Public Comments and Responses
Outdoor Recreation Plan
Public Meetings Spring 2001

Sonoma County Regional Parks Department
Jim R. Angelo, Director
Philip Sales, Park Planning & Design Administrator

August 17, 2001

Introduction:

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the questions and comments received on the June 2000 Outdoor Recreation Plan and the Regional Parks Department responses.

The report covers the comments, questions received on the Outdoor Recreation Plan at the seven meetings held around the County between March and April 2001. In addition to comments and questions made at the meetings, the public was also invited to mail-in comments.

The public was asked to write their comments on comment cards provided at each meeting. Some choose to make their comments orally and not in writing at the meetings. Staff attempted to accurately record comments from notes taken during each meeting.

Overview of Questions and Comments received:

Generally, comments and questions fell into three categories, the categories are:

1. Requests for additional park and recreation facilities not included in the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan.
2. Requests to delete projects from the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan.
3. Questions relating to proposed draft policies and existing Sonoma County Regional Parks Department management policies.

Format:

The comments and questions received have been identified by a number. Where there is a response required, there is either a written response directly below the question or comment. Where a question or comment was repeated our response is provided and can be found beginning on page 35 of the document.

F:\Data\Sites\WebServer1\parks\RecPlan\originals\ORPPub_Mtg2001QA.doc

Sonoma Veterans Memorial Building. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meeting. 3/8/01

Marsha Peterson:
1. Concerned about hiking trails. The Southern Mayacamas trail is surrounded by private properties. What is the proposal for that trail?

> *Response:*
> *Trail alignments are conceptual only. The ORP describes this trail on page 125 as "Mayacamas Ridge Trail South (AH) This proposed trail begins in the City of Sonoma and ends at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. The trail connects the City of Sonoma, Mountain Cemetery, proposed regional preserve using B.L.M. property (P14), Trinity Road, and Sugarloaf Ride State Park." Also see Response #1.*

Dave Henderson:
Supports the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan. He would like to make some suggestions:

2. Would like to have trail segments more unified under one title, eg. A Sonoma to Santa Rosa Trail.

> *Response:*
> *See Response # 4.*

3. Is in supportive of the Sonoma Valley Trails but would like to include an additional trail connecting Petaluma Adobe State Park to the Sonoma Adobe.

> *Response:*
> *See Response # 14.*

4. Sonoma Mountain: not enough protection, would like more open space preservation
See Attachment 1

> *Response:*
> *The purpose of the ORP is to focus on outdoor recreation. The Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District's Acquisition Plan and the County's special study zone for Sonoma Mountain include preservation measures for Sonoma Mountain.*

Mr. Bailey:
5. A resident of the area where the proposed Mayacamas Ridge Trail South would be located does not want these trails on or near his property.

> *Response:*
> *See Response #1.*

Richard Dale:
6. Supports Recreation Plan and stated that he felt that Sonoma County is a world class tourist destination. He indicated that he may submit additional comments by mail. We received a letter supporting the establishment of wildlife parks in the Sonoma Valley, as well as a network of trails. **See Attachment 18**

Response: Future acquisition and development of land for specific park and recreation facilities has to balance the conservation of significant natural resources and public use. The primary purpose of the Draft Plan is to address public recreation needs. In the course of preparation of this plan several properties with unique habitat values have been considered. In many cases, resource management agencies and policies limit public access. Because of these limitations, these properties are not counted towards meeting the recreational goals of the Draft Plan. For reference, we have designated those properties as "Preserves". This designation is by no means a complete listing of all preserves, but simply those properties that have come up in the course of researching this plan.

Jacquelyn Steuer:
7. She stated that she represented the City of Sonoma and supports the ORP. She drew staff's attention to Resolution No. 46-1999 from the City of Sonoma that supported the establishment of a county-wide network of trails and natural parklands, recognizes the need for outdoor recreation opportunities of all types and make the protection of natural areas for recreation a priority. **See Attachment 2**

Response:
No Response needed. Copy of City Resolution is included in the Outdoor Recreation Plan Appendix 11-11.

Helle Griffiss:
8. She is concerned that these trails would increase trespassing on her property on Gehricke Road.
Response:
See Response #1 and #3.

Chris Jones:
9. He supports the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan. He wanted to know why is the Bay Area Ridge Trail is not named specifically?

Response:
See Response #4.

Phil Morton:

10. He felt that there are too many restrictions placed on dogs in parks and that there are not enough places for owners to take their dogs.

Response:
See Response # 5.

11. He stated that he understands the concerns of the homeowners who are afraid that trails will increase trespassers on their property, his solution is open communication and obtaining permission from individual landowners.

Response:
See Responses #1 & #3.

George Ellman:
12. He stated that he was concerned about child safety and urged that a trail be constructed to link the surrounding community with Dunbar School as there are no sidewalks for children to walk to school on Dunbar Road.

Response:
Safe access to public schools is a concern for a number of agencies including the Public Works Department and the School District. Dunbar School has been in existence for many years. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan proposes a trail to extend from Sonoma to the Santa Rosa City Limits (see page 125-6 for description). The north-south conceptual trail corridor of the proposed Sonoma Valley Trail includes the Dunbar Road area. When the time comes to do project specific planning the option of improvements to Dunbar Road as a trail corridor between Sonoma and Santa Rosa could be considered. Sidewalk improvements are handled through the County Public Works Department. His comments will also be forwarded to Public Works.

13. He asked whether the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan was being coordinated with City General Plans. **See Attachment 3**

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan has been coordinated with City General Plans in several ways. In determining parkland needs, city park properties have been included in the tabulation of available recreation resources. Often recommendations made in the city general plans that occur outside city limits have been included. Two examples include: the Western Hills Regional Park outside of Cloverdale and Taylor Mountain Regional Park and on the edge of Santa Rosa. Existing and proposed trails that are referenced in city general plans run through city limits have been connected with proposed County trails in the ORP. In addition, the cities have commented on the ORP. Several City Council members and/or staff – from various cities in Sonoma County have attended ORP public meetings and have prepared comments on the Draft Plan; see Draft ORP Appendix II.

Lou Benson & Marsha Peterson:
14. They represent landowners surrounding Mayacamas Mountains and are concerned about the dangers that would come with building a trail in their area, such as fire danger, traffic hazards, trespassing, crime, and trash. They have sent out 600 Surveys to property owners in the area. They stated that 227 respondents do not want the trail. 196 of these have agreed to provide their names on a petition. Only 24 respondents had either no opinion or would not mind a trail near their property. Requested that the Mayacamas Trail be deleted from the Plan. **See Attachment 4**

Response:
See Responses # 1, #3, #6 and #7. Also see Response to Question #1.

15. Wants Vailetti property in Boyes Hot Springs to be a park.

Response:
The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department is willing to work with the Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District and willing landowners to acquire property in the Boyes Hot Springs Area for a park that is already included in the existing General Plan.

16. Ms. Benson stated that she did not agree with Mr. Dale about the desirability of making Sonoma a "world class destination"

Response:
No Response needed.

Arthur Dawson:
17. He stated that he is a member of the Sonoma Valley Trails Committee and would like to support the proposal for a route for the Central Valley Trail from Madrone to the northern intersection of Dunbar Road and Highway 12.

Response:
See response above to Mr. George Ellman's question #12.

18. He reminded everyone that the Board of Supervisors are meeting to discuss the development of the Gemini property and the future of the trail link with Sonoma Valley Regional Park and Glen Ellen on April 3rd. **See Attachment 5**

Response:
No response necessary. (Note: On April 17, the Board approved the Gemini project and included the trail link as a result of negotiations between the Geminis and the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department).

Arden Kremer:

19. She stated that: "Trails and open-space parks are fine but what we really need in Sonoma Valley are "hardware" facilities. Aquatic therapy pools for seniors; recreational swimming pools for our growing youth population; tennis & bocce courts for all!"

Response:
See Response #5.

Santa Rosa Veterans Memorial Building. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meetings. 3/15/01

Bob Griswald:
20. What is planned for access from Los Alamos Road to McCormick Ranch?

Response:
The County, State Parks and Landpaths are working together to repair the road and access to Hood Mountain Regional Park and the McCormick Ranch property belonging to State Parks.

Ken Wells:
21. He stated that he represented the Coalition for the Outdoor Recreation Plan (CORP). Although he supports the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan, he feels plan is incomplete and would like to have the following trails added. He also indicated that CORP would send a letter to us with more details
? ? Petaluma Adobe to Sonoma Adobe Trail.
? ? A trail, connecting with Shiloh Regional Park with Foothill Regional Park.
? ? Mark West Trail.
? ? Salmon Creek Trail.
? ? Bay Area Ridge Trail.
See Attachment 6

Response:
See Response #13.

Matt Praetzel:
22. He stated that he feels that more trails should be added. Also concerned about whether hikers and bikers should be allowed on the same trail. Would prefer a more primitive trail system for hikers only verses "Multi-use" trails.

Response:
The Plan assumes all trails are multi-use, however as each project moves forward with more specificity there may be conditions that require some limitations on use on a case by case basis. See Responses #7, #8 and #11.

J. Lee:

23. “Please fund passive use parks and build more trails connecting the parks. These are relatively low maintenance items once they are financed and built, compared to active use parks. Passive use parks are environmentally sound!”

Response:

See Response #9.

Healdsburg, Villa Chanticleer. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meetings. 3/22/01

During the course of the presentation, several questions were asked in addition to those during the scheduled question and answer session:

24. What about access (to parks and trails) for the disabled?

Response:
Since the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became law in 1991, the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department has been implementing the ADA transition plan to upgrade and modify all facilities that existed prior to 1991. An ADA Transition Plan is required of all public agencies. All facilities constructed since the Americans with Disabilities Act became law must comply with Federal and State accessibility guidelines. Sonoma County Regional Parks maintains a proactive approach to issues including monitoring new proposed trail guidelines that may become law in 2002.

25. What about traffic concerns in specific park proposals?

Response:
See Response #7.

26. What is Open Space sales tax funds being used for?

Response:
The Open Space District is funded by a quarter cent sales tax that will expire in 2010 unless reauthorized by voters. The Open Space District, which administers the funds, uses the funds for acquisition of conservation easements and can use funds to acquire property for parks. The Open Space District has a new Acquisition Plan that was adopted in 2000 detailing its goals and objectives for the next ten years.

27. A question was asked about the "Parks Neighbor Survey" conducted by Sonoma County Regional Parks Department in 1997. Although the survey was sent to almost 500 park and trail neighbors three hundred that did not respond. Was the survey sent to people who lived next to or near the parks?

Response:
The response to the survey was over 40%, which by most mail surveys is a high number. Typically with these types of surveys the agency sending out the survey tends to hear from the least satisfied people who want to share an opinion of how to improve things or register a complaint. In the 1997 survey of Park and Trail Neighbors, there were a high number of respondents who indicated that they were

satisfied being a trail or park neighbor. It might also be concluded that many of the non-respondents are also satisfied. The survey was sent out to all property owners within 200 feet of the parks or trail surveyed.

28. Where does the money come from to build these parks?

Response:
Typically development funding comes from developer impact fees and grants. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department actively pursues federal and state grant funding for parks.

29. Is the trail around the county a dream or reality?

Response:
All projects within the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan will take time to implement. However, the purpose of the Plan if adopted is to provide a "blueprint" for obtaining land and getting funding. Prioritization of projects would depend on the availability of funding and land. The County has a Five-Year Capital Project Plan that is updated annually reflecting projects that the County would like to pursue.

Elisa Barron:
30. What are the plans for the proposed park on Fitch Mountain, I am concerned about fire and earthquakes affecting the park (and surrounding areas).

Response:
The County is interested in acquiring Fitch Mountain as a regional park and has invested a considerable amount of time and cost to date to acquire the property. However, the owners have not indicated any willingness to pursue negotiations at this time. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department has continued to keep in touch with the owner's representative.
For Fire Concerns See Response #6.

Earthquakes as they relate to park planning and development is limited. The geology is studied in order to determine where there are geologic and possibly earthquake hazards that need to be mitigated. These factors are incorporated into the infrastructure, such as the loading of a retaining wall. Pt. Reyes National Sea Shore, Pinnacles National Monument and other parks have used geologic faults and earthquake impacts as an educational and interpretive opportunity.

Jim Hamilton:
31. Geyserville Planning Committee would like to work with Regional Parks to build and maintain a community/visitor Center in Geyserville. They have $1.3 million dollars available towards such a

project. Also interested in the C3 and R3 conceptual idea for a river access and community park in the Geyserville area. **See Attachment 7**

Response:
If and when the Outdoor Recreation Plan is adopted, the Board of Supervisors could direct the Regional Parks Department to proceed with implementing the projects in collaboration with local communities.

Ron Norgrove:
32. Is Regional Parks affected by the land freeze to build a certain amount of homes in Sonoma County?

Response:
Residential development does provide park mitigation fees in the unincorporated areas of the County. These are paid by developers of new residential units. There would be some loss of funds available from park mitigation fees if there were a "freeze" on new housing units.

Dave Lewers:
33. What will these trails do to the environment and wildlife/habitat for endangered species, will they be protected?

Response:
See Response #8.

34. Hunting concerns- will these trails be seasonal?

Response:
Each trail easement may cross through a number of properties with different uses. There might be different management policies for areas such as hunting on adjacent lands. See also Response #11.

35. What will be done to maintain these trails?

Response:
Trail maintenance is handled through Regional Parks Maintenance Division. Depending upon the type of trail and site specific conditions, there are different maintenance practices used to maintain the trail.

36. What about the environmental pollution from horse manure from recreation?

Response:
The issue of the impact of manure is being researched by a group called Enviro-Horse. Their findings regarding ammonia quantities, invasive seed dispersal, and other issues as they relate to equestrian use are posted on their website: http://www.californiastatehorsemen.com/envirohorse.htm. Enviro-Horse's findings can be summarized that ammonia levels are negligible and other impacts can be mitigated. In addition to addressing health and environmental concerns with horse manure, there are also studies on other ecological and regulatory issues regarding equestrian trail use.

37. If someone allows trail access on part of their property, would they be able to put some restrictions on how and when it can be used?

Response:
The conditions of access permitted on a property are subject to negotiation between the landowner and purchaser. Conditions such as time of year of operation, time of day, signage, methods of travel, etc. are negotiated at the time of sale. However, if restrictions make the trail easement impractical, it may require consideration of alternatives.

Fred Euphrat:
38. Eco-tourism raises the most money – why no projects?

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan recognizes the value of recreation within the Sonoma County Economy (Chapter II). Depending on what the definition of "Eco-Tourism" is, the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan identifies many potential locations for visitors to enjoy the uniqueness of Sonoma County. In many places Eco-tourism involves private development and/or partnership. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan does not address private facilities specifically. However, Draft Policy 4.1 recognizes the possibility of working with non-profit groups and organizations to provide a range of recreational uses on lands acquired with public funds.

39. Economic analysis does not include hedonic value of housing or equipment.

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan has not, due to budget, been able to investigate all possible economic benefits, however, it is clear from the results of the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department's 1997 "Park Neighbor Survey", that adjacent property owners mostly regard the adjacency of a park or trail as a benefit.

40. The Federal Government is trying to sell some BLM properties in the County— please buy them.

Response:
Sonoma County has been notified of surplus B.L.M. properties in the County. The Federal government is required to notify all other government agencies prior to selling surplus lands. Where appropriate and practical, the County may consider acquiring these parcels. However, several of these properties are landlocked, small parcels and some such a parcel in the Geysers has a geothermal plant as a lessee. Two large parcels near Sugarloaf Ridge State Park are being pursued by State Parks (P11). A parcel near the City of Sonoma is being considered as a Preserve (P14) as part of the Draft Plan.

41. River access with beaches is necessary at regular intervals along the Russian River.

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan has seven proposals for river access sites at regular intervals along the Russian River.

42. Lake County – please consider extensive parklands.

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan does not identify any properties outside of existing State Parks. Within Sonoma County the State Park superintendents for the Silverado District indicated that they prioritize projects that add to existing State Parks (see Chapter IV page 40).

43. Multi-use (especially bike) trails in North County for tourism industry are important

Response:
The Plan assumes all trails are multi-use, however as each project moves forward with more specificity there may be conditions that require some limitations on use on a case by case basis. See Responses #7, #8 and #11.

Kathleen Palmer:
44. What are the plans for a Mill Creek trail?

Response:
Currently there is no trail in the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan that would be near Mill Creek.

Bodega Bay, The Grange. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meetings. 3/29/01

Bonnie Hughes:
45. Doran Park – Recommends outlawing jet skis in Bodega Bay due to noise.

Response:
See Response #11.

Chuck Rhinehart:
46. Supports CORP's list to six additional trails.
See Attachment 8

Response:
See Response #13.

47. He felt that the balance of the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan with its "emphasis on Community and Active Parks", means the plan is out of "whack."

Response:
See Response #9.

Bill Wheeler:
48. What will happen with the Collis property?

Response:
The project is included in the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan as a segment of Bodega to Sebastopol Trail (AA). The Trail is not in the existing General Plan. The County has a signed and recorded Irrevocable Offer of Dedication for the trail from the owner. Once the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is adopted, the County may accept the offer. An actual alignment and location of the trail would have to be worked out.

Sebastopol Veterans Memorial Building. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meeting. 4/12/01

Kim Cordell:
49. Preserve the Laguna de Santa Rosa by designating it as an Open Space Park in the plan.

Response:
See Response #10.

Helen Shane:
50. Need to help preserve the Laguna de Santa Rosa.

Response:
See Response #10.

51. In support of the swimming pool for the City of Sebastopol.

Response :
See Response #5.

Sue Nosker:
52. She spoke as an adult speaking for the teens in Sebastopol. She would like to see the creation of a park where kids can be creative and release some positive energy. She would also like to see a skate park at Ragle Ranch Regional Park.

Response:
See Response #5.

Colin Close:
53. Make coastal trail for backpacking too.

Response:
Currently, backpacking (overnight wilderness travel, as opposed to car camping) is only permitted in two places in Sonoma County, neither of which is along the Coast. Backpacking along the Coast Trail is found where there is a significant sized wilderness area, such as Sinkyone State Park Wilderness at the Lost Coast. It should be noted that there are planned proposals for expansions of County Parks and State Parks along the Coastal Trail.

54. Please don't put bridges on the Kortum Trail.

Response:

State Parks is the agency involved in the management of the Kortum Trail. There are a number of existing bridges along the Kortum Trail that allow for trail users to cross creeks. The trail would not be possible without these bridges. State Parks: Sonoma Coast State Beach office can be contacted at 707-875-3483 for questions about their facilities.

55. A skate park is needed in Sebastopol.

Response:
See Response #5.

56. Supports the preservation of the Laguna de Santa Rosa.

Response:
See Response #10.

Debra Caprio:
57. In support of a skate park in Sebastopol and hopes the City of Sebastopol and the County of Sonoma can work together.

Response:
See Response #5.

Carol Vellutini:
58. Would like CORP's proposed six additional trails to be added to the plan.

Response:
See Response #13.

Eric Wildt:
59. Wants a skate park in Sebastopol.

Response:
See Response #5.

Jim Finn:
60. Would like CORP's proposed six trails to be added to the plan.

Response:
See Response #13.

Petaluma Veterans Memorial Building. Outdoor Rec. Plan Public Meeting, 4/19/01

Ted Elliott:
61. Make sure that you do not lock yourself into specific projects under this plan, you want to be able to take advantage of opportunities that may come up. Use appropriate language to leave room for changes.

Response:
See Response #12.

Matt McGuire:
63. Frustrated at the lack of open space parks in the Petaluma area where there is only Helen Putnam Regional Park. Why isn't the majority of money spent on open space parks, if that's want the population wants? Listen to the public's needs which are more trails and open space parks.

Response:
See Response #9.

Peter Kramer:
62. The Survey shows that the population wants open space parks and trails, but the Supervisors say that more active recreation parks should be built. How can the people be heard if the Supervisors are against it? The cost for active recreation parks is so much higher and takes away money to acquire Open Space land.

Response:
See Response #9.

Pat Elliott:
64. Concerned about loss of park designation on top of Sonoma Mountain.

Response:
See Response #2A.

65. What about Galvin Ranch?

Response:
Supervisor Mike Kerns has made it a high priority to acquire land for a south Sonoma Mountain Regional Park. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department, the Open Space District and the Bay Conservancy Program have been actively pursuing the offer by the property owner to sell Galvin Ranch for a park.

Larry Modell:
66. On page 47 of the Plan it states that according to the survey the majority of the population would like emphasis placed on Open Space Parks and Trails. If this is the case why does it seem like more emphasis is being placed on Active Parks?

Response:
See Response #9.

67. Will you be able to take advantage of opportunities that may come up or are you locked in with the projects that are listed in the plan?

Response:
See Response #12.

68. Don't back off on Lafferty Ranch – the County supported it in the past General Plan.

Response:
Lafferty Ranch is a park project being developed by the City of Petaluma. An EIR has been prepared for the project by the City. The project is acknowledged and inventoried along with other state, federal and city projects in the unincorporated areas Outdoor Recreation Plan, under Other Lands.

69. The General Plan has showed 500 acres at Coopers Grove, what happened?

Response:
See Response #2B.

70. A large park is needed on Sonoma Mountain, why not acquire piece by piece?

Response:
See response to Question # 65.

Hank Flum:
71. Why not take another survey – one that the Board of Supervisors will be happy with?

Response:
Although individual members of the Board of Supervisors expressed concerns about the methodology of the original 1995 Survey prepared by Strategy Research Institute at the Policy Workshops in 1999, the Board did not direct any additional survey work be conducted.

Mary Pink:
72. Doesn't understand why the Board of Supervisors does not accept that the majority of the population wants open space parks.

Response:
See Response #9.

Carol Vellutini:
73. Ridge Trail – wants it to be a multi-use trail.

Response:
The Plan assumes all trails are multi-use, however as each project moves forward with more specificity there may be conditions that require some limitations on use on a case by case basis.

Jim Duffy:
74. Won't buy an annual pass this year because he feels there are not enough trails or open space parks to warrant the pass. There needs to be more open space parks.

Response:
The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department is working to increase the number of open space parks, trails, and other recreation facilities.

Presentation to the Sea Ranch Association at Sea Ranch 5/5/01

A presentation of the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan was made to the Sea Ranch Association on May 5th, 2001 at the request of the Association. Although this meeting was not one of the six Public Meetings, several non Sea Ranch residents attended.

John Kerns:
75. Concerned that the Bluff Top Trail (at Sea Ranch) is eroding, easement is in danger of falling into the Ocean.

> *Response:*
> *In response to this issue, the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department contacted the State Coastal Commission. The Commission was the body that required the trail nearly three decades ago. Regional parks received a letter from the Coastal Commission in April 1998 stating that the Sea Ranch trails should be maintained in or near their present location. They suggested constructing bridges, etc. However, the Commission staff stated that "if any portion of the trail needs to be abandoned because of worsening erosion, we will be glad to assist in the investigating what is necessary to relocate the underlying easement to an alternative location still proximate to the shoreline".*

Jerry Rudy (Mr. Rudy prefaced his remarks by stating that he was a volunteer at Stillwater Cove Regional Park)**:**
76. Concerned with the maintenance at Stillwater.

> *Response:*
> *The focus of the Outdoor Recreation Plan is future needs and facilities. This concern was directed to Sonoma County Regional Parks, Parks Maintenance Manager.*

77. What happened to the signs on top of the bluff to prevent erosion of the trails? Now it is eroding due to poor administration, not a lack of time and money.

> *Response:*
> *The signs that were originally installed on the bluff top that alerted park users to erosion and cliff hazards have disappeared for unknown reasons. Regional Parks Maintenance will review policy with County Risk Management and reinstall appropriate signage.*

78. Restrooms in the cove are too close to the ocean and creek. The riprap makes it seem like a quarry. The restroom shouldn't have been located there in the first place. Now there is a 6-7 foot drop to the beach with some rough steps.

Response:
The location of the restrooms was selected in 1970's for several reasons. There was existing infrastructure from an old boathouse from the previous landowners that was used as part of the new restroom. Due to the projected high-use of the cove, a permanent restroom was located near the point of access for public and marine health issues. Riprap and similar protection will be necessary to protect the building against erosion from the sea.

79. What about the orange fence along Highway 1 that was supposed to be temporary?

Response:
The orange barrier fence along the Highway is at the edge of Caltrans right-of-way and Regional Park's property. Caltrans originally erected the fence. Regional Parks will contact Caltrans to determine when the slide will be repaired.

80. Where does planning fit into these maintenance and operating issues?

Response:
The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department's Parks Operations and Maintenance staff review all proposed park development projects. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan includes the estimated costs of operating and maintaining proposed new facilities. This is reflected in Appendix #7.

81. Describe your plans for Stillwater Cove Regional Park expansion. Will there be additional campsites?

Response:
At this time an adjacent property owner has deeded a life estate to Sonoma County. Eventually Stillwater Cove will expand by over 220 acres. The County will only acquire the property on the death of the owner. Once the County accepts the property a Master Plan will be prepared for it. At this time it will be determined if there will be additional campsites.

82. Is there a Master Plan for Stillwater Cove Regional Park?

Response:
Yes. The Stillwater Cove Master Plan for the original park was adopted in August 1976.

83. What about the trail that will connect Stillwater Cove Regional Park with Salt Point State Park?

Response:
The trail that will connect Stillwater Cove Regional Park with Salt Point State Park is near completion on Regional Parks property. The State is still in the planning stages of connecting their existing trail system with the new trail connection. Regional Parks will be constructing a bridge over Stockoff Creek this summer. The bridge is located at the old logging bridge site to minimize impacts. The trail connection utilizes the Canyon trail for only a short section and to avoid Stockoff Creek. There is a 132' gap between the State and County property that Regional Parks is in negotiation with the landowner.

Julie Verran: Reporter for the Independent Coast Observer
84. Where will the funding for Kelly Road come from?

Response:
At this time, there is no answer to that question.

85. When Kelly Road was offered by the Corps of Engineers where was the County?

Response:
In discussions with the United States Army Corps of Engineers Corps (Corps) in 1999, the County had raised a number of issues. These included the Corps' actual title to sections of the road, the differences in some areas where legal descriptions did not match the road's actual location and the physical condition of the road. The United States Army Corps of Engineers sold its interest in Kelly Road in 1999 to a private party. The County was surprised and disappointed that the Corps did not respond to letters from the County expressing a willingness to acquire the section from Soda Springs Road to the park. It appears that the Corps found it more convenient to dispose of the entire road to a single private property owner and avoid the questions and due diligence that is required of a public agency acquiring property with public funds. Since that time the County has been attempting to resolve the matter of the access to the existing County Park (Soda Springs Reserve) with the new owners.

Tom Cochrane:
86. What is the Gualala River Waterway Trail?

Response:
The Gualala River Waterway Trail is one of three waterway trails identified in the existing General Plan. On page 183 of the existing General Plan "Gualala River Waterway Trail. The Gualala River is a navigable waterway and as such, public access is protected by Article XV, Section 2 of the California Constitution. The trail follows the river from the Sonoma/Mendocino county line to Stewart's Point Road."

On page 184 "Recreational Waterways: Recognize boating and canoeing activities on designated waterways. Limit hiking trails to connections between urban areas, parks and the waterway."

87: There is a need for a soccer field to accommodate the 55 kids who live in the affordable housing area. This would be low cost, and low maintenance. Please consider locating a soccer field at Gualala Pt. Regional Park.

Response:
The County has already provided funds to create a Community Park at Horicon School where most of the kids attend school. There are new play fields created for public use. There are no plans at this time to amend the Master Plan Gualala Point Regional Park. The Master Plan and environmental documents identified activities that are compatible at the site. The activities that are compatible at the site include fishing, camping, picnicking, hiking, swimming, boating, nature study, etc.

Kathy Mondragon:
88. What about the expansion on Gualala Point Regional Park?

Response:
In 1991, the Regional Parks Department commenced negotiations with the Gualala Redwoods Company to acquire 32 acres to expand Gualala Point Regional Park for camping and fishing access. Funding assistance was requested from the State Coastal Conservancy and the Save-the-Redwoods League. Negotiations ended in 1992 because the asking price was far more than the County's appraisal substantiated. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department would be interested in reviving negotiations.

Dale Cox:
89. How does the Coastal Trail affect the Sea Ranch Association. How will it be established?

Response:
The California Coastal Trail is a State project. The Sea Ranch Homeowner's Association would be involved when the State is at a more detailed planning phase.

Comment Cards/Letters:

Note: In some cases the Comment Card reflected the authors' verbal statements at the meetings. Where extensive responses to a particular questioner have already been made to a question, we have reflected this as a note next to the questioner's name.

Jim Finn:

90. Please include the following trails:

1. Adobe to Adobe
2. Mark West
3. Foothills
4. McCray Ridge
5. Cedars
6. Salmon Creek

Response:
See response #13.

91. "We need a park up on Sonoma Mountain. These [trails] must be in the General Plan or Open Space can't get the easement. It will take many years to implement the trails so we can't wait for a latter plan to include these trails."

Response:
See response #2 and answers to Question # 65.

Carol Vellutini:

92. "The Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, a coalition of volunteers and agencies, plans, promotes, builds, acquire and maintains the more than 400 mile Bay Area Ridge Trail, a multi use trail that when complete will connect over 75 parks and open spaces on the ridgeline surrounding the San Francisco Bay. Recognizing the growing recreational needs of the bay Area diverse populations, along with the desire of individuals to connect with their communities and the outdoor environment the council creates links between parks, people and communities. In the Petaluma area, the trail will come from Helen Putnam Regional Park to the Old Adobe and connect to Jack London State Park. We ask that the Trail be designated as a Bay Area Ridge Trail in the Outdoor Recreation Plan".

Response:
See Response #4.

Mike Stiffler:

93. "I enjoy hiking in Sonoma County. I would like to see funds go towards passive parks (and trails), as well as the active ones. The CORP's trails are very important to everyone's future in Sonoma County to retain some natural beauty and habitat. Thank you for planning our future."

Response:
See response #13.

Val Hanson:
94. "I support the proposed trail additions of 1) Adobe to Adobe Trial 2) the Mark West Trail 3) the Foothill Trail 4) the McCray Ridge Trail 5) the Cedars Trail 6) the Salmon Creek Trail."

Response:
See response #13.

Stephen M. Brown:
95. "I am a hiker and would like to have passive parks and trails: I would like to have the six CORP Trails 1) Adobe Trail 2) Mark West Trail 3) Foothill Trail 4) McCray Ridge 5) Cedars Trail, 6) Salmon Creek Trail. Let's have more and better trails."

Response:
See response #13.

Elizabeth Ward:
96. "Please include these 6 trails: Adobe, Mark West, Foothill, McCray Ridge, Cedars, and Salmon Creek."

Response:
See response #13.

Judith Reimuller:
97. "I support the CORPS proposed 6 trails: 1) Adobe 2) Mark West 3) Foothill 4) McCray Ridge 5) The Cedars 6) Salmon Creek. I also believe passive parks should receive funds equal to the active parks. I ask that you support these trails."

Response:
See response #13.

Eugenia Lea-McKenzie:
98. "There are 6 trails on the CORP list that aren't included in the General Plan update. Please consider adding these trials. Also the thrust should be for passive use- i.e. Trails, rather than active use i.e. Soccer fields, etc. on County land"

Response:
See response #13.

Laura Blatt:
99. "I am an avid hiker who is concerned about our Sonoma County Trail system. Please include the CORP trails in you plans: Adobe Trail, Mark West Trail, Foothill Trail, McCray Ridge, Cedars Trail, and Salmon Creek Trail".

Response:
See response #13.

Kim Barker:
100. "I love the out-of-doors! And hope you will consider (positively) the CORP's proposed trail additions to the Outdoor Recreation Plan. Imagine these trails around the County and the good they do for each of us – exercise, relief form city stresses, beauty, etc".

Response:
See response #13.

Stephanie Zaborowski:
101. Letter supporting the CORP proposal of the six additional trails to be added to the Outdoor Recreation Plan.
See Attachment 9

Response:
See response #13
.
Mary Vercoutere:
102. "Dear Folks, We really need trails for hiking in Sonoma County. We'll need these easements: Adobe to Adobe Trail, McCray Ridge Trail, The Cedars Trail, and Salmon Creek Trail. I promote passage on these trails and am a hiker".

Response:
See response #13.

Sue Nosker:
103. "It is imperative that the County provide recreation for teens. Re-creation is to create through expansion of body, mind and spirit. Teens need an alternative to TV viewing and video games. Please consider skateboard parks in as many urban areas as possible."

Response:
See response #5.

Christina Sophia:

104. “Sounds good, happy to hear recreation and open public space is such a big priority. My concern specifically is to address the recreational needs of adolescents in the Sebastopol –River Area & get a skate park into the master plan for Ragle Ranch Regional Park or into another park plan which would be built in the next year.”

Response:
See response #5.

Jennifer Prowell:
105. “We need a skate park at Ragle Park now! Please amend the General Plan to reflect this. Our teenagers need a place to focus their energies on skating. They are good kids – please help support them as well as you have supported other age groups. We need a skate park now!”

Response:
See response #5.

Steve Weinberger:
106. “WSCS would like to encourage the County to promote aquatic facilities in its Outdoor Recreation Plan. Public swimming pools can serve a wide range of residents, from your to adult, for both recreational and health needs. The state of aquatics in Sonoma County is the worst in the Bay Area. The number of pools is decreasing while our population is increasing.”

Response:
See response #5.

Paul Peyrat:
107. Letter of support for more tennis and other recreational facilities.
See Attachment 10

Response:
See response #5

Janis Dolphin:
108. Letter encouraging the inclusion for off-leash recreation with dogs in the Northern Sonoma Coast area.
See Attachment 11

Response:
See response #5

Natosi Johanna:
109. “Since hearing about ORP, I’ve been shocked with the few number of accessible acres compared with Marin and even Napa counties. We have more land-base and less population

density, how can this be? To change this, I wish you could work on better trails - most important a trail that runs along the river from Forestville to the Ocean – through forests. The time is now to begin this."

Response:
Table 5 on Page 39 of the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan shows that Sonoma County has less publicly accessible land per 1000 population than Napa and Marin. However, the actual amount of accessible land is higher than Napa. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan, if adopted and implemented would improve Sonoma County's standing. The Draft Plan contains several proposed trails that would link Forestville with Jenner. The proposed Russian River Trail (AD) and the Monte Rio to Coast Trail (AZ). Please see Page 104 for trail descriptions. The trail would include river and crest components.

110. "Since the major landscape feature of Sonoma (besides the ocean) is the Russian River watershed more must be done to open access for the public. I've written before about a river trail from Forestville to Jenner, I think there also be a crest trail that follows probably the southern ridge of the river from Forestville to Jenner. This portion of the river must be a national monument."

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan recognizes the significance of the Russian River. Several proposed trails converge on the Jenner area (See answer to Question #106).

Richard Migliore:
111. "I very much would like to see more passive use parks. A greater appreciation for the outdoors comes from these types of parks for adult and children. Sonoma County is far behind other Bay Area Counties in the amount of open space and passive use parks, and before development takes over all the land. 'In wilderness is the preservation of the wild' Thoreau. Please vote for more passive use parks."

Response:
See Response #9.

Tom Berry and Brigette Mausell-Berry:
112. "Please consider some parks in Geyserville! We need more common, safe, focused recreation in town and try the Russian River! We know the improvements made would benefit local citizens as well as other county residents visiting Geyserville. Let us know if you need more specific input or support to create more outdoor recreation parks, open-space in Sonoma's northern little town of Geyserville."

Response:

The Draft ORP includes a community park and regional recreation area/river access in the Geyserville area.

Susan Bendinelli:

113. "Skate Park – Yes. County needs to share responsibility for the needs of teens and others involved in this sport. The City of Sebastopol is willing to partner modeling after Sonoma. The needs of the skaters have not changed in the last 10 years".

Response:
See Response #5.

David Dippe:
114. "It's time to stop the criminalization of the kids in this city [of Sebastopol]. We need a [skate] park, this will keep the kids off the street, out of school yards, and places they do not belong. Please promote positive qualities in these kids instead of punishing them by ignoring them. Thank you for your time."

Response:
See Response #5.

Debra Capria:
115. "Skate park incorporated in the Sonoma County Outdoor Recreation Plan / Master Plan. Recreation Opportunities for the youth of West County. Ragle Ranch Regional Park serves other recreational needs, why not skateparks? Existing facilities: No skate parks in west County. For the last 10 years every 2 years we have gone to the County, its time. Skateboard park for Ragle Park is a perfect opportunity for the County, since the City of Sebastopol is willing to support the park and work out an agreement with the County. Highly successful Sonoma Skate Park on County property, City of Sonoma takes full responsibility – we would do the same."

Response:
See Response #5.

Monique Rubin:
116. "Please make provision for a skateboard park in Ragle Ranch Park . There is a great need for such a facility in the West County – efforts towards creating one, dates back 10 years. Ragle Park is in my neighborhood, I love it and frequent it daily (walking, running, sporting events, meditating) I think a skate park would fit nicely amongst the soccer fields, where the storage pond is. Thank you for your consideration of this matter."

Response:
See Response #5.

Suzanne and Mark Albin:
117. Letter in support of a skateboard park in Ragle Ranch Park.
See Attachment 12

Response:
See Response #5

Ken Booth:
118. Letter supporting a skateboard park at Ragle Ranch Park.
See Attachment 13

Response:
See Response #5

Christina Sophia:
119. Letter supporting a skateboard park at Ragle Ranch Park.
See Attachment 14

Response:
See Response #5

Robert Rubin:
120. Letter supporting a skateboard park at Ragle Ranch Park.
See Attachment 15

Response:
See Response #5

Diana Short:
121. Letter promoting recreational facilities.
See Attachment 16

Response:
See response #5

Irene Gillooly;
122. Letter supporting a skateboard park at Ragle Ranch Park.
See Attachment 17

Response:

See response #5

Willy Fedun and Dr. Ed Fedum:
123. "A need exists, in the community, for a recreation area outdoors for people here of all ages and ethnic groups. For community health and fellowship it is vital to this community to have a recreation area for the people of Geyserville to meet each other."

Response:
A. The Draft ORP includes a community park and regional recreation area/river access in the Geyserville Area.

Colin Close: (Note Responses to Ms. Close's other questions and comments are made above under questions #53 & 54)
124. "Please include a regional focus on skateparks. This sport has been growing since the 1930's. It exploded in the 1970's with the advent of private skateparks that closed due to liability issues. Now, however, those issues have been laid to rest for unsupervised skateparks on public land. Please support this incredible sport"

Response:
See Response #5.

Cassandra Mathis:
125. "I would like to see more open spaces, trails and rural parks in the Plan. I heard about a plan to connect Armstrong Woods with a trial near Mill Station Road, through a Cedar Grove. Yes to this plan and more of these kinds of plans-trails!"

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan identifies a proposed State preserve on a 1500 acre B.L.M. property called "The Cedars" located northwest of Austin Creek State Recreation Area near Armstrong Woods State Reserve. This property, which has a unique abundance of Sergeant Cypress trees, has no Cedar trees despite its name. CORP has proposed an additional trial that would connect Austin Creek State Recreation Area, The Cedars, and Lake Sonoma. In addition, CORP is advocating the McCray Ridge Trail that would connect Westside Road with Armstrong Woods State Reserve and/or Austin Creek State Recreation Area that would be in the greater region that Mill Station Road is in. At this time neither of these trails is included in the Plan. See Response #13.

Gary Nelson:
126. "Please have more money or equal money set aside for passive recreation parks/trails as active high maintenance parks. Please use the east bay or south bay as examples of such a trail system."

Response:
See Response #9.

Suzanne Nelson:
127. "Hiking trails are essential to appreciating life and the beauty that abounds in Sonoma County. Passive trails are less expensive to maintain than active parks. Consider some equality – consider the south and east bay counties as good examples."

Response:
See Response #9.

A.P. Gelpi:
128. "Compared to the usual City Council, City Planning Commission, or School Board meetings, this is the best organized presentation of the lot!"

Response:
Thank you for the feedback. The Citizens Advisory Committee, public and staff have worked hard to present an effective overview of the plan.

Bonnie Hughes:
129. "Sonoma County Coast Area 1, Bodega Bay compatibility with agriculture/fish industry. Question: As part of this element to be incorporated in to the new General Plan, do you plan to outlaw jet skis and such?"

Response:
See Response #11.

Natasha Leask:
130. "I enjoy the outdoors and hiking. I would suggest that the CORP's five proposed trails be included in the master plan."

Response:
See Response #13.

K. Deforrest:
131. (by e-mail) "Hello: Thank you for visiting the Sea Ranch on May 5 to keep us informed. My question re: the Coastal Trail continuum, which is obviously going to pass through The Sea Ranch. This will be a 10 mile hike. What facilities will hikers use? Is the plan to use existing toilets at public access points? What is the definition of "Coastal"? Within sight of the ocean? Directly along the ocean? Somewhere within access of the ocean?

Response:
The California Coastal Trail is a State project. Questions about specific facilities, parking, restrooms, etc. would be answered when the State is at a more detailed planning phase. For more information, you can contact State Parks Russian River-Mendocino District Headquarters in Duncans Mills.

132. Re: Gualala Regional Park – please do not turn this into a community park for Mendocino County / Gualala residents. The appeal is the natural open space. Thank you again for the opportunity for input."

Response:
There are no plans at this time to amend the Master Plan for Gualala Point Regional Park. The Master Plan and environmental documents identified activities that are compatible at the site. The activities that are compatible at the site include fishing, camping, picnicking, hiking, swimming, boating, nature study, etc.

Kathy Gordon:
133. Support expansion of Gualala Point Park to the east.

Response:
The Draft ORP contains a proposed expansion to the east along the Gualala River.

134. Can (Coastal) trail join up to Sea Ranch trail?

Response:
That detail would be worked out as the State plans the trail route.

135. Support Coastal Ridge Trail from Stillwater Cove to Gualala Point Park.

Response:
The Draft ORP contains a proposed Coastal Ridge Trail from Stillwater Cove Regional Park north to Hauser Bridge Road where the Gualala River Waterway Trail begins. The proposed Coastal Ridge Trail does not continue to Gualala Point Park. During the trail analysis in August 1997 this link was evaluated and scored a low priority.

Denny Tibbetts:
136."Public access to the Estero Americano across private property on Estero Lane is not appropriate. Besides the obvious issue of private, a narrow single lane, no parking, the land itself is an extremely sensitive ecosystem. Neighbors from the area were very pleased to have David Katz form Sonoma Land Trust concur with this and state that public access would occur only on a very limited basis as part of a docent program.

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan includes the Estero Americano Preserve and waterway access.

137. "The Short Tail Gulch Trail is not an appropriate access for general use. If one is not very mindful of tides, rock slides, etc. it can be potentially very dangerous."

Response:
Short Tail Gulch Trail is in the planning stage and is reflected in the Coastal Plan. Currently, access in Short Tail Gulch does not exist. Improvements will be made to provide safe access to the Coast. Regional Parks has applied for grant funding for this project.

Dard Hunter:

138. Regarding Soda Springs Reserve. Too much time wasted. Who is to blame regarding Kelly Road?

R*esponse:*
In discussions with the United States Army Corps of Engineers Corps (Corps) in 1999, the County had raised a number of issues. These included the Corps' actual title to sections of the road, the differences in some areas where legal descriptions did not match the road's actual location and the physical condition of the road. The United States Army Corps of Engineers sold its interest in Kelly Road in 1999 to a private party. The County was surprised and disappointed that the Corps did not respond to letters from the County expressing a willingness to acquire the section from Soda Springs Road to the park. When a public agency acquires property it has to exercise due diligence because it is using public funds. The County has been attempting to resolve the matter of the access to the existing County Park (Soda Springs Reserve) with the new owners.

139. Have wasted road to Preserve. The road is in excellent condition as are the bridges.

Response:
The County has estimated that to bring the 2.5 mile section of road into an acceptable standard for public use as a County road, it would cost over $1 million.

140. The County should have the flexibility to adjust their standards. Such as the ability to post signs limiting weight on bridges.

Response:

The Board of Supervisors will weigh advice from the responsible departments before making decisions to vary from standards.

141. The County should accept the gift from the Lewers and proceed per above.

Response:
The County is in discussion with Mr. Lewers concerning the use of Kelly Road.

142. Do not create another way to get to Soda Springs Reserve. Therein leads too many ecological problems.

Response:
Should an alternative route be deemed a solution to the issue, there would be a study to determine the impacts of that proposal.

143. "Gualala River Hiking Trial extending from Gualala County Park to fork of North and South trenches of the Gualala River." Excellent concept; Let's get on it now; I can line up volunteers to map it; I can line up volunteers to maintain it; Please don't delay; The new County Plan has provision for 409 miles of trails. Lets get all new ones built now and start planning for 409 more miles.

Response:
Until the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is adopted, the proposed project is not County policy.

144. Regarding the trail connecting Salt Point State Park with Stillwater Cove County Park County has gotten their end done – Bravo. State dragging their feet; County should be pushing State to complete their part of the deal. Very soon (this month) mapping will be done by State; then there is nothing but to build it. There are already volunteers ready to take care of the maintenance.

Response:
Volunteers are always welcome to participate through the Sonoma County Regional Parks Volunteer program.

Douglas Neumann:
145. "I'm concerned about County Parks not having enough funds to maintain trails through private property dedication. Don't expand the Parks and trail systems until you can maintain what you already have".

Response:
The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan contains information on the costs of operating and maintaining all the proposed projects in the Plan. This was required by the

Board of Supervisors. There is also a chapter that discusses some potential funding sources.

146. Our community is very concerned about the fire danger on trails that do not have adequate maintenance policing."

Response:
See Responses #3, #6 and #11.

Maggie Salenger Haywood

147. "I am writing to support the inclusion of the Mayacamas Trail Segment in the County Outdoor Recreation Plan. As you may know, those of us in Southern Sonoma Valley must drive to Kenwood or Glen Ellen to access a wilderness trail. With the closing of the Bartholomew Park trail (private land that had allowed public access) and with the potential loss of the McCrea trail, the Mayacamas trail segment will be the only county trail for this area. Moreover, the Mayacamas segment is a necessary part of our long term goal of having a variety of trail options for residents and visitors and linking with other Ridge trails. I understand that the reality of such a trail may be years away, but we must have the vision if we are ever to have the reality."

Response:
The trail is shown on the Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan.

Judy James and Mike Strunk

148. It would be desirable to purchase sufficient width of right of way for trails in areas where there is active agricultural spraying programs on adjacent properties. This would allow the agricultural neighbor to spray up to their property line. It is suggested that a 50' setback buffer space be used.

Response:
We have prepared, with the assistance of our consultant, ,a research report on the status of requirements for "buffer" space between areas where agricultural spraying occurs and other land uses. We contacted several counties on their practices and regulations. We have also included information on the amount and type of chemicals that are applied in Sonoma County as well as the status of those chemicals that are being phased out. We have prepared a map that overlays the trail corridors proposed in the Draft ORP and the locations of properties where there is a permit for chemical applications of pesticides and herbicides on file with the Sonoma County Agricultural Commissioner's Office. Most of the proposed trail corridors are not located within the areas where spraying is currently permitted. The County's West County Rodota Trail passes through areas where there are properties with spray permits. To date there have not been any conflicts between trail users and agricultural operators. A copy of this report will be provided to the CAC and included in the final draft plan.

Residents of Sonoma Valley:

149. Post cards received from residents of Sonoma Valley supporting; "Recreational facilities in Sonoma Valley that emphasize activities such as swimming, tennis and aquatic therapy for citizens of all ages in our valley"

See Attachment 19 – for list of names

Response;
See response # 5

Responses to Comments and Questions where the item was raised several times during the course of the Public Meetings.

1. The Plan has policy language (Policy 2.2, page 28) that states the County will work with willing land owners.

2. Response to issues regarding parks on Sonoma Mountain:

   A. The triangle symbol shown on the top of Sonoma Mountain in the 1989 General Plan was not specifically identified with a particular property on Table PF-5 in the December 1986 EIR and no specific acreage was recommended. The symbol is shown on the vicinity of the former Freiberg property. This property was subdivided in the early 1990s. At the time that the subdivision was being considered, the idea of a park dedication in this area was discussed. Due to access concerns through Sobre Vista, the park was not included in the project, however the Open Space District did acquire a conservation easement on a portion of the property and an offer to dedicate a trail easement. Park symbols on the 1989 General Plan, represent a general area where a park both State and County might be located. In the case of the triangle near the former Freiberg property, this can been interpreted as consistent with the expansion of Jack London State Park, which now includes some Sonoma Developmental Center lands, the trail easement through the former McCrea property and Freiberg trail easement. The Draft ORP identifies the expansion of Jack London State Park in Chapter VI as project P13.

   B. The December 1986 General Plan EIR Table PF-5 recommends a 100 acre park. In 1993, the County obtained 85 acres of property adjacent to Cooper's Grove that is "landbanked" for future parkland development. Although the tables and recommendations in Chapter VI of the Draft ORP reflect how the acreage needs might be addressed, there is some flexibility between projects to address a need within each sub planning area. If the opportunity presents itself, additional acreage could be added. It is anticipated that future expansion of the park would involve coordination with State parks and the Fairfield –Osborne Preserve.

See Attachment 20 – Table PF-5 from December 1986 General Plan EIR

3. Trespass issues have been addressed in the Plan in Appendix 6 Impacts of Recreation. Using 1997 data from the Sheriff's Department, every trespass call was plotted on a map of the county in order to determine if there was a significant correlation between trespassing and public land. These calls to the Sheriff's Department include all calls, regardless of whether an incident report was made by the officer responding to the call. The results of this analysis revealed no correlation between higher levels of trespass reports and proximity to public parks and trails.

4. The Trails element of the plan is broken down into geographically identified segments that can function as separate stand alone trails. The Bay Area Ridge Trail is a proposed 400 mile trail that includes nine bay area counties. Several trails within Sonoma County have already been

designated as segments of the Bay Area Ridge Trail and the ORP includes several proposed trail corridors, which might be designated as part of the Bay Area Ridge Trail once constructed. However, since the ORP is looking at trail corridors to connect communities and facilities within Sonoma County, the use of local land marks, destinations and community names have been used to more clearly identify the corridor.

5. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is a programmatic planning document. Specialized recreation facilities such as dog parks, skate parks, bocce ball courts, tennis courts and swimming pools, are considered at the time that a specific park plan is being developed. This occurs when a master plan and environmental document is being prepared. The project is submitted to public review through the Sonoma County Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission, the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

6. **A.** Chapter IV Impacts of Recreation addresses this issue. There does not appear to be a correlation between higher incidents of fire caused by public use of parks and trails. The ORP includes information on California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) statistics for 1996. This shows that the most prevelant causes of fire and acreage burned are from power lines, equipment operation and vehicles. (This included the 1996 Cavedale Fire caused by a downed power line, that consumed a large number of acres). A study of CDF fire statistics from 1992 to 1999, prepared for the Lafferty Ranch EIR*, revealed that the two primary causes of wildland all fires were equipment use (22.92%), vehicle use (14.58%). Each specific trail or park project may need to consider fire issues as part of their planning process. (* Leonard Charles and Associates)

   B. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department also analyzed all fire incidents in Regional Parks for the period 1990-1998. The number and extent of fires was relatively small. During that period, over 13 million visitors used the parks and trails. (See page 6-18 of the ORP Appendix).

7. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is a programmatic planning document. Traffic impacts created by specific projects are considered at the time that a specific park plan is being developed. This occurs when a master plan and environmental document is prepared. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department uses qualified professional traffic engineers to study potential impacts and propose mitigation for each project. The project is submitted to public review through the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

8. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is a programmatic planning document. Environmental concerns created by specific projects are considered at the time that a specific park plan is being developed. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department uses qualified professional biologists, botanists, archaeologists and other specialists study specific park and trail proposals. Where deemed necessary, park and trail design incorporate mitigation measures for any unavoidable impacts created by a specific project. Regulatory agencies review plans and mitigation for any impacts of proposed park projects. Where permits are required, conditions

are placed on projects to limit negative impacts and maximize benefits. The project is submitted to public review through the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

9. In October 1999, the Board of Supervisors requested that the Draft Plan be revised to include an analysis of community/neighborhood park needs within the unincorporated areas of the County. The Board requested that the Plan use the existing General Plan goal of 5 acres per 1000 population for community and neighborhood parks. The June 2000 Draft Plan includes community/neighborhood park facilities and illustrates how the acreage goals can be met within each sub planning area.

10. The EIR for the 1989 General Plan identifies the Laguna de Santa Rosa Preserve as a 500 acre County Park. Since that time the Laguna has been additionally protected by new regulations and requirements that preserve the unique biotic makeup of this area. The Laguna Foundation working with City of Sebastopol and the Department of Fish and Game have taken a conservative approach to public access and prefer a more limited access approach. Because of the more limited recreational uses, the ORP designates the Laguna as a preserve. Management of these types of facility is usually by an agency whose primary focus in resource conservation and management and where recreation is a secondary goal. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department does however provide access to some parts of the Laguna via the Joe Rodota Trail and the planned Laguna bikeway project that will connect Rohnert Park to Sebastopol.

11. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan is a programmatic planning document. The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department has policies in place that apply to all its facilities. Additional park management policies developed for specific projects. These are developed at the time that a specific park master plan is being developed. These park operational policies and guidelines are included in the Park Resource Management Plans for individual facilities. Proposed changes in parkland management policies are reviewed by staff, the Sonoma County Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

12. The Draft Outdoor Recreation Plan establishes a menu of needs for future project implementation. Locations of facilities are in general areas. The Plan seeks to address the idea of an opportunity purchase in Policy 1.2e: Unforeseen Acquisition Opportunities on pages 26.

13. Additional Proposed Trails (Coalition for Outdoor Recreation Plan)
    Several letters and postcards were received requesting six additional trails be added to the Outdoor Recreation Plan. The description of the trails is consistent in all letters and postcards and reflects the six trails as described by the Coalition for the Outdoor Recreation Plan letter dated March 19, 2001.

    - Adobe to Adobe Trail (6.5 miles)*
    - Mark West Trail (15 miles)
    - Foothill Trail (10 miles)*

- McCray Ridge Trail (9 miles)*
- The Cedars Trail (10 miles)
- Salmon Creek Trail (12.5 miles)*

(* Indicates trail corridor ranked in 1997 evaluation)

Of these proposed additional trail projects four were ranked in the original trail evaluation in 1997. Three of them scored below the Priority 1 level and were not included in the draft ORP. The trail route that follows the proposed "Adobe to Adobe" trail was integrated into that general alignment of the South Sonoma Mountain Trail. The South Sonoma Mountain Trail was ranked (Priority 1).