

**From:** [Jennifer Woodworth](#)  
**Subject:** Board Questions Re: 8/24/16 Agenda  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 23, 2016 4:12:39 PM  
**Attachments:** [leiq10923-01June7quote.pdf](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Good afternoon all,

Please find the responses below in blue to questions submitted by the Board regarding items on tonight's agenda.

Director Cyr

I'd like a bit more info on the cost for fog harvest item, seems high for frame and material. Does this reflect the monitoring component?

Primary expenses for the fog-harvesting project are for scientific monitoring devices and related hardware (quote attached), including:

- 12 tipping rain gauges sensitive enough to tell the difference between 6 different types of mesh at each of 2 locations;
- Anemometer, pyrometer, and thermometer (2 each);
- Data collector and sending unit to broadcast the data over the cellular network for real-time data monitoring by USGS (2 each);
- Metal frames, mounting hardware, gutters, other minor hardware and electrical hook-up.

This equipment, which is part of USGS's recommended experimental design, will provide more accurate information for future decision-making about whether to implement larger scale fog collection projects. While the District is covering these expenses, USGS is contributing the various mesh materials (some with very expensive micro coatings); fog particle size monitor (\$30,000 machines at each location); laptop computer for monitoring and configuration; and substantial monitoring time, data evaluation, and scientific expertise.

At the beginning of the project, the team discussed the potential budget with the General Manager, who authorized a \$25,000 budget. A more detailed report on the fog-harvesting project is being prepared for the Board's information in the near future.

**Director Riffle**

1. check 73052 - can someone describe the \$17,357 expenditures on fog harvesting equipment?

Please see response above.

2. check 73075 - is electric vehicle charging station for the public or for staff? Who pays for the electricity charges? How many EVs can be charged at one time?

- EV Charging will be primarily for staff between 7am – 5pm
- The public can use and access the chargers outside those hours provided they create an account with SemaConnect
- Staff and the public will be charged for the electricity that they use by SemaConnect at a rate per kWh the District assigns. The rate set by the District will cover the cost of electricity and SemaConnect's service fee (i.e. goal is to make vehicle charging cost neutral to the district).
- The District will receive a check quarterly from SemaConnect for the amount of electricity used less a small service fee. The District received a grant that paid for the installation of the electrical conduits to the pedestals plus \$2,500 toward the installation of the actual charging units.
- 4 vehicles will be able to charge at the same time ( dual mounted charger see [link](#) )

Chargers will be installed this Thursday 8/25 and configured over the following 1- 1.5 weeks. IST is working with Land and Facilities for signage and parking stall labeling for EV Charging.

I will also request that we pull Consent Item 2 to allow for a brief staff presentation and an opportunity for discussion/direction by the public and the Board. I am very supportive of moving this forward, but it has been a while since we have been briefed by staff about plans for this important access location for LHCOSP.

Staff will be prepared to provide a brief presentation on Item 2 during the Board meeting.

**Director Kishimoto**

Item 1 - claims. #73081 \$10,518 for fuel for vehicles. Is this for what period of time?

This was the fuel costs for July from Valley Oil.

Under credit card, there was \$1079 for a refrigerator for a tenant. Seems high for a regular non-commercial refrigerator - what was it??

The refrigerator was a standard residential refrigerator, a little bit larger because it was for a large family. \$1000 is about what we have been spending for refrigerators.

Item 2 - What were the three bids (amounts)? I know we select based on qualification but it's good to see the amounts too.

Through the RFQP process we received 11 proposals that included varied approaches to the scope of work. The table below presents the amounts of all fee proposals received listed in ascending order. We selected three firms to interview based on the qualifications and the best proposed project approach.

After we selected MIG, we negotiated to include additional services necessary to complete the project (e.g. Phase I & II environmental assessment, wildlife permitting, wetland permitting).

1	\$193,793	RRM
2	\$232,155	Design Workshop
3 (I)	\$267,082	Callendar
4	\$299,356	RDG
5	\$299,776	Harris
6 (I)	\$302,718	MIG*
7 (I)	\$312,265	Placeworks
8	\$321,406	BFS
9	\$355,942	RHAA
10	\$367,462	PGA
11	\$372,106	Nuvis

#### **(I) Interviewed 8/4/16**

**\*Selected MIG, total contract with additional services negotiated after selection: \$400,000**

Item 4 - Peterson Property - water rights! How do we know what we have "no obligation to provide" if springs run dry? Is there some legal way to put condition on transaction or delay until we resolve water rights issue including this and permits for the well? (We have seen \$1 million obligations to provide water)

The General Manager does not recommend nor see a benefit in delaying the Petersen Transaction. Please see the detailed rationale below:

#### Spring Water Easement:

The District has no obligation to provide water as the easement speaks to spring water. The fundamental premise with this easement, and most easements, is a proactive right given to another with the Grantor (District) having a passive role. The Grantee (neighbor) is responsible for maintenance and repair of the spring systems including road maintenance, and the District has no obligation to provide water to the neighbor in the event of spring failure. Below is the specific language from the easement document, which the District drafted, with the pertinent section shown in highlight.

"As-Is Conveyance. Grantee agrees and acknowledges that Grantor makes no representations or warranties as to the condition of the area contained in the Easement or its suitability for Grantee's purposes. **Neither Grantor nor anyone acting for or on behalf of Grantor has made any representation, statement, warranty or promise to Grantee concerning the physical aspects or condition of the Easement including, without limitation, conditions of the water supplies, soil, land use restrictions...**"

#### Water Well:

At this time, it is unclear if the District will have any need or future use for the water well. If a future use is desired the District may pursue retroactively permitting the existing well or drilling a new well. The advantage we have in this case is the fact that we know that good water exists on the property so there is little to no risk of drilling a dry, unproductive well if that is the direction we move in.

Item 5 - Seems too simplistic to say fiscal impact is \$18,606 this year since we the organization are looking at long term costs, including retirement benefits. Isn't it more accurate to say impact could be 8-12% increase for the department - or maybe not? It could well be the right thing to do, but we should be open about costs.

The chart below provides the financial impact for the next five years (excluding COLA adjustments). With the current classifications, salaries and benefits will increase based on annual step increases, until the grades is maxed out by the employee. The proposed reclassification costs also include annual step increases until reaching the maximum step in the range.

The table below shows the difference between the current classification amount and proposed reclassification amount per year over the next five years.

	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021
Reclassification	\$ 18,606	\$ 22,358	\$ 37,617	\$ 48,177	\$ 58,178
Current Classification	\$ -	\$ 9,279	\$ 18,761	\$ 27,306	\$ 32,079
Additional Salary Expense	\$ 18,606	\$ 13,078	\$ 18,857	\$ 20,870	\$ 26,099



**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.