From: Jennifer Woodworth
Subject: 5/11/16 Agenda Questions
Date: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 2:37:16 PM

Good afternoon all,

Please find the responses to Director Kishimoto's questions below in blue. Thank you.

Jen

Jennifer Woodworth, MMC
District Clerk
jwoodworth@openspace.org
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District
330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022
P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

Item 3 - I plan to pull (Bear Creek water resources)

* Is it true that existing water system is adequate if we have equestrian trails and day use but we need 8,000 gallons/day for stables?

Based on current water usage at the Stables and flow measurements collected and analyzed by Balance Hydrologics, the existing water system is not adequate to supply the water needed for the stables, caretaker's house, restroom facility, and fire suppression system. The future stables improvements identified in the Site Plan Alternatives will require approximately 8,000 gallons per day. The Board directed staff to evaluate a minimal improvements project. A project of 'equestrian trails and day use' only has not been evaluated, and therefore we don't know what the water demands would be for that type of project option."

* I hear San Jose Water is a possibility which is great! What are the steps/requirements to make this a possibility? What is timeline for evaluating this option?

The San Jose Water Company (SJWC) informed the District on Friday, May 6th, that they will be able to provide a new water service connection on Bear Creek Road. The Engineering and Construction (E&C) Department is working with consultants, MNS Engineers, to obtain a conceptual design, construction costs and operation and maintenance costs for this water system. This report should be ready in late June. Staff anticipates including this additional information and costs related to the new water service connection as part of the next Board presentation of the Bear Creek Stables Site Plan Alternatives, currently scheduled for July 6.

* What is likely costs (capital and operating)?

The construction, operation and maintenance costs of the SJWC Bear Creek Road water system are unknown at this time. However, the E&C Department believes that the SJWC water system will likely be less than many of the other water system options that have been evaluated in the Water Resources Inventory (by Balance Hydrologics) and in a separate Constructability Assessment and Cost Estimation that is being prepared by MNS Engineers, Inc.

* Have the stables stakeholders been alerted to the escalating costs of water infrastructure and discussion of what they might be willing to pay (capital and operating)?

On February 24, 2016, staff presented the Stables alternatives and associated costs to the Board of Directors. At that time, preliminary construction costs for the various water systems were estimated to be greater than one million dollars. No further updates have been provided to the stakeholders since the updated water systems costs have been developed. A full range of water systems options and preliminary cost estimates will be presented as part of the next Bear Creek Stables Alternatives Board item, which is scheduled for July 6th.

On February 24th, staff also presented to the Board expected tenant profits based on the various site alternatives and public programming options. The specific cost sharing between the District and a future long term tenant will be negotiated during a later RFP/lease development process.

* stables alternatives still scheduled for late May?

The next Bear Creek Stables Alternatives presentation has been rescheduled for July 6, 2016, in order to allow sufficient time for staff to work with MNS Engineers to develop capital and operating and maintenance costs for connecting directly to SJWC line along Bear Creek Road.

Item 7 - Alma College.

What choices does the board have if it doesn't want to spend this amount on all three phases? It would be just postpone project?

The District would need to implement Alma College Site Rehabilitation Plan Phases 1A, 1B, and 1C (as described in the Board Report) to ensure the project be "self-mitigating" for the potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed demolition of buildings and construction of the new parking lot within a site that is listed on the Santa Clara County Heritage Resource Inventory. From a CEQA standpoint, the potentially significant impacts associated with the demolitions and new parking lot construction would be balanced by the proposed rehabilitation and interpretation of the cultural landscape and remaining structures that contribute to this landscape. The District would work with the County to obtain conditional approval of a demolition permit and landmark alteration permit, which would require rehabilitation actions be implemented as funding becomes available. Were the Board to decide to only partially implement phases of the Rehabilitation Plan, the County may, at its discretion, deny the District's application for the permits. If that happened, the District could stabilize the buildings via "mothballing" measures to secure the site or keep the site fenced off. It should also be noted the County could deny the permit even with all the

rehabilitation actions included.

In addition, Phase 1A, 1B, and 1C require further evaluation in the implementation phase of this project. Specifically, staff will further explore what actions are feasible to permit with Santa Clara County regarding the historic buildings, what contracting efficiencies might be gained by bundling related projects, and general analysis of cost-reduction measures. While the preliminary cost-estimates provide an opinion of costs at this early planning stage, further analysis is needed to refine the cost estimates based on more refined design plans for the project.

The Board can enter into Phase 2 "Enhanced Public Access" at its discretion, pending grant funding and/or partner funding (for all or some of the $4 million).