

TAYLOR MOUNTAIN REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE PRESERVE RESULTS FROM JUNE 29, 2011 WORKSHOP NO. 3 SURVEY

PAST PARTICIPATION IN WORKSHOPS

1. Did you attend either of the previous Community meetings related to the Taylor Mountain Master Plan process?

Yes: 22 (39.3%)

Yes: 10 (17.9%)

No: 30 (53.6%)

No Response: 1 (1.8%)

ALLOWABLE USES & DEVELOPMENT ENVELOPES

1. Considering the community-supported goal *to balance the preservation of Taylor Mountain's natural resources and public access to the property*, do you generally agree with the overall plan?

Yes: 39 (69.6%)

No: 8 (14.3%)

No Response: 9 (16.1%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit A for all comments/suggestions received in the Allowable Uses & Development Envelopes category.**

TRAILS

1. Does the proposed conceptual layout of trails shown on the Trails Map meet the needs of the following:

Equestrians yes: 31 (55.4%), no: 3 (5.4%), no response: 22 (39.2%)

Pedestrians yes: 42 (75.0%), no: 3 (5.4%), no response: 11 (19.6%)

Bicyclists yes: 34 (60.7%), no: 2 (3.6%), no response: 20 (35.7%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Item 1 on Exhibit B for all comments/suggestions received in this portion of the Trails category.**

2. Does the proposed trail system provide adequate access to a variety of destinations, habitats, views, and terrain?

Yes: 47 (83.9%)

No: 1 (1.8%)

No Response: 8 (14.3%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Item 2 on Exhibit B for all comments/suggestions received in this portion of the Trails category.**

ACCESS POINTS / TRAILHEADS

1. Do you agree with the locations* and number of access points proposed?

Yes: 33 (58.9%)

No: 15 (26.8%)

No Response: 8 (14.3%)

*note that an access point requires public land, a public street, or an access easement

Comments / Suggestions: **See Item 1 on Exhibit C for all comments/suggestions received in this portion of the Access Points/Trailheads category.**

2. Is the public access proposed adequate/appropriate to accommodate all types of visitors, including users who are disabled, or less physically able, users of all age groups, and users arriving in cars or bikes, as pedestrians, or by public transit?

Yes: 39 (69.6%)

No: 1 (1.8%)

No Response: 16 (28.6%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Item 2 on Exhibit C for all comments/suggestions received in this portion of the Access Points/Trailheads category.**

3. Is adequate parking provided?

Yes: 25 (44.6%)

No: 10 (17.9%)

No Response: 21 (37.5%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Item 3 on Exhibit C for all comments/suggestions received in this portion of the Access Points/Trailheads category.**

KAWANA SPRINGS AREA (HISTORIC RESORT)

1. Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type and level of intensity of improvements shown in the plan and sketches for the historic resort area?

Yes: 31 (55.4%)

No: 12 (21.4%)

No Response: 13 (23.2%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit D for all comments/suggestions received in the Kawana Springs Area (Historic Resort) category.**

BARN AREA

1. Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type and level of intensity of improvements shown on the plan and sketches for the Barn area?

Yes: 36 (64.3%)

No: 9 (16.1%)

No Response: 11 (19.6%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit E for all for all comments/suggestions received in the Barn Area category.**

PETALUMA HILL ROAD TRAILHEAD

1. Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type, and level of intensity of improvements shown on the plan and sketches for the trailhead area adjacent to Petaluma Hill Road?

Yes: 38 (67.9%)

No: 6 (10.7%)

No Response: 12 (21.4%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit F for all comments/suggestions received in the Petaluma Hill Road Trailhead category.**

LINWOOD TRAILHEAD

1. Do you generally agree with the location and level of intensity of improvements shown on the site plan for the potential trailhead area at the end of Linwood?

Yes: 30 (53.6%)

No: 6 (10.7%)

No Response: 20 (35.7%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit G for all comments/suggestions received in the Linwood Trailhead category.**

PANORAMA DRIVE TRAILHEAD

1. Do you generally agree with the location and level of intensity of improvements shown on the site plan for the potential trailhead area adjacent to Panorama Drive?

Yes: 21 (37.5%)

No: 19 (33.9%)

No Response: 16 (28.6%)

Comments / Suggestions: **See Exhibit H for all comments/suggestions received in the Panorama Drive Trailhead category.**

Name:

Address:

Email:

Completed surveys can be mailed to: Sonoma County Regional Parks, 2300 County Center Drive, Suite A 120, Santa Rosa, CA 95403

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit A: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Allowable Uses & Development Envelopes Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Considering the community-supported goal to balance the preservation of Taylor Mountain's natural resources and public access to the property, do you generally agree with the overall plan?*

- Yes, I generally agree with the overall plan, but no wheels! (1)
- I would hope that the goal would reflect the original wishes of the original property owners. (2)
- Prefer not having bed & breakfast/hotel in the park. No dogs, please – not even on leash – they would disturb the natural wildlife. (3)
- I would like to see as little human impact within the park, no dogs, no cattle or at least only a small number of them. I would also like to see some habitat restoration, more native trees and plants. It is interesting to have the cattle there. (4)
- Access is good for the park. Please no dogs – go to Spring Lake. (5)
- It seems like an excessive amount of infrastructure development. I like reclaiming the old resort...especially if services (B&B) are accessible/affordable to most all. (6)
- I don't think dogs are compatible with preservation goals. I hike on Taylor Mountain often and people bring dogs which disrupts wildlife. (7)
- You are doing a great job protecting the wet meadows. (8)
- No access on Panorama Drive. (11)
- I do agree that on-leash dog access be allowed. (12)
- Would support no dog policy. (13)
- Holland/Panorama should be an emergency fire access only. Most of the drawings (except the one showing probable Farmers Lane extension) have too small a parking lot. All the neighborhoods around will have to receive overflow parking of park users. This is the PLANNING STAGE – PLAN to have a people park! (15)
- No dogs in my opinion due to wildlife on property. (18)
- Cattle and the public don't mix. Hard to understand how cattle can stay once the park is open to the public. Seems dangerous to animals and people. (19)
- Most access should be from Kawana Springs Road area. (20)
- Access from Panorama has many unresolved problems. I suggest having a full time ranger living on property near barn. (21)
- Should be "drive in" off Pet Hill Road period. (22)
- Do not think you should access the park through residential communities. (28)
- The plan has many effective elements. Specifically I am concerned about the Panorama Drive access. (29)
- It would be nice to have it all to myself but...barring that option. What the heck – bring in port-a-potties and the folks fill 'em. And empty them. (30)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit A
June 29, 2011

- No reason to have so many entrances. (31)
- It seems like a very well thought out and diverse plan so far. (32)
- Natural resources – in images of plan there are palm trees? Natural? (35)
- Dogs on leash are totally appropriate. Too much development – keep park more primitive. (37)
- It was proposed to us that it would be mainly hiking trails and not an elaborate park with camping, bed & breakfast, etc. (40)
- I like that most of the trails, etc. use existing ranch roads rather than cutting new ones. (41)
- Hopefully the Master Plan will be guided by science and technical experts – not the loudest voices crying out against various components. (46)
- The overall plan is exciting and well thought out. (50)
- I think there is too much public access on the full plan. Resort? Really? (51)
- Some of the improvements seem questionable – B&B, visitor center event area, barn – all are very low priority for me. My interest is being able to hike on the property. (54)
- I love this plan – it’s great. (55)
- I generally agree, except in lieu of hot springs, could we construct a natural “hot tub”? (56)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit B: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Trails Category

Item 1

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Does the proposed conceptual layout of trails shown on the Trails Map meet the needs of equestrians, pedestrians, bicyclists?*

- I believe that horses and bikes put a huge “footprint” on the land – it should be somehow restricted to pedestrians only. (1)
- I am opposed to bicycles being allowed on single track trails. I would hope that the bicyclists would not use the hiking only trails, but that has not been the case in other parks. (2)
- Limit bicycles and horses. (3)
- Hiking is my priority – the more “wilderness” the better. (5)
- Less multi-use trails in favor of pedestrian only (single tracks) – keep all trails off the iconic open areas (iconic from the distant view). (6)
- I personally like the trails that are pedestrian. (7)
- Yes, I think it is great that you are removing the trail that goes straight up the mountain. (8)
- I would like to see dogs on-leash. (9)
- Possibly meets the needs of pedestrians (did not vote yes or no). (10)
- Horses should be restricted to very specific areas – otherwise they’ll dominate the park. (11)
- Holland Drive is a narrow, curvy, rural road which should not be used for equestrian, pedestrian, or bicycle access if it means arriving in a car, to perform that use. Only a fire access makes sense! (15)
- I’m only a walker/hiker. Not sure about the rest but it looks good. (18)
- Dog walkers? (yes – please!) Like the idea of stacked trails. (20)
- Multi-use access can work with education signage and management. (21)
- Should be left in wild state. (22)
- Considerable interest was voiced in the first meeting about having dogs access the property. I strongly favor being able to bring my dog, on leash, with me while hiking. (26)
- The trails plan looks great! Need to ensure access to leashed dogs. (27)
- Don’t know, never been on the park. (28)
- Too many people. Support Planned Parenthood – plague and pestilence. (30)
- It seems that the needs are met, yet there are many details still to be defined. (32)
- Horses intimidate hikers in confined trail areas. **Annadel** is their option. (34)
- Need to set a list of priorities or order of importance for all these improvements. What gets built first? (37)
- I would like to see some single track pedestrian only trails in more remote areas of the park. (39)
- Pedestrians should not share the trails with bicyclists and equestrians. (40)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit B
June 29, 2011

- Unable to assess if the needs of equestrians are met. Pedestrian and bicyclists needs are met with some qualifications: some of the steeper single-track trails should be bike only or pedestrian/hiker only. (41)
- Dogs on leash on trails and only on trails. Please allow dogs! I live less than a mile from the park and would love to take her there. (42)
- Appreciate all the multi-use trails. Also appreciate the protection of natural resources by using hiker only in specific areas even though this will pose some territorial and patrol issues. (44)
- Make one more trail – single track. (45)
- Perhaps a bit more single-track in the trails plan – in the “center” forested area? “5 stars” for the “diversity” of types of trails – good job! (46)
- Single track trails should be pedestrian only. (48)
- Although regional parks policy up ‘til now, in other, older parks may allow dogs, that is not a valid reason to allow dogs, in newly acquired, newly developed open space. Please preserve this space for wild animals and birds. Do not allow dogs. (49)
- Not sure about equestrian and bicyclists needs – pedestrians needs need work. For hikers the trails certainly need improvement as far as setting priorities. Priority 1 should be trail establishment and marked. (51)
- Please have bike racks at all trailheads parking areas and pedestrian access points. (54)
- Wonderful. (55)
- Smooth out the trails. Put in a couple benches. (56)

Item 2

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Does the proposed trail system provide adequate access to a variety of destinations, habitats, views, and terrain?*

- I fear that the turtles, bobcats, foxes and other wildlife will suffer. (1)
- Hope you keep limited grazing here. (2)
- Yes, but perhaps reconfigure trails so they don’t destroy the landmark of Taylor Mountain as a backdrop to Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park, and travelers on Highway 101. It’s a beautiful mountain! Currently, the track bisects the open area and creates a visible scar. Great hiking and wonderful vistas can be achieved without destroying this iconic element of our region. (6)
- Well thought out – I appreciate your efforts. (7)
- Concerned with grass/fire management. (14)
- Has any study been done on access from Mt. Taylor Drive? From the maps it looks like a natural access, use the Bennett Valley school property to create parking and begin a road that goes up over the top for fire and rescue access as well as equestrian for trailers and vehicles. (15)
- Great. (18)
- Adequate access without Panorama Drive – way and parking. (20)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit B
June 29, 2011

- Greater emphasis on reserve should be considered. (21)
- This is the wrong questions. Too much access. (22)
- The trail stacked loop system looks great! I can't wait to get my poles and start hiking! (26)
- Yes – it seems to! (28)
- What? No tennis courts? Concert venues? Any provision for star gazing? Besides overnight camping? (30)
- Wooden walkways seem very unnatural for this big park! (31)
- Yes – it seems so... (32)
- I like the stacked loop concept. Will they have mile/time markers? (36)
- I like the stacking – should be able to get away from the masses. (37)
- Could push out trail into far eastern and far southern park. (38)
- There needs to be a trail to access the only hounds tongue flower location and call it the Howard Moes Memorial Trail. (43)
- I love the “stacked loop concept” and use of entire property. Thank you for listening and working with all of the trail groups. (44)
- Yes – it appears that way. (46)
- Well done! (49)
- I love the stacked loops concept as well as the perimeter loop. (50)
- Yes – seems so. (51)
- Big loop the best. (52)
- Looks really great with lots of trails and good variety of terrain. (54)
- I can't wait to explore this mountain. (55)
- Bird and animal habitat. Have plants, herbs, flowers – indicate on trail map. (56)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit C: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Access Points/Trailheads Category

Item 1

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you agree with the locations and number of access points proposed?*

- I would forget about the Panorama Drive access. (2)
- Seems excessive, but probably necessary for the size of this property. (6)
- I think fewer access points might work better. Only two should be parking. (7)
- Giving high priority to #1 is excellent. (8)
- 5 would be good. Eliminate Panoramic. (10)
- No Panorama access. (11)
- Pedestrian access at Petaluma Hill Road is problematic. (13)
- Stay off Holland Drive – it is an absurd idea to send traffic through that neighborhood! (15)
- No, except #6, Panoramic Drive. (16)
- Yes, except for auto access at #6. (17)
- Strongly against Panorama entrance. (20)
- No, on all except Panoramic – suggest fire have access and rangers – gated walk through only for pedestrians. (21)
- No access except off of Petaluma Hill Road. (22)
- Panorama Drive is not a public street. The only reason to use the road is to go to owners' residences. (28)
- The Panorama Drive access will increase traffic and parking in Holland Heights which cannot handle it safely. (29)
- Too many access points (not necessary) – Too many problems for the residents of Holland Heights due to narrow and dangerous roads. (31)
- I really need time to read more and study them before I can answer. (32)
- Access should be restricted to main public areas – not neighborhood dead end roads. (34)
- Good to spread them out. (37)
- Panorama access is critical. (39)
- No – there should not be access from Panorama Drive. If you look at your minutes from the beginning it was promised it wouldn't be an access. (40)
- The attention to providing non-vehicular access is good. (41)
- Water and toilet facilities at Petaluma Hill Road and future Farmers Lane access. (42)
- Limit access at Panoramic Drive. (43)

- Understand neighbor concerns at Panorama – contact Jonathan Glass at LandPaths for ideas/brainstorming about Willow Creek neighbors on Coleman Valley Road. (44)
- The access point at Kawanis Terrace is noted as “pedestrian” – but, hopefully, bicycles would be allowed as well. (46)
- Primary access points at this time seem to be Petaluma Hill Road and Kawana Springs. Speed on Petaluma Hill Road should be reduced in area. Public opposition to Panorama and Linwood may be an issue. (48)
- Leave the Panorama folks alone. Opening a parking lot at Panorama would make it a destination thus more traffic in a neighborhood. By the way, I don’t live there.
- For horse trailers, Petaluma Hill Road access should be adequate; for hikers and bikers, Linwood Avenue and Panorama access should be included. (53)
- Number and location seems okay for my needs. (54)
- I like the pathway in my backyard “sort of speaking.”

Item 2

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Is the public access proposed adequate/appropriate to accommodate all types of visitors, including users who are disabled, or less physically able, users of all age groups, and users arriving in cars or bikes, as pedestrians, or by public transit?*

- There was an encampment near the bath house in summer of 2010 – police came – there was a BBQ (gas) being used. (1)
- Education is important for the future. (5)
- Don’t know. (10)
- Even excluding Panorama. (11)
- Yes – mostly. Pedestrian access at Petaluma Hill Road is problematic. (13)
- Concern with combined use of pedestrian, bike and equestrian. (14)
- The parking lots have too much landscaping. Where are the bus only and the truck/trailer parking spaces in addition to regular vehicles? (15)
- **Is** a limited fashion currently. Greater access within the lower loop trails. (21)
- Wrong question – overly accessible. (22)
- Not applicable. (28)
- I haven’t seen the cyclist route per se. (32)
- In some ways too much access. Runs a real risk of overuse/environment damage. (37)
- Pedestrian/bike access bridge over Colgan Creek from Kawana Springs Road. (42)
- I don’t know yet. (43)
- It appears so. The access point at Kawanis Terrace is noted as “pedestrian” – but, hopefully, bicycles would be allowed as well. (46)

- Unless Petaluma Hill is improved, that will be point for accidents. (51)
- The present access point (interim parking area) is very convenient for cyclists from central Santa Rosa. Would be much better than Petaluma Hill Road. (54)
- Great plan – sounds like it includes everyone. (55)

Item 3

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Is adequate parking provided?*

- Not sure. (2)
- Not clear. (3)
- Not sure. (10)
- Make sure main lots are large enough. (11)
- The parking lots have too much landscaping. Where are the bus only and the truck/trailer parking spaces in addition to regular vehicles? (15)
- Not sure. (18)
- Delete parking at Panorama. (20)
- Yes, except no parking from Panoramic. (21)
- Put parking off Petaluma Hill Road only. (22)
- Not sure if adequate parking is provided. Petaluma Hill Road access could be very popular. May not be enough parking. (27)
- Not clear where, and how many spaces. (28)
- Don't have any idea. (30)
- Not sure yet. (32)
- No – Panorama/Linwood?
- Don't know. (37)
- Possibly too much parking! (41)
- Not enough parking at Petaluma Hill (especially for equestrian staging area). (42)
- It looks like it. (43)
- Make sure enough area for horse trailers at Matteri – e-mail me: alphamare@peoplepc.com. (44)
- Yes – it seems so. (46)
- I think lots seem small on Petaluma Hill Road and may cause users to park along road creating traffic issues. (48)
- The Petaluma Hill Road access might need more spots, if possible. (50)
- Not sure. (51)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit C
June 29, 2011

- Currently the interim parking lot serves adequate; in the future we may need more parking. I'm not sure how many parking spots are planned for the Petaluma Hill Road entrance? (53)
- I don't have a car, but seems okay. (54)
- I hope parking is adequate – there's going to be slow seasons – fall, winter, spring. (55)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit D: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Kawana Springs Area (Historic Resort) Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type and level of intensity of improvements shown in the plan and sketches for the historic resort area?*

- I think it will be a sad day when they begin the development of the area! (1)
- Most – don't necessarily agree with the bed and breakfast idea. (2)
- Should limit buildings. No businesses like B&B/hotel. (3)
- Please no B&B. (5)
- Somewhat – I wonder if B&B would be revenue generate? Maybe affiliate with international hostels! (6)
- Skip the B&B but otherwise excellent. (7)
- It looks excellent. (8)
- Not supportive of B&B. (13)
- Yes – bath house. No – bed & breakfast. (14)
- Yes – it looks lovely, but no – not now – 10 years! Seems like a very future plan, really not necessary to develop within the next 10 years. (15)
- This is really lovely! I like the bed and breakfast! (18)
- Camping is a concern re: fire protection. This is a very dry area. (19)
- A wildlife center both for rescue and education – similar to Lindsey Wildlife Museum or Wild Care in San Rafael. (21)
- Too much. (22)
- Keep it to a minimum. (27)
- Like to see more open space and fewer constructed facilities. (28)
- Sell Kawana fizzy water. Love the B&B. Keep a good record of what you're destroying of historic nature. Or better yet, bottle the water off the Hill Springs that feed the "life estate." \$ (30)
- Have you done a historic study? The proposed future plans do not appear to follow the necessary historic element. Have you done an EIR? (31)
- The concept of pressuring its historical perspective is good.
- Bed and breakfast, why? Who, and where does profit go?
- Will a percent of proceeds go toward improvements/maintenance to park (from B&B and parties)? (36)
- B&B is not going to fly. (37)
- Bed and breakfast – if developed, big chunk of revenue should go to support park; but, should not be too expensive or exclusive – maybe a lottery reservation system, like Yosemite Trail camps. (39)
- It does not follow the original plan. (40)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit D
June 29, 2011

- Overall good, but the B&B is not appropriate. Maybe a walk-in hostel facility, but not a commercial operation. (41)
- Lovely, but I don't think I'll live to see it! Ha! (42)
- No bed and breakfast. Rebuild the old stall which was in the guest house that burned down. (43)
- This site provides a unique opportunity unlike anything else in our other regional parks with this type of usable historical buildings. (44)
- Not my priority, but seems okay. (46)
- The development plans seem to be excessive and should be scaled back to more modest level (B&B could be overnight lodging for edu/researchers or café). (48)
- Nice gathering area in itself. Tasteful landscape and building architecture. I appreciate the historic and cultural space. (49)
- The buildings and grounds design look lovely. I love the idea of a B&B, in keeping with the historical site, and like many other state and national parks that have lodging (i.e. West Pt. Inn on Mt. Tam, Yosemite, etc.). (50)
- Remove the resort. (51)
- Access from Kawana Springs makes sense. (52)
- Not sure about the B&B plan. Visitors center and demonstration garden a good idea. (53)
- Visitor center and B&B seem too costly and not really needed to enjoy this park. Should be a low priority. (54)
- Sounds good. (55)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit E: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Barn Area Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type and level of intensity of improvements shown on the plan and sketches for the Barn area?*

- Outdoor education is important for this area. (2)
- Seems like good use. (6)
- Wonderful spot for nature talks, events. NO CARS. (7)
- It looks like a wonderful location for camping. I wondered whether water is available at the campsite. (8)
- Sounded interesting. (9)
- No – limited Access only. (11)
- It looks good except seems very little use is anticipated with so few parking spaces and limited camping sites. (15)
- Camping has never been mentioned and should not be included. (20)
- Yes – except camping access should be only from lower parking areas and no fires. (21)
- Too much access. (22)
- Why only group camping? I don't understand the need for a bed and breakfast. (25)
- Minimize. Development is inconsistent with preservation. (27)
- Less structure. (28)
- Just make sure George Bath's illegally built barn is safe and adheres to Sonoma County standards. Fire is a real danger up there. (29)
- One hell of an ugly barn but it's sturdy. Be great in a rain, hail, or snow storm. (30)
- Where will large "special" groups park if this is using any entrance from Holland Heights? (31)
- I need to see more detail. (32)
- Cars should not be allowed access. (34)
- Camping only for designed groups, such as students for educational uses...not open to everyone? Wish it were. (35)
- Will barn be accessible to hikers? How will hikers know when a group is using camping area? Can persons other than Boy Scouts organization rent group camping? (36)
- Nice area. (37)
- Seems a bit much. (38)
- There should not be any camping or barbeques in this area. (40)
- Yes – but I have concerns about the group camping facility and the impact that would have. (41)
- Water and toilet facilities (? access ?). (42)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit E
June 29, 2011

- I haven't seen any design for the barn utilization. (43)
- Picnic tables, shade?, hitch rails, interpretive panels. (44)
- Not my priority – okay by me. (46)
- I have concerns about overnight camping and req'd facilities (showers, restrooms, cooking) and size of groups (traffic, noise). Fire is also a concern. (48)
- Haven't seen the area spending \$ on barn or other improvements should be very low priority. (54)
- Work on funding – all areas. (56)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit F: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Petaluma Hill Road Trailhead Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you generally agree with the design character, location, type and level of intensity of improvements shown on the plan and sketches for the trailhead area adjacent to Petaluma Hill Road?*

- It resembles a rest stop. (1)
- The traffic on Petaluma Rd is going around 55 miles per hour. There would need to be turn lanes. Please don't put a crosswalk as so many people have been seriously hurt in crosswalks. (2)
- Should not look so much like a rest stop off the road. (3)
- Traffic would need mitigation of turning lanes. It doesn't seem (from drawings) to accommodate very many vehicles. (6)
- Seems like a great spot for access and trailhead but major concern on safety – PHR is dangerous. (7)
- More parking. (10)
- No - Pedestrian access – turn lane for cars. (13)
- Must have a turn lane in for sure. NO left turn out of trailhead parking lots onto Pet Hill Rd. (15)
- Because of speed of drivers on Petaluma Hill Rd., please provide lane to slow down and then enter/exit the parking lot. (18)
- Big concern about safety due to speed of traffic on Pet. Hill Road. (19)
- Traffic study re: turn ins off busy road. (20)
- S. R. City has talked about traffic changes needed along Petaluma Hill Road. (21)
- That is where access belongs. (22)
- Minimize! (27)
- Traffic access problems **insurmountable**. (28)
- Yes – Blood Alley – Great way to handle overpopulation, or at least a good start. (30)
- Yes – Not enough parking. (31)
- As long as it does not pose a safety problem. (32)
- Will there be restroom facilities? Who will be cleaning up picnic/garbage area? Will there be a fee for access? (36)
- Seems like too little parking for what will be a major access point. Also concerned about traffic flow on PHR. (Turn in). (37)
- Need at least flashing lights, if not a stop light, on Petaluma Hill Rd here; if possible, a bus stop here would be great. (39)
- Yes – But this is an important access point. However, it should be non-vehicular w/poss. exception of horse trailers. Also lose the picnic thing. It is imperative that crosswalks and controlled intersections supporting non-vehicular access be installed at Petaluma Hill Road and Shyden Lane

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit F
June 29, 2011

(add crosswalks) and the entrance to the access area. Also – have a horse boarding facility there! Horses are being abandoned because they are too expensive. A subsidized livestock facility would reduce horse abandonments. It would also provide increased opportunity for public use on horseback (rent a horse from the stable). Also the horse and/or cow manure could be used for BIOGAS and/or COMPOST generation much closer to SR and RP. Now we need to go out to the **Meecham** dump – a long automobile trip for a load. Use the existing “poop points” in a new 21st century sort of way. (41)

- 1) Larger area for equestrian parking/staging area, 2) Traffic light, 3) Signage to other parking areas for overflow. (42)
- Fantastic parking lot design! Thank you! Suggest “no parking signs” on Petaluma Hill Rd. for safety by Public Works Dept. Impossible to park off pavement - would be blocking bike lanes. (44)
- Screen from traffic – berm, plantings – otherwise it will be unattractive for picnicking. Also – rethink concrete pads. (45)
- Looks like a fine plan – despite popular comments about the “danger” of Pet. Hill Rd. (46)
- Parking probably not adequate. (48)
- Hazardous area. (51)
- Could be difficult access due to high traffic traveling at high speeds. (54)

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit G: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Linwood Trailhead Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you generally agree with the location and level of intensity of improvements shown on the site plan for the potential trailhead area at the end of Linwood?*

- That neighborhood will lose their quiet charm. (1)
- Not that familiar with it. (2)
- Access? (3)
- Can't say. (6)
- I am no familiar with this access, but it seems like a good idea to have a limited-use access for neighbors. (8)
- Looks great but plan for more parking market it and get people out there using it; collect fees ONLY for special uses such as weddings and camping or group education or group walks, runs, biking events. (15)
- This is great! (18)
- Linwood should be at greater access both for parking, equestrian and bicycles. (21)
- Too much, shouldn't be open. (22)
- Unsure (28)
- Don't remember them – seems difficult access through narrow high density streets. (30)
- (Unknown area). (31)
- I can envision a link between the proposed Greenway extension and pedestrians and cyclists but there is so much traffic on Farmers Lane as far as cars that it seems it would only add to it. (32)
- Is it a narrow road? (34)
- Too close to neighborhood. (37)
- Not enough information to evaluate (no drawing). (39)
- Not familiar with area so it is difficult to assess that. (41)
- I haven't seen enough information. (43)
- Limited parking – but easy access for peds/bikes/and maybe horses? (46)
- I think this needs further conversation/meetings with area residents. (48)
- Not sure. (51)
- Yes, generally agree with location. (52)
- This should be for hikers and bikers only, not for horse trailers. (53)
- I'll enter here usually as I live closest to it. **Truck potable water by week at trail likely turn around 2 insulated 25 gallon containers. (56)**

RESULTS OF WORKSHOP NO. 3 – PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

Exhibit H: Comments/Suggestions Received in the Panorama Drive Trailhead Category

Comments/suggestions received following the question: *Do you generally agree with the location and level of intensity of improvements shown on the site plan for the potential trailhead area adjacent to Panorama Drive?*

- Don't know about it. (1)
- I do not live anywhere near the park but am very familiar with trouble trailhead parking. I have lived here for many years and have driven the roads around Panorama. I do not agree with a trailhead here unless it is a turnstyle for the neighborhood. (2)
- Very limited access is appropriate. (7)
- I am not familiar with this access point. (8)
- I live in a nearby neighborhood and would like to be able to hike or walk on to the property. (9)
- This is a cul-de-sac and is not suitable for a parking lot or access of any kind. The neighborhood would certainly suffer due to increased traffic. The streets are in bad shape and cannot handle more cars. (10)
- Access not defined. (14)
- I grew up on Holland Drive. It is a terrible idea to invade the personal space of so many families who have chosen to live a rural lifestyle. That road is barely passable for two cars in many places and should be ABANDONED as an access. (15)
- No!! Road is too dangerous. Also one-way on several roads. Need road repair. Lots of dangerous curves. I almost got hit by cars walking around the hill. (16)
- Holland Drive is too narrow and twisty for heavy traffic. (17)
- Wonderful. Hope all can be brought on board...For those of us not living up there...we would like access. (18)
- No parking, no camping or fire pits, walk-in only. (20)
- Suggest – building residence for full time Ranger to live in near barn – Gated pedestrian access only from Panorama with no parking. (21)
- Too much. Shouldn't be open. (22)
- Would love to have this access. (24)
- Safety, road conditions, fire, etc. does NOT make this feasible. (28)
- Jeff asked me to note the meeting when Open Space voted to purchase the Haas property, it was written in the minutes and promised Dr. Van Giesen's and my request that Panorama is not used as an access. (29)
- Sock it to 'em, they ARE whiners! (30)
- Where will we park? Why would you promote BBQ's (a major fire hazard) as an area-of-interest next o the "potential" Panorama entrance? (31)

Results of Workshop No. 3 – Public Input Survey
Exhibit H
June 29, 2011

- I need to see a map where I can really understand what other road leads to Panorama. I like the idea of access from Panorama Road (I live in the Vista del Lago Community). (32)
- Any neighborhood parking restricts the access of emergency vehicles. (34)
- Do you have full permission of people living in this area - they seem to be against access in this area. (36)
- A good access point for that part of park. Still worry about potential heavy use impact. (37)
- Panorama is critical. Could use info kiosk on Ranger Creek Fault. (38)
- Not enough information to evaluate (no drawings). (39)
- This should not be an access to Panorama Drive. Please review the early minutes for the reasons. (40)
- Not familiar with area so it is difficult to assess that. (41)
- Limit access. (43)
- Need to continue to mitigate with neighbors to make sure to limit traffic and parking and access. Adequate signage to other access points and parking. Suggest “No access” signs. (44)
- To avoid conflicts & legal issues with neighbors – make it walk/bike in accessible and emergency access only for authorized vehicles. (46)
- I think this needs further conversations/meetings with area residents. (48)
- Yes – [To location only]. (52)
- This should be for hikers and bikers only, but not for horse trailers. (53)
- Not at all sure if this is worth the trouble as it seems very unpopular with neighbors. (54)
- I’ve walked down Panorama and felt unwanted big time. Please put a small gate there. (55)
- “Average” halfway point. (56)