; might have a little time to make a stop on the Preserves.)</b>						
<b>Docent-led hikes</b>	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i> <b>1</b>						<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i> <b>I really like the Event Center &amp; would like to see it developed for all User</b>	<b>site has all kinds of opportunities to be used by Dog walker/Hiker &amp; ADA accessible.</b>						<b>I have huge concerns with Highway ingress/ egress safety here. I am not sure that</b>		<b>Ditto, please see other comments</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

	<b>groups. The site has all kinds of opportunities to be enjoyed by hikers, dog walkers &amp; equestrians</b>							<b>Midpen can assure the safety of the public with the existing driveway solutions.</b>		
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<b>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</b>	<b>Type response in cells 1</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4</b>
<b>PAWG Member Comments</b>	<b>Type response in cells I really like this site &amp; hope it will be developed for all user groups. This site has tons of opportunities to be explored &amp; it should be available to all, not only</b>				<b>My favorite two sites. They give access to the middle of the Preserve &amp; there is ample space for all users, including Equestrians &amp; dog walkers.</b>	<b>Love this site also for the same reasons. This lot would be hidden from view &amp; has ample space for all user groups, plus it is a safe access to Highway 84.</b>	<b>The main attraction is the ample Pullout on Highway 84. I think the site is small, steep and lends itself to hikers &amp; dog walkers but is not ADA friendly. It is a steep hill, which we</b>	<b>A very dangerous spot on the Highway for any access other than Rangers. I did need to back out onto the Highway when the gate code was inoperable.</b>		<b>Ditto. Please see comments on the other site which would use the same area on Highway 84</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

	<i>equestrians. Many equestrians camp &amp; take their dogs too. Dogs, hikers, ADA should be allowed to use this site.</i>							have been unable to tour sufficiently.	Luckily we did this, but it made us discuss the fact that it is not a 'safe public access site'		
Distribution of Use: <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.	
PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)	Type response in cells 1	1	1	6	1	1	1	4		3	
PAWG Member Comments	Type response in cells I think the District should actively curate areas for family & picnics- at all locations!										
Distribution of Use: <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	
PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)	Type response in cells 1	6	6		6	6	1	Please consider using Porta Potties ADA		Please consider using ADA Porta Potties. If	

**Gradients of Agreement**

1: I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. 2: I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. 3: I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. 4: I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. 5: I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. 6: I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

										the District cant make this happen it is a real shame & fairly unrealisitic to not provide restrooms to the Public.
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells Yes! Build another beautiful restroom here for hikers &amp; equestrians. How about adding a shower too for those camping here or for the events that could be staged here.</i>	<b>In my opinion it is not realistic to expect people to walk to this one restroom. If they are in a group, can you imagine the backlog of waiting people?</b>			<b>ADA bathrooms should be added here! Even if it is ADA Porta Potties. Otherwise people will be forced to relieve themselves on the ground. Just saying! It is not realisitic to expect people to pee in a bottle :) or walk a mile</b>	<b>Ditto. Please see comment</b>	<b>Ditto. Please see comment</b>	<b>Ditto. Please see comment</b>		<b>Ditto. Please see comment</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

					<b>when they need to go.</b>					
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells 1</i>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells Yes! I am a fan of all equestrian access here &amp; would appreciate all user groups gaining access here. To have it only open to equestrian "permit" only seems very constrained &amp; gives the impression that the District is 'tone deaf' &amp; not allowing the public to</i>	<b>Lot too small for any equestrian trailers. Unable to even turnaround here</b>	<b>Yes! Love this site for equestrians, &amp; hikers</b>	<b>I am not a fan of putting any lot here overlooking the school. It feels like "big brother", not a good neighbor. If I had children at this school I would be very unhappy with a lot here overlooking the school. Safety concerns</b>	<b>Yes! Love this site for equestrians</b>	<b>Yes! Love this site for equestrians</b>	<b>Great turnout, but not safe for equestrians</b>	<b>Very Dangerous access! for anyone</b>		<b>Very dangerous access site. I shudder to think about the existing driveway use onto Highway 84</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified "yes" to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



	<b>use District properties.</b>									
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells 1</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells The Master plan could be amended to include dogs on leash, which works well for equestrians &amp; hikers</i>						<b>A small site here</b>			

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020 – SANDY SOMMER

#### Other Options and Iterations per Site

(updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)	1	n/a	n/a	1	5	5	1	5	1	1
PAWG Member Comments	Please add to long term: Develop additional trails.				Not needed. Only a mile away from B1 and B3	Not needed. Only a mile away from B1 and B3	In long run, prefer that this site be fully open – no permit needed. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity.	Quite visible from upper preserve	Agree with removal. Too visible, encroaches on “sacred space” at Barn	Support as first phase. Suggested second phase: get creative to reduce speeds on Hwy 84, with hope of full site access in the future. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<b>Option</b>	<b>A</b> Event Center	<b>B1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	<b>B2</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	<b>B3</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	<b>C1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	<b>C2</b> Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	<b>D</b> Preserve Gate LH07	<b>E1</b> Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	<b>E2</b> Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	<b>E3</b> Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>							<b>In long run, prefer that this site is fully open – no permit needed. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity.</b>	<b>Quite visible from upper preserve</b>	<b>Agree with removal. Too visible, encroaches on “sacred space” at Barn</b>	<b>Support as first phase. In long run, prefer that this site is fully open – eventually no docent needed. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</b>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support, but prefer waiting until full site development</b>				<b>Support this site or C2 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education,</b>	<b>Support this site or C1 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education,</b>			<b>Agree with removal. Too visible, encroaches on “sacred space” at Barn</b>	<b>Incorporate into nice vista of barn from tree line / fence line</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<b>Option</b>	<b>A</b> Event Center	<b>B1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	<b>B2</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	<b>B3</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	<b>C1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	<b>C2</b> Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	<b>D</b> Preserve Gate LH07	<b>E1</b> Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	<b>E2</b> Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	<b>E3</b> Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
					<b>family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>	<b>family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>				
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support, but not with equestrian permit only access. Prefer waiting until full site development</b>	<b>Very exposed and visible. No site interest, no shade</b>	<b>Better site than B1</b>		<b>Support this site or C2 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education, family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>	<b>Support this site or C1 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education, family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>	<b>Picnic and short trail down to redwood groves would be very enjoyable</b>		<b>Agree with removal. Too visible, encroaches on “sacred space” at Barn</b>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot’s restroom.	Use existing lot’s restroom.	Use existing lot’s restroom.	Use existing lot’s restroom.	Use existing lot’s restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1 – Add another restroom here since more central</b>	<b>1 – Add another restroom here since more central</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support, but prefer waiting until full site development</b>	<b>Support using existing restroom</b>	<b>Support using existing restroom</b>	<b>Support using existing restroom</b>	<b>Support this site or C2 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education, family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>	<b>Support this site or C1 as the central hub for LHCOSP access, with new trail loops, education, family / picnic, &amp; restrooms</b>	<b>This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity.</b>	<b>Support no restroom with use of existing driveway.</b>	<b>Agree with removal. Too visible, encroaches on “sacred space” at Barn</b>	<b>Support no restroom with use of existing driveway. Still hope for full site access in the future. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<b>Option</b>	<b>A</b> Event Center	<b>B1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	<b>B2</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	<b>B3</b> Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	<b>C1</b> Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	<b>C2</b> Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	<b>D</b> Preserve Gate LH07	<b>E1</b> Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	<b>E2</b> Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	<b>E3</b> Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support continuing existing use</b>	<b>Quite visible from surroundings</b>	<b>Still quite visible from surroundings</b>	<b>Best solution for equestrian staging at Sears</b>	<b>Equestrian staging not needed. Only a mile away from B1 and B3</b>	<b>Equestrian staging not needed. Only a mile away from B1 and B3</b>	<b>Agree – space limitations for equestrian staging</b>	<b>Agree – space limitations for equestrian staging</b>	<b>Agree with removal.</b>	<b>Agree – space limitations for equestrian staging</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Would support leashed dogs in open grasslands, pending more info about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Concerned about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Concerned about habitat sensitivity</b>	<b>Agree with removal.</b>	<b>Concerned about habitat sensitivity</b>

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### Other Options and Iterations per Site (updated from December 12, 2019 and February 6, 2020 PAWG meetings)

*Please indicate your level of support for each option at each location, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote.  
If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	A Event Center	B1 Sears Ranch Road – Expansion of Existing Lot	B2 Sears Ranch Road Area – Site West of Parking Lot	B3 Sears Ranch Road Area – Gate LH15	C1 Sears Ranch Road – Former Residence Area	C2 Sears Ranch Road – Cattle Corral at Former Residence Area	D Preserve Gate LH07	E1 Red Barn Area – Site Behind Ranger Residence	E2 Red Barn Area – Corral Area Below and West of Red Barn	E3 Red Barn Area – Area Near Shed Below Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Continue interim permit lot for equestrian. Long term, better as a fully developed site with multi-use access. Future standalone site planning effort.	Not applicable. Lot is already open.	Not applicable. Lot would be open like existing lot.	Potential for permit lot for equestrian or specific events.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential for 2-4 space equestrian permit lot.	Potential but not for equestrian due to space constraints.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal from consideration, based on PAWG feedback (December 12 <sup>th</sup> and February 6 <sup>th</sup> meetings).	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells 1</i>	6	6	6	6	6	1	1	0	1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i> <b>Too far away</b>	<b>Too far away</b>	<b>Too far away</b>	<b>Too far away</b>	<b>Too far away</b>	<b>Too far away</b>	<b>Very excited if restroom included</b>	<b>Large enough but would mar view shed</b>	<b>Looks like wetland</b>	<b>Would not mar any view. Well hidden by trees</b>
Docent-led hikes	Interim solution until site plan can be implemented.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Not applicable. Site is already open.	Potential.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential 10-15 spaces. Minimal site development. Use of existing driveways.

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	6	6	6	6	6	2	2	0	2
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes	remove	Not a big fan of decent lead hikes
<i>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</i>	Education and interpretation of grazing operations.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Potential for connection to school.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential e.g. interpretive signage.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	Not much else going on there	Not much else going on there	Not much else going on there	Not much else going on there	Not much else going on there	More interesting	More interesting	remove	More interesting
<i>Distribution of Use: Picnic/family</i>	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential gathering area under trees.	Potential under redwoods (requested modification by S. Sommer).	Potential.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	6	4	6	3	3	1	1	0	1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	No shade or view	Some shade & view	No shade or view	Didn't know this is a district goal	Didn't know this is a district goal	Didn't know this is a district goal	Didn't know this is a district goal	remove	Didn't know this is a district goal
<i>Distribution of Use: Restrooms</i>	Potential.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Use existing lot's restroom.	Potential. If space and access allow.	No. Pump truck access limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	0	1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	OK. Doesn't allow midpark access	OK Doesn't allow midpark access	OK Doesn't allow midpark access	OK Doesn't allow midpark access	OK Doesn't allow midpark access	I hope it's possible	Disappointing	remove	Disappointing
<i>Distribution of Use: Equestrian</i>	Existing use.	Potential. May be part of the existing lot.	Potential. Separate but near the existing lot.	Potential. Separate lot. Could be permit only.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Permit only. Possibly 2-4 trailers depending on space.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Low potential. Space limitations.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Low potential. Space limitations.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	3	1	1	1	1	6	6	remove	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	Would be an eye sore here	Better hidden	This would work if school ok with	More expensive Future needs.	More expensive Future needs.	I agree no horses	I agree no horses	remove	Not enough room
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Under study.	Under study.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.	Suggest removal, based on PAWG feedback.	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	remove	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<i>Type response in cells</i>	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	Not a dog supporter	remove	Not a dog supporter

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.





## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
Permit Only	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	5
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration. Possibly use as a handicap access only to red barn ?</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	4

---

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Public comment and site safety conditions should preclude this site from consideration</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### E4 Site Assessment

### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
Permit Only	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>If E4 were to be among our recommendations, it should be permit-only. E3 remains best choice in this area.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Docent hikes would be fine; preferred from E3.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Not an ideal place for amenities; limited access because of ranger house and shared driveway.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>E3 is a much better site for gathering and staging for hikers and docents.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

#### Barbara Hooper

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4 Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Traffic and public safety concerns. <u>See Note 1 below.</u></b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Traffic and public safety concerns. I may be in favor of this option if visitors of Docent-led hikes arrived in MROSD provided vehicles.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6

---

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>In favor of interpretive signage for hikers accessing area from Sears Ranch Road and Allen Road trails.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
Distribution of Use: <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
Distribution of Use: <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Equestrian use in the area okay if the visitors arrived via a trail originating at the Event Center or Sears Ranch Road.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

**Notes:**

1. The only *relatively safe* ingress and egress access to LH07 and LH06 (the driveway to behind the Ranger Residence) on Highway 84 was demonstrated in our MidPen site tours on October 19, 2019 and November 16, 2019. It seems highly unlikely that visitors arriving to the areas for Docent-led hikes or Permit parking only would be as careful as the MidPen drivers who took the time to drive to Alice's Restaurant at Skyline Blvd. to safely enter the driveways and then exited to the west to return us to La Honda.
  - a. For each of those sites, **safe access** is:
    - i. When heading WEST on Highway 84, ENTER the driveway by making a right-hand turn.
    - ii. EXIT the driveway, by making a right-hand turn to *continue* heading west on Highway 84.
  - b. It is NOT safe to:
    - i. ENTER the driveway when heading EAST on Highway 84; a vehicle would need to make a left-hand turn, cross the double yellow line, and cross traffic heading west.
    - ii. EXIT the driveway to head EAST on Highway 84; a vehicle would need to make a left-hand turn, cross the double yellow line, and cross traffic heading west.

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>This area is hidden from view from the highway so would not impact any views and would be further from the ranger residence.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>There is a lot going on here – the Red Barn, the bats, grazing, the gateway to the rest of the preserve, so it will be a popular site. It makes sense to offer docent led hikes here to educate visitors.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>

---

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Given how much there is at this location, it makes sense to offer up some kind of education or interpretive info, whether that is via signage or docent led hikes. A gathering area would be great, but the size of the area may be a constraint.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Given that this site is a bit lower down the slope there would not be the views to overlook, but picnic tables would be a nice addition to the site.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>That's a bummer.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Same concerns apply about long trailers trying to enter/exit over Hwy 84</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I assume this is not currently in the LHMP as there is no lot here. If this lot gets developed, could this be considered (like site B2)? As a launching site to the central portion of the preserve, many visitors would love to come here to hike with their dogs.</b>

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

### E4 Site Assessment

### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

**Karl Lusebrink**

Option	<b>E4</b> Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>E4 has lower impact to residence and less obtrusive in views from surrounding hills than E1. Permit can include specific highway entry safety instructions.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Low volume, controlled access use is appropriate</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>2</b>

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Signage ok, other amenities may fit at nearby E3</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Minimal infrastructure perhaps suitable at nearby E3. Keep visitors back from 100 ft. buffer around barn.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>na</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Unlikely due to poor highway access</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Fenced dog run area elsewhere</b>

---

### **Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
Permit Only	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	6
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>As a local accustomed to these roads, I was still nervous about entering and exiting this site. For those unfamiliar with Hwy 84, it could be quite dangerous.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	5
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I have the same reservations as expressed for permit only access, but perhaps feel slightly better with having a docent on site to coach visitors on how get in and out of the Preserve at this site as safely as possible. I would limit the access to 6-8 spaces.</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>While I don't like the use of this site along Hwy 84 at all, if it were located here I see no problem with these amenities being added here.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>While I remain opposed to the use of this access point on Hwy 84 for safety reasons, if access is located here it seems a nice spot for picnicing.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Seems a moot point if no pump truck can access the site.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>It would be very dangerous to have larger and slower moving horse trailers accessing the preserve at this site.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I am agnostic on this, I leave it to the MidPen Master Plan</b>

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4 Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	5
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I am not in favor of Permit only lots &amp; I do not believe this is a safe access point on Highway 84</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	1
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	1

---

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>If a safe access is determined to be feasible, then i am strongly in favor of family use</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I am concerned that midPEN SHOULD have some Restrooms available Porta- Potties are a great alternative &amp; this should be considered, otherwise people will just use a ‘bush’ :))</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>This is not a safe access point for Equestrians Use. The Highway curves at the access point ( I think)</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Dogs on leash should be considered, especially with the increase in Mountain Lion sightings/ activity</b>

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



**La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study**  
**Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020 –**  
**Sandy Sommer**

**E4 Site Assessment**  
**(Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)**

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
Permit Only	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Does not relate as well to Red Barn. Support as first phase. Suggested second phase: get creative to reduce speeds on Hwy 84, with hope of full site access in the future. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support as first phase. In long run, prefer that this site is fully open – eventually no docent needed. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity.</b>
<i>Distribution of Use: Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Good vistas to upper preserve and west</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>1</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Support no restroom with use of existing driveway. Still hope for full site access in the future. This area is important to Ridge Trail continuity</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Agree – space limitations for equestrian staging</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Concerned about habitat sensitivity</b>

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

---

**Gradients of Agreement**

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.



## La Honda Creek Parking Feasibility Study

### Homework: Level of Support for March 5, 2020

#### E4 Site Assessment

#### (Adjacent to and North of Ranger Residence at Red Barn)

*Please indicate your level of support, using the scale of 1-6 as described in the footnote. If you would like to share ideas for what would make this element more appealing at this site, you may do so in the comments section.*

Option	E4
	Red Barn Area – Area Adjacent to and North of the Ranger Residence
Permit Only	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>This site would mar the view from Upper La Honda Vista Point and provide too few spaces.</b>
Docent-led hikes	Potential 10-15 spaces. Some site development (grading, retaining walls potentially). Use of existing driveways.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Not a fan</b>
Distribution of Use: <i>Education/Interpretation</i>	Potential for additional amenities related to education, e.g. gathering area, additional interpretive signage.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>2</b>

---

#### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.

<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>I favor education</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Picnic/family</i>	Potential.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>No shade, sloped.</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Restrooms</i>	No. Pump truck access limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>3</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>Oh, darn!</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Equestrian</i>	Low potential. Space limitations.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>People first</b>
<b>Distribution of Use:</b> <i>Dog access</i>	Not currently in the La Honda Master Plan.
<i>PAWG Member Level of Support (1 – 6)</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>PAWG Member Comments</i>	<b>People and wild animals first.</b>

---

### Gradients of Agreement

**1:** I can say an unqualified “yes” to the proposal. **2:** I find the proposal acceptable. It appears to be the best of the options available to us at this time. **3:** I can live with the proposal, although I am not especially enthusiastic about it. **4:** I do not fully agree with the proposal, but I am willing to stand aside, remain neutral, so the process can move forward. **5:** I do not fully agree with the proposal. I have some suggestions and I would like the Working Group to do more work to see if we can reach a higher level of agreement. **6:** I do not agree with the proposal and I will work actively to oppose it.