

**From:** [Jennifer Woodworth](#)  
**Subject:** Board Questions RE: 9/28/16 Agenda  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 28, 2016 4:00:17 PM

---

Good afternoon,

Please find the responses below in blue to questions submitted to the Board regarding tonight's agenda items. My apologies on not sending these this morning. I will also have printed copies on the dais and available to the public. Thank you.

Jen

**Director Cyr**

Please provide more information for claim 73297 - \$441.00 for a tent permit

The permit is from Menlo Park Fire District to have the tent at Cooley Landing for the Volunteer Recognition Event last Saturday.

**Director Kishimoto**

I had a process/timeline question on Bear Creek.

The preserve plan is beautifully written and presented, by the way!

Are we planning to have another session on the preserve plan or is this it before we have a final (hopefully) approval vote on both plan and FEIR? In other words, if the board or public has any proposed changes, better to bring it up this week so staff can evaluate and draft any changes?

Conceptual plans have been brought to us, but this is our first detailed look.

Depending on the outcome of Wednesday's meeting, we may consider scheduling one separate session focused on the Preserve Plan in the coming months, with a final hearing for the Board to consider CEQA certification and Preserve Plan approval in December/January. We will definitely take input this Weds on the Preserve Plan, as well as input in writing between now and the December/January hearing. Any *major* recommended changes to the Preserve Plan will require that staff determine if the current Draft EIR is still sufficient to address the change or if an Addendum or recirculation is warranted. Note: recirculation would delay the final approval. Recommended changes to the Preserve Plan will be identified and clearly described for the Board for their consideration at the December/January hearing.

Here's one question I have so far as an example.

\* when will we have an analysis of public/private costs and benefits for the boarder area? I see public monies going into an area that will have private benefits - e.g. AA funds going into parking for

boarders — Obj PU-6.2 \$1,200,000 for 2-4 public horse trailers and 12-20 boarder trailers as well as 30 (public?) vehicles. How will the private boarders be selected to receive this public subsidy? Lottery or % disadvantaged public? Or put time limit on how long any one person can board if there is more applicants than spaces?

At the July 6, 2016 Board meeting, staff presented the order of magnitude costs associated with five (5) Site Plan alternatives, including the Phased Alternative A2, that the Board selected as the Preferred Alternative for the purposes of CEQA review.

The estimated preliminary cost estimates associated with the 30-space parking area at the Stables (described in Obj. PU-6.2e) are for the public. The 12-20 boarder trailers space is intended to be for long-term storage (shown as 1.8 in Figure 3-8A Bear Creek Stables Preferred Alternative A2). To further clarify, staff proposes that “public” be added in front of “vehicles” for revisions to the Stables Parking Area description in Obj. PU-6.2:

6.2e – Design and construct new parking area(s) with capacity for approximately 30 **public** vehicles, 2-4 horse trailers and long-term storage for 12-20 boarder trailers.

Future analysis of the public/private costs will be developed once staff initiates work on the Stables Implementation Plan, which will include design development for the Stables improvement and development of the Request for Proposals (RFP). Preliminary designs for the stables improvements are needed in order to identify funding sources and future tenant obligations. At that time, staff will also evaluate the selection process for boarding. The Real Property Committee will have an opportunity to review the findings of the public/private costs and discuss what are public costs and private-borne costs, before the RFP is issued. The schedule for developing the Stables Site Implementation Plan has not been identified yet.

Other questions I have so far

\* erosion/sediment. I know we are proposing to fix many old roads, but we are also adding new trails and net increase in non-permeable surface. I assume this will still end in a net decrease in erosion and sediment run-off? (perhaps aim for no net increase in non-permeable in general - or net drop)

Preserve Plan Natural Resources Goal NR5, Objectives NR5.1-5.2, as well as Maintenance and Operations Goal MO1 and Objective MO1.3, reduce and control sources of erosion and sedimentation. Drainage upgrades will be made to all existing roads prior to opening to the public to achieve these objectives. There will be a net increase in impervious surface due to new parking areas. All new impervious surfaces will incorporate state of the art stormwater treatment. Also, the Stables will be re-graded for improved drainage, and stormwater treatment and control will be installed.

\* I didn't see much mention of bike parking - how many are planned and where?

Bicycle facilities, including racks and a tune-up station, will be provided at the Alma College Parking

Lot. The size of the racks has not yet been determined and will be part of the design process. A second bike rack can be added at the north parking lot in Phase III.

\* Preserve plan 3-47 - why strive to maintain 72? better to say Not to exceed 72?

The intent of this Stables Management guideline was to state the maximum allowed horses yet defer to the future lessee's development of a viable business model for the Stables management. Please see revised language for the Board's consideration:

- ~~Strive to~~ Maintain a horse capacity as close as possible to, but not exceeding, the 72 maximum allowed by the Santa Clara County Use Permit.

\* on that same page instead of "jointly develop" - better to say "develop with tenant input" since we ultimately have responsibility and authority?

Thank you; that is a good point. Please see revised language for the Board's consideration:

- Develop with tenant input, ~~jointly between District and tenant~~, rules and regulations for maintaining a safe environment for visitors, riders and horses. Post the rules and regulations in prominent locations throughout the facility.
- Develop with tenant input, ~~jointly between District and tenant~~, rules and regulations for parking and/or storage of horse trailers and other mobile equipment related to the horse boarding operation.

\* public access plan - add "subject to district approval"

Change will be made as suggested for the Board's consideration.

\* horse troughs - how is water supplied to them?

The troughs near the Stables would presumably be supplied by the new water line (hook up with San Jose Water). If needed, a trough may be included at the Alma College Parking Lot. This and any other troughs would need to be filled manually.

\* picnic tables proposed - still without trash/recycling receptacles?

Per current policy, the Preserve Plan does not call out trash/recycling receptacles. Regulations require that visitors pack in and pack out.

**Jennifer Woodworth, MMC**  
District Clerk/ Assistant to the General Manager  
[jwoodworth@openspace.org](mailto:jwoodworth@openspace.org)  
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District  
330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022



P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

E-mail correspondence with the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.